

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, February 22, 1980

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of His might.—Ephesians 6: 10.*

O God, we offer to You our hearts full of thanksgiving for Your love that You express day by day. Though we strive to do Your will, we miss the mark and fall short of Your glory, though we long for Your kingdom and seek the fulfillment of Your promises, we are still weak and uncertain. Grant to us, O Lord, Your heavenly power in our lives, that we will be strong in our faith and obedient to Your word. Enable all Your people to sense the joy that we can know when sustained by Your presence and blessed by Your peace. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 282, nays 10, answered "present" 2, not voting 139, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]  
YEAS—282

Akaka	Beard, Tenn.	Burgener
Albosta	Bedell	Burlison
Alexander	Bellenson	Burton, John
Anderson,	Benjamin	Burton, Phillip
Calif.	Bennett	Butler
Andrews, N.C.	Bereuter	Byron
Annunzio	Bethune	Campbell
Anthony	Bevill	Carter
Applegate	Bingham	Cavanaugh
Archer	Boggs	Cheney
Ashbrook	Bolling	Clay
Aspin	Boner	Clinger
Atkinson	Bonior	Coleman
AuCoin	Bonker	Collins, Tex.
Badham	Bouquard	Conable
Bafalls	Bowen	Conte
Balley	Brademas	Conyers
Baldus	Brinkley	Corcoran
Barnes	Brooks	Coughlin
Bauman	Broomfield	Courter
Beard, R.I.	Buchanan	D'Amours

Daniel, Dan	Jones, Tenn.	Regula	Dellums	Jenkins	Quillen
Daniel, R. W.	Kastenmeier	Rhodes	Derrick	Johnson, Calif.	Rangel
Danielson	Kelly	Rinaldo	Devine	Johnson, Colo.	Reuss
Dannemeyer	Kildee	Ritter	Diggs	Jones, Okla.	Richmond
Daschle	Kindness	Roberts	Dingell	Kazen	Rose
de la Garza	Kostmayer	Robinson	Dixon	Kemp	Rodino
Deckard	Kramer	Roe	Dodd	Kogovsek	Rostenkowski
Dicks	LaFalce	Rosenthal	Donnelly	Latta	Rousselot
Dougherty	Lagomarsino	Roth	Dornan	Leach, La.	Runnels
Downey	Leach, Iowa	Roybal	Duncan, Oreg.	Leland	Satterfield
Drinan	Leath, Tex.	Royer	Eckhardt	Lewis	Selberling
Duncan, Tenn.	Lederer	Rudd	Edwards, Ala.	Lungren	Shuster
Early	Lee	Russo	Edwards, Okla.	McClory	Simon
Edgar	Lehman	Sabo	Erdahl	McCloskey	Skelton
Edwards, Calif.	Lent	Santini	Ferraro	McCormack	Spellman
Emery	Levitus	Sawyer	Filippo	McEwen	Staggers
English	Livingston	Scheuer	Ford, Mich.	McKinney	Stangeland
Erlenborn	Loeffler	Schulze	Fountain	Maguire	Stenholm
Ertel	Long, La.	Sebelius	Frenzel	Marlenee	Stewart
Evans, Del.	Long, Md.	Sensenbrenner	Frost	Mathis	Stockman
Evans, Ga.	Lott	Shannon	Gialmo	Mattox	Stump
Evans, Ind.	Lowry	Sharp	Grassley	Mazzoli	Symms
Fary	Lujan	Shelby	Guarini	Moakley	Thomas
Fascell	Luken	Shumway	Gudger	Moffett	Treen
Fazio	Lundine	Slack	Hagedorn	Moore	Vander Jagt
Fenwick	McDade	Smith, Iowa	Hall, Ohio	Moorhead,	Waxman
Findley	McDonald	Smith, Nebr.	Hammer-	Calif.	Weaver
Fish	McHugh	Snowe	schmidt	Moorhead, Pa.	Weiss
Fisher	McKay	Snyder	Hanley	Murphy, Ill.	White
Fithlian	Madigan	Solaz	Hansen	Myers, Pa.	Williams, Ohio
Florio	Markey	Solomon	Harkin	Nelson	Winn
Foley	Marks	Spence	Harsha	Nolan	Wirth
Ford, Tenn.	Marriott	St Germain	Heckler	Oakar	Wolf
Fowler	Martini	Stack	Holland	Pashayan	Wylder
Fuqua	Matsui	Stanton	Hollenbeck	Pepper	Young, Alaska
Garcia	Mavroules	Stark	Holtzman	Pickle	Zerferetti
Gaydos	Mica	Steed	Hutto	Pursell	
Gephardt	Michel	Stokes	Jeffords	Quayle	
Gibbons	Mikulski	Stratton			
Gilman	Miller, Calif.	Studds			
Ginn	Miller, Ohio	Swift			
Glickman	Mineta	Synar			
Goldwater	Minish	Tauke			
Gonzalez	Mitchell, N.Y.	Taylor			
Gore	Mollohan	Thompson			
Gradison	Montgomery	Traxler			
Gramm	Mottl	Tribble			
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Udall			
Green	Murphy, Pa.	Ullman			
Grisham	Murtha	Van Deerlin			
Guyer	Myers, Ind.	Vank			
Hall, Tex.	Natcher	Vento			
Hamilton	Nedzi	Volkmer			
Hance	Nichols	Walgren			
Harris	Nowak	Wampler			
Hawkins	O'Brien	Watkins			
Hefner	Oberstar	Whitehurst			
Heftel	Obey	Whitley			
Hightower	Ottinger	Whittaker			
Hill	Panetta	Whitten			
Hillis	Patten	Williams, Mont.			
Hinshaw	Patterson	Wilson, C. H.			
Holt	Paul	Wilson, Tex.			
Hopkins	Pease	Wolpe			
Horton	Perkins	Wright			
Howard	Petri	Wyatt			
Hubbard	Peyster	Wyllie			
Huckaby	Porter	Yates			
Hughes	Preyer	Yatron			
Hyde	Price	Young, Fla.			
Ichord	Pritchard	Young, Mo.			
Ireland	Rahall	Zablocki			
Jeffries	Rallsback				
Jenrette	Ratchford				
Jones, N.C.					

NAYS—10

Derwinski	Jacobs	Walker
Dickinson	Lloyd	Wilson, Bob
Forsythe	Mitchell, Md.	
Goodling	Schroeder	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gingrich

NOT VOTING—139

Abdnor	Boland	Clausen
Addabbo	Breaux	Cleveland
Ambro	Brodhead	Coelho
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Calif.	Collins, Ill.
Andrews,	Brown, Ohio	Corman
N. Dak.	Broyhill	Cotter
Ashley	Carney	Crane, Daniel
Barnard	Carr	Crane, Phillip
Biaggi	Chappell	Davis, Mich.
Blanchard	Chisholm	Davis, S.C.

Dellums	Jenkins	Quillen
Derrick	Johnson, Calif.	Rangel
Devine	Johnson, Colo.	Reuss
Diggs	Jones, Okla.	Richmond
Dingell	Kazen	Rose
Dixon	Kemp	Rodino
Dodd	Kogovsek	Rostenkowski
Donnelly	Latta	Rousselot
Dornan	Leach, La.	Runnels
Duncan, Oreg.	Leland	Satterfield
Eckhardt	Lewis	Selberling
Edwards, Ala.	Lungren	Shuster
Edwards, Okla.	McClory	Simon
Erdahl	McCloskey	Skelton
Ferraro	McCormack	Spellman
Filippo	McEwen	Staggers
Ford, Mich.	McKinney	Stangeland
Fountain	Maguire	Stenholm
Frenzel	Marlenee	Stewart
Frost	Mathis	Stockman
Gialmo	Mattox	Stump
Grassley	Mazzoli	Symms
Guarini	Moakley	Thomas
Gudger	Moffett	Treen
Hagedorn	Moore	Vander Jagt
Hall, Ohio	Moorhead,	Waxman
Hammer-	Calif.	Weaver
schmidt	Moorhead, Pa.	Weiss
Hanley	Murphy, Ill.	White
Hansen	Myers, Pa.	Williams, Ohio
Harkin	Nelson	Winn
Harsha	Nolan	Wirth
Heckler	Oakar	Wolf
Holland	Pashayan	Wylder
Hollenbeck	Pepper	Young, Alaska
Holtzman	Pickle	Zerferetti
Hutto	Pursell	
Jeffords	Quayle	

□ 1110

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6374. An act to authorize the President of the United States to present on behalf of the Congress a specially struck gold medal to Ambassador Kenneth Taylor.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 214. An act for the relief of Rocio Edmondson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1390. An act to promote highway safety, to reduce highway fatalities and injuries, to minimize property damage by encouraging the safe operation and maintenance of commercial motor vehicles, to minimize dangers to the health of operators when operating commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

## THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

(Mr. GUYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I learned with a great deal of sadness that our esteemed friend and former colleague, William McCulloch, passed away this morning. Many of the Members served with Bill. He was my predecessor from the Fourth District of Ohio. After a long and distinguished career as the speaker of the house back in Ohio, he served here 25 years. He was the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, but mostly he will be remembered as a champion of civil rights at a very crucial time in this Nation's history.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete, but I want to ask all of the Members to be thoughtful of Bill's family, his wife Mabel, his daughters Nancy and Anne and the others in their hour of sorrow. I hope that we can all appropriately pay respects, and tributes at a later time to this great American.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members for sharing with me this moment of condolence and respect for Congressman Bill McCulloch, who was truly a rose on the grave of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GUYER), in expressing my deepest regret and sympathy to Bill McCulloch's family. I served with Bill for many years in the House of Representatives. He was a distinguished Member of the House, a very valuable member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and we have missed him since he left. We certainly wish the best of everything to his widow, and she has our sympathy.

Mr. GUYER. We will convey that to the family.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1120

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of serving, the great pleasure of serving under Bill McCulloch as the ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee when I was a freshman Member. I really do not know of any minority Member that had more to do with the furtherance of civil rights. I would say that if Clarence Mitchell, the head of the NAACP, were here today, he would tell my colleagues that all of the Members of Congress, of all of the members of the House Judiciary Committee, Bill McCulloch, working very closely with Emanuel Celler, did more for the cause of civil rights than any other legislator in the House.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the statement just made. That is precisely true. In my opinion—and I worked on every civil rights bill that ever passed the House of Representatives—if it had not been for Bill McCulloch, there would not have been any civil rights legislation. He and another distinguished Member from Ohio, being on the Republican side, the elder Clarence Brown, were absolutely key in the passage of all that legislation starting with the first bill that passed the House in 1956, and going on to the act of 1957 and the major bills down the line.

This country will always owe a major debt to Bill McCulloch.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly agree with everything that has been said. After I was elected to this body in 1968 I came to Washington, as all Congressmen-elect do and Bill McCulloch was the first Republican Member that I called on as the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. This is the committee I wanted to serve on, because of the reputation it had in such fields as civil rights. The example that he set, an example of statesmanship in working with the committee chairman, Emanuel Celler, in vital matters concerning civil rights legislation was a fine lesson for the rest of us who had the honor to serve under him. I wish to convey my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. GUYER. And we will do that.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in expressing not only my profound respect, but my affection for Bill McCulloch. For those who did not serve here at the time, I would like the record to show that Bill McCulloch was a very courtly, very dapper Member of the House. No more civilized, more classically educated man or woman ever served in the House of Representatives. His loss is a profound one, not only to the House of Representatives, but to humanity, which, according to poetry, he was very much involved with and was very much a complete part of.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Bill McCulloch was, indeed, a beloved public servant and a beloved man. Wherever I go in that part of the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio, formerly represented by him, people ask about him constantly. They will ask about him long beyond today. He will be well re-

membered and well respected and well loved for all he did for the people of the United States and the people of our State of Ohio.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to say that the expressions here, speaking of CLARENCE BROWN, of CLARENCE BROWN, JR., the expressions by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FISH), the expressions by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS), are what I was going to say about Bill McCulloch. These are all congressional children who have been referred to and who have been speaking. Truly the McCullochs were great Members of the House of Representatives. The whole family respected the institution of the House. All of them served the people equally well as good congressional families always do.

Though Bill's son is not in this House his daughter has been a great force in the civic, political, and philanthropic life of this city and of her native State.

It is a real sadness to me to miss an old friend, and I love his widow and his family and extend to them my deepest sympathy.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I personally will convey these sentiments to the family, and later an appropriate way will be found for all of us to honor him. I just want to say in closing that he truly is a rose on the grave of Abraham Lincoln, that great American.

#### REPUBLICANS DENY DUE PROCESS TO CONGRESSMAN RICHARD KELLY

(Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RICHARD KELLY and I are a thousand light years apart. His definition of the role of government is almost absolutely opposite to my definition of the role of government. We have not been particular friends.

But what occurred yesterday with reference to his membership in the party I think is of signal danger to every Member of this House. There is something called due process and this House, in its component parts, ought to be the zealous guardians of due process.

What occurred to the Congressman from Florida (Mr. KELLY) yesterday was violative of due process. We do not know anything about the acts that he is alleged to have committed except what we have read in the papers. There has been no indictment. There has been no trial. There has been no finding of guilt.

Had there been a finding of guilt, he has not exhausted his legal remedies.

I think, what the Republican Party did, and the Republican Members did, is

a clear and present danger to all of us in this House and to the Nation.

#### BOB KELLER OF GAO ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to note that on yesterday, Bob Keller, the Deputy Comptroller General of the United States, announced his retirement after 45 years of dedicated service.

Bob has been well and favorably known to the members of the Committee on Appropriations over the years, especially during his service as the General Counsel of GAO beginning in 1958 and from the time he was appointed Deputy Comptroller General in 1969. He is a man of remarkable personal courage and has been a pillar of strength and stability in the financial management community.

Bob has degrees in both law and accounting. He has distinguished himself throughout his career and has been the recipient of the Rockefeller Public Service Award, the National Civil Service League Award and other commendations. Incredibly, he has served under all five Comptrollers General since the General Accounting Office was established by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

The Appropriations Committee has sought Bob Keller's judgment and counsel on innumerable occasions. We will all miss Bob and in behalf of the committee I wish Bob and his wife, Benton, great happiness in their well-deserved retirement.

#### CONGRESSMAN KELLY'S CASE IS LYNCH MOB JUSTICE

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

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, some traditional American values like due process, innocent until proven guilty, and a fair trial apparently have no place in the congressional wing of the Republican Party.

The expulsion of Representative RICHARD KELLY from the Republican Conference before charges have been brought against him violates every tenet of American jurisprudence.

Great Republicans of the past, men like Borah, LaFollette and Theodore Roosevelt must be turning over in their graves.

How sad it is to see a party born in the struggle for individual liberty and human rights yielding to the forces of reaction and political expediency.

The Republicans may have helped themselves in the short run of this election year.

But in the long run they have done themselves and the House a terrible disservice.

History will record this, whatever the eventual disposition of Mr. KELLY's case, as lynch mob justice.

#### TIA LUISA

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 a remarkable woman turned 100 years old. Her name is Luisa Champion Personius—affectionately called "Tia Luisa" by her family and friends. She is my great, great, great aunt.

I have been a very fortunate man, but the real rewards of my life have been in the treasured relationships that have come from knowing and loving people like Tia Luisa. The simple inescapable fact is that she cares and that it shows.

A poem for the occasion was written by Teresa C. Alamia which I would like to share with my colleagues:

"TIA LUISA"—A CHAMPION OF CHAMPIONS  
In 1846 the spirit of war was still alive,  
When at Brazos Santiago the Champions arrived.

From far-away Italy they came seeking success

Alberto, Pedro, Nicolas, Jorge, and one named José

With ambition, religion, and very little gear  
They readily joined forces with Texas pioneers

Boat-builders, merchants, fishermen they became,

Nothing deterred them, winning was part of the game.

As they all married we find Pedro and Felicitas Solís

Raising a large family, taking pride in their breed

Luisa, the 12th child was destined to shine  
For she had sparkle, charisma all in her smile

Incarinate Word Convent's First Graduating Class

Found Luisa, Gold Medal Winner, proud of her task

In 1917 a blessing that came from above,  
Her marriage to Clarence, this was true love

God gave them no Children this was His plan  
She scattered her love to the whole Champion Clan

One hundred years of devoted working and praying

Can be proclaimed by simply saying . . . .

Luisa spent a life time of fathering  
Mothering, sistering and brothering . . . .

Filling the physical and spiritual needs  
of young and old . . . . she planted these seeds

Happy Birthday Tia Luisa, as you celebrate  
The 100th year of your Historic Birthdate  
1880-1980

#### ENOUGH PATIENCE—WE NEED ACTION FOR RELEASE OF AMERICAN HOSTAGES

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I just think it appropriate that the Republican Party take care of its disciplinary problems and the majority party take care of its own.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported our administration's course of patience in dealing with Iran's barbaric kidnaping of our diplomats—but 111 days of captivity is enough.

Patience is indeed a virtue, but excessive patience becomes paralysis.

The public pronouncements concerning the purpose and probable results from the Waldheim Commission's work are totally unacceptable—a further guilt trip for America and adding to our store of national humiliation.

We must stop rewarding the outlaws and start penalizing them.

Perhaps something is going on secretly that we do not know about—but recalling Jimmy Carter's campaign pledges against secret diplomacy I doubt it.

Mr. Carter, you told the world you would turn the screw on Iran a little tighter every day—but the only cries of pain we hear are from our hostages.

Mr. President, please put down the press releases and pick up the screwdriver—enough is enough.

#### WE ARE RIDING AN INFLATION MERRY-GO-ROUND

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, recently we have heard some of the most distressing economic news. Rampaging inflation has hit a new peak. An editorial in our Wisconsin newspaper stated:

We're riding an inflation merry-go-round. And there's a good question whether the Fed or any other governmental body can really stop the carnival.

The pessimistic news from Washington seems to be crushing the will of the American people to fight back, to find solutions to our problems. The editorial went on to say that, "continued deficit spending of Government" is the basic cause of inflation.

I think we all realize that the decisions made here contribute to our unbearable inflation. We cannot survive as a nation with annualized inflation of 19.2 percent. We will financially wipe out our middle class, our senior citizens, and people on fixed incomes.

It is not Government's function to run the lives of its people, but just the opposite. Fewer programs are required, not more. That will reduce spending and stem the tide of inflation.

### IS IT AN "ECONOMIC CRIME" TO SELL FOR PROFIT?

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in the Soviet Union, you can be jailed or executed for committing an "economic crime." Under this heading come such antisocial offenses as selling a good or service to a willing buyer for profit.

Considering the tyranny in Iran, I was not surprised to see a photo in the papers recently of a small businessman being lashed in Tehran by revolutionary guardsmen. His crime was "profiteering." He made the mistake that Chrysler avoided—making a profit by serving the consumer.

The economic climate in the United States, created by the laws written by Congress in principle, may not be much different. A young service station owner in Boston was arrested by the Federal energy police for selling gasoline to customers at a price higher than the DOE allows. Customers were glad to pay the price, because this station owner stayed open nights and weekends in a tough neighborhood, but this cut no ice with DOE bureaucrats. They would rather have no gasoline offered for sale, than a market price set voluntarily in transactions between willing buyer and seller.

This service station owner, Mr. Glenn Heller, was just sentenced to 30 days in jail and \$9,450 fine. Can we, as Representatives in a free country, be proud of this example of justice? Is this part of the American dream? I certainly hope not.

### THE ACTION OF THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

(Mrs. FENWICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some very interesting remarks from the other side of the aisle this morning. One of them was that the concern of the Republican Party is somehow politically motivated, and that this will somehow benefit one party rather than another in the election.

What is being said when we hear these words? It is that the American people understand better than some Members of this House how a tragedy such as that which has fallen on this House must be regarded. They know what we are trying to do, even if you do not. We are trying to express that this House is the temple of the people, as is written on the doorways downstairs. "We have no oracle but our Constitution; no temple but our Capitol"—that is inscribed over our doors.

Standards must be on a higher level here than those we have all had to accept from time to time. Nobody can cast stones, and nobody is judging guilt or innocence. That is not our object; we are not judging guilt or innocence.

Ethical conduct is what must be judged, and that is what one tries to do. It should not be considered otherwise. The motives here are not political. This has nothing to do with politics. We must get that out of our thinking. The people are asking for something more.

### THE ACTION OF THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the reports of the activities of the House Republican Conference yesterday were very sketchy. It was a closed conference, and I am certainly under no burden to try to explain the rationale behind the deliberations of the conference, or what resulted in the form of action by our friend from Florida (Mr. KELLY).

I can speak only for myself in seconding the sentiments voiced by Mrs. FENWICK, and in explaining why I encouraged Congressman KELLY to act as he did and why I would have supported a resolution to suspend his party privileges had he not taken that step.

It was not to find guilt or innocence at all. It was rather to establish a precedent which has applied to policemen, school teachers, and others, a course which I think is pretty well throughout the country. If a policeman or a school teacher is put under a heavy cloud of allegation, he or she is suspended from their responsibilities. They are not suspended from pay, but suspended from responsibilities until such time as the allegations are satisfactorily disposed of. I think this is a proper responsibility of party leadership.

### THE ACTION OF THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I was surprised, Mr. Speaker, when I heard two of my Democratic colleagues this morning make reference to an act of the Republican Conference on yesterday relating to Mr. KELLY, because I am not sure they read what was the issue. The action of the conference proposed that Mr. KELLY be suspended, not that he be expelled.

There is a significant philosophical difference between these two approaches. We have not judged anybody's guilt. We have just established a new procedure, a precedent for the House, by saying that criminal charges will be adjudicated in a court with respect to guilt or innocence, entailing due process of law at every stage of the proceedings. But, separate and apart from the issue of criminality, there is an ethical standard which the American people have a right to expect from people who are privileged to serve in this House. This ethical issue is separate and apart from anything having to do with the criminal charge.

When it is alleged on good evidence that a Member of the House is involved in criminal activity, that Member should voluntarily suspend himself from the conference pending the adjudication of whether or not the charges are correct. The Republican Party has taken this action as a reflection of this ethical standard and it is entirely appropriate to suggest to the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House that they can demonstrate that they too recognize the existence of this ethical standard.

Policeman, bank tellers, and teachers are routinely suspended pending the adjudication of criminal proceedings. It is not unreasonable that House Members be subject to the same standard.

□ 1140

### THE REPUBLICAN PARTY DOES NOT JUDGE PEOPLE FOR THEIR IDEAS BUT IT DOES FOR THEIR CONDUCT

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am inclined to respond a little bit to what was said on the other side. I think the American people, since you have injected politics, got a pretty good example of the politics of this body.

I look upon myself—I do not say it favorably—as probably considered one of the worst renegades in the Republican Party. I say what I think. I criticize my party. I have not been proud of my party many times, or even people in the White House. As yet, in 22 years, I have not had any Republican leader tell me to shut up or that what I was saying was wrong and that I should not say it. The Republican Party does not move on people who have ideas and express them. We do when it comes to conduct.

What happened on the other side of the aisle? I sat here when two of my friends, Albert Watson and John Bell Williams were stripped of their seniority, not for a crime, not for their conduct, but for what they thought philosophically in the opposition they had to the Democratic Party of a candidate for their party, to weed out their differences.

We do not judge people for their ideas, but we do for their conduct. On the other side I am inclined to think they quite often judge them for their ideas, but not their conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

### SPECIAL CENTRAL AMERICAN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1979

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 581 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 581

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, sec-

tion 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6081) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance in support of peaceful and democratic processes of development in Central America, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any need to debate this resolution. It makes in order the bill that deals with aid to Nicaragua and some other countries. I think everybody knows what is in it. It is an open rule. It provides for normal debate. All it does besides that is to waive a point of order under the Budget Act which I do not believe is in controversy.

I have a couple of speakers who want to speak on the question of the secret session, and I will put them on at the appropriate point. In the meantime, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I may require some time. I have a number of requests for speakers on this side, so for Members who are trying to plan their morning, we will probably take the entire time on the rule. We will probably have a vote on the rule. We will probably have a vote on going into the committee. We will probably have a lot of discussion here, so if anyone wants to leave and not listen to me, they might as well leave and go to their offices and get their work done, because I am going to speak. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) he may leave too, and I will be glad to protect his interests while he is gone.

Mr. Speaker, no debate on the issue of aid to Nicaragua would be complete without an examination of precisely what has been said by the leaders of that country since the Sandinista guerrillas took over on July 19. I have repeatedly and consistently heard the apologists for the Government of Nicaragua in this House and elsewhere ask us not to look at what they are saying but what they have done and to ignore our preconceived notions about the new leaders of that government and their rhetoric before we vote to provide aid to that nation. That is sound advice and we ought

to take that direction. That is what I intend to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am such a brilliant orator and I am so able to persuade the Members of the House that I would request that there be a modicum of order so that my pearls of wisdom are not lost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is not in order. The gentleman from Maryland is entitled to the attention of the House. Will those Members desiring to converse please leave the Chamber.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Panama Canal Subcommittee, and the ranking member of that subcommittee, I have for the last 2 years had a keen interest in the affairs of Central America because of the bearing of events in that area on the jurisdiction of my subcommittee and the operation of the canal. Concomitant with that interest I have made it a habit to read each day the State Department summaries and publications of all of the major news events in Central America, particularly as they pertain to Nicaragua.

Some of you will recall that at the time we debated the implementation legislation that carried out the terms of the Panama Canal Treaty, we discussed in a secret session, and to some degree openly, the involvement of Panama and Cuba at that time in overthrowing the existing Government of Anastasio Somoza. In reading those dispatches from the controlled media in Nicaragua, from that time until the present I think that we can find undeniable proof that any aid or money that we give to the current Government of Nicaragua in an effort to keep them from turning communistic will fail because they already have a Communist government and they are dominated by Communists trained in Cuba.

First, I think the House ought to know a little bit about the system that exists in that Government at this time since we are going to have to vote on whether to finance this Government's operation and the so-called private sector that remains in that unfortunate country.

There is a five-man junta that serves at the pleasure of the Sandinista National Liberation Front. The true power lies with a Sandinista directorate that actually controls the Government. This Sandinista National Liberation Front is composed of Cuban-trained guerrillas and self-styled Marxists. It has full representation throughout all the agencies of the Government; the ministers and members of that military directorate hold key positions in every ministry. The powerless junta itself is composed of some private sector figures, also members from the Sandinista directorate, including Daniel Ortega, who is a leader of the Sandinista guerrilla forces; Moises Hassan Morales, a Marxist university professor who also participated in the guerrilla war; Sergio Ramirez Mercado, a leftist lawyer; and Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, the widow of a noted newspaper owner and opponent to Somoza

who was killed last year and whose death was probably one of the ultimate factors in the eventual overthrow of Somoza.

Lastly, the fifth member of the junta is Alfonso Robelo Callejas whom I had the honor to meet last weekend when I was in Managua, an industrialist who began political activity shortly after newspaperman Chamorro's death—and, I might say, an interesting gentleman who, quite obviously wields little power in the Government. He and Senora Chamorro, in fact are figureheads so that the Government can have a somewhat moderate face.

The real power, the people with the guns, are the Sandinistas. Their actions since July 19 show that they have pushed this country hard to the left into the Soviet orbit, into the Cuban orbit under Fidel Castro and they have taken Castro and Cuba as their role model.

I wish the Members of the House could have joined me last Saturday night when I sat for an hour with my aide who speaks fluent Spanish because he is a refugee from Cuba, and talked to the five Sandinista guards who were assigned to me. It is a little bit difficult for a Member of the House of Representatives to become used to having five guards wherever he goes in and out of buildings in public places, with loaded guns held out as they walk in front of him and behind him in order to protect him.

Mr. Speaker, they told me through my aide that they had been given strict instructions that nothing was to happen to an American Congressman while he was in Nicaragua. As I understand other Members who have been there last November, and since, had similar protection.

We talked for over an hour with these young people, one of them 23 and a law student, and they made it very plain that they view the United States as their enemy and some would say they have perhaps good cause to feel that way because of some past policies regarding the previous head of government. They made it plain that they admire Cuba and Fidel Castro. They made it plain that they feel the United States owes them money as retribution for our past policies. They made it plain that they are in fact in almost every way dedicated Marxists willing to renew the revolution at any time in order to carry out what they believe is best for their country.

Mr. Speaker, I gave some detailed description of that experience because quite frankly I think the House should know. These young men admitted to me openly that they were trained by Cubans in police work, intelligence, and military activities. Hundreds of Cuban trainers are there. They are very proud of the fact that they are the government. On every street corner similar young people armed and ready to fire guns are to be seen and they control the situation in Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, it is a bit alarming for a Member of the House to be awakened by

the crow of a rooster outside the International Hotel in Managua followed by several rounds of gunfire as I was on Sunday morning. Eight months after the revolution Nicaragua still is a very dangerous place particularly for those who oppose the government in any respect because they might very well find themselves on the receiving end of one of the guns I have described.

Mr. Speaker, during the war against Somoza we repeatedly saw the evidence of that Cuban involvement that I mentioned. They trained, they armed, they equipped and they assisted and they fought with the Sandinistas in overthrowing the government. Today, as far as I can tell from published sources publicly known, Cuba is still assisting that government and they are fomenting revolution in other surrounding countries.

The influence of Cuba on Nicaragua is very deep. It is increasing every day. They have taken over with Cuban advisers the indoctrination of the Nicaraguan youths, they have adopted Cuba's model of work/study education. On March 15 they will send any number of Cubans and others, men and women, out into the countryside to educate the peasants in a literacy campaign called Alfabetizacion, which is very much like the first efforts by Castro in Cuba to take over the indoctrination of young people there.

Mr. Speaker, there are 1,200 Cuban teachers, there are 500 Cuban medical personnel, 200 so-called roadbuilders, there is Cuban military there training and assisting the government. They have sent large numbers of Nicaraguan children to Cuba to be trained. Literally the Cuban presence is everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, such intense activity by Cuba has not gone unnoticed by the countries surrounding Nicaragua and there is some concern about the direction this has all taken. At the same time Nicaragua has firmly cemented itself to the Communist nations in Eastern Europe including the Soviet Union and their satellites. They have recognized Vietnam. East Germany has given them \$20 to \$30 million I was told by the head of the central bank. They have received aid from Russia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Bulgaria. They are already establishing relations with all of those countries as well as Mongolia, Iraq, Poland, and all of the Communist bloc countries. It goes without saying that the Soviets who have established a mission there already have hailed publicly what is happening there. They have praised them continually for this activity.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to recognize the revolution in Nicaragua for what it really is. In September in Mexico City the Communist Parties of Latin American nations endorsed the Nicaraguan Government, proclaimed their solidarity with the revolution and in fact we only have to look to the words of those who are in control of the government as to what they really believe. Not all of Nicaragua's officials are hesitant at all in what they say. For instance, Humberto Ortega, who is the commander in chief of the Nicaraguan Army,

made it plain a few months ago that the Nicaraguans and the Sandinistas would strike against perceived enemies any time, anywhere even beyond its national borders and the Sandinistas have lived up to that promise. Nicaragua's neighbors Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador have taken in refugees who have fled from the Sandinistas and each country reports kidnappings and murders by the Sandinista hit squads that are sent into those countries, such as the infamous murder of the Commander Bravo who was one of Somoza's military leaders. He was hunted and assassinated in December by Nicaraguans who had orders to kill him.

Mr. Speaker, similar hit squads have been sent out by the Sandinistas to other countries. Honduras has seemed to have borne the brunt of these attacks but quite frankly they have occurred in many parts of Central America.

Those who have stayed behind in Nicaragua and have not fled are under constant heavy pressure to support the new regime—or else. Schools have been taken over completely. As I mentioned, there is the campaign of so-called literacy; the national university has fired any professors who had the slightest disagreement with the regime. Marxism and Leninism are now taught as regular political courses. They formed a children's association so there will be "good cadres of the revolution," as they put it.

They have controlled the press. La Barricada is their newspaper. La Prensa is the only free paper but it too has been warned to watch its step or it will not be publishing very long.

Mr. Speaker, most interesting is that in every block in the city of Managua, in all parts of the countryside they have established so-called Sandinista Defense Committees. These defense committees are precisely the same kind of committees set up in Cuba and still to this day exist in Cuba where the local Sandinista representatives control the people, watch the people, report back to the government, spy on the people and at one point even controlled whether they would have license plates for their cars and how much food would be distributed to them.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the revolution has been highly successful. It has been organized in a very efficient manner so that freedoms are diminished and that the Communist government has maximum control.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman just a couple of questions dealing first with the rule.

During the meeting of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman raised some very serious questions to which the gentleman said he did not have answers, based on his recent trip to Nicaragua and asked for at least a 1-week postponement of the granting of this rule.

Obviously that request was not honored by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman been able to pursue these additional questions that he had in mind when he brought them up in the Committee on Rules?

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman from Maryland has had the benefit of reading four documents in the possession of the Select Committee on Intelligence which, under the rules of the House, cannot be discussed in open session. I have been told these documents were available to any Member of the House but yesterday when the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) and myself went to the select committee we had to obtain individual permission, by a vote of the committee members polled by telephone, in order to see those documents.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the intention of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) at an appropriate time next week—as this matter, I understand will be carried over—to move for a secret session so that the entire House can be made aware of the facts contained in those memoranda from our intelligence agencies. They do indeed answer some of the questions I have had and to which the gentleman from Mississippi refers. I think it is very important that we do have that session at an appropriate time to let the Members know the character of the Government of Nicaragua and its activities before we vote.

Mr. LOTT. Again, Mr. Speaker, addressing just the rule, I think it is important that the Members know how this rule was reported out. Has the gentleman discussed that in his comments so far?

Mr. BAUMAN. I have not. The minority members on the Committee on Rules did request a week's delay and moved to delay the rule until next Tuesday so that some of this information could be obtained and put in a form to be presented to the House. That motion was voted down. The Committee on Rules, lacking a quorum because the minority members declined to participate further and left, had to wait some minutes until they were able to round up a quorum and they then reported the rule. Unfortunately for the majority members of the Committee on Rules, someone on the staff did not file the rule and that led to the situation in which we find ourselves today.

Mr. LOTT. In the gentleman's visit did he find any reason to suspect there was any inclination to move toward a more democratic government in Nicaragua or a more pro-American government, in any way?

□ 1200

Mr. BAUMAN. I cannot honestly say in the 2 days that I was there, and it was a limited time, that I saw any disposition toward democracy. They have refused to establish a date for elections. The political activities of groups in opposition are severely curtailed. The press is curtailed. There is talk of nationalizing all the private schools. Most major busi-

nesses have been nationalized. Quite frankly, they are following the Cuban model almost to the nth degree, step by step.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and the very fine presentation the gentleman is making should be listened to very carefully by the Members.

I would just like to make one point. I have over the years been very interested in communism, the Communist Party and their ideological struggles. I probably have talked to a hundred or more FBI-CIA personnel who have dealt with Communists, who have tried to get them to come over to our side. There is one caveat that I would throw out in which I think we make a mistake. I have yet to ever talk to an FBI or a CIA agent who said that money was ever a reason for bringing an agent from the other side to this side. As a matter of fact, it is the first thing that turns them off. The very first thing that makes a Communist repel is the thought of any money. You can win them on ideology. You can win them on strength. You can win them on the idea that your side is going to win, but you never win them, you never get them to defect because of money.

Yet, as a nation, our State Department seems to think that the way we can get these people to move away from a Communist line position to ours is to engage in some kind of a contest with them on the dollar sign.

I think it is doomed from the very beginning. It has been doomed in the past and I think in Nicaragua we will see another classic example of failure based on something that just does not work when you are dealing with the Communist mentality.

Mr. BAUMAN. I would say to the gentleman, it is indeed ironic when the President is telling us we must oppose communism in Afghanistan and the Middle East to protect our best interests that we are being asked today to vote for legislation that will aid communism very directly and very specifically in a country that needs not approval of communism, but removal of communism from its borders.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of this bill. I will not take much time except to say that the trouble has just begun for our Latin American brothers and sisters near the equator. With underdevelopment, overpopulation, failing economies and Cuban resurgents, all of which stirs violence and revolution among the islands adjacent to Central America in the Caribbean as well as in Central America.

The March 1 edition of the Saturday Review publishes a disturbing article that reveals some facts about the Caribbean. I commend that information as mandatory reading for every Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the article is as follows:

CARIBBEAN IN CONFLICT: STORM CLOUDS OVER PARADISE  
(By Horace Sutton)

At first glance, Key West, the southernmost part of the United States, seems a frivolous island. Where else would the postman arrive in standard government uniform wearing a green stone in his pierced ear? Where else might a cobbler's shop called Shoe Fly sell boots made of python at \$175 a pair? Where else would the premier department store be called Fast Buck Freddie's, or the bookstore display in its front window *The Complete Travel Guide to Cuba*?

On the surface Key West is the Capital of Camp, yet only a few blocks from the swirl of shops and bars, at a disused corner of an obsolete naval base, in a building called the Truman Annex, Rear Admiral Thomas Replogle commands the no-nonsense staff of 70 officers and men of the Caribbean Contingency Joint Task Force. They are there because hurricanes of conflict are rolling the Caribbean Sea, stirring violence, revolution, and terrorism on islands that are strung out from the American keys clear to South America, as well as in the Central American republics that form the southwestern curve of the Caribbean basin. It is an area that the United States has written off as an American playland. But while Washington has been preoccupied with the problems of Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, an ominous change has taken place agitated by underdevelopment, overpopulation, falling economics, and Cuban resurgence.

Replogle's prime function, therefore, is to keep binoculars trained on Cuba, 90 miles away and the home of a Soviet brigade. His mission: to call, if necessary, upon airborne troops, naval strike units, the marines, or whatever forces are deemed necessary by him and confirmed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to contain the Caribbean. The job is a critical one, for the United States has vital interests in the area—in order of their importance, oil, aluminum, and access to the Panama Canal. Fifty-two percent of all oil imported by the U.S. flows through the Caribbean Sea. Tankers sail through the deep-water channel alongside the island of Grenada, where the Cubans are building an airfield, on their way to refineries in Houston and New Orleans. There are no other deep-water ports in the south or on the eastern coast of the United States capable of taking supertankers that displace 100,000 tons and have a draft of 90 feet, larger than an aircraft carrier. The closest harbor is Portland, Maine, which can handle a tanker of 70,000 deadweight tons.

Tankers from the Persian Gulf, Nigeria, Venezuela, and other petroleum exporters deliver oil to refineries in the Bahamas, Trinidad, Aruba, and Curacao. But even after the oil is transhipped to smaller tankers on those Caribbean islands, it must pass through this newly charged area en route to the East Coast of the United States. And if Moscow's aggression in Afghanistan "is a stepping-stone to possible control over much of the world's oil supplies," as President Carter stated in his speech of January 4, the Soviet-Cuban posture in the West Indies is fraught with even more significance. In addition, the United States is dependent upon Caribbean aluminum, the metal of the space age, half of which is provided by Jamaica, an island considered the ripest of those that could fall in the Communist basket. Finally, there is our access to the Panama Canal in

case of war, which is no longer assured under the new treaty.

So far the Cuban-Soviet alliance has been content to push American patience as far as it will go, and at the same time to stir sensitive areas. Objectives are not lacking. In the outer rim tensions run high. Guatemala seethes with political murder. A dozen years ago, John G. Mein became the first United States ambassador ever to be assassinated, killed by Cuban-style rural guerrillas. Two years ago, a new terrorist group kidnaped the Guatemalan foreign minister and four weeks later murdered the Nicaraguan ambassador. President Kjell Laugerud claimed the terrorists got their support and their instructions from Cuba, an allegation that the CIA corroborates. In El Salvador, one weekend last September, 11 people were killed in skirmishes between left and right. Earlier that week leftists had killed the brother of President Carlos Humberto Romero. A banner of the Sandinistas was among the flags left beside the corpse.

Five months after the summer revolution, which at last disposed of the 45-year despotic rule of Anastasio Somoza Debayle, the political flavor of the Nicaraguan junta is still hard to define. Of the top nine Sandinista guerrillas, all young, some well-born, four and perhaps six were primed in Cuba, one in Moscow. Another chose exile in Chile during the reign of Salvador Allende, the late Marxist president. The only Sandinista on the executive junta that governs the nation is Daniel Ortega, a 33-year-old tough-talking revolutionary who spouts anti-imperialist rhetoric. Communists have sprouted on the expropriated Somoza land. "Counterrevolutionary" has become a pejorative label, and certification that one is clear of such taint comes from neighborhood committees that were the underground cells during the revolution. Some of these groups are fiercely militant.

A handbill distributed in one district not long ago urged the formation of "strict vigilance committees" whose duty it would be to "watch who enters and leaves the houses of your friends." It urged such suspicious people to be followed, for "they may be counter-revolutionaries." Although no caudillo, no strongman has appeared—Ortega is one candidate—and there is no clear determination of the political complexion of what will emerge in Nicaragua, one junta member has said, "We are clearly headed toward some kind of socialist system."

Whatever Castro's hand in Nicaragua may have been or may still be, it is at least equally involved in Puerto Rico, the American commonwealth that leans now toward statehood. Although the State Department denied that any deal was struck, Castro had publicly stated that he would free the last four American prisoners held on political charges in Cuban jails if the United States would free the four Puerto Rican nationalists who had been convicted of violent terrorist activity in the U.S. Three had gained access to the spectator's gallery of the House of Representatives in 1954 and, opening fire, had wounded five congressmen. One had tried to assassinate President Truman at Blair House in 1950. They were released on September 10 last year, and a week later Castro commuted the sentences of his American prisoners.

Even though the New Progressive party, advocating statehood and led by San Juan Mayor Hernan Padilla and Governor Carlos Romero Barceló, polled 49 percent of the vote in 1976 (while the Independistas, Marxists included, polled 6 percent), the released nationalist terrorists were unrepentant and vowed to keep up the fight. "We are stronger than ever, more committed than ever," said newly freed Lolita Lebron. "I hate bombs, but we might have to use them," she declared.

Less than three months later, terrorists in Puerto Rico ambushed a bus filled with navy men and women, killing two and wounding 10. "We are in a state of war," roared the head of the Communist party. "The war" broke out when a group of independence advocates, seeking to create an incident, trespassed on posted federal land on the island of Vieques, east of Puerto Rico, where the U.S. Navy was holding maneuvers. Arrested, the demonstrators refused bail and were arraigned before a federal judge, a Puerto Rican. He offered them dismissal of sentence in return for a promise not to demonstrate again on Vieques. The offer was spurned, and Angel Rodriguez Cristobal was enjoined by the other demonstrators not to offer a defense. Instead the band challenged the jurisdiction of the federal courts to operate in Puerto Rico. They were given six months in jail, fined \$1,000, and remanded to a federal penitentiary. Since there are none on the island they were flown to mainland prisons. Rodriguez landed in the Federal Correctional Institution at Tallahassee. There, he was a recalcitrant prisoner and tried repeatedly to wound himself by cracking his head against the bars of his cell. Placed in solitary, he hung himself. Whether this tragic turn was an act of martyrdom to incite further unrest, whether it came as the result of instability of the inmate, or whether he had met with foul play became an immediate subject of wild speculation in Puerto Rico among all classes.

The Independentista movement, backed by Marxist elements and possessed of a bottomless treasury, went on the radio crying "assassination." The message was repeated over and over until it was believed in circles not at all in sympathy with the movement. As sophisticated a Puerto Rican as Ricardo Alegria, long the head of the Puerto Rican Institute of Culture and responsible for the island's magnificent plan for colonial restoration, told me quite soberly that Angel Rodriguez Cristobal had been sent off the island, which meant double punishment, and that when the prison guards cut him down he had a large gash on his face. There was no doubt in Alegria's mind that he had been killed by sinister forces. A mild-mannered middle executive for an American company who lives in Ponce and is not given to polemics told me matter-of-factly that it was the work of the CIA. To what end, to serve what means, he didn't seem to know. He had heard the radio say "assassination" enough times to believe it.

Yet records of Angel Rodriguez Cristobal show he was separated from government military service for 100 percent neuropsychiatric disability. He had been undergoing treatment as an out-patient for a condition diagnosed as schizophrenia of the undifferentiated type. His medical history shows he had previously tried to destroy himself. With that background he could have had the charges dropped for mental instability, but was otherwise persuaded. Rodriguez's disordered mental condition was vaguely hinted at when the news of his hanging first broke, but although detailed information was offered to *El Mundo*, the oldest San Juan daily, the full story was never printed and the accusation of foul play continues to be widely believed to this day.

So determined is the leftist bloc to thwart full Puerto Rican entry into the United States that Cuba and Iraq pushed a proposal through the United Nations calling for hearings on the internal matter of the independence of Puerto Rico.

Down the island chain, Prime Minister Eric Gairy, the dictatorial leader of Grenada, was deposed last March and replaced by Maurice Bishop, an opposition leader. A new airport is being built by the Cubans. And the Torchlight, which supported Bishop when

he was in opposition to Gairy, and which now questioned Bishop's new-found friendship with Cubans and Russians, was shut down.

When Prime Minister Milton Cato of St. Vincent won a landslide victory over Marxists and other opponents in December, armed terrorists seized the five-square-mile island of Union midway between St. Vincent and Grenada. Cato had promised to help stem the tide of leftist government sweeping the Caribbean. This seemed to be Grenada's response—democratic process challenged by terrorist revolt.

The most enigmatic character in the Caribbean, and prime minister of Jamaica, the sea's most questionable country, is Michael Manley, the light-skinned charismatic leader who is the son of an English actress and of Norman Manley, the island's first prime minister, still highly esteemed.

In 1978 Jamaica received \$22 million in U.S. aid. It exports bauxite and bananas, and before its recent travail, fraught not only with hostile politics but outrageous crime, had been a tourist favorite for Hilton- and Inter-Continental-style holiday seekers, as well as for wealthy Americans and Britons, many of whom maintained winter villas there. Since 1972 when he first took office (and soon declared American ambassador Vincent de Roulet persona non grata), Manley has swung his government closer and closer to Cuba. His son studies in Havana. Cubans by the hundreds are in Jamaica for the avowed purpose of working in schools and hospitals. The Jamaican police force, which is larger than the Jamaican army, is Cuban trained. Those constables who found Castro's control personally unacceptable have, like many of Jamaica's professional people, emigrated to the United States.

Traveling in the Jamaican boondocks, Manley affects Jamaica pidgin. But for a speech in Miami at the Conference on Caribbean Trade Investment and Development, last November, he was all Western businessman.

It had been alleged, he said, that the government of Jamaica is anti-West and anti-American. "This is absolutely untrue," he offered in rebuttal. "I have the profoundest admiration for both the people and the achievements of the great Western democracies. The gifts to civilization of this group of nations beggar description in terms of technology, material standards, artistic and cultural accomplishments, respect for personal liberties, and evolution of highly advanced and sophisticated political systems and processes."

While Manley was effectively blowing smoke in the hall in Miami, Jamaicans violently opposed to the direction in which he is leading the country were demonstrating noisily across the street. They shouted imprecations through bullhorns, carried signs reading "Manley Does What Fidel Says" and "Manley Is a Communist Dictator," all in loud objection to his presence and his policies. Manley has been in a running battle with the *Gleaner*, a 145-year-old independently owned daily newspaper published in Kingston. Though he once called it "truly a great newspaper," he has, since it has scored him for his clubby relationship with the Cuban ambassador, taken to calling it "the North St. whorehouse."

The *Gleaner* claimed that the envoy, Ulises Estrada-Lescalles, had issued threatening statements and it asked for him to be withdrawn. Indeed, Western intelligence identifies Estrada-Lescalles as an agent of DGI, the Cuban intelligence apparatus. Manley has vaguely threatened the *Gleaner* with extinction. To turn the screw, government ministers accused members of the *Gleaner's* board of lying, breaking the law, and publishing partisan articles.

Manley's speech at the Miami Conference, where he sought international trade, invest-

ment, and development, was in marked contrast to a lengthy peroration he delivered only two months earlier at the Non-Aligned Nations Conference in Havana. There he was the perfect parrot for the Kremlin line. Seventeen times, as he threaded his way along the party pathway, he referred to Fidel Castro as "Comrade President." Manley ran through a litany of leaders whom he called "catalyst and rock." Among them: Marcus Garvey, the Harlem black who advocated a back-to-Africa movement; Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana; Lenin; and of course, Castro himself. He wrung his hands over "the forces of progress extinguished in Guatemala and snuffed out, like a candle in the Dominican Republic." As for Cuba, he said of a nation that is supported by \$2 billion in Soviet grants, buys its oil from Moscow at \$14 a barrel, gets 95 percent of its steel and all of its sheet metal from Russia, and accepts military equipment for its overseas adventures and its home defense, "We are absolutely satisfied that Cuba is a nonaligned country." He condemned "those who malign you and your country as a surrogate acting on foreign orders." Manley lauded Grenada's turn to the left, rejoiced in the Sandinista success, called for the "support of those who struggle for Puerto Rican independence regardless of whether they are in the minority at this time." He demanded the return of Guantanamo Bay, asked for the recognition of the PLO as the "sole representative of the Palestine peoples."

That speech set off warning bells in the State Department whose measured assistant secretaries don't flap easily. Taken together with the Cuban specter to the north, the threats seemed very real indeed to the Pentagon and especially to NATO far across another sea. The presence in Cuba of the 3,000-man Soviet brigade and untold MIG-23s was one thing. The Soviets' agile deployment of troops—as evidenced by the fast action in the Afghanistan invasion (compared with the seemingly sluggish movement of U.S. Marines in an excursion to bolster Guantanamo last fall)—was sobering. Far more chilling is the potential use of Cienfuegos, on the southern coast of Cuba, dead north of Grand Cayman, as a Soviet submarine base in time of war. Work has been proceeding at the base all through the Seventies, and as of now it will accommodate two submarines as well as their tenders and crews. Cuba operates one submarine of the Foxtrot class given them by the Soviet navy, but this month a second one, also donated by Moscow, is being towed across the Atlantic, doubling the Cuban undersea capability. The recently retired commander of NATO's Atlantic forces, Admiral Isaac Kidd, has said that any increased Moscow presence or Moscow-allied presence in West Indian waters could, in case of war, severely harry an American supply line reinforcing Europe.

According to the naval scenario, the northern route to Europe by way of Greenland, Iceland, and on to the British Isles would be threatened by Soviet submarines and by Backfire bombers, both based in Murmansk. Were the Russians to move forward to airfields in Norway, the Soviet bombers could attack ships in the south Atlantic, forming an effective pincers with submarines operating from Cienfuegos.

American diplomatic sources familiar with the island nations see no real Cuban-Soviet master plan for domination of the Caribbean. "Everything is going well for them," one official says, "they can sit back and choose targets of opportunity." Ambassador Lawrence Pezullo, the American envoy in Managua, thinks the concept of a red star shining over the Caribbean is "too dramatic." Yet if our geopolitical generals and admirals are writing "what-if" scenarios, it is not an extreme stretch of the imagination to assume that Kremlin war-room planners are



making their own sketches, too. Had the Pearl Harbor attack been proposed as a possibility in 1940 it would have been dismissed as fanciful and dramatic.

The Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based think-tank generally viewed as conservative, recently published a carefully documented paper in which it concluded that the Sandinista victory is part of a long term, carefully planned campaign to reduce the influence of the United States in Latin America. The report termed the outbreaks of violence and revolt around the Caribbean rim far more than merely "indigenous protests or spontaneous rebellions against oppressive regimes." Rather, the report says, "They are part of an internationally orchestrated campaign of subversion and terrorism. Almost every significant Latin American terrorist group of left-wing orientation has had or has today links with Cuba or the Soviet Union or both."

The Soviets have effectively controlled the Cuban DGI (Direccion General de Inteligencia) since 1970. Largely responsible for Cuban support of Latin American terrorists, DGI has been under the direct control of the KGB for almost all of Castro's years. All anti-Soviet personnel were removed from the DGI by Raul Castro in 1970. Supervising the DGI in Havana is Vassily Petrovich Semenov, a KGB general who resides with his staff in the Cuban capital.

An escalation of terrorism and guerrilla warfare in Latin America, with U.S. businessmen and diplomats its targets, is part of the grim prediction for the future. Concomitantly, the Soviets and the Cubans will attempt to destabilize and overthrow pro-American governments to reduce further U.S. political and economic influence in Latin America.

Warships of the Soviet fleet are frequently deployed in the Caribbean and cruise on sea lanes that are vital to the United States. Reconnaissance aircraft fly the ocean. Soviet intelligence-gathering vessels run along the East Coast. The Kremlin presence in Cuba now numbers between 4,000-6,000 civilian advisers, and 2,000 permanently assigned military personnel, in addition to the 3,000-man brigade. This challenge to the southern security of the United States will be augmented when Cuban troops, some 37,000 of them, return home from their global adventures in Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Guinea, Libya, and elsewhere and begin to look for something to do.

How did we get in such a fix in the Caribbean that most Americans have thought of only as a balmy retreat for winter pleasure? Very possibly, says one State Department analyst, because we thought of this benevolent sea in the cushy terms of Sunday-supplement travel sections. We have failed to see the needs and the suffering of those who live there. The million-dollar villas built by Americans in Jamaica are in shocking contrast to the pathetic street signs chalked on Kingston walls that say, "The poor can't take no more."

As Oliver Serephine, prime minister of tiny Dominica pointed out at the recent Miami Conference on Caribbean Trade Investment and Development, the per capita GNP in 1977 ranged from \$230 in Haiti to \$2,380 in Trinidad and Tobago. The average per capita GNP of the least-developed Caribbean common market nations was \$600 compared to a per capita GNP in the United States in 1977 of \$8,520. "The deep deprivation of our people in the basic necessities of life—food, clothing, housing, education, and medicare," Serephine said, "is heightened by our proximity and constant exposure to North American living standards."

He called for a major attack on Caribbean poverty, to be implemented by investments and joint ventures in agro-industries, fruit processing, furniture manufacturing, production of building materials using indige-

nous raw materials, garment manufacture, and tourism. Raw materials, "vast pools of labor," and a "determination to develop industrially" are what island nations have to offer the larger nations.

Both Prime Minister Serephine and Jacobo Majluta, vice president of the Dominican Republic, have scored protective tariffs which invoke "competitive need criteria" that keep Caribbean goods out of the United States market. Serephine acknowledged that pressure groups in the U.S. would fight for limited market access, but it must be realized that "developing countries will quickly spend their exports receipts on imports of manufactured goods and services that developed countries supply."

A trenchant political note was added to those basic economics by Vice President Majluta. "It is utterly incompatible with leading nations, supporters of a democratic style of life, to exercise such restrictive policies over the free enterprise only to protect inefficient areas of their economies, in detriment to those small nations whom they call their allies with whom they share noble ideals of justice, liberty, and progress." The Miami hall, filled with delegates, stood up at that and awarded the Dominican delegate an ovation.

Young Caribbean leaders turn to the Cuban role model because it appears to offer instant results. And they need an instant turn-around to hold their constituency, one of the youngest in the world. The Caribbean median age is 16 compared to 29 in the United States. But the employment index varies between 15 and 35 percent, compared to 5.9 percent in the U.S. For the new, young leaders Castro is a romantic figure who, in the words of one State Department official, "kicked Uncle Sam in the pants for years and got away with it."

The alternatives of emulating the economic and political patterns of European democracies from which they have only recently been freed, or those of the United States, which has neglected them and/or used them, emerge as unattractive. Says Ambassador Pezullo, "When they talk about a democratic or capitalistic model, it has been implemented so badly and so oppressively and so corruptly that it doesn't show well, and part of that is what brings about radical change. Bad businessmen and corrupt leaders are not good examples of either capitalism or democracy."

The other winter's night, with balmy winds blowing across the Condado lagoon in San Juan, I stood with hundreds of Puerto Ricans on the ramparts of a colonial fort that helped repel an invasion led by Sir Francis Drake in 1595. Huge bursts of fireworks exploded in the sky above the Caribe Hilton in celebration of that hotel's 30th anniversary. It was also the anniversary of Operation Bootstrap, designed by Puerto Ricans and financed by mainland Americans to lift that island out of the economic pits. Two years before that, in 1947, on my first visit to the island, I had viewed shanty towns with open sewers that in their squalor were worse than any I had ever encountered.

Now Puerto Rico, despite a food-stamp program larger than any of the 50 states, has the highest standard of living south of the Rio Grande. It has pulled itself up with the help of jobs and investment provided by such American companies as General Electric, Westinghouse, Star-Kist Tuna, Union Carbide, Pfizer, Eli Lilly, and Searle. Operation Bootstrap is one of the most successful economic schemes in the world.

"We are bullish on Puerto Rico where we have had a presence for 25 years because the track record there has been good for decades," says Charles Ramos, a vice-president of Merrill Lynch. "When Puerto Rico wishes to sell its bonds it clears them through a management group that includes First National

Bank of Boston, Solomon Brothers, Blyth, Banco Popular, Weldman, and Merrill Lynch. We sold a \$100 million bond issue for the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority. It was oversubscribed. We had orders for \$148 million. The demand was staggering. It proved the faith of mainland U.S. institutions in Puerto Rico even though the island sits in the center of the Caribbean."

Governor Carlos Romero Barceló says flatly, "We haven't had an effective Latin American or Caribbean policy, so what can be expected of these countries? Who is there to listen to them and to lead them? Has there been a commitment from government to support a Caribbean policy? Has someone been specifically designated? If someone has been given that responsibility, who knows about it? Is he visible?"

Although Puerto Rico should stand as effective a role model for Caribbean governments in extremis as does Cuba, it seems difficult for us, Romero says, "to export our success the way Cubans export revolution, socialism, and communism."

Romero is never consulted on Caribbean matters. A Washington diplomat deeply involved with the Caribbean waves off Puerto Rico as an area outside his responsibility because it is an American territory. Says Romero, "I haven't even been asked about decisions on the Caribbean even though I have a feeling for this region that perhaps transcends the knowledge of those who have studied the islands more than I."

In arguing the case against Cuban influence and for democratic advancement and free enterprise in the Caribbean, Ambassador Philip Habib, President Carter's special representative for Latin America, says plainly, "We oppose Cuba's adventurism in this hemisphere as elsewhere and we will continue to do so. One-quarter of Cuba's gross national product is accounted for by its relationship to the Soviet Union, yet Cuba still has not escaped economic underdevelopment. In fact, Cuba is trapped in a new and unprecedented dependency. . . . No other country votes as systematically with the Soviet Union in the United Nations. . . . No Caribbean nation need barter its independence for security. Our companies do not seek to dictate national policies, concludes Habib.

But more than rhetoric is needed. Comprehensive aid visibly stamped "Urgent" will be a basic requirement to return stability to the Caribbean and restore it to democratic process. As Dominica's Serephine put it, "When Hurricane David devastated my country a few months ago, the response from your government was quick and substantial. The world responds to crisis brought about by natural disaster with sympathy and immediate action. The economics of the Caribbean states is in grave crisis as we move into the 1980s. It is my fervent hope that the same spirit of cooperation for development will influence the response of your country to the needs of the region in this crisis." The hurricane has hit. The time for rescue is now. Poverty is the scourge and humanitarianism the motive. To fail is not only to be callous, is not only to be immoral, it is also to court a real threat to the veritable security of the nation and ultimately its commitment to its allies abroad.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the real issue to me this morning is going to be a far more critical one that we are going to vote on than anything that has been discussed up to now.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there is going to be a motion offered to move this House into secret session.

Mr. Speaker, from May 27, 1830, until June 20, 1979, this House never went into secret session. We added over 26 States

to the Union. We had Presidents assassinated. We have had world wars. We have had Vietnams. We have had impeachment procedures and we have gone through the worst crises imaginable and yet during that period of time we never had to go into a secret session.

Mr. Speaker, I think the greatest blow we strike at democracy in this country today and the clearest indication to the rest of the world that the democratic process does not work is when we start having motions successfully passed saying that we are going into secret session.

What that means, incidentally, and I am sure the Members all realize it, that all those sitting in the galleries are going to be asked to leave. The press is going to be asked to leave. The television cameras are going to be turned off. We are going to put policemen at all the doors.

Are we in the House of Representatives when that happens? I do not believe it. When this happened, Mr. Speaker, on June 20 of 1979 during the Panama Canal debate when we went through this, it shocked most of the Members. No one even knew it was coming. When that happened, we closed it up. I felt like I was sitting perhaps in the Politburo or some place in the Soviet Union and not in the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C.

I said at that time if we ever move this again, I am going to do whatever I can to stop that kind of a motion. It is not debatable, though, Mr. Speaker. When that motion is made there is no debate on it and this is the only opportunity to debate it. I believe when we have reached that point that we cannot speak in this body, in this Chamber freely, we have a major problem, because to my experience if I wanted to know anything, whether it was a CIA budget, whether it was intelligence information, I could go to the committees and I could get it. I may have to sign a document, as I have on some occasions, stating that I would not reveal that information, but at least I would know.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I was just a little upset when the gentleman talked about the Politburo, because although it is somewhat rare for the House of Representatives to go into secret session, the fact of the matter is that the other body has gone into secret session in innumerable cases when the Defense budget was being discussed.

I think there is no more reason why we should not go into executive session when there are classified matters than should the other body. Certainly, this is a rare occasion, but I do not think the gentleman is quite right in suggesting that if we want to protect our secrets we are somehow aping the Soviet Union.

Mr. PEYSER. Not at all, and I thank the gentleman.

This Chamber is known as the people's House, the people's Chamber. What the other body does is their business;

but in this House, I believe it ought to be open and the public should hear whatever has to be said, and a perfect example was the Panama Canal debate, when nothing was introduced that had any relevance or any real effect on that issue; yet we went into that kind of a secret session.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I want to join the gentleman in his observations and his comment about going into secret session.

I am going to go into secret session and vote to do that only because I do not want to leave any inference that there is something that somebody is trying to hide.

I want to state right now that as far as I am concerned the documents the gentleman refers to that require a secret session ought to be put on the public record, and if it was not for the fact that it would compromise perhaps one of our own agencies, that would be the only reason they should not be put on the record. I would want everything that is said in those documents in verbatim and in toto to go in the record if it would not compromise the Agency, and that is the only reason I would vote to go into secret session.

□ 1210

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER).

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for his comment, because we have to have, it seems to me, in our system in this Congress a confidence, both in our committees and in our intelligence people, and a confidence in the process of public debate in a public forum for legislative action.

We should consider that now, twice in 8 months, after 149 years of not doing it, we are starting to go into secret sessions again, which I hope we will not do. Because what is going to happen next?

I can think of a dozen different issues where we can begin to say we need a secret session. On the Committee on Armed Services, where issues may be brought up, there are certain things that are discussed that are not brought to the floor. "Well, now," we may say, "maybe we ought to have a secret session on them."

Then, Mr. Speaker, pretty soon we can forget the gallery because people are going to say, "We don't want to come to the Congress because we don't know whether they are going to be open or closed."

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the remarks of the gentleman in the well and

also in the remarks made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

It seems to me that secret intelligence must be evaluated by those in the intelligence community, with other factors taken into account and with the proper analytical tools which they possess.

On the other hand, the House is not so equipped, and I do not think in the heat of debate is the proper place to bring up certain factors of intelligence. I can tell the Members for certain that the documents that will be brought up on the floor of the House in secret session are only a small part of the total amount of intelligence that has come forward about Nicaragua.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN).

Mr. Speaker, I only have a fraction of a minute left, and I do want to say one more thing. I hope that all the Members understand that under the rules of the House, when we are in secret session, the Members themselves are not sworn to secrecy. The Members are not sworn to secrecy in a secret session, and we can walk out of this place and say anything we want to say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an outrageous procedure, and I am hopeful that this House today will vote against any secret session.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I should probably state that I understand this is the rule we are debating, but I think it is necessary to put into some proper balance the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) in terms of the makeup of the Government in Nicaragua.

I also have just returned from Nicaragua and from Panama and, like the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN), have expressed an interest in Latin American affairs, having served on the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal.

The point I want to make to my colleagues is that the picture that has been given to us here this afternoon about Nicaragua being a complete leftist state is not accurate. It is not accurate, and there are organizations that recognize that. The VFW would not be supporting this rule and this bill if that was the case. The Council of the Americas, a private investment group, would not be supporting this rule and this bill if that was the case. The U.S. Catholic Conference and leading Protestant denomination groups are supporting it. I could go on and on and cite organizations and groups that recognize we have a vital interest and role to play in Latin America and, particularly, in Nicaragua.

There have been suggestions that the media or the education system of the press as a whole in Nicaragua is leftist. I want to tell the Members that the only move that was made in Nicaragua against the press that I have been able to ascertain has been against the far

leftist press. There has been no move made against the democratic press.

One of the main means of communication in Nicaragua is television because of the high illiteracy rate. Let me see if I can for just a second give the Members an example of the leftist television programming in Nicaragua. They have such leftist shows, if you will, as Baretta and Petricelli and such lovely leftist family shows as "Class of '65." They have shows like Popeye and Clutch Cargo. I could go on and on and on and cite those.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, do they have Archie Bunker?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Yes, they have Archie Bunker. They have Heidi.

These are the types of shows and the media that is getting through to the Nicaraguan people, and I suggest that if we had such a dominant Cuban role in Nicaragua today as has been suggested, we would not be seeing this type of action on the television programming in Nicaragua.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Does the gentleman mean to say that on national television in Nicaragua they are presenting such shows as Porky and His Friends and Petricelli and Baretta and Archie Bunker? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I am suggesting that is what they are doing.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was supporting this legislation because I wanted to see this assistance get through to Nicaragua.

If they are going to be showing that same kind of junk down there that they are showing up here, maybe I will change my mind on this whole bill.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I only have 5 minutes, so let me go on to a few more points. I do not want to make light of the institution.

I just want to point out to the Members of the House that, indeed, there is a difference of opinion and ideology in Nicaragua today.

Let us take the church for example. The church has a tremendous influence, as we can imagine, in all of Latin America and Central America. They have a particular interest in Nicaragua, and Archbishop Obando is working closely with the revolutionary government in Nicaragua. There are members of the Cabinet in Nicaragua working with priests and ministers, and leftists they may be, but they still have a good influence and affiliation and affection for the church. Unlike Cuba and unlike Mexico after their revolution, the church has been accepted and embraced in Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to the Members an article published in the

New York Times about the "Christian message" that was adopted during the Christmas period in Nicaragua. The message was given by Interior Minister Borge, who was one of the leading members of the junta in Nicaragua. He said: "Two thousand years ago, a woman gave birth to a child"—and he gave this message at a Christmas party for poor children—"and that child's message was, 'let us love one another.'"

That message is the revolutionary message. That is the message of the Sandinista revolutionists.

Similarly, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was celebrated in all government offices while Christmas parties were organized by the Sandinista Defense Foundation. I could go on and on and cite the connection and the deep religious feeling the Sandinistas have for the Catholic Church and for their religion.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) stated that he was under armed guard. I guess that is the fundamental difference between our ideological makeups. I did not have an armed guard, and I did not feel unsafe as I walked through the streets of Managua.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the committee chairman for yielding me the extra time.

Mr. Speaker, I met with the chamber of commerce in Nicaragua. I met with a gentleman from Coca-Cola, I met with the Bank of America, and I met with coffee producers, who desperately think that we can have an influential role to play in Nicaragua. I met with Nicaraguans, the junta, the directorate, and the church, and they are begging this country to show the feeling and the compassion of the United States and provide this aid—60 percent of the aid, which, by the way, will go to the private sector, and the 40 percent of the aid, to developing the infrastructure, the sewers, and the roads.

Mr. Speaker, let me finish by citing to the Members a point that happens to have come up at the end of my trip when I was in Panama. The Panamanians admitted to me, almost to a person, that the reason they were willing to accept the Shah was to show the gratitude and friendship of the Panamanian people toward this country for the role we played in the treaty and implemented by legislation. I would suggest to the Members that we have the same opportunity in Nicaragua, and if we use our diplomacy and use our compassion, we can be friends with the Nicaraguan people.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed in the last few weeks that there

has been a certain temperament developing in the House that I do not like to see. There are touchy feelings that Members have toward each other, and there has been an overdose of political rhetoric that bothers me.

So to try to correct that, I would first direct my attention to our beloved Speaker and express my great commendation to him, not necessarily for his actions as Speaker but for the successful record this year of the Boston Celtics and the Boston Bruins. If the Speaker would just concentrate on that good record instead of listening to the barbs of some of my political colleagues, his disposition would be better, I assume.

I commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) for presenting us with an open rule so we can discuss this matter in such a liberal fashion.

I would like to point out to the Members the \$75 million in this bill is not the only money we are providing Nicaragua. We have already provided Nicaragua with \$71 million since July of 1979. That was done by Executive action, including \$33 million that was held from the previous government and then released to the new Sandinista government.

Then in fiscal 1981 we have over \$50 million in the budget request, including \$5.5 million for military assistance.

I would just point out to the Members that we ought to think twice before we vote for military assistance to a government whose police are being trained by the East Germans. I will elaborate on that further next week.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) for their discussion of the information that might be forthcoming during a possible closed session of the House. It is true that most of the material that is contained in so-called classified information is not particularly startling.

□ 1220

But it does shed a practical light, much more than rhetoric from the State Department, on what conditions really exist. I think its delicate purpose is not to have our State Department or any other entities of Government embarrassed or not to upset the people in Nicaragua or other governments with the kind of information we have available. The information itself is not particularly earth-shaking, I reemphasize.

Last but not least, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, was lecturing us on the influence of the church. I cannot cover Latin American church history in 30 seconds. I would like to point out to the House that there is a great deal of difference between the titular relationship of the church and the real deep roots that it has in some other countries. Historically, in Latin countries, the depth of church strength has not been as strong compared, for example, to Ireland, Poland, Lithuania, or some of the other countries where the church has been a bulwark against communism. You have only to look at the situation in Cuba to see that the church

was not able to stand up against Mr. Castro.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, during the earlier debate, some of our colleagues had a very humorous approach to this matter of Communist influence in Nicaragua, and it was good for a couple of laughs. That is OK with me.

I do not want everyone in the world to have to wring their hands about the threat of communism despite the fact that it is very real. I am willing to be more concerned about it for those who are not quite so concerned. But their humorous approach and their attempt to ridicule this attempt that is being made today to bring all of the facts to the attention of the Members of the House on the subject of the Communist involvement in Nicaragua becomes very, very important.

The discussion of whether the Communist threat is serious or not reminds me of the speech, the very major foreign policy speech, the President of the United States made not too many months ago when he accused many in America of having an inordinate fear of communism. Well, he is entitled to that opinion. I understand now, though, that since Russia invaded Afghanistan 2 days after Christmas that he has all of a sudden, after 3 years of wearing blindfolds, after 3 years, he now has admitted that he recognizes the Soviet Communist threat for what it really is.

Now, that is not something to make light of, that is not something to make fun of. The Communist threat is real. And if you do not believe it, you can look at Africa, look at Angola, look at Mozambique, you can look at Ethiopia, look at South Yemen, look at the influence they are now beginning to assert in North Yemen, a country that once was friendly to us, look at how our friends in Egypt and Israel are being surrounded by the ever expanding Communist threat in the world and you see that our interest and the interest of our friends is being threatened, and it is nothing to make light of.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the need for an executive session, a closed session. I do not like to see this House go into closed session unless it is absolutely necessary.

I pay close attention to my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), with whom I agree on many, many issues; but I would like to say this: The House has voted too many times in the dark, without knowing the truth, and I can only recall to the Members that very important vote on the so-called Gulf of Tonkin resolution, when the Members of the Congress voted in the dark. When the vote was taken on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, the Members voted in the dark, based on their own account. After the Vietnam war got bogged down, many of them came to the floor of the House saying that they had not had all the facts when casting that vote.

What we are trying to do today, Mr. Speaker, is to allow the Members to vote on a matter that we think affects the Communist movement in the world, but we do not want the Members to vote in the dark any more. We want them to vote knowing the truth. The way this bill was pushed, the request for delay so that Members have an opportunity to find out for themselves through the various committee files was denied. The Members need to have this information and it can only be done through a closed session, because it is important, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) said, that this secrecy be protected, to protect lives of people involved in the operation.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

#### [Roll No. 66]

Akaka	Daschle	Hopkins
Albosta	de la Garza	Howard
Alexander	Deckard	Hubbard
Ambro	Derwinski	Huckaby
Anderson, Calif.	Dickinson	Hughes
Andrews, N.C.	Dicks	Hyde
Annunzio	Dodd	Ireland
Anthony	Donnelly	Jacobs
Applegate	Dougherty	Jeffries
Ashbrook	Downey	Jenkins
Atkinson	Duncan, Ore.	Jenrette
Badham	Duncan, Tenn.	Jones, N.C.
Bafalls	Early	Jones, Tenn.
Balley	Eckhardt	Kastenmeier
Baldus	Edgar	Kelly
Barnes	Edwards, Calif.	Kildee
Bauman	Emery	Kindness
Beard, R.I.	English	Kostmayer
Beard, Tenn.	Erlenborn	Kramer
Bedell	Ertel	LaFalce
Beilenson	Evans, Del.	Lagomarsino
Benjamin	Evans, Ga.	Leach, Iowa
Bennett	Evans, Ind.	Leath, Tex.
Bereuter	Fary	Lederer
Bethune	Fascell	Lee
Bevill	Fazio	Lehman
Bingham	Fenwick	Lent
Blanchard	Findley	Levitas
Boggs	Fish	Livingston
Bolling	Fisher	Lloyd
Boner	Fithian	Loeffler
Bonior	Florio	Long, La.
Bonker	Foley	Long, Md.
Bouquard	Ford, Tenn.	Lott
Bowen	Forsythe	Lowry
Brademas	Fountain	Lujan
Brinkley	Fowler	Luken
Brodhead	Fuqua	Lundine
Brooks	Gaydos	McDade
Broomfield	Gayhardt	McKay
Buchanan	Gibbons	Madigan
Burgener	Gilman	Markey
Burlison	Gingrich	Marks
Burton, John	Ginn	Marrlott
Burton, Phillip	Glickman	Matsul
Butler	Goldwater	Mavroules
Byron	Gonzalez	Mica
Campbell	Gradison	Gore
Carter	Gramm	Michulski
Cavanaugh	Gray	Miller, Calif.
Cheney	Green	Miller, Ohio
Clay	Grisham	Mineta
Clinger	Guyer	Minish
Coleman	Hall, Ohio	Mitchell, Md.
Collins, Tex.	Hall, Tex.	Mitchell, N.Y.
Conable	Hamilton	Moffett
Conte	Hance	Mollohan
Conyers	Harkin	Motti
Corcoran	Harris	Murphy, N.Y.
Corman	Hawkins	Murphy, Pa.
Coughlin	Hefner	Murtha
Courter	Hefel	Myers, Ind.
Daniel, Dan	Hightower	Natcher
Daniel, R. W.	Hillis	Nedzi
Danielson	Hinson	Nichols
Dannemeyer	Holt	Nowak
		O'Brien

Oberstar	Sawyer	Traxler
Obey	Schroeder	Trible
Panetta	Schulze	Ullman
Patten	Sebellus	Van Deerin
Patterson	Sensenbrenner	Vander Jagt
Paul	Shannon	Vanik
Pease	Sharp	Vento
Perkins	Shelby	Volkmer
Petri	Shumway	Walgren
Peysner	Skelton	Walker
Porter	Slack	Wampler
Preyer	Smith, Iowa	Watkins
Price	Smith, Nebr.	Weaver
Fritchard	Snowe	Weiss
Rahall	Snyder	Whitehurst
Rallsback	Solarz	Whitley
Ratchford	Solomon	Whittaker
Regula	Spellman	Whitten
Reuss	Spence	Williams, Mont.
Rhodes	St Germain	Wilson, Bob
Rinaldo	Stack	Wilson, C. H.
Ritter	Stanton	Wilson, Tex.
Roberts	Stark	Wolpe
Robinson	Steed	Wright
Roe	Stokes	Wyatt
Rosenthal	Stratton	Wyllie
Roth	Studds	Yates
Roybal	Swift	Yatron
Royer	Synar	Young, Fla.
Rudd	Tauke	Young, Mo.
Russo	Taylor	Zablocki
Sabo	Thompson	

□ 1240

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 295 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

#### SPECIAL CENTRAL AMERICAN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1979

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON).

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my objection to the action expected to be taken when the bill made in order by this rule is considered. I refer to a motion that the House go into secret session for the purpose of discussing classified information.

My friend from New York (Mr. PEYSER) has made a speech in opposition to that motion, on philosophical grounds. They are sound. I agree with them.

Mr. Speaker, my arguments against the motion are more technical and practical in nature.

I am a member of the Intelligence Committee and participated in the debate concerning release of this information for floor consideration. I voted against such release in the committee but my position did not prevail. I want to present my reasons for objecting.

My concern stems from the fact that no session on the floor can be truly secret. To say so is not to insult the integrity of any Member of Congress or of any staff person. It is not a question of integrity, but one of technical fact. It has been known for many hours that this secret session is likely to occur. When it does, the Chamber will simply be cleared of those not authorized to be present. An enterprising reporter, much less a foreign intelligence agent, can easily leave behind a tiny recorder for later recovery or a transmitting device with a receiver outside of the Capitol. No quick search or sweep is likely to uncover such equipment and there is no risk to the indi-

vidual if it is found—he just loses it. Such a loss would hardly be severe. The equipment could cost as little as \$25 and no more than a few hundred. We are almost defenseless against such methods and as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I can assure you that the technology available is incredible.

I am also concerned for the security of the written documents to be brought here. It may not be hard to maintain custody of the written documents but they will be read into the record along with the accompanying debate. Now, I have complete faith in the recorders and clerks of the House, but they have no facilities for properly handling the classified information recorded. They have no training in its handling and the House has no procedures for adequate handling of this information. We will disserve ourselves and the employees of the House if we ask them to handle materials without the procedures and facilities they need.

Often, the specific classified information is relatively innocuous but its revelation could reveal and endanger its source, either directly or indirectly. Without considerable appreciation of the particular way in which specific intelligence is sensitive, it would be easy for a Member to err disastrously without ever knowing he has done so until the damage is done. In a sense, we put the Member himself at risk. This concern may or may not be valid for the information to be discussed today but it will be true as this procedure is repeated—as it surely will be. Recall that in June 1979 the House went into secret session for the first time in nearly 150 years. Now only 8 months later, we may do so again. Will such sessions become monthly events? Moreover, such sessions will inevitably consider ever more sensitive materials moving from today's secret material to top secret, specially compartmented intelligence of greater sensitivity.

Mr. Speaker, there is an alternative to bringing intelligence information to the floor. The Intelligence Committee has office space nearby. It is adequate for reasonably large groups; and they are secure spaces. The committee spaces are alarmed and under 24-hour guard by the Capitol Police. The committee staff itself employs three full-time security officers at an annual cost of about \$75,000. Materials are kept in safes contained within a vault. In the situation we have here, the committee and its secure areas could serve the House well. The committee could provide materials for members to read and, better than that, could arrange briefings by CIA officials or other, and by its own staff, about the intelligence which is of interest.

This could be done for several days in advance of a floor meeting. The specific information which can be discussed on the floor openly would have been determined and would be carefully explained to Members, thus avoiding risk to valuable sources of intelligence and to people's lives. Members could be carefully advised of the reasons that the information being presented is sensitive. Exactly this procedure is followed each year when the intelligence authorization

bill and later the Defense appropriation bill is brought up for consideration. In the case of the authorization bill, over the past 2 years 29 Members have reviewed the Intelligence Committee's voluminous and highly sensitive reports and nothing has been leaked. If this method were to be employed here, Members could be at more leisure to explore all aspects of the subject with more thoroughness, and with greater security. We thus avoid the cumbersome and inadequate procedure of a secret session on the floor.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, one additional point: I am prepared to make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether rule XXIX or rule XLVIII governs in the release by the House of classified information at issue. I might say that the House Committee on Intelligence sent this material here under rule XLVIII, which sets up a highly structured and detailed procedure for our committee in releasing classified information. It includes giving notice to the President. If we hear nothing from the President in 5 days, we can release it. If the President objects, then it must be reconsidered by the committee, and before it can be released subsequent to that, of course, affirmative action must be taken after the committee makes its recommendation to the floor.

In contrast to that highly structured procedure, Mr. Speaker, is rule XXIX, which merely says that the House at any time may release by vote of the House classified information. It is my understanding that the Speaker is leaning toward the ruling that rule XXIX applies. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that had our Intelligence Committee known that there was a chance that the Speaker would so rule, the committee would never have considered releasing this information.

Now, I might say to my colleagues that if the Speaker does so rule, it will satisfy my concerns and my problem, because I know that thereafter the Committee on Intelligence will never release information to be brought to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we set a bad precedent if we approve the motion when it is offered. I hope that the House will refuse to enter secret session and hear the intelligence material, and I hope that we will thus reject the motion to go into secret session.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLISON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the argument the gentleman makes, and I would like to go along with a vote against going into secret session. I have already said that I would do it because I did not want anybody to think that there is anything to hide. I am willing to bring the information before the people themselves to make their own decisions.

But I do not want to compromise the intelligence sources or the agencies. So I am perfectly prepared, as a practical matter, to yield to the gentleman's effort to go into secret session.

Why cannot the gentleman's committee meet again and undo the agreement it has just agreed to? Then, we would not have this problem.

Mr. BURLISON. One of the problems is the precedent that is set of sending classified information to the floor.

Mr. FASCELL. I agree. Why could not the gentleman's committee meet right away and undo what it just did? That would eliminate the problem.

Mr. BURLISON. We do not know whether the time is available. I might say to the gentleman that my voice was a voice crying in the wilderness in the committee. But, I do assure the gentleman that the committee will not again take similar action if the Speaker should rule that rule XXIX prevails.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Missouri let me say this: It is very difficult to respond to his arguments because the Members of the House, and the gentleman from Maryland included, labor under the disability of being unable to discuss the contents of the classified memorandums to which we are referring. But, I think it is permissible under the rules to say to the House—and I think those who have read these memorandums would have to concede—the contents are directly at variance with the statements being made by a number of people in this debate. The only means which I could see that these memorandums could be brought up and discussed and debated would be in a closed session—just reading these memorandums is not enough. Reading them and fully debating their contents, as to their meaning, is necessary because good people will differ in their interpretation.

So, at the appropriate time, when the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) will make the motion—and I understand from discussion with the Speaker and with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) that that will be done next Monday when we continue consideration of the bill—not today—we should support a motion for a secret session and allow a reasonable debate on the content of these documents. I think these documents will aid the individual Members' decisions as to their votes on the amendments to be offered, and whether to vote for the bill.

I do not see how else the House could be properly informed. The Intelligence Committee by majority vote yesterday released these documents and allowed the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) to bring them to the House under the secret session rule.

I would also point out that the last time we had such a secret session the Speaker ruled that any Member who violates the secrecy of that session and discloses what is said could be censured, reprimanded, or other action taken by the House. I agree there is a risk of the classified information being released, but we cannot vote intelligently, in my view, unless this information is laid before the House and allowed to be debated at least for the hour which the rule permits.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is a serious matter. No one is taking it lightly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute, and yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. No one is taking it lightly. When I made the request of the Intelligence Committee to allow me to bring certain documents to the floor, it was done after a great deal of consideration of the possible effect. Now, the last time this House had a closed session was at the request of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN), and the uproar of criticism about what he presented in that closed session was that there was nothing specific, that he did not have any positive, detailed facts.

Well, that is the reason that I decided to bring the Members some positive, detailed facts. We wanted the Members to know that there is a very hard school of thought on the subject that we would like to present during this debate. Now, the question of presenting it to a closed session—

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. The gentleman agrees that this information is being brought to the floor under rule XLVIII of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, the time is simply not appropriate to be considering the economic assistance in this bill for a regime that continues to give every indication it is establishing a Marxist totalitarian state in Central America.

I need only point to one recent example where a respected journalist is leaving Nicaragua because he is no longer able to freely express his opinions.

Oscar Montalvan worked in journalism in Nicaragua for 25 years. For the last 3 years, he directed a popular radio news program, but on February 2 he announced he can no longer work as a newsman or professor, that he must leave Nicaragua to work in the field of journalism somewhere else.

The official Nicaraguan response is that in Nicaragua there is "moderate freedom of speech; there is no absolute freedom." There is "freedom of speech for the revolution."

To believe that is the atmosphere for promoting pluralism and the principles of democracy is naive. All the signs in Nicaragua are pointing to one end: The establishment of a totalitarian state.

Incidentally, the TV stations in Nicaragua are owned and operated by the Government.

There should be no consideration of economic assistance until there are positive signals that the Sandinista regime clearly intends to promote democratic principles and to permit the survival of the private sector. It would be irresponsible to support the use of American taxpayers money on the vague hope it would be used to promote democracy when there is no legitimate proof that would happen. Moreover, more than \$60 million in economic assistance has already gone to the Sandinista regime with no indication that there has been any moderating influence on the regime.

Another \$50 million is being requested in the 1981 fiscal year budget, including \$5½ million in military aid.

Until we can be more certain of the intentions of the Sandinista regime, it makes no sense for this body to pass this bill at this time. There is time to consider this aid when we take up the 1981 fiscal year aid bill.

I urge my colleagues to reject consideration of aid for Nicaragua.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 251, nays 60, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]  
YEAS—251

Akaka	Bouquard	Downey
Albosta	Bowen	Drinan
Alexander	Brademas	Duncan, Ore.
Ambro	Brodhead	Early
Anderson,	Brooks	Eckhardt
Calif.	Buchanan	Edgar
Andrews, N.C.	Burlison	Edwards, Calif.
Annunzio	Burton, John	Emery
Anthony	Burton, Phillip	English
Applegate	Butler	Erlenborn
Aspin	Byron	Ertel
Atkinson	Carter	Evans, Del.
AuCoin	Cavanaugh	Evans, Ga.
Balley	Cheney	Evans, Ind.
Baldus	Clay	Fary
Barnes	Clinger	Fascell
Beard, R.I.	Conte	Fazio
Beard, Tenn.	Conyers	Fenwick
Be'tell	Corcoran	Findley
Bellenson	Corman	Fish
Benjamin	Coughlin	Fisher
Bennett	Courter	Fithian
Bereuter	D'Amours	Florio
Bethune	Daniel, Dan	Foley
Bevill	Danielson	Ford, Mich.
Bingham	Daschle	Ford, Tenn.
Blanchard	de la Garza	Fountain
Boggs	Dicks	Fowler
Bolling	Dingell	Fuqua
Boner	Dodd	Garcia
Bonior	Donnelly	Gaydos
Bonker	Dougherty	Gephardt

Gibbons	Lundine	Santini
Gilman	McDade	Sawyer
Ginn	McHugh	Schouer
Glickman	McKay	Schroeder
Gonzalez	Markey	Sebelius
Goodling	Marks	Selberling
Gore	Matsui	Shannon
Gradison	Mavroules	Sharp
Gramm	Mica	Shelby
Gray	Mikulski	Skelton
Green	Miller, Calif.	Slack
Grisham	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Iowa
Guyer	Mineta	Smith, Nebr.
Hall, Ohio	Minish	Snowe
Hall, Tex.	Mitchell, Md.	Solarz
Hamilton	Moffett	Spellman
Hance	Mollohan	St Germain
Harkin	Murphy, Pa.	Stack
Harris	Murtha	Stanton
Hawkins	Natcher	Stark
Hefner	Neal	Stokes
Heftel	Nedzi	Studds
Hightower	Nichols	Swift
Hopkins	Nowak	Synar
Horton	Oberstar	Tauke
Howard	Obey	Thompson
Hubbard	Ottinger	Traxler
Huckaby	Panetta	Trible
Hughes	Patten	Udall
Hyde	Patterson	Ullman
Ireland	Pease	Van Deerin
Jacobs	Perkins	Vander Jagt
Jenkins	Peyser	Vanik
Jenrette	Porter	Vento
Jones, N.C.	Preyer	Voikmer
Jones, Tenn.	Price	Walgren
Kastenmeyer	Pritchard	Waxman
Kildee	Rahall	Weaver
Kostmayer	Rallsback	Weiss
LaFalce	Ratchford	Whitley
Leach, Iowa	Regula	Whittaker
Leath, Tex.	Reuss	Williams, Mont.
Lederer	Rhodes	Wilson, C. H.
Lehman	Rinaldo	Wilson, Tex.
Lent	Ritter	Wolpe
Levitas	Roberts	Wright
Lloyd	Roe	Wyatt
Long, La.	Rosenthal	Wyllie
Long, Md.	Roybal	Yates
Lowry	Royer	Yatron
Lujan	Russo	Young, Mo.
Luken	Sabo	Zablocki

NAYS—60

Archer	Hinson	Myers, Ind.
Ashbrook	Holt	Paul
Badham	Ichord	Petri
Bafalis	Jeffries	Robinson
Bauman	Kelly	Roth
Brinkley	Kindness	Rudd
Broomfield	Kramer	Schulze
Burgener	Lagomarsino	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Lee	Shumway
Coleman	Livingston	Snyder
Collins, Tex.	Loeffler	Solomon
Daniel, R. W.	Lott	Spence
Dannemeyer	McDonald	Stratton
Deckard	Madigan	Taylor
Derwinski	Marriott	Walker
Dickinson	Michel	Wampler
Duncan, Tenn.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whitehurst
Forsythe	Montgomery	Whitten
Gingrich	Mottl	Wilson, Bob
Goldwater	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Fla.

NOT VOTING—122

Abdnor	Derrick	Jeffords
Addabbo	Devine	Johnson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	Johnson, Colo.
Andrews,	Dixon	Jones, Okla.
N. Dak.	Dornan	Kazen
Ashley	Edwards, Ala.	Kemp
Barnard	Edwards, Okla.	Kogovsek
Biaggi	Erdahl	Latta
Boland	Ferraro	Leach, La.
Breaux	Flippo	Leland
Brown, Calif.	Frenzel	Lewis
Brown, Ohio	Frost	Lungren
Broyhill	Giallmo	McClory
Carney	Grassley	McCloskey
Carr	Guarini	McCormack
Chappell	Gudger	McEwen
Chisholm	Hagedorn	McKinney
Clausen	Hammer-	Masuire
Cleveland	schmidt	Marlenee
Coelvo	Hanley	Martin
Collins, Ill.	Hansen	Mathis
Conable	Harsha	Mattox
Cotter	Heckler	Mazzoli
Crane, Daniel	Hillis	Moakley
Crane, Phillip	Holland	Moore
Davis, Mich.	Hollenbeck	Moorhead,
Davis, S.C.	Holtzman	Calif.
Dellums	Hutto	Moorhead, Pa.

Murphy, Ill.	Rodino	Stump
Myers, Pa.	Rose	Symms
Nelson	Rostenkowski	Thomas
Nolan	Rousselot	Treen
O'Brien	Runnels	Watkins
Oakar	Satterfield	White
Pashayan	Shuster	Williams, Ohio
Pepper	Simon	Winn
Pickle	Staggers	Wirth
Pursell	Stangeland	Wolff
Quayle	Steed	Wylder
Quillen	Stenholm	Young, Alaska
Rangel	Stewart	Zeperetti
Richmond	Stockman	

□ 1310

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Abdnor.  
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Gudger.  
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Nelson.  
 Mr. Zeferetti with Mr. Pursell.  
 Mr. Rodino with Mr. Quillen.  
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Rousselot.  
 Mr. Leland with Mr. Stangeland.  
 Mr. Wolf with Mr. Stockman.  
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Symms.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Winn.  
 Mr. Hutto with Mr. Young of Alaska.  
 Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Brown of California.  
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.  
 Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Harsha.  
 Ms. Ferraro with Mrs. Heckler.  
 Mr. Glialmo with Mr. Broyhill.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Clausen.  
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Cleveland.  
 Mr. Rangel with Mr. Kemp.  
 Mr. Rose with Mr. Leach of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lungren.  
 Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Marlenee.  
 Mr. Moakley with Mr. McClory.  
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
 Mr. Flippo with Mr. Devine.  
 Mr. Digs with Mr. Philip M. Crane.  
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Davis of Michigan.  
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Conable.  
 Mr. Carr with Mr. Carney.  
 Mr. Ashley with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
 Mr. Guarini with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.  
 Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Hansen.  
 Mr. Kazen with Mr. Hagedorn.  
 Mr. Mazzoli with Mr. O'Brien.  
 Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Pashayan.  
 Mr. Wirth with Mr. Quayle.  
 Mr. Barnard with Mr. Daniel B. Crane.  
 Mr. Coelho with Mr. Dixon.  
 Mr. Dellums with Mr. Dornan.  
 Mr. Derrick with Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. Kogovsek with McCloskey.  
 Mr. Jones of Oklahoma with Mr. Latta.  
 Ms. Holtzman with Mr. Erdahl.  
 Ms. Oakar with Mr. Frenzel.  
 Mr. Nolan with Mr. Treen.  
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Thomas.  
 Mr. Richmond with Mr. Wylder.  
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Frost.  
 Mr. Holland with Mr. Grassley.  
 Mr. Maguire with Mr. Hammerschmidt.  
 Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Hillis.  
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Hollenbeck.  
 Mr. Stump with Mr. Jeffords.  
 Mr. Stenholm with Mr. Lewis.  
 Mr. White with Mr. Martin.  
 Mr. Mathis with Mr. McEwen.  
 Mr. Mattox with Mr. Moore.  
 Mr. Watkins with Mr. McKinney.  
 Mr. Simon with Mr. Moorhead of California.  
 Mr. Shuster with Mr. Stewart.  
 Mr. Johnson of Colorado with Mr. Williams of Ohio.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6081) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance in support of peaceful and democratic processes of development in Central America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RATCHFORD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 257, nays 42, not voting 134, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—257

Akaka	Dodd	Jacobs
Albosta	Dougherty	Jenkins
Alexander	Downey	Jenrette
Ambro	Drinan	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Calif.	Duncan, Oreg.	Jones, Tenn.
Anderson, N.C.	Duncan, Tenn.	Kastenmeier
Annunzio	Early	Kildee
Anthony	Eckhardt	Kostmayer
Applegate	Edgar	LaFalce
Aspin	Edwards, Calif.	Leath, Tex.
Atkinson	Emery	Lederer
AuCoin	English	Lehman
Badham	Erlenborn	Livitas
Baldus	Ertel	Lloyd
Barnes	Evans, Del.	Long, La.
Beard, R.I.	Evans, Ga.	Long, Md.
Beard, Tenn.	Evans, Ind.	Lowry
Bedell	Fary	Lujan
Bellenson	Fascell	Luken
Benjamin	Fazio	Lundine
Bennett	Fenwick	McDade
Bethune	Flindley	McHugh
Bevill	Fish	McKay
Bingham	Fisher	Markay
Blanchard	Fithian	Marks
Boggs	Florio	Matsui
Bolling	Foley	Mavroules
Boner	Ford, Mich.	Mica
Bonior	Ford, Tenn.	Michel
Bonker	Fountain	Mikulski
Bouquard	Fowler	Miller, Calif.
Bowen	Gaydos	Miller, Ohio
Brademas	Gephardt	Mineta
Brinkley	Gibbons	Minish
Brodhead	Gilman	Mitchell, Md.
Brooks	Glickman	Moffett
Broomfield	Goldwater	Mollohan
Buchanan	Gonzalez	Montgomery
Burlison	Goodling	Mottl
Burton, John	Gore	Murphy, Pa.
Burton, Phillip	Gradyson	Murtha
Butler	Gray	Natcher
Byron	Green	Neal
Campbell	Grisham	Nedzi
Carter	Guyer	Nichols
Cavanaugh	Hall, Ohio	Nowak
Cheney	Hall, Tex.	Oberstar
Clinger	Hamilton	Obey
Conyers	Hance	Oettinger
Corcoran	Harkin	Panetta
Corman	Harris	Patten
Coughlin	Hawkins	Patterson
Courter	Hefner	Pease
D'Amours	Heftel	Perkins
Daniel, Dan	Hightower	Petri
Danielson	Hopkins	Peysner
Dannemeyer	Horton	Porter
Daschle	Howard	Preyer
de la Garza	Hubbard	Rahall
Deckard	Huckaby	Rallsback
Dicks	Hughes	Rangel
Dingell	Hyde	Ratchford
Dixon	Ichord	Reuss
	Ireland	Rhodes
		Rinaldo

Ritter	Snowe	Vento
Roberts	Solarz	Volkmer
Roe	Spellman	Walgren
Rosenthal	St Germain	Wampler
Roth	Stack	Waxman
Roybal	Stanton	Weaver
Royer	Stark	Weiss
Russo	Stokes	Whitehurst
Sabo	Studds	Whitley
Santini	Swift	Whitten
Sawyer	Synar	Williams, Mont.
Scheuer	Tauke	Wilson, Tex.
Schroeder	Taylor	Wolpe
Sebelius	Thompson	Wright
Seiberling	Traxler	Wyatt
Shannon	Trible	Wyle
Sharp	Udall	Yates
Shelby	Ullman	Yatron
Skelton	Van Deerin	Young, Fla.
Smith, Iowa	Vander Jagt	Young, Mo.
Smith, Nebr.	Vanik	Zablocki

NAYS—42

Archer	Kelly	Myers, Ind.
Ashbrook	Kindness	Paul
Bafalls	Kramer	Robinson
Bauman	Lagomarsino	Rudd
Burgener	Lee	Schulze
Coleman	Lent	Sensenbrenner
Daniel, R. W.	Livingston	Shumway
Derwinski	Loeffler	Snyder
Dickinson	Lott	Solomon
Forsythe	McDonald	Spence
Gingrich	Madigan	Stratton
Hinson	Marriott	Walker
Holt	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whittaker
Jeffries	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob

NOT VOTING—134

Abdnor	Ginn	Murphy, Ill.
Addabbo	Gramm	Myers, Pa.
Anderson, Ill.	Grassley	Nelson
Andrews, N. Dak.	Guarini	Nolan
Ashley	Gudger	O'Brien
Barnard	Hagedorn	Oakar
Bereuter	Hammer-	Pashayan
Biaggi	schmidt	Pepper
Boland	Hanley	Pickle
Breaux	Hansen	Price
Brown, Calif.	Harsha	Pritchard
Brown, Ohio	Heckler	Pursell
Broyhill	Hillis	Quayle
Carney	Holland	Quillen
Carr	Hollenbeck	Regula
Chappell	Holtzman	Richmond
Chisholm	Hutto	Rodino
Clausen	Jeffords	Rose
Clay	Johnson, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Cleveland	Johnson, Colo.	Rousselot
Coelho	Jones, Okla.	Runnels
Collins, Ill.	Kazen	Satterfield
Collins, Tex.	Kemp	Shuster
Conable	Kogovsek	Simon
Conte	Latta	Slack
Cotter	Leach, Iowa	Staggers
Crane, Daniel	Leach, La.	Stangeland
Crane, Phillip	Leland	Steed
Davis, Mich.	Lewis	Stenholm
Davis, S.C.	Lungren	Stewart
Dellums	McClory	Stockman
Derrick	McCloskey	Stump
Devine	McCormack	Symms
Diggs	McEwen	Thomas
Donnelly	McKinney	Treen
Dornan	Maguire	Watkins
Edwards, Ala.	Marlenee	White
Edwards, Okla.	Martin	Williams, Ohio
Erdahl	Mathis	Wilson, C. H.
Ferraro	Mattox	Winn
Flippo	Mazzoli	Wirth
Frenzel	Moakley	Wolf
Frost	Moore	Wylder
Fuqua	Moorhead,	Young, Alaska
Glialmo	Calif.	Zeperetti
	Moorhead, Pa.	

□ 1330

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6081, with Mr. FOLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, at the very outset let me say to my colleagues that we intend to complete general debate on the bill, H.R. 6081, today.

Then on Monday next the bill will be considered for amendments. It is my understanding that prior to the consideration of amendments a request will be made for the House to go into a closed session. I make this announcement in order that the Members will clearly know that indeed on Monday next we intend to finish this bill.

I would also like to advise our colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that at the desk here, we have a rather succinct but very informative paper as to why there should be aid to Nicaragua, and I would invite those who wish to be further informed on the bill, H.R. 6081, to avail themselves of this paper.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6081, the Special Central American Assistance Act of 1979, would provide \$75 million in assistance to Nicaragua, and \$5 million to Honduras.

The need for this emergency assistance to Nicaragua was created as a result of the devastation from 18 months of civil war which ended in July of last year. The toll in human suffering and economic destruction includes 35,000 people dead and over \$1 billion in physical damage. There has been a 25-percent decline in the gross national product of Nicaragua as a result of the civil war. The unemployment rate is 33 percent. In the first few weeks after the end of the fighting, the U.S. Government provided some \$27 million in emergency relief to meet immediate food and health needs.

The bill before us today, Mr. Chairman, would provide interim rehabilitation assistance. Over half of the assistance will be used to get the private sector back on its feet. Of the \$70 million loan, 60 percent, some \$42 million, is earmarked to aid the private sector so the local economy can once again meet the needs of the country and provide employment.

The continuation of the existing economic conditions in Nicaragua will only foment further instability and violence. We cannot permit this to happen.

In addition to this economic purpose of the assistance there also is a political purpose. Nicaragua is in the early stages of postwar development. There are both totalitarian and democratic forces at work in the country. The political process is in a state of flux.

□ 1340

Within the governing councils, there is considerable Cuban influence, and there are anti-U.S. elements. We admit this readily. There are Communist elements that would like to take over Nicaragua to dominate it. But there are also prodemocratic forces, including the church, the

private sector, and certain important government leaders who will resist Communist domination.

The issue before us today is, are we going to just write off Nicaragua and permit the antidemocratic forces, the elements in Nicaragua that are trying to destabilize the country, to take control and establish a Marxist government which is unfriendly to the United States?

The question is, Are we going to take a gamble to prevent that from happening? Are we going to take a chance so that the people of Nicaragua may have an opportunity to establish an independent, democratic government?

In addition to authorizing assistance for Nicaragua the bill also provides \$5 million for Honduras, where antigovernment forces are also at work. The objective of this program is to give a timely demonstration of encouragement to the Government of Honduras for its improved commitment to equitable economic and political development.

Mr. Chairman, let me warn Members about the likely tenor of the debate during the consideration of this legislation. We have already heard mention of the arguments those who are opposing this assistance will use, and the nature of their allegations.

We will hear charges that Nicaragua has already or is about to go Communist. Indeed, some call it a Communist country now.

We also hear allegations that Cuba and Soviet supporters dominate the government and that the Sandinistas are trying to foment revolution in El Salvador and Honduras.

It is true that there are Marxists in the government but there are also businessmen, priests, and others, who believe in democracy. Furthermore, the conclusion of most observers, including most Members of Congress who have visited Nicaragua, is that Nicaragua is not about to go Communist, although it could in the long run if the United States does not join the other free-world countries who are providing assistance and trying to influence the direction in which the country moves.

We heard today that Nicaragua has been assisted by Communist countries, but we were not told that some 30 other countries have provided some \$270 million in loans and grants, and that in addition to Cuba and the U.S.S.R. the donors include Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Peru, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Venezuela, the Federal Republic of Germany, and others, all non-Communist countries.

Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that there are other countries that are just as anxious as we, the United States, to insure that Nicaragua moves in the direction of a free independent and democratic government. Indeed, we all hope that some day Cuba will also move in such a direction.

True, there is Cuban influence within Government circles. Cuba did provide the Sandinistas with training and arms during their struggles and there are Cuban advisors in the country. However, the Cubans are not the only influence. It is the best judgment of our observers that even some of the far leftists in the Government are not seeking to replicate the Cuban model and are looking for other examples and experiences to follow, independent of Cuba, independent of the Soviet Union, and yes, independent of the United States.

We must be there to help the democratic elements succeed.

Finally, many of the allegations which we will hear discussed are based on information from persons of unknown reliability. Therefore, perhaps it is proper that we have a secret session so we can discuss these allegations in detail.

Mr. Chairman, let me leave the committee with some recollections of two countries. I recall when I came to Congress some 31 years ago, one of my most difficult votes was to support assistance to Yugoslavia. There was no question that Tito was a Marxist. There were those at that time who said that Yugoslavia was gone; it would be just a matter of time and it would be part of the Warsaw Pact; and that our assistance to a Communist regime was like pouring money down a rathole.

Well, what has happened? Sure, Tito was a Marxist, albeit not the typical Communist, and he has led Yugoslavia along a path in which there is some political and economic freedom and some freedom of expression and total freedom of religion. Most important of all, Yugoslavia has proved to be independent from the Soviet Union and more supportive of the United States foreign policy objectives than it has been of the Soviet Union.

A more recent case, Mr. Chairman, is the situation which existed in Portugal in 1974 when that country was considered by some to be lost to communism. Marxists appeared to be in the driver's seat. And where is Portugal now, after assistance from the United States and Western Europe? Portugal today is a democratic country.

We can provide no assurance—I must underline this, Mr. Chairman—that the \$75 million, or even more, will make Nicaragua a democratic government that is friendly to the United States. I agree that dollars do not buy friends. But the assistance that we are giving is not dollars alone. It is goods and services. When we give \$42 million to the private sector, the material will come from the United States.

As I said we cannot provide assurance that this assistance will turn the tide toward the democratic forces. But of this I am sure; not to provide assistance would be to walk away and concede victory to the Cubans and Soviet surrogates.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this legislation on Monday will have overwhelming support.

Let me close by sharing with my colleagues and you, Mr. Chairman, a letter that was received from the national commander in chief of the



Veterans of Foreign Wars, Howard E. Vander Clute, who recently visited Nicaragua.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
February 20, 1980.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee, U.S.  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Recently, I visited Nicaragua and, based upon this visit and my trust in the judgment and patriotism of the U.S. Country Team in that damaged and volatile country, I hereby recommend that your Committee recommend approval of \$75 million in reconstruction aid for Nicaragua.

We cannot "run the film backwards." Perhaps there was, at some point, an alternative to Somoza rule, other than the Sandinistas, that might have been practical earlier. But if there was a lost choice then, I see no choice today.

The young junta may follow the Cuban model; I don't know. But I do know we must offer them a real policy choice.

The devastation left in the wake of the revolution is sickening. This I saw with my own eyes and, as a Christian, I can do no less than to urge swift and compassionate American assistance.

I urge prompt passage of the \$75 million aid package for Nicaragua.

Please advise me of your intended course of action.

Most sincerely,  
HOWARD E. VANDER CLUTE,  
National Commander in Chief.

□ 1350

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute and yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to compliment him on making a very good case in a very difficult situation, because I think it is hard to make a good case. The gentleman has presented the best face that he could on his proposition.

But I also enjoyed his historic analogies, references to Yugoslavia and other countries where we have had a chance, and I think if we had occasion to go back and read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba, the gentleman's speech was probably made many, many times at that time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's compliment. I would wonder what follows. He has been more generous than I had expected and I thank him for his commendation.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this legislation as it is seeking to provide substance for the continuance of oppression of an unwilling people. Now

that the Carter administration has let the Marxist horse out of the barn in Nicaragua, Congress is being asked to vote a \$75-million lock for the door.

The administration used its human rights policy selectively against its friends in Nicaragua and the Somoza regime there was an early casualty. Now, State Department policymakers are arguing that the United States should send \$75 million in aid to protect democracy there.

If I had any hope that the Sandinista radicals who control Nicaragua would promote democracy, I would be the first to want to help. But the evidence is overwhelming that democracy is the last thing on Sandinista minds.

The Sandinistas have made blatant power plays to control key elements of Nicaraguan life. They have created government unions, calling AFL-CIO associated unions CIA puppets, despite the long record of those unions of opposition to Somoza. Using a \$560,000 grant from East Germany, the Sandanista labor front has used armed guards to intimidate workers and take over two-thirds of Nicaragua's unions.

Freedom of the press is in danger. Human rights have been ignored, while Sandinistas conducted some 500 to 1,000 illegal executions and imprisoned 7,000 people for political reasons.

National elections have been labeled unnecessary and too expensive. The government wants to wait until illiteracy has been eliminated and the population is "properly educated" before allowing a popular vote.

The Sandinistas have nationalized banks, mines, insurance companies, fishing, timber and grain production. Private schools, including religious ones, face seizure by the government.

A network of neighborhood committees has been established to provide political education, organization, surveillance and military training.

Meanwhile, Cuba has sent some 1,200 teachers and 500 doctors to Nicaragua, along with technical and military advisers.

The Sandanista government has adopted a Cuban-style education reform program, based on removal of all parental influence and encouraging political indoctrination of all citizens from the age of six onward.

Does this sound like an emerging democracy? I am afraid not. The Sandinistas have joined the Soviet/Cuban bloc in support of terrorists in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia, Namibia and the Western Sahara, and they are trying to export their brand of revolution to other countries in Central America.

The Carter administration is deluding itself and the American people by thinking that we can buy friendship. This \$75 million aid program will do the opposite—it will brand the United States a "patsy" in the eyes of the world.

So far, the Sandinistas have not managed to maintain the Nicaraguan economy, nor have they kept the country running. They need this money to make their revolution work. Instead of trying to buy them off, we should be saying,

"If you think your system works, let's see it work—without American dollars."

Instead of supporting an obviously leftist government in Nicaragua, we should be helping democratic regimes in Guatemala, El Salvador and Costa Rica. Congress is not being asked to send any aid to these countries, and only \$5 million would go to Honduras.

The administration chose to ignore congressional concern in its dealings with the Somoza regime. I am completely opposed to buying a \$75-million lock to close the door now that the horse has run away to join the Communists.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this aid request for the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua; certainly at least in its present form but more important than that is my very strong belief that every Member of the House should be completely advised so that an informed and intelligent decision can be made.

I and five of my colleagues went to Nicaragua during the Thanksgiving recess to look at what was going on in that country. We were able to talk to practically all of the members of the government there. It is very plain to me, and they made little pretense about it, that many of them, if not most are dedicated Marxists.

There is nothing that has occurred since November to change my very clear impression that the Nicaraguan Government is controlled by the Sandinista National Directorate and not the supposed bipartisan five-member junta.

For example, Thomas Borge, a member of the directorate, the minister of the interior, who is in charge of security and the prisons, is a Marxist and a close friend of Castro. Borge spent a great deal of time in Cuba. In addition, more than 1,200 Cuban teachers are in Nicaragua and 600 Nicaraguan students are being educated on the Isle of Pines, now called the Isle of Youth, in Cuba. These actions can only be interpreted as methods used for political indoctrination, since the government openly advocates political education for all Nicaraguan youth between the ages of 6 and 14.

Speaking of culture, you might be interested in an article that appeared yesterday in the Los Angeles Times:

In a unanimous decision, the state's nine-member Board of Prison Terms has rejected a petition by a Nicaraguan convicted of murder asking that his parole date be advanced so that he could be deported to Nicaragua as requested by that country's government. Robert Zelaya, also known as Pancho Agulla, the name under which he has had five books of poetry published while in prison was sentenced to life in prison for the 1969 slaying of a security guard during the robbery of a San Francisco store. Nicaragua's ruling Sandinista junta has indicated that if Zelaya is returned, he would be asked to join the junta as a member of the Ministry of Culture. Zelaya, 34, is scheduled for release in 1989.

While in Nicaragua we also learned that the regime nationalized or expropriated all lands that belonged to Somoza, which in itself should not be too

surprising. However, the Sandinistas did not stop there. They have nationalized banks, insurance companies, mining, fishing and forestry industries, foreign marketing of agriculture as well as lands and properties of former Somoza supporters. There are even reports of properties of anti-Somoza supporters being confiscated.

We heard reports that violations of human rights are, some say, as bad as they were under Somoza, and these are by people who had been opposed by Somoza, not friends of his, saying that. The regime also acknowledges there are more than 7,000 political prisoners in Nicaragua, and reports of torture and abuse have been documented. The president of the Nicaraguan permanent human rights commission Jose Esteean Gonzales alleges that there have been at least 500 and might be as high as 1,000 executions in the first 4½ months after the end of the revolution. This commission was very active in opposing Somoza.

Reports continue to come in that the Sandinistas are aiding guerrilla movements in El Salvador and Guatemala. It would be unrealistic to assume that the Sandinistas would turn their backs on those same groups who supported them in their struggle to take over Nicaragua. In the international arena, the Nicaraguan regime solidly supports the Soviet/Cuban lead in the Third World movement and in the United Nations. Their statements voice support for the PLO and emphasize the "people's struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, racism—including Zionism—and all forms of oppression." The Sandinistas call for the return of Guantanamo Naval Base, end to the Cuban embargo and express support for the Puerto Rican terrorists as the "authentic representatives" of Puerto Rico in their call for independence. They oppose the Camp David accords and express their solidarity with the PLO, stating that "our common enemy is American imperialism and we must always be united to fight it." Nicaragua abstained on the vote condemning the Soviets for their invasion of Afghanistan, attacking the United States for having a fleet in the Indian Ocean, among other things.

The Nicaraguan regime is not regarded by all Latin nations as a model of progressive government either. The Colombian Ambassador to Venezuela last week charged that human rights are being violated in Nicaragua. The closing of the newspaper El Pueblo resulted in trials of the editorial staff and prison sentences of 2 years. Incidentally El Pueblo operated freely under the Somoza regime, even though it was violently anti-Somoza. The only other nongovernment-owned newspaper, La Prensa, has also been warned. Commander Bayardo Arle, a member of the Sandinista directorate and official in charge of communications said:

Therefore a measure has been taken against an organ of the counterrevolution. The counterrevolution consists not only of military attacks on the revolutionary process; it also involves political attacks, the type of underhanded attack that was being carried out by El Pueblo, as is being done by other media which, unless they change their

attitude, will have to receive the same medicine.

There are charges that trials are held without competent judges, and with no right of appeal. Colombia, itself, has virtually severed diplomatic relations with Nicaragua over long-disputed Caribbean islands. Colombian officials charge that Cuba is interfering as well in the maritime problem between Colombia and Nicaragua as part of Castro's plan to expand further into Central America.

There are also reports from Nicaragua that negotiations will begin soon with the United States to arrange for the extradition of Somoza followers who fled to the United States following the Sandinista triumph. The Attorney General is reported as saying:

All Somoza followers now abroad who committed crimes, assassinations and thefts will be brought before common courts to be tried and sentenced for the crimes they committed. No Somoza criminal will escape revolutionary justice for the many crimes and the genocide against the Nicaraguan people.

Turning once again to the question of aid for this regime, all the arguments in favor of this request that carry any weight say that it should be done to promote pluralism in Nicaragua. Yet, in Nicaragua some view the aid as a "means to pressure the government to give the bourgeoisie and the oligarchy a prominent place in the Nicaraguan Government."

From the economic viewpoint, the interventionist aspirations of the imperialist banks have not changed in essence, only in form. The aim is to perpetuate their political influence with the support, this time, of reformist groups in Latin America and international reactionaries. In view of the fact that they have retained their traditional policy—openly admitting their intention to manipulate the economic aid by interfering with national politics to protect their interests and those of their local puppets throughout Central America—the imperialists are clearly demonstrating their intention to maintain neo-colonialist domination in a more subtle and thus more dangerous manner. Of course, it will be very difficult for them to intervene successfully in today's Nicaragua, but it is important to know what kind of aid we can expect from the U.S. Government: usurious loans with interventionist intentions. To believe otherwise is to daydream.

That last sentence sums up perfectly the delusion of offering aid to a Marxist regime. This economic assistance will not promote democratic principles in Nicaragua. "To believe otherwise is to daydream." Interestingly, an official of the Nicaraguan Government criticized as interventionist a statement by Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs William Bowdler, that he hoped for a pluralistic society.

It is absurd to think that democratic institutions and free enterprise can be promoted in Nicaragua when the Sandinista regime has effectively taken control of all aspects of society.

Moreover, the message we are sending to our remaining friends in the region is that reward goes to a Marxist-dominated regime that has come to power through revolution. That means you cannot count on the United States to help fight Cuban-supported terrorists.

Based on the terrorist history of the ruling Sandinista elite, there is little reason to be encouraged by their lack of respect for democracy, human rights and freedom. By taking this gamble, the likelihood is that we won't be promoting democracy, freedom, and human rights but rather simply solidifying the control of the Sandinistas. We have no reason to contribute aid to make Marxism work in Nicaragua.

I urge my colleagues to oppose aid for Nicaragua unless severe restrictions and conditions are placed on this measure to establish the principles of freedom and democracy in Nicaragua.

□ 1400

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, my gut instincts tell me that the gentleman speaking in the well is eminently correct in his observation, and that those who would have us vote for this bill are indulging in extremely wishful thinking. I come to that conclusion because our intelligence, as is usually the case in these days, and has been the case since Watergate, is woefully inadequate.

I have not been able to get the type of hard information that I want to really pass intelligently upon this bill. Has the gentleman received any intelligence briefings in his committee on regard to the situation, the political situation that does prevail in Nicaragua at the present time?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Yes, we have, although I am obviously not able to comment.

Mr. ICHORD. Were they able to tell the gentleman how many people have been executed by those in power, and the circumstances of the executions?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Well, unfortunately the briefings were executive session. That was confidential, classified, so I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. ICHORD. Well, were they able to tell the gentleman, I would ask the gentleman in the well, as to how much property had been expropriated by those ruling now in Nicaragua, and whose property that was that was expropriated?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Well, again I do not know how I can answer that without violating the rules of the House. I have heard that information from others, and the figures vary a great deal. The Sandinistas give one figure, and I have forgotten exactly what it is. Others down there give other figures.

Mr. ICHORD. Let me ask the gentleman, what would the basis be, was it ELINT or UMINT or COMINT? I think I have felt that since I have been in the House, by reason of the committee I have served on, dealt with more intelligence matters or as much intelligence matters as any Member of this body. Now, I think that can be told, what has been the intelligence sources of the gentleman's committee; whether ELINT, COMINT, or UMINT. Let us be honest with the American people and with the Members of this House. What kind of

intelligence did the gentleman receive? Was it credible?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I can answer that question. I think it was credible, certainly.

Mr. ICHORD. It was credible?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. It was credible to me.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. There are no executions in Nicaragua. There is no death penalty. Second—

Mr. ICHORD. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon. I did not understand that.

Mrs. FENWICK. There is no death penalty in Nicaragua.

Mr. ICHORD. Is the gentlewoman telling us that no one has been executed in Nicaragua after the revolution?

Mrs. FENWICK. We know of no governmental activity that has resulted in executions.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that we have admissions from the Nicaraguan Government officials themselves. They admit that 700 to 1,000 people have been executed, most of them summarily, and the excuses that were given were that these murders are caused by overzealous Sandinistas.

Mrs. FENWICK. All I said was, no government executions.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I am going to reclaim my time, but I am going to repeat the statement I made. The president of the Permanent Human Rights Commission, who opposes Somoza, says that at least 500 have been executed, and he thinks as many as a thousand.

Mrs. FENWICK. But that is guerrillas.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. No, government action.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH).

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6081. As you know, similar legislation has already been passed by the Senate. I hope that the House will follow suit this afternoon by approving this modest request, thereby authorizing our participation in the important task of helping to reconstruct Nicaragua.

Mr. Chairman, there are three basic points that I would like to make on this bill.

First, regardless of our own personal preferences, a basic and fundamental change has taken place in Nicaragua. One can label it a change for the better or for the worse depending upon the ideological preferences one brings to the issue. However, nothing that we do today will alter the fact that a change has taken place. Thus, what we are called upon to decide this afternoon is how the United States will respond to change.

Second, as a people and as a government, we are faced with very few choices at this point. One alternative is to do nothing, and, if that is what the Mem-

bers want to do, they should vote this proposal down. That approach may appear to be the safest one politically because none of us can be sure how the Nicaraguan revolution will turn out. However, in my judgment that would not be the wise course, or one which would serve our own interests.

For us to do nothing would send a very clear signal to the Nicaraguan people that they must look elsewhere to meet the very serious and pressing problems they face. And we should have no doubt about the gravity of those problems.

For example, in human terms, the civil war left between 35,000 and 40,000 people dead, 100,000 wounded, 40,000 orphaned, 250,000 homeless, and almost 1 million people in need of food and medical assistance. In economic terms, the costs of the war are estimated at approximately \$2 billion. The national debt is estimated to be approximately \$1.5 billion, with some \$660 million of that amount due this year. Since virtually no money was left in the national treasury when the former government fled power, it is clear that progress will not be possible without substantial foreign assistance.

In short, doing nothing will force the Nicaraguan people and the Nicaraguan Government to turn elsewhere for help. In the face of these grave human and economic problems, the United States would be turning its back. In addition to not offering this modest aid, we would also be forsaking any chance to constructively influence the future. I do not believe that is in our interest.

My final point, Mr. Chairman, is that we can respond to these circumstances on the basis of either our hopes or our fears. Since none of us can be certain about the ultimate political outcome in Nicaragua, our votes this afternoon will tell as much about us as it does about the future of Nicaragua. In our effort to simplify a complex situation, it will be easy for us to apply labels to the people and Government of Nicaragua. But the fact is that every shade of opinion is represented in the Nicaraguan revolution. There are leftists represented, and some of them have made statements that are offensive to us. Yet, there are other elements represented in that revolution as well, moderate elements that can be found in the church, in the private sector, in the communications media, and in the Government itself.

At this point, there is no way of knowing whether the moderates or the radicals will prevail. As a result, our own hopes and fears, insofar as they are reflected in our votes, take on an especially crucial role.

I urge the Members to decide the issue today on the basis of hope, not fear. Only with our help and the help of others can the forces of pluralism and moderation prevail in Nicaragua. There are no guarantees that can be given about Nicaragua. The future outcome is cloudy. What is clear, however, is that if we decide this issue on the basis of our fear about what might happen, it almost surely will. That would not serve the people of Nicaragua, nor the interests of the United States.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

□ 1410

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strenuous opposition to this legislation if history should teach us anything about foreign aid, it is that you cannot "buy" friendship. The motion that providing the pro-Marxist Sandinista regime of Nicaragua with \$75 million in hopes that such aid will gain us influence with that government is sheer folly.

Yet this is precisely what the Carter administration would have us believe. Indeed, the committee report summarizes and accepts this motivation behind the aid proposal.

It is sheer naivete to think that the Nicaraguan Sandinistas are susceptible to United States or free world influence. On the contrary, U.S. financial support of the present regime would only serve to bolster the unpopular leftist government and further entrench its authoritarian control. We U.S. citizens should not be required to prop up this oppressive, socialist government through our tax dollars.

Such a proposition is neither in the best interest of the United States nor our neighbors in this hemisphere, including, I should emphasize, the people of Nicaragua.

In a sense, Mr. Chairman, the President is asking the Congress and the American people to buy a "pig in a poke." He is seeking rapid, and I believe premature, approval of this grant before a comprehensive analysis can be made of the situation in Nicaragua. Initial indications of that government's commitment to democratic principles, however, are not encouraging.

In my view, Congress should not consider such an aid request before free and open elections have been held—a minimum condition which must be a prerequisite for resumption of U.S. support.

Instead, we are told by the State Department to trust the vague assurances of the Sandinistas, while the Carter administration insists we should ignore the overt pro-Marxist statements and actions of the new government.

President Carter has stated that this \$75 million aid package for Nicaragua will "demonstrate that the United States can be relied upon to support democratic aspirations, the rebuilding of broken economies, and the security of our friends in the nearby region." A closer examination of the situation, however, reveals that passage of this bill would contribute toward precisely the opposite result.

The Government currently in control in Managua is an unelected totalitarian Government created out of chaos.

Power in the country lies with a self-appointed directorate—nine men from three Sandinista guerrilla factions, some with histories of violent terrorist activity and recipients of training, weapons, and sanctuary in Cuba. This directorate subsequently named the five-man ruling junta.

The overwhelming majority of Nicaraguans are opposed to communism, and the United States should be encouraging these truly democratic factions to unite to bring reason out of chaos in opposing the bloody pro-Communist regime. Thus far, they have no role in the Sandinista government.

The State Department apparently has never considered this course of action, but rather dawdled while the Communists consolidated their position within Nicaragua and then meekly recommended accepting the Sandinistas as being the only government available.

The Carter administration now recommends this amount of money with the misplaced hope that we can entice the Sandinistas to implement democratic principles and prevent them from "going Communist." The State Department and President Carter fail to recognize, however, that the governing body in Nicaragua has already gone Communist. The remaining question confronting the United States is whether we will help finance their Castro-Cuban form of government.

From the early and vociferous anti-American, pro-Communist statements of the new government it should be obvious that there is no way, by any amount of money, that the United States can win the true friendship or support of this self-appointed Government in Nicaragua. The Marxists in control are inherently opposed to the individual freedom and free enterprise economy for which our Nation stands.

The Sandinistas will simply use us to further their own ends and discredit the United States, as is the objective of communism worldwide. This is the course upon which they have already embarked, as should be readily apparent from the initial actions and statements of the junta.

It should be obvious that Fidel Castro is the primary force behind the Nicaraguan revolution. He has consistently supplied the terrorists throughout Central America with advisers, guns, money, and also put them in contact with international Communists from Moscow, Marxists and PLO supporters in such diverse places as Libya and Panama.

In October 1979, Sandinista Deputy Foreign Minister Ramirez affirmed that—

The Government of Nicaragua is on the side of Cuba, the Soviet Union . . . and is in favor of the policy of the Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran.

On November 20, the Managua barricada reported Ramirez as stating—

The date on which the Bolshevik revolution occurred is known historically as the date of the decree of peace, which maintains peaceful co-existence among socialist nations and responds to the people's best interests.

The nature of the Sandinista government becomes even more obvious when we examine those with whom they associate.

Soviet boss Brezhnev forwarded his hearty congratulations in October to the new pro-Soviet ally:

We congratulate the Nicaraguan people for their historic victory against the dictatorial Somoza regime.

The message went on to note that the Soviets highly respected the Nicaraguan people for their—

. . . Important contribution in the history of the struggle for independence and national liberation.

The Sandinistas were quick to reciprocate these felicitations in kind. News services noted—

The Sandinista workers central and the Socialist and Communist parties . . . commemorated the Russian revolution on its 62d anniversary.

On December 11, Acan-Panama reported that another pro-Marxist revolutionary, Yasir Arafat, had sent his congratulations. The same report noted that Nicaraguan leaders met with Libyan delegates to discuss ways in which that pro-Marxist country could aid in the Nicaraguan reconstruction.

Most recently, the Nicaraguan delegations abstained on the U.N. resolution condemning the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, unmistakably an anti-American/anti-free world vote.

There should be increasingly less doubt about the pro-Soviet, pro-Cuba nature of the Sandinistas as pro-Communist actions further reveal their true character.

Yet the State Department continues to hope that Nicaragua's leftist tendencies can be moderated by U.S. aid. Rather, those policies will continue, now with U.S. financial support, if the House approves this authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD) has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have been closely following the events now taking place in Central America.

Throughout the region, social, and political unrest resulting from population growth, pressing economic conditions, and restrictive authoritarianism combined with Cuban inspired terrorist violence, has threatened to ignite the entire area in revolution. In Nicaragua, the revolution has come and gone, leaving thousands of its citizens dead and inflicting tremendous damage to its economy. El Salvador, a moderate government seeks to bring about needed reforms in an atmosphere overshadowed by political violence of the extremes, inspired by the revolution in Nicaragua. Guatemala and Honduras are also experiencing the effects of growing unrest and concern about the mounting strength of radical forces and the instability that they bring.

In this regard, I have grave reservations about our Nation's current policy responses to this challenge. The arguments concerning our need to continue supporting those elements of the private sector in Nicaragua who share our views and ideas on democracy, human rights, and the need for a pluralistic society cer-

tainly merit our consideration. I am concerned, however, about the lack of evenhandedness in our support for those groups in Nicaragua where at the same time we fail to provide equal support for those elements in the neighboring Central American nations where we have a more favorable opportunity to help bring about change without violence.

The amount of U.S. aid provided to the new Government in Nicaragua since it came to power in July of 1979 totals some \$71.8 million. If we add to that the \$75 million in the bill now before the House and the fiscal year 1981 request of \$50.4 million, the administration's package for the new Sandinista government totals some \$197.2 million, including military aid.

On the other hand, in the three neighboring States of El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala, who face the most critical challenges stemming from the Nicaraguan revolution, the administration has failed to respond in like manner in its assistance efforts. In El Salvador, the comparable fiscal year 1980 and fiscal year 1981 aid levels total \$71.1 million. In Honduras that total is \$84.4 million. In Guatemala it is only \$23.8 million.

My concern is that in Nicaragua where the Marxist-dominated Sandinista have already seized power, we are asked to approve some \$197.2 million to help that nation revive its economy and to help prevent it from becoming another Cuba. On the other hand, to its three most seriously threatened neighbors in Central America the administration proposes only a combined assistance of \$184.3 million, or \$12 million less than the total for Nicaragua alone.

I urge my colleagues to seriously consider this imbalance in our proposed Central American response. It makes little sense to concentrate so much effort in trying to close the barn door in Nicaragua after the horse is gone while at the same time we neglect to adequately respond to the internal threats to its neighbors where our chances of success in bringing about a peaceful moderate change are far less of a gamble.

The legislation before the House presents us with an opportunity to correct this imbalance and to truly provide significant assistance for the peaceful and democratic processes in all of the critical regions of Central America.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. YATRON).

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6081.

Last November, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I had the honor of being a member of a delegation which visited Nicaragua to ascertain to what extent the country's economy had been devastated by a recent civil war. While in Nicaragua, the delegation had the opportunity to discuss the problems facing this country in detail with key officials of the junta, members of the directorate, leaders of the private sector, and Archbishop Obando Y. Bravo of Managua.

It was clear from our talks that the need for U.S. aid to Nicaragua is es-

sential to alleviate the widespread suffering of the populace, and to insure the future of Nicaragua itself, through needed funds to help rebuild this war-torn country.

I feel that it is important that we join the worldwide response of assistance to Nicaragua.

In the past two decades, Nicaragua has been one of the fastest growing countries in Central America. If given the opportunity offered by this aid package, I believe, in light of their past productivity, that their economy would improve greatly over the next few years.

I recently had the privilege to speak with the Presidents of Venezuela and Costa Rica. During our discussions they impressed upon me their strong support, for aid to Nicaragua.

It was their position that aid would not only benefit the people of Nicaragua, but that in assisting this country, we would also be preventing any possible hardships to the economies of Nicaragua's neighbors, by keeping the borders open for vital trade.

Another key factor in granting aid to Nicaragua, is that the United States certainly has a strong interest in strengthening Nicaragua's ties to the West in order to offset Communist influence. Support for moderate forces is vital to this objective.

We have to encourage the influential voices of freedom and moderation in Nicaragua to help preserve a degree of political openness and freedom of the press. Free enterprise still is predominant in their economy. The failure of the United States to try to strengthen the forces of democratic development at this time, I feel would be to abandon the field to possibly dangerous outside influences.

If we are to achieve stability in Central America, we must pledge our support to Nicaragua. I feel it is in the U.S. interests, to do so.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 6081 by the House of Representatives.

□ 1425

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a few excerpts which I think the committee might find interesting:

This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word and there are no Communists in positions of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman reading from an executive session of the Committee on Intelligence?

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman is reading from the New York Times.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BAUMAN. I will continue.

This is not a Communist revolution in any sense of the word and there are no Communists in position of control. This is the overwhelming consensus among Cubans in the best position to know and this writer subscribes to that opinion after searching inquiries and talks with Cubans in all walks of life and with many Americans \* \* \*

There seem to be very few in Cuba—and one need have no hesitation in saying this—who believe Fidel Castro is a Communist, is

under Communist influence or is a dupe of Communism. The problem of Communism, which aroused little interest in Cuba until Americans picked it up, can be easily summarized. The point of view among the most experienced and knowledgeable Cubans is as follows:

There are no Reds in the Cabinet and none in positions in the Government or in the army or in the sense of being able to control either governmental or defense policies. The only power worth considering in Cuba is in the hands of Premier Castro, who is not only not Communist but decidedly anti-Communist, even though he does not consider it desirable in the present circumstances to attack or destroy the Reds—as he is in a position to do if he wants.

There are some Communists in secondary positions in such fields as motion pictures and culture and a few in the army, although not in key positions. In addition there is the much less clearly defined zone of fellow-travelers, Communist sympathizers and those who are tolerant \* \* \*

This is a revolt of youth, and youth proverbially has its fling, and learns only by trial and error. Young men who should be spending years learning by guidance and experience how to run a department have been forced suddenly to take control of ministries, to wield great authority and to handle many millions in public funds.

I am reading from an article by Herbert L. Matthews in the New York Times, Thursday, July 16, 1959, only a short time after Fidel Castro first came to power. In fact it is probably why Castro was once quoted apocryphally saying, "I got my job through the New York Times." History does repeat itself and the parallel to what we are hearing today is striking.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON).

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of H.R. 6081, the Special Central American Assistance Act. As we know, the bill would provide emergency economic and humanitarian aid of \$75 million for Nicaragua and \$5 million for Honduras. It is an integral part of a larger effort to boost our assistance programs for several troubled nations in Central America and the Caribbean.

#### SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE BILL

Before I discuss the background of and reasons for this proposed legislation, I want to mention a number of its especially worthy features. We should keep these features in mind as the bill is debated.

First, 60 percent of the loans authorized by the bill would go to Nicaragua's private sector, as would the local currency generated by the loans. This provision is in line with our desire to strengthen prodemocratic elements on the contemporary Nicaraguan scene.

Second, the President, as he furnished assistance to Nicaragua, would be directed to take into account the extent to which independent labor unions, human rights, the free press, and the open practice of religion were respected by the Nicaraguan Government. The President would also be ordered to encourage the Nicaraguan Government to exhibit such respect. A semiannual report to Congress would keep Members apprised of the actions of both the President and Nica-

ragua's leaders. These provisions clearly indicate the importance we attach to the fundamental freedoms of the Nicaraguan people.

Third, the President must terminate assistance to Nicaragua if he determined that Nicaragua was—

Helping or harboring international terrorists; or

Aiding or supporting acts of violence in other countries.

This provision makes it unmistakably clear that we will not accept Nicaragua as an instigator of turmoil in Central America.

Fourth, the President would be required to terminate assistance to Nicaragua if he determined that foreign combat forces were stationed in that country and threatened the national security of the United States. This provision states our firm resolve that Nicaragua will not be a platform for foreign military adventures in the region.

Last, Congress would express its sense that traditionally faithful allies who were responsible members of the Organization of American States should have our support against external subversion. This provision shows a steadfast commitment to the proposition that all peace-loving nations in the hemisphere must be permitted to conduct their own affairs free from outside interference.

#### BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The principal recipient of the funds authorized by the bill, Nicaragua, has suffered through a devastating civil war and is now attempting to pick up the pieces. Just how those pieces will be put back together—just what kind of society will eventually emerge from the ongoing process of reconstruction—is the matter at issue.

Some colleagues believe that Nicaragua's revolution is carrying that nation toward totalitarianism. Others think that the Nicaraguan political landscape will remain uncertain months from now. Still others express a cautious optimism that an open society in Nicaragua is possible. Who is right? That is the question we must try to answer.

A review of the present situation in Nicaragua gives us part of the answer we seek. There are negative and positive factors to be discerned and acknowledged.

#### NEGATIVE FACTORS

We would be foolish to turn a blind eye to unsettling events and circumstances known to all of us:

The dominant political organization in Nicaragua, the Sandinista National Liberation Front, is a left-leaning body some of whose members are avowed Marxists.

Cuba actively backed the Sandinistas during the civil war and has continued to provide technical assistance in such areas as education, health, and agriculture.

A few government leaders in Nicaragua have made strident, anti-American statements, at times going to almost comical lengths to paint a bad portrait of us.

A number of businesses, such as banking and mining, have been nationalized, and some properties have been confiscated as well.

Nicaragua has moved away from us on international affairs with its recent abstention on the Afghanistan resolution at the United Nations.

There is little reason for us to gloss over such events and circumstances, nor is there reason for us to make apologies. Our wish that things had turned out differently should not tempt us to distort the nature of the challenge we face.

#### POSITIVE FACTORS

At the same time, we would be foolish to paper over encouraging facts also known to all of us:

There are influential voices of pluralism and moderation, among them businessmen, professionals, and priests, at the very apex of the Nicaraguan Government.

Democratic nations from all around the world have given Nicaragua generous amounts of aid, far more generous in fact than the amounts of aid given by the Communist bloc.

Many government leaders and prominent citizens in Nicaragua have stated their preference for close, friendly relations with the United States.

In spite of its deep difficulties, Nicaragua is a remarkably diverse society: There is a free press, a highly capable private sector, and a strong church, not to mention a number of independent labor unions, professional associations, and political parties.

Nicaragua has shown every intention, whether through international pact or public dialog, of living in peace with its neighbors.

The force and significance of the facts just cited should not be overstated. These facts are not set in concrete, but they do represent a great potential that can be developed. Whether we help in the development of that potential is up to us.

We can choose to compete or we can choose to withdraw. If we choose to compete we stand a chance of exerting influence in virtually every aspect of Nicaraguan life. We can channel events to better endings, always, of course, with respect for Nicaraguan sovereignty.

If we choose withdrawal, we forfeit our right to lead, and our protests on behalf of freedom will ring very hollow indeed.

#### REASONS FOR THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, I want to argue briefly for the passage of H.R. 6081 by discussing four major reasons why the bill is in the national interest of the United States. I may have referred obliquely to these reasons already, but it can do no harm to amplify them here.

First, the bill will bolster the prodemocratic elements of Nicaragua—the independently owned press, the business community, the Roman Catholic Church, the free trade unions, the various professional societies, and the small but vital political parties have all played a role in the Nicaraguan revolution, yet these elements favor democracy and they are striving to assume the place that should be theirs in the nation's life. We must not let them down.

Leading representatives of each of these groups has called on Congress to pass H.R. 6081. The leaders know that

the counterweight of support from the United States will help keep the scales of power from tipping too far in favor of those who have something other than freedom in mind for the beleaguered Nicaraguan people.

Cuba always casts itself as the friend and benefactor of the people. In turn, it casts us as a decadent power that will fight only to protect vested interests and preserve the status quo. Cuba is wrong about itself and about us. The passage of this bill will show to the Nicaraguan people and the people of Central America that the United States wants them to have human rights, democracy, and a better life for the ordinary man and woman.

Second, failure to pass this bill would have critically important effects.

It will make more likely—perhaps even assure—a return to totalitarian rule and suppression of the Nicaraguan people.

In Central America, the failure to pass this bill would increase the threat of subversion in the hemisphere. Agents of violent change throughout the isthmus would be prompted to redouble their efforts.

A striking paradox appears when we survey our posture in the world today. Communist aggression materializes 10,000 miles from our shores, and we react so vigorously that our staunchest allies have trouble following suit. A major treaty is shelved, a grain embargo is ordered, troops, ships, and aircraft are rushed to the scene, and our participation in a significant international event is called off. But let a situation that may eventually become just as serious materialize in our own backyard, and we are reluctant to address it by spending less than 20 percent of what the grain embargo alone will cost—this after our allies have committed enough funds to put us to shame.

Failure to pass this bill would:

Delight the Cubans by showing them our lack of will,

Signal our Latin American friends that we no longer chose to exercise leadership in this hemisphere, and that we do not support economic and social development, and

Tell Nicaraguans that we really do not care about their plight or their future.

Third, the bill would alleviate abject human misery.

The recitation of statistics seldom sensitizes us to the suffering that always follows civil war, but in cases like the current one the statistics are all we have. Permit me to highlight them by giving comparable figures for the United States had we fought a civil war of similar ferocity:

In the aftermath of the Nicaraguan civil war there were 40,000 dead. In the United States there would have been 4 million dead.

In Nicaragua there were 100,000 wounded. We would have sustained 10 million nonlethal casualties.

In Nicaragua there were 40,000 orphans. Here, 4 million children would have been left without parents.

In Nicaragua there were 200,000 homeless. In the United States there would have been 20 million without shelter.

In Nicaragua the gross national produce fell 25 percent during the belligerency. Americans would have been hit with a \$500 billion loss of purchasing power.

In Nicaragua 55 percent of the work force was left idle. Here, more than 50 million people would have been without work.

The idea that Nicaragua is a shattered nation was not concocted by Nicaraguans so that they could get some credit on easy terms. When we try to understand their suffering by expressing it in terms appropriate to our larger land, we cannot even conceive of the conditions they face.

Humanitarian concern, a quality that Americans have always manifested, compels us to consider H.R. 6081 positively. Also, we should bear in mind that the results of our concern will not be like dust in the wind. The Nicaraguan people will know and remember who helped them in their time of need.

Fourth, and finally, this bill will be a watershed in our relations within Latin America, a region of increasing importance to us.

Issues such as immigration, trade, energy, and regional security, among others, will turn our eyes slowly to the south over the next several years. We must begin to deal with them. Nicaragua raises sharp questions of national sovereignty, social change, economic development, and political stability in the heart of a region we have too long taken for granted.

This bill in particular, and Nicaragua in general, are acid tests of our ability to cope with these questions in a context that is at once familiar and foreign:

Familiar because we share the Western values and modern orientation of our Latin American neighbors.

Foreign because the region has rankled too long under the weight of our neglect.

How we vote on H.R. 6081 will cast lines far beyond the borders of the small country whose fate we ponder. It will establish a precedent, set a tone, and sever a notice concerning our overall will and intention in Central America and beyond.

The question this bill poses for the United States is: Do we want involvement, competition, and leadership, or will the United States choose to disregard, to withdraw, to capitulate?

I earnestly hope that a majority of my colleagues will choose with me by supporting the Special Central American Assistance Act.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I take part in this debate today for one very specific reason. When the honorable gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Long) and I, the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, bring the appropriations bill to the floor and try to make changes in the appropriations versus the authorizations we are often told: "We have made a commitment. You have to stick by the commitment."

Today is the day we make the commitment on the authorization bill. That is why I feel no unease in being involved in this debate on the commitment stage as well as the appropriations stage.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read from a document if there is no objection. The document is entitled "The Special Central American Assistance Act of 1979." It is a report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, together with dissenting and additional views.

Mr. Chairman, the more I look at this bill and the more I look at the map of Central America, I realize that \$75 million of the \$80 million in this bill is going to Nicaragua. If we are sending a message to Central America, certainly those who are not in this bill are going to get a big message that those countries who have been friendly to us and who have in the past supported us and who are not anti-American, are getting nothing in this bill. The message is that Nicaragua is getting 75 million of the \$80 million.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to pursue that point today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am sure the gentleman would not want to leave the impression that the United States is not giving assistance to the other countries in the region. It is not included in this bill, but the gentleman must know that the executive plans, in conjunction with this bill, \$55 million for Honduras, \$11.4 million for Guatemala, and \$49.8 million for El Salvador, partly through reprogramming.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman by saying that the title of this report is "A Special Central American Assistance Act."

As this gentleman is well aware and the gentleman from Wisconsin is well aware there are many dollars that are going to be included for Nicaragua and other countries in other bills.

□ 1430

Today it was my understanding that we were just debating the one bill.

Now, while the gentleman is at his lectern, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, if the gentleman would respond.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Well, the gentleman has the time. Ask me the question and I will be delighted to answer.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would respond to my question,

On page 4 of the report, it says:

The \$75 million in U.S. assistance is to be composed of a \$70 million program loan and a \$5 million grant.

Could the gentleman explain to us the terms of the loan?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes. The loans will be under typical aid terms regarding length of repayment and the interest.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is the point. What is the rate of interest that will be supposedly repaid on this?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The interest will be

2 to 3 percent. The number of years would be negotiated.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The years are to be negotiated; the gentleman is saying the years are to be negotiated? That still has not been settled yet?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. My understanding is that it would probably be a 40-year loan.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Will there be a grace period?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Probably.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Ten years?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Five to 10 years.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Five to 10 years. Well, I thank the gentleman for his comment.

In effect, we have what is commonly known as a concessional loan with really hardly enough interest being charged to administer the loan.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further in order that I can also respond?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. As the gentleman is so very anxious that we give assistance to all the Central American countries, he is aware that our aid and loans to other Central American countries are under the same terms?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I understand that, but I just wanted to establish for the record what those terms were. We make a lot of loans that are concessional all over the world, not only directly, but through the World Bank; but I just wanted to establish that once again.

But out of the \$75 million now, \$70 million of it is for that program loan. Now, in effect, that is going to be a cash transfer.

My understanding when the gentleman from Indiana spoke was that this was to deal with abject poverty and, of course, when we talk about foreign aid bills, we are always talking about abject poverty and we are always talking about feeding the poorest of the poor or we are talking about sending food or helping them to develop their economy.

In this case, we are, in fact, making a cash transfer to the Government of Nicaragua; is that not correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, certainly.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Florida presumably is referring to the 60 percent of the \$75 million, which is approximately \$42 million, which would be made available to the private sector. That is not a cash transfer. The money will be made available through the Central Bank of Nicaragua, by being deposited in a U.S. bank in New York, under a contract for the specific purpose of private enterprise's making purchases of equipment or services from the United States. Every project is specific and there will be review and audit by U.S. personnel. It is not a cash transfer to the Central Bank for whatever purpose the bank in Nicaragua chooses.

The money is to be made available for transfer for purchases in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is the point I was making. The cash is trans-

ferred to the nationalized bank in Nicaragua and then the bank will disperse the funds under whatever agreements there are, if there are any agreements existing today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have a certain sympathy with the minority representative who spoke about these concessional loans. Any time prime interest is at 15¼ percent and we make 2 percent loans for 40 years, I think we ought to call a spade a spade and call it a grant. That does not mean that it is not justified as a grant. But I do not think we ought to kid ourselves and kid the recipient countries by calling this kind of assistance loans.

As to the comment of the gentleman from Maryland about Herbert Matthews, yes, Herbert Matthews was taken in. He wrote four articles at that time from the Sierra Maestra Mountains before Castro finally was successful in his effort to take over the leadership of that country. He not only was taken in himself, but he also took in a young liberal Democrat from New York who held a fund raiser for Castro in 1959 on the basis of those four articles representing Castro as a liberal agrarian reformer.

My sense of mortification, guilt, and embarrassment prevent me from identifying the chap who held the fund raiser for Castro in 1959.

Let me say about this bill that we have several choices. They are not all sure bets. They all involve risk. The one choice that involves no risk is to say no, to turn our backs on Nicaragua and the rest of Central America and send out a message loud and clear that we are only going to make grants and loans and only provide foreign aid when there is a clear political advantage for us and when we can do some arm twisting and muscling.

Now, that has not been our tradition. The fact is we have been pretty doggone successful in our foreign aid program without the mean spirited toughness and duress that has frequently characterized Russian foreign aid efforts. If you look at Africa and Asia, you will not see that the Russians or the Chinese have outdone us. If you travel across the length and breadth of Africa as I have done, if you had had lunch, as I did with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JIM WRIGHT, about 2 weeks ago in Abidjan in the Ivory Coast with a half dozen members of our Peace Corps there, you would have burst with pride to see these marvelous young ambassadors at work generating in their wake enormous good will for the United States.

You would have been convinced of the value of our foreign aid, even though it was not transcendently clear that we were producing X, Y, and Z political results.

The reason that we create all that good will and the reason that we should support this bill is because it is true to us and the very essence of our heritage. It is true to what America is all about. We have given away several hundred billion dollars in the last generation since World

War II, in the most extraordinary continuous systematic program of human compassion and decency in the history of civilization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I am proud of that record.

I do not say that we have not made a few mistakes, and maybe the aid contemplated in this bill will turn out to be a mistake. Unfortunately, it is impossible at this time to tell what kind of government will emerge in Nicaragua. Most of these leaders are young kids in their 20's. They are impressionable. They are malleable. They are going to respond to the people. Events in post revolutionary periods have a way of being very fluid and unpredictable.

I hope that the aid will be in the form of human services, rather than in the form of capital investments. I hope that our aid will be in the form of sending some Peace Corps people out there to help with education, with literacy, with family planning, with various methods of developing better food raising techniques, with systems of elementary health care delivery.

I hope we will be showing them something about appropriate technology, about how to produce jobs with the least amount of capital. How do you produce investments that are labor intensive in the rural areas that give jobs to the poor in the rural areas where most people in the developing world live. For too long we have piled up all the manure in one small corner of the field and there has not been enough left for the rest. By that I mean that most of our foreign aid has been of the capital intensive, high technology variety, owned by the elites of the recipient country, who manufacture a product, generally with imported materials, sell it in international trade, and bank the profits in numbered accounts in Switzerland.

Far too little of our foreign aid, and far too little of the aid programs financed by the World Bank, and the regional development banks—have really helped the rural poor where most of the world's poor live—with literacy, family planning, preventative health, food and sanitation and above all job training and employment programs. This is what the developing world needs—not a continuing obsessive preoccupation with capital intensive high technology programs. The essence of the developing world's problems is that, with current projected developing world population growth rates, the developing world will have to produce almost a billion additional jobs by the year 2000—far more than the entire currently employed population of the developed world. I hope this aid contemplated in this bill will address these horrendous problems looming up ahead.

I hope that we spend our funds down there primarily in human services, for

health care, education, food production and intermediate technology, in cottage industries for poor people in rural areas. I am very, very confident that if we do that, that we will produce an enormous fallout of good will for the United States, not only in Nicaragua, but in the entire world, because the world is watching. And can prove that we have been true to the Judeo-Christian ethic that has motivated us for 300 years and that has proven to be pragmatically successful in Asia, in Africa, and Latin America, as well as moral, decent and right.

We have nothing to apologize for and if you examine our record of success in our third world development efforts vis-a-vis the Russians and the Chinese, it will be perfectly clear that when we act like Americans and when we act in the spirit of what America is all about, the political benefits seem to flow as naturally as day follows night.

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in the last few days Members of the House have received several "Dear Colleague" letters concerning H.R. 6081, which would provide \$75 million in emergency economic assistance for Nicaragua. Some of the letters opposing the bill are from members who have visited Nicaragua, but who cling to their belief that the country has become or is becoming a totalitarian Cuban satellite even in the face of the most convincing evidence to the contrary: namely, that during their visits to Nicaragua, these members, known opponents of the present Nicaraguan regime, were nevertheless allowed to travel freely through the country and to question whomever they wished.

These letters argue that "we need the facts" before we vote. Unfortunately, their letters do little to further their plea, relying as they do less on facts than on half-truths and unsubstantiated allegations. Members of Congress for Peace through Law has recently prepared a rebuttal to the misstatements and allegations that have been flying about; I commend their sober, careful analysis of the Nicaraguan situation to the attention of all my colleagues:

#### NICARAGUA: ALLEGATIONS VERSUS FACTS

**Allegation:** Our aid money will be routed through the Sandinista-run Central Bank, with no guarantee of how it will be distributed. Soviet advisers are working in the Central Bank.

**Fact:** The aid money will be disbursed through a series of government-to-government contractual agreements, with the United States having the right of audit and of inspection. Both governments have agreed that 60% of the money will go to the private sector. There is no evidence of Soviet advisers in the Central Bank. The president of the bank, Sr. Arturo Cruz, is hardly a wild-eyed Sandinista; he has worked for many years in international financial institutions, including the Inter-American Development Bank in Washington.

**Allegation:** The Sandinistas have started a Cuban-style "literacy campaign." The instructor's manual is laced with references to the "Yanqui aggressor" and to the need to develop an "anti-imperialist conscience of national liberation."

**Fact:** There is indeed a literacy campaign; not surprisingly, it is based upon the Cuban model, since one of the few good things the Castro government has accomplished is to eradicate illiteracy. In the 126 page student's textbook, there is exactly one reference to imperialism, one to the "Yankee enemy," one to Che Guevara, and none to Cuba. The bulk of the textbook consists of the kinds of reading and writing exercises familiar to all of us from grammar school.

**Allegation:** A Spanish-speaking House aide could not find one person in a housing development rebuilt with U.S. assistance who knew of our aid. The bill proposes that "plaques" identify U.S.-financial projects, but these can serve no purpose, since 60% of all Nicaraguans are illiterate.

**Fact:** How many persons did this aide question? One? Two? Twenty? And why should this matter be so important? Our aid is intended to bolster the private sector, not to induce a flood of thank-you notes. If certain House members are suspicious of the worth of plaques in a country with much illiteracy, they might wish to reconsider the value of that literacy campaign which so excites their ire.

**Allegation:** The Sandinistas have "already" nationalized all banks, mines, insurance companies, fishing, timber, and grain production and they plan to take over all private and religious schools.

**Fact:** The word "already" is the red herring here. Upon assuming power, the Sandinistas carried out their earlier promise to nationalize banks (national, not foreign), mines, and insurance companies, along with property belonging to Somoza and his associates. No nationalizations are planned for the future. In December the government, admitting that there had been abuses, rescinded the decree authorizing the nationalization of Somoza's properties. Only grain export—NOT grain production—has been nationalized. Some fishing and timber industries have been taken over: for these the government has promised compensation at book value, with 6½% interest over 6 years, and a one year grace period. The Minister of Education announced last week that there are no plans to take over private or religious schools in Nicaragua.

**Allegation:** None of this money goes to the beleaguered governments of El Salvador and Guatemala. By aiding Nicaragua, we will be encouraging Marxist revolutionaries in those countries.

**Fact:** El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala all receive U.S. aid, and plans are afoot to provide some of these countries with more. The Administration is now preparing a \$50 million emergency aid package for El Salvador; Honduras will receive \$55 million for economic aid in FY 1980; Guatemala will receive \$11 million during the same period, plus \$50 million now in the pipeline. All these economically troubled countries thought a stable Nicaragua important enough to provide the new government with substantial aid, including more than \$100 million for export credits.●

● Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. Chairman, the arguments of those who favor this bill containing \$75 million in aid to the revolutionary pro-Marxist Government of Nicaragua have a certain amount of surface appeal. But closer review of what Nicaraguan aid advocates are saying, no matter how cleverly they attempt to mask or disguise the import of their words, reveals a reliance on now discredited and shopworn notions of how this Nation should conduct its foreign policy.



We are told that we must give them \$70 million in loans—which, incidentally, will probably never be repaid—and \$5 million in direct grants to keep Nicaragua from moving further into the Soviet-Cuban sphere of influence. We can buy the friendship and goodwill of Nicaragua. It seems to me that we have heard this siren song of liberalism before; recent events throughout the world have demonstrated that it is not true.

Do proponents of the aid package really believe that we are going to win friends or influence people by throwing millions of dollars in the general direction of Nicaragua? The Nicaraguan Ambassador to the United States, Rafael Solis, has already downplayed the significance or impact of U.S. assistance. Writing in the January 1980, issue of the Nicaragua Newsletter, Ambassador Solis states, and I quote:

But finally, let me observe that our needs are so great that even \$75 million loan from the United States will do little to help us rebuild our country."

Advocates of aid to Nicaragua downplay or conveniently overlook the fact that Nicaragua abstained from voting on a United Nations resolution demanding the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. They are more concerned with finding fault with the foreign policy of the United States. Indeed, in their January 1980 Nicaragua Newsletter, the Nicaraguan Government criticizes U.S. naval maneuvers in the Indian Ocean, potential U.S. aid to Pakistan, and the failure of the U.S. Senate to approve the SALT II treaties. The Government of Nicaragua concludes by observing that, and I quote:

The partiality of the spirit of the (Afghanistan) Resolution is not conducive to a solution.

Now I would like to know why we should export American tax dollars to a government that will not even condemn the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Their abstention from voting demonstrates a tolerance for Communist aggression.

Our Nation's foreign policy and foreign aid programs ought to reflect our intention to reward friends of the United States and punish, or at least penalize, our enemies. We ought to pursue our own enlightened self-interest.

Let me conclude by saying that I hold no brief for the ousted Somoza government. That is past history and no constructive purpose would be served by re-primations or fixing the blame. Opposition to this aid package is neither consistent nor inconsistent with the question of approving this foreign aid to Nicaragua.

It seems to me that the evidence at hand suggests it requires congressional disapproval of the President's efforts to reallocate and make possible aid to Nicaragua.●

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering H.R. 6081, the Special Central American and Caribbean Security Assistance Act. As you know, this bill will authorize \$80 million in assistance to Central America and the Caribbean; \$75 million of which is earmarked for relief and reconstruction in Nicaragua, \$5 million which is

allotted for grants for agricultural, technical, and educational assistance. I am aware that some of my colleagues have expressed opposition to aid for Nicaragua because they feel the United States will be supporting or rewarding a "Marxist" dominated government.

I can only counter by saying such comments are overreactive and a definite danger to the Nicaraguan's constructive course of implementing a new and creative development strategy and pursuit of a new independent foreign policy. It remains my firm belief that nations of the Third World should be aided by the United States and other technologically developed countries in their search for economic, social, and political stability.

While I do not believe that we or any of the developed countries should attempt to dictate the political, economic, and social systems of the Third World, I believe that we can encourage the growth of democratic institutions and policies in these countries by contribution to their economic progress, the factor that I consider to be most crucial to the evolution of stable political orders. We can only add to the threat to world peace—and by so doing imperil humanity—if we choose to ignore the pressing development needs of the Third World countries.

I stand for a foreign policy posture and international commitments which to me, and many of my constituents, seem most likely to result in a lasting peace and a world where resources are shared, human rights respected, and no basic human needs are neglected.

I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the aid package to Nicaragua and accordingly would like to share the following remarks of the Nicaraguan Ambassador, Rafael Solis, to President Carter.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR RAFAEL SOLIS CERDA UPON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF HIS LETTER OF CREDENCE

Mr. President: On behalf of the Junta of the Government of National Reconstruction of the Republic of Nicaragua, which I represent to the government that you head, allow me to take this opportunity to extend a cordial greeting to you on this historic occasion on which, for the first time after 45 years of dictatorship under Somoza, the Nicaraguan people, exercising their full sovereignty and independence, have the opportunity to address the people of the United States through you, their distinguished President.

In order to understand the historic significance of this moment, it is necessary to recall that, throughout history, relations between the heroic Nicaraguan people and the United States Government have never been as happy and friendly as relations should be between two peoples whose traditions include a love of freedom.

For us, the Sandinistas, the legitimate heirs of our immortal General of Free Men, Augusto César Sandino, and the legitimate representatives of our people, it has been very difficult during our 18-year struggle to make a distinction between the United States Government and Somoza regime since, until recently, the United States Government established, protected, and strengthened the dictatorship.

After 1977, when you became President of the United States of America and implemented your human rights policy, relations between the United States Government and

the dictatorship underwent a change that was favorable to the interest of our people. This change occurred when your government publicly condemned the constant violations of human rights in Nicaragua and suspended, first, military aid, and then economic aid to Somoza's genocidal government in an effective implementation of your human rights policy.

Although it is true that the struggle to overthrow the dictatorship was successful principally because of the tremendous sacrifice made by our people and their vanguard, the *Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional* (Sandinista National Liberation Front), it is important to note that, in addition to the valuable assistance from friendly countries, the position maintained by your administration towards Somoza's Government also helped to a certain extent to isolate him and it seriously weakened one of his three pillars of support, the United States Government.

Our government certainly recognizes this fact and it is grateful not only to you, Mr. President, but also to all the people in your administration, in Congress, in the churches, in the universities, and in all other sectors of the United States who contributed in one way or another to the overthrow of the Somoza dictatorship by weakening this basic pillar of support.

Today, Mr. President, our government sincerely wishes to initiate and maintain a new type of relations with your government based on the principle of respect for the sovereignty, self-determination, and integrity of our countries and on a frank and cordial friendship between many peoples and governments. It must be remembered that Nicaragua is a small country that Somoza's regime left completely bankrupt, burdened with an enormous foreign debt, and to a large extent, destroyed. Our country has many needs that will certainly require assistance from all the friendly peoples and governments in the world. In this regard, we feel that the United States has an important role to play.

Prompted by the desire of further strengthening, if possible, the frank and friendly relations that fortunately exist between our two countries, and inspired by a clear concept of hemispheric solidarity, I hope that in performing my lofty mission I will be able to achieve and maintain the President's esteem and regard. Relying on this, I request that you give entire faith and credence to any information I communicate to you in the name of the Republic of Nicaragua and its government, especially when I express my warmest wishes for the personal well-being of the President, to whom I am honored to present the letters of credence that accredit me as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Nicaragua.●

● Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, there is much talk these days about the United States providing aid only to those countries that support basic human rights and that have made the commitments of insuring the protection of the social and economic rights of its citizens.

With this in mind, we cannot afford to ignore the current plight of Nicaragua and the special provisions of H.R. 6081 and the Special Central American Assistance Act.

Since the Somoza regime ended last year, more than a quarter of this country's GNP has been wiped out. In the closing days of the Somoza dictatorship, banks, businesses, and the national treasury were looted. Many businesses have fled the country and those remaining are in dire straits.

The new regime that succeeded the

Somoza regime has nationalized some industries, but there are private sector industries that remain. H.R. 6081, the Special Central American Assistance Act, insures the survival of economic pluralism in both the private and public sector economy by earmarking 60 percent of the \$75 million for use by the private sector.

The new leaders of Nicaragua have already expressed an interest in establishing good relationships with the United States and have called for an immediate release of the hostages in Iran.

Now is our opportunity to foster good relationships with these countries rather than waiting until they have come under the hegemony of other nations.

We are protected from supporting a country inimical to our standards on human rights by the specific provisions of H.R. 6081 which directed the President to grant these funds only on the condition that human rights are protected and which require the Secretary of State to make twice yearly reports on the status of human rights in these Central American countries. Approving support for these countries now may be our only chance. ●

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6081, the Special Central American Assistance Act of 1979. The \$75 million in aid to Nicaragua is part of the international response to help rebuild the torn and shattered Nicaraguan economy in a way that will enable the people of Nicaragua to begin to resume their normal, productive lives. The simple fact of the matter is that because of the revolution, the economy has been severely disrupted, and the new government has had the difficult task of rebuilding the nation almost from scratch. As a result, Nicaragua will face an expected \$300 to \$400 million gap between essential imports and central bank reserves. An international aid effort is now underway, with contributions pledged from several West European nations including Sweden and West Germany. In all, \$275 million has been offered in bilateral aid, with another \$300 million pledged by the international financial institutions. The \$75 million contained in this bill for Nicaragua will fulfill the U.S. contribution to this effort.

On a fact-finding mission to Nicaragua early last month, I asked if the revolutionary government that took over last July could bring forth a stable and democratic state. My answer, after extensive discussions with members of the Government, the Church, and others, is optimistic and hopeful.

The revolution that followed 43 years of Somoza dictatorship enjoys incredibly widespread support. It is open and searching, and unique in that it appears to have been a truly populist revolt. In my talks, particularly with bishops, priests, and nuns, I was regularly surprised and encouraged at their universal feeling that finally a Latin American nation had achieved a government capable of avoiding that violence and polarization that seems so endemic to societies in Latin America.

Today, Mr. Chairman, we must decide whether to give Nicaragua \$75 million in

economic assistance. The future of the post-Somoza Government is dependent, in important ways, on the attitude of the American Government, as determined by our actions today.

The first, and perhaps the most compelling justification for supporting this legislation is that the economic aid is desperately needed to bolster the private sector and provide necessary jobs and services for the Nicaraguan people. We cannot ignore the human suffering that resulted from the long months of fighting.

Second, while it cannot be denied that there are Cubans today in Nicaragua, the people of Nicaragua represented by their Government, very much want the United States friendship, and desperately need our economic aid. It is misleading to suggest that because Cuban teachers and Cuban medical technicians are working in the countryside that the Sandinista revolution is pro-Soviet or pro-Cuban. It is, at this point at least, a nationalistic, pro-Nicaraguan revolution, which is desperately in need of assistance from the more wealthy nations of the world.

Beyond the compelling humanitarian reasons for assisting this ravished nation lies the hard, cold fact that our withholding of aid would leave the Nicaraguan Government with no alternative but turn to the Soviet bloc. Those here today who argue against the granting of this aid, because they contend we would be assisting a Communist or pro-Soviet state, are engaging in the clearest form of self-fulfilling prophesy.

This tiny Central American nation, torn by civil war, plundered by decades of corrupt, dictatorial rule, is today fighting for its economic existence. I cannot stand here today and tell anyone that the granting of this aid package will absolutely assure that Nicaragua will become a model democracy and will shun the role of a Soviet puppet. But I can virtually assure you that, if we do not help Nicaragua in its moment of great need, the new government will be forced to look to the Soviets for aid, and to pay the price for that aid.

The Third World is watching this vote very carefully, especially in view of the Soviet's recent brutal invasion of Afghanistan. In Latin America, in the Caribbean, in Africa and in Asia, nations are watching and waiting to see whether the United States has abandoned its heavyhanded "big brother" attitude toward developing nations. This is our chance to practice what we preach, and to foster the growth of democracy and social justice in our hemisphere.

Both morally and politically, it is the only logical path for us to follow.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and add extraneous material in the RECORD at this point.

#### NICARAGUA AFTER SOMOZA

(By ROBERT F. DRINAN)

Can the revolutionary Government that took over Nicaragua after the July 1979 coup against the hated President Anastasio Somoza bring forth a stable and democratic state? That was the question I investigated as a member of a study group, financed by

the Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee, that visited Nicaragua in early January 1980.

My answer is optimistic and hopeful. The junta that followed 43 years of Somoza dictatorship and a sanguinary 18-month revolution enjoys almost incredibly widespread support. It is open and searching; it candidly acknowledges its debt to Cuba and the presence in Nicaragua of hundreds of Cuban teachers. It asserts, sometimes ambiguously, that it is neither another Cuba nor another capitalist Central American country to be exploited by American corporations.

The revolution in Nicaragua is unique in that it appears to be a truly populist revolt inspired to a surprising degree by the Catholic social activists. Some persons in Managua claim that the new Government in their country is the first fruit of Medillin and the cry of Latin America's 300 bishops for a just economic order. Priests and nuns in Nicaragua even suggested that their revolution might become the model for Latin America. Four priests hold cabinet or high positions in the new Government: One of them is foreign minister, Father Miguel D'Escoto, a Maryknoll priest trained in the United States.

Everything converged happily in Nicaragua to bring about the fall of President Somoza. He had so little constituency toward the end of his rule that his Government and even the army fell before a people's crusade organized around the sayings of Augusto César Sandino, a guerrilla leader of the 1920's who was assassinated by a previous Somoza government. The murder of the renowned journalist Pedro Joaquín Chamorro in January 1978 seems to have been the final event needed to solidify the revolution that had been forming for at least a generation.

Added to all of these elements was the presence of a united Catholic hierarchy of seven bishops and a few hundred priests and nuns, mostly from outside of Nicaragua. Working along parallel lines, Catholic social activists and Cuban publicists united the people in their desire to rid themselves of a tyrannical and corrupt government.

In my talks with bishops, priests and nuns, I was regularly surprised but encouraged at their universal feeling that finally a Latin American nation had achieved a government capable of avoiding that violence and polarization that seems so endemic to societies in South America. One priest told me that Catholic teachers in Nicaragua had fulfilled precisely the February 1979 Puebla mandate of the Latin American bishops:

"We ask all Christians to collaborate in the changing of unjust structures. . . ." At a Mass on Epiphany, which I concelebrated, the pastor, in his homily, compared the revolutionaries of Nicaragua with the Magi because both, he said, searched for and found the truth.

The bishops of Nicaragua have issued two pastorals since the change of government in July. Both letters are carefully nuanced in their qualified endorsement of Christian socialism. Both messages condemn Communism and the abuses of capitalism. Both of the widely discussed statements make it clear that Catholics should support the new Government and not undermine it by any unreasonable fear of Communist influences.

But the buoyancy in Nicaragua over the new Government is restrained by the knowledge of its enormous problems. Up to 50,000 of Nicaragua's most educated citizens may have left the country, its external debt is gigantic, its agricultural produce is sharply off as a result of the civil war, and other nations are hesitant about investing in a country whose government is still on probation.

The U.S. Congress will have to decide in the near future whether it desires to give

Nicaragua the \$75 million in economic assistance strongly recommended by the Carter Administration. The vote will clearly be a referendum on whether the Congress thinks that Nicaragua will be another Cuba. The invasion of Afghanistan is logically unconnected with the merits of the \$75-million grant to Nicaragua, but it may nonetheless dominate the debate. I informed the highest leaders of Nicaragua of this and urged them to join the overwhelming majority of nations that have condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. They bristled sharply at the perceived condition of American aid. But they had to admit that if they were silent, this would be seen as an implicit condition of their receiving aid from Cuba and the socialist nations of Eastern Europe.

On Jan. 14, 1980, Nicaragua was one of 18 nations in the General Assembly of the United Nations that abstained from condemning the Soviet Union for invading Afghanistan. That vote will not help Nicaragua with the U.S. Congress.

One of the impressive developments in the new Nicaragua is the vibrant campaign to overcome the illiteracy that affects 840,000 persons over the age of 10, or 53 percent of the adult population. The director of this program, Rev. Fernando Cardenal, S.J., asserts that the structures of the Somoza regime institutionalized illiteracy as a method of preventing participation by the people in their government. There can be no economic or human development without literacy, Father Cardenal insisted to my group. Indeed, he asserted, the entire future of Nicaragua as a democracy depends upon the elimination of illiteracy.

Despite the undeniably broad support for the new Government of Nicaragua, its future is clouded. In El Salvador and Guatemala, I heard leaders almost tremble in fear as they referred to the new "Communist nation" of Nicaragua next door. An invasion of Nicaragua by rightwing elements of Guatemala and El Salvador is not an impossibility. This would become more possible if Nicaragua moves to the left in land reform and in the nationalization of industry. The near-paranoid fear of Communism that pervades the mentality of those in power in Latin America seems sometimes to be so powerful that it could erupt in counterrevolutionary measures against the Sandinistas in Nicaragua.

The future of the post-Somoza Government will depend in important ways on the attitudes of Americans. If the Congress votes down the \$75 million, a deep-seated resentment against America present everywhere in Central America will surge. The people of Nicaragua feel that the Somoza regime could never have survived for more than 40 years without substantial U.S. support. In their more bitter moments, the people of Nicaragua demand restitution; in their more realistic moods, they want a continuation of that aid which, after the 1976 earthquake, the Congress gave somewhat generously. A reversal of that policy, brought about possibly by the antidétente mood following the invasion of Afghanistan, would surely be looked upon as unjust.

The priests and nuns of Nicaragua expressed to me in several ways their desire for solidarity and support from American Catholics. They are proud of the liberation they helped to bring to Nicaragua. They want the new Government to flourish. But this is simply not possible without the good will of the United States. The Catholic leaders of Nicaragua want the American Catholic community to educate the country and to lobby the Congress about the urgent needs of Nicaragua. They made a direct, simple and prayerful plea. America's response may well have an enormous impact on the future of Christian democracy and social justice in Latin America. ●

□ 1440

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, to close debate.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, at a time when our concern for events overseas has been riveted on the Middle East and Southwest Asia, it is well to remember that we face serious challenges, perhaps no less threatening, closer to home. The Caribbean and especially Central America have become a potential powder keg. Nicaragua has gone through a civil war; El Salvador may be on the brink of another; and other countries of the region are troubled by mounting turmoil and violence.

The \$80 million authorized by this bill obviously cannot attack all our problems in this vital region. But these funds are essential if we are going to take serious action to protect our interests in our own back yard.

Nicaragua now presents our country with a unique challenge. It emerged from its long civil war against the Somoza dynasty devastated, with more than a quarter of the country's gross national product wiped out, and the treasury and the banks looted by the departing regime. A new revolutionary government has taken power, deeply committed to eradicating the injustices of the past. Some say the government is Marxist.

To see the situation in Nicaragua firsthand, I and several other members of the House visited there last November. We met with a broad range of government leaders, industrialists, small businessmen, the press, the Archbishop of Managua, and many others.

We found that Nicaragua is definitely not a Marxist country now. There is free press; human rights have been respected more than in most revolutions; and the Nicaraguan private sector is alive and struggling to get back on its feet after the destruction of the civil war. The Catholic Church is a strong, independent force, supporting the objectives of the revolution while encouraging respect for human rights and pluralistic values. The Nicaraguan Revolution, in short, was truly national, supported by all sectors of Nicaraguan society apart from the Somoza machine itself.

Some of the leaders of the new government are Marxist in their ideology; there seems no question about that. But equally important, many others are not. There are a great many Nicaraguans, including the overwhelming majority of the middle class, who joined the struggle against the Somoza regime but who are just as determined to fight against any threat of Nicaragua becoming a totalitarian dictatorship of the left.

This bill is specifically aimed at helping our friends in Nicaragua, the non-Marxist elements and, in particular, the middle class. The Nicaraguan private sector, the heart of the middle class, is under great pressure. Without our help and support, it may not survive. And if the middle class does not survive, democracy will have little chance in Nicaragua.

Some have expressed concern for Nicaragua's abstention on the U.N. reso-

lution to condemn the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. To me that vote, while far from satisfactory, showed only that Nicaragua is neither in our camp nor in the Soviets'.

Nicaragua is clearly going to follow its own path. That is what the revolution last year was all about. We cannot expect it to move in lockstep with our own thinking, on either its domestic or foreign policies.

Things have changed in Nicaragua, and will never return to what they were. We can either adjust to that change and attempt to make the best of it to protect our national interests in Central America, or we can stand by with folded arms and allow the radicals in Nicaragua to gain the upper hand.

Too often in the past our foreign aid has gone to support unpopular dictatorships, with the result that the United States has become identified with the military and authoritarian governments of the world rather than with the aspirations of the people in those countries. Too often we have found ourselves rushing to an area after a country has fallen under Marxist domination in an attempt to limit the damage by shoring up neighboring countries.

Many of us are, with good reason, concerned for the Marxist threat in the Caribbean and Central America. But this threat cannot be countered by simple rhetoric to the effect that the new government in Nicaragua does not meet our standards. We can combat the threat only if we pitch in there and fight with a significant assistance program to help save the middle class and other forces for democracy in Nicaragua. This bill will do just that.

Therefore, I urge adoption of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) has expired.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman in the well be given an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that all time has expired under the rule. The Committee of the Whole cannot change the rule adopted by the House.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6081) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize assistance in support of peaceful and democratic processes of development in Central America, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on general de-

bate on H.R. 6081, the bill just under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the acting majority leader as to the schedule of the House of Representatives for next week.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield to me?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the program for the House for the week of February 25, 1980, is as follows:

On Monday, the House will meet at noon. Monday is District Day; no bills are anticipated.

There will be considered one suspension bill, H.R. 4996, the Paiute Indians of Utah Restoration Act, and the vote will be taken by the yeas and nays on that suspension on Monday, if ordered.

Then we will take up H.R. 6081, the Special American Assistance Act. We will continue consideration, and completion of the consideration of this bill is anticipated.

On Tuesday, February 26, the House will meet at noon. There will be one suspension considered on which a vote will be taken, if ordered. That suspension is House Concurrent Resolution 274, United Nations presence in Indochinese refugee camps.

We will then take up H.R. 3829, international development banks authorizations, under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate. The rule and general debate only will be completed on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, February 27, the House will meet at 3 p.m. to consider a series of House committee funding resolutions.

On Thursday and Friday, February 28 and February 29, the House will meet at 11 a.m. and consider the following legislation:

Conference report on S. 643, the Refugee Act of 1979;

Conference report on H.R. 3398, the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1979; and

H.R. 3829, international development banks authorizations, complete consideration.

The House will adjourn by 3 p.m. on Friday and by 5:30 p.m. on all other days except Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, this program is, as stated before, subject to the usual consideration that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well if I were to inform the acting majority leader that I have been told by some of the Members on my side that on Wednesday, when there is a series of House committee funding resolutions scheduled, there probably will be a number of record votes requested.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader for that information.

□ 1450

Mr. RHODES. Since it is the plan to meet at 3, I am wondering if it might be well to either move up the time of meeting on Wednesday or, in the alternative, to provide for clustering those votes for the purpose of expediting the business of the House.

Mr. FOLEY. I will convey the distinguished gentleman's suggestion to the leadership on our side, and there will be time earlier in the week to make a decision on those suggestions. But I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman from Washington, and I yield back the balance of my time.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 6291, AMENDING THE EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL CREDIT ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1978 AND THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT**

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight, February 22, 1980, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 6291) to amend the Emergency Agricultural Credit Adjustment Act of 1978 and the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to extend and increase certain agricultural loan programs, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

**DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT**

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

**ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1980**

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

□ 1130

**STOP COMMITTEE GROWTH**

(Mr. COLLINS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, subcommittee staff growth must be cut back by the 96th Congress. These non-elected, bureaucratic staffers have obtained far too much power and influence over our country's legislative process.

Let us look at the recent history of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for a classic example of this debilitating growth of subcommittees. As the following chart shows, Commerce Committee expenditures have skyrocketed since the 90th Congress while the number of laws passed has remained comparatively stable. The 90th Congress spent \$566,705 to pass 38 laws, the 91st spent \$1,018,000 on 60 laws, the 92d spent \$1,453,000 on 43 laws. But the staff explosion occurred between the 93d and 94th Congresses. In 1975, rules were established directing each committee with over 20 members to create four subcommittees, including one on oversight. The upshot was that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee spent \$1,638,180 to pass 52 bills in the 93d Congress and \$6,006,000 to pass 48 bills in the 94th. That is a 366-percent increase in cost with less legislation.

With such a record how can Congress claim to be fiscally responsible? Overall congressional spending mushroomed from \$271,067,000,000 in 1974 to \$334,239,000,000 in 1975.

The present committee budget being considered for the second session also includes almost \$100,000 for "House Information Systems" which are word and data processing services that are already provided for all Members of Congress.

These committee employees are not selected under civil service. There are no standard qualifications to be met; they have only to be approved by the chairman of the committee. But there is no tenure.

The legislative process is further hampered by the fact the majority party has a disproportionate share of subcommittee employees. Look at the makeup of the six subcommittees of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the 96th Congress: The majority to minority ratio is 107 to 14—which is nearly 8 to 1. To insure all viewpoints are well discussed, this proportion must be trimmed and the majority must join in this action.

Subcommittees initiate new expanding bureaucracies of government. This country today has more government than we need, we have more government than the people want and the government requires more taxes than people can afford to pay. Less government can be achieved when we have less subcommittee staff.

**EXPENDITURES OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE (FULL)**

	Expenditures	Laws passed
90th Congress.....	\$566,705	38
91st Congress.....	1,018,000	60
92d Congress.....	1,453,000	43
93d Congress.....	1,638,180	52
94th Congress.....	6,006,000	48
95th Congress.....	8,099,687	38
96th Congress.....	(?)	(?)

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE,  
96TH CONGRESS: SUBCOMMITTEE BREAKDOWN—MAJORITY/MINORITY

	Majority	Minority
Communications.....	10	1
Consumer protection and finance.....	15	2
Energy and power.....	25	3
Health and environment.....	16	3
Oversight and investigations.....	26	3
Transportation and commerce.....	15	2
Total.....	107	14

ADMINISTRATION SLEIGHT OF  
HAND ON DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out yesterday, that the administration is playing sleight of hand with the American people on the defense budget. I would like to comment again on the defense budget.

Our intelligence community reveals that over the past 10 years the Soviets have outspent the United States on defense hardware procurement and military construction, by over \$104 billion and on research and development over the past 5 years by \$40 billion. Now, to say that we have a 5 percent real growth in defense spending this year is completely misleading, because we are not buying more; we are buying less. We are not closing the gap, but the gap is widening.

I would hope that the American people would not be deluded into thinking that the increase of 5 percent—which in fact is 3.3 percent in outlays—is closing the gap. We are falling further behind, and the administration is not meeting the needs of the American people for defense.

I have been sitting through CIA and DIA briefings as well as the DOD budget hearings during recent weeks. While I cannot go into an awful lot of detail on either the intelligence assessments or the budget, I would like to take a minute and offer my perspective on both the current United States/Soviet balance of power and with the illusion of the 5-percent budget increase.

Five percent is not enough. We need more. We need to accelerate our pace, and we need to maintain this accelerated pace over the next few years if we are to avoid falling even further behind our adversaries.

Over the last 5 years the Soviets have outspent the United States by the astonishing amount of \$104 billion, or an average of almost \$21 billion per year on hardware and military construction.

To put this in perspective, if this \$104 billion had been available to the U.S. military, we could have purchased the entire fleet of 244 B-1 bombers, the baseline MX program (missiles and shelters); all of the currently programed Trident submarines and missiles; the roughly 7,000 XM-1 tanks we plan to acquire, together with a matching number of infantry fighting vehicles and the once-planned buy of AMST transport aircraft

for intratheater mobility; and still had enough left over to buy all of the F-14's, F-15's, F-16's, F-18's, and A-10's now planned for Air Force and Navy tactical air modernization. This amount would have, therefore, sufficed to modernize all three legs of the triad, strengthen our ground combat capability, and fully modernize our Air Force and Navy tactical airpower.

Even more troubling is the fact that over the last 5 years the Soviets have outspent us by a total of \$40 billion on research and development—an average of \$8 billion per year.

This huge expenditure on hardware and technology has allowed the Soviets to outproduce us over the last 5 years by 10,000 to 3,600 in tanks, 1,000 to 280 in intercontinental ballistic missiles, 50 to 12 in submarines and 3,000 to 1,400 in tactical aircraft, to name but a few examples.

This aggressive Soviet modernization program includes virtually every category of weapon system including those in which our lead was undisputed only a few years ago. Of particular concern to me and the Research and Development Subcommittee on which I serve as ranking Republican member, are recent Soviet advancements in such high technology areas as the development of: First, a highly accurate ICBM guidance system; second, a look-down/shoot-down interceptor aircraft; third, a killer satellite; fourth, an advanced submarine; and fifth, a new family of high-speed computers.

Based on this very significant difference in spending, together with what we have all seen happen in the world recently, it is very clear in my mind that a 5-percent increase in defense spending is not adequate to address this imbalance that has developed between the United States and Soviet military capability. Rather than saying the 5 percent will help us to catch up, I think it might be better characterized as keeping us from falling behind as quickly. That will not cut it. We need to do much more.

ILLINOIS COAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) is recognized for 10 minutes.

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 the Illinois congressional delegation was briefed on "The State of the Illinois Coal Industry," by Mr. Michael E. Walsh, president of Ziegler Coal Co., Des Plaines, Ill.

I felt this was a very worthwhile presentation, and accordingly, recommend it to my colleagues for their review:

STATE OF THE ILLINOIS COAL INDUSTRY  
(Address presented by Michael E. Walsh)

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. My name is Michael E. Walsh. I am president of Ziegler Coal Company, a subsidiary of Houston Natural Gas Corporation. Our office is located in Des Plaines, Illinois and I reside in Palatine, Illinois. Ziegler, at the present, has five active producing coal mines in Illinois and our proven coal reserves in the State are in excess of one billion tons. All of Zeig-

ler's mines are underground operations. We have been entirely underground oriented since our founding over 75 years ago. Our annual Illinois production is approximately 4 million tons.

I certainly appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you this afternoon some of the problems of the Illinois Coal Industry. In the past, problems existing in the Illinois Coal Industry were primarily of concern only to the southern part of our State. Today, the Illinois coal industry's problem should be of concern to all sections of our State and the entire Nation.

In 1970 Illinois produced approximately 64.8 million tons of coal. Early estimates of 1979 production indicate somewhere between 59.1 and 59.6 million tons. The highest production we have achieved in 6 years, and yet the State's total production for 1979 was still approximately 5 million tons less than we produced 10 years ago.

During this same period, the demand growth of the United States Electrical Power Industry grew 7% per year for the years 1970 through 1974. It dropped to 2.5% in 1975, increased to 5.5% in 1976 and then has been about 3.5% for the years subsequent.

While this prime market—the Electrical Utilities—has been growing, Illinois coal production has been steadily decreasing. Nuclear power has not been totally responsible for this replacement, because approximately 68% of the electric power generated in the State of Illinois is generated by coal-burning facilities. The Illinois Coal Industry needs help now. The synfuels programs that are being discussed and initiated for the increased use of coal will not affect the Illinois Coal Industry in the immediate future. Undoubtedly, these processes will create a tremendous demand for our State's vast coal reserves at some point in time, but presently our problem is really one of survival. We need help now to keep our producing organizations intact and viable.

One of the major concerns many studies have indicated as being a hindrance to producing the quantities of coal this Nation will need by the late 1980's is the lack of an adequate trained labor force. It will be impossible to furnish trained, qualified miners for this predicted coal boom unless the present producing organizations are kept intact and expanded. The unemployed miners in Illinois and other coal mining areas will leave the coal miners' ranks by necessity and they will not be easily replaced when we need them. The Illinois coal mining workforce must be kept intact in order to have the trained men that will be called for at some future date.

About 85% of the coal produced in Illinois goes to Electric Utilities. Traditionally, a large amount of the coal mined in Illinois has been used within the State. During the past several years, however, the percentage of Illinois coal shipped out of the State has increased while the percentage of Illinois coal burned in the State has fallen. In part, this trend can be attributed to the Illinois anti-pollution regulations, which greatly restrict the burning of its native coal. In 1970, 33.9 million tons of Illinois coal were burned within the State, which was over 80% of the State's total burn. In 1978, only 19.5 million tons of Illinois coal was burned within the State, or only 50% of the State's total burn. 1979 figures are not available at this time, but I am certain they will be even more devastating than 1978's 50%.

The impact of clean air regulations have had and will continue to have a dramatic economic impact on our State's economy, as well as the entire Nation.

The Illinois Coal Industry is the fifth largest of all industries in our State and is second in the State in nonmanufacturing industries; only agriculture generates more revenue.

The use of western coal in place of our native production has cost our State billions of dollars in lost revenue in the last decade. The use of this western coal to comply with these regulations needlessly causes our State and the neighboring coal producing States loss of revenue and unnecessary costs to the consumer.

The regulations on sulfur dioxide were arbitrarily set without application and use of scientific data to determine a safe level of emissions. Because of these overly stringent regulations, many utilities were compelled to replace our midwest coals with western coal. The unduly restrictive sulfur dioxide emissions limitations should be re-examined and relaxed to the level which would not jeopardize the Federal ambient air standard for sulfur dioxide.

A reasonable Clean Air Act would be welcomed as an important tool in assuring a healthy environment while allowing sustained economic growth. But the law we now have, tightened and made more strict by amendments passed in 1977, threatens to push the cost of coal-generated power so high that the advantage it does have over alternative forms of generation is dwindling. The present environmental restrictions are extremely costly to the ultimate consumer in addition to extreme economic effects of unemployment in some of the traditional coal mining states. The coal mining areas of Illinois have been severely hit by unemployment directly related to the marketing problems of Illinois coal.

Zeigler Coal Company has over 500 less people employed today than we did 18 months ago. This reduction was more than 30% of our workforce, and is a direct result of the environmental restrictions confronting all midwest coals. This trend of dwindling markets for our State's coal will cause additional unemployment in the mines and the other industries dependent on the mines, and will continue unless a more reasonable approach is taken regarding our State's vast coal reserves.

The bringing of western coal into Illinois, with its dramatic economic consequences on our residents, should be weighed very heavily against the environmental restraints imposed on Illinois coal.

Western coal, on the average, has a much lower heating value than Illinois coals. Generally, it takes over 5 tons of western coal to furnish the same Btu equivalent of 4 tons of Illinois coal. Illinois coal is far cheaper on a cost-per-million Btu delivered basis. About 2/3 of the cost of western coal delivered to the midwest is attributable to transportation. Thus western coal is far more vulnerable to the escalating transportation costs than our local coals. That is a certainty!

The amount of diesel fuel used to transport these unit trains from the west is startling. To move 10,000 tons of Wyoming coal to the Chicago area (1,200 miles) takes somewhere between 36,000 gallons to 48,000 gallons of diesel fuel per round trip, depending on the size of the power units. That is 3.6 gallons to 4.8 gallons per ton. On that basis, to move 16 million tons annually from Wyoming to the Chicago area would total approximately between 56 million gallons (1,330,000 barrels) to 76 million gallons (1,810,000 barrels) of diesel fuel.

In addition, in some instances anywhere from 2 to 3 additional gallons of residual oil is added to allay the dust. We can safely say that moving 16 million tons of Wyoming coal to northern Illinois consumes somewhere between 1,400,000 barrels to 2,800,000 barrels per year. Thus, while we become more dependent on foreign oil, scarce natural resources are not being utilized efficiently and the Illinois consumer pays the price.

Studies performed in the past several

years show that transportation is the major contributor to our air pollution. It accounts for approximately 60% of the total. All other industries such as petroleum refineries, chemical plants, paper mills, cement manufacturers, etc. contribute 20% of the air pollution produced. Electric power generation, burning both coal and oil in the boilers is responsible for about 10% of our air pollution emissions. From this, it would appear that the major thrust of the EPA has been at that segment of the industry that causes the least percentage of pollutants.

There has been much debate once again over mandatory conversion to coal plants. Mandatory conversion will not have any short term benefits to our State's energy problems. Utilities will drag their feet until they have no other alternative. And with the use of the courts and the environmentalists, that could be a considerably long time.

Voluntary conversions would be far more expeditious if the utilities were given some attractive economic incentives to burn coal instead of oil; and to burn locally produced coal instead of coal produced 1,000 miles to 1,500 miles away. Rate adjustment put-throughs for the conversion, rapid depreciation and/or other economic incentives will get the job accomplished far more effectively than additional mandatory regulations.

Our energy problems today are more critical than ever before in our Nation's history and, yet, the Illinois Coal Industry is unable to market anywhere near its capacity during this critical period.

The Illinois Coal Industry needs revitalizing, and this can be accomplished without further polluting our air, damaging the environment, or impairing the health of our citizens.

We need help now, so that we can make an appreciable contribution in the future. ●

#### PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, none of us serving in the House today was in Congress on July 28, 1932. This is the infamous day when President Hoover ordered and Gen. Douglas MacArthur supervised the harsh eviction of the bonus expeditionary force from the Mall and across the Anacostia River, where they had set up camp.

The BEEF consisted of some 25,000 vets and their families who were penniless in these early depression days and had come to Washington in hopes of receiving a bonus from the Government for their former military service.

According to reports, however, General MacArthur did not believe them to be veterans and had already made it plain that he would not tolerate agitators posing as veterans. As a later Veterans' Administration survey showed, 94 percent of the bonus marchers had Army or Navy records, well over half had served overseas and almost 25 percent were disabled, but MacArthur refused to believe it.

Mr. Speaker, I bring up this incident in history because there are a number of these veterans still alive and many are, in economic terms, as financially

strapped as they were in that summer of 1932.

I do not believe we can forget these men and the sacrifices that they made for our Nation in the early part of this century, and Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to give all World War I veterans the bonus the Government refused them almost 50 years ago.

They have waited a long time to receive a gesture of thanks from their Government and the bill I am proposing would provide each World War I veteran who served from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, with a bonus of \$10,000 which amounts to around \$208 per year for each year since 1918.

I do not believe that this amount is too much to give to those who went to war in 1917 to make the world safe for democracy. After the war was over democracy indeed came to Western Europe as the aristocrats and kings that had run this part of the world were gone.

Those veterans of World War I whose average age is 84, and are dying daily in numbers, were willing to fight to protect the ideals that our Nation was founded on. They felt they had an obligation to our country and I believe our Nation now has an obligation to them.

Great advancements have been made in many areas in the 80 years of this century, but none of this could have been accomplished if the efforts of World War I veterans to make the world safe for democracy had been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, the young people of today need to be aware of the role these elderly of our society have played in making our Nation what it is today, and I cannot think of a better way than honoring our World War I veterans through this financial bonus. It certainly will not make them rich, but it will enable them to enjoy some of the pleasures that we all now enjoy because of their willingness to defend the ideals of our Founding Fathers.

#### MONETARY MORASS NO. 3

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CAVANAUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have previously included in the RECORD recent articles dealing with the deteriorating international economic order. On February 2, 1980, the Wall Street Journal printed an important story on the perilous debt situations of Brazil and the growing potential damage to the creditor banks who have provided the financing of the \$50 billion of external debt which now burdens that nation. The article follows:

BIG BORROWER: BRAZIL COUNTS ON BANKS TO LEND MORE BILLIONS AS TOUGH YEAR LOOMS—HIGH PRICE OF OIL IS HURTING LAND INTENT ON GROWTH; WILL FUNDS COME EASILY?—MIRACLE WORKER TRIES AGAIN

(By Everett G. Martin)

SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL.—Celso Ming, an economics analyst here, ponders Brazil's out-

look for 1980 and concludes, "We are facing the worst situation in 20 years." Businessman Luiz Suplicy Hafers believes that Mr. Ming is unduly optimistic. "This will be the toughest year in our history," he says.

Why such gloom? Run Brazil's problems through your pocket calculator and you'll see. Exports in 1980 could reach \$20 billion at most. From that, subtract \$11.5 billion to import oil at \$30 a barrel. Then take away another \$10 billion to import essentials like food, raw materials and machinery.

Finally, having already gone past zero, subtract \$14 billion more to make payments due on foreign debt. At about \$50 billion, Brazil's external debt is the largest in the Third World.

Government economists can think of only one solution to all this: Borrow another \$15 billion from banks around the world. Will the bankers go along? In the Brazilian view, they have little choice. Mr. Ming says:

"If I owe a million dollars, then I am lost, but if I owe \$50 billion, the bankers are lost."

#### DOUBTS ARE VOICED

Others aren't so sure that the new loans will come easily. Bankers often mention Brazil and the Philippines as heavily indebted countries that may have trouble borrowing more. "The private supply of funds isn't going to grow," says Robert Slighton, chief international economist of Chase Manhattan Bank. "It may not fall much, but at the same time funding needs are going to grow significantly."

They will grow because Brazil's problems are increasingly shared by a host of Third World nations. Amid worsening world economic conditions, these nations desperately seek not only to survive but also to sustain economic growth to satisfy their people. High interest rates notwithstanding, they still consider borrowing the only way out.

As long as a country continues to grow rapidly, Mr. Slighton says, "rollovers of loans aren't necessarily bad for a bank, even though it isn't something you would prefer to do." But for this year at least, rapid growth isn't likely anywhere. "The outlook for the world economy in 1980," Mr. Slighton says, "can only be characterized as bleak."

If any big gap develops between what Brazil wants and what it gets from the bankers, international lending agencies can't be expected to make up all the difference. For one thing, these agencies now are focusing on countries poorer than Brazil. Also, if Brazil borrowed many billions from, say, the International Monetary Fund, the organization would soon run out of ready cash and it has more than a hundred other countries to worry about.

#### LAST RESORT

Anyway, Brazil wouldn't turn to the IMF except as a last resort because IMF policy is to require economic policy change—usually unpleasant ones, such as budget slashes and tax increases—as a condition for granting large loans. The idea is to solve the problems necessitating the borrowing. Brazil wouldn't relish such strong medicine, especially since it feels, as Mr. Ming puts it, that it is "the victim of a world situation out of its control."

Mr. Ming notes that Brazil, like many other Third World countries, is victimized by the price increases both of the oil-exporting nations and of the industrialized countries that are compensating for their own higher fuel bills. Brazil is even hurt, he says, by actions that seem far removed, such as the Federal Reserve Board's Oct. 6 credit-tightening moves that raised U.S. interest rates. That cost Brazil \$1 billion more in interest payments because up to three-quarters of its debt is in Eurodollars—dollars on deposit outside the U.S.—and interest rates on Eurodollar loans move up and down in line with domestic U.S. interest rates because of supply-and-demand factors.

Brazil isn't even considering going hat-in-hand to its creditors—mainly U.S. European and Japanese bankers—to ask for relief on its debt payments. Karlos Rischbieter, who recently resigned as finance minister, of Brazil's military-run government, argues that all oil-importing Third World countries are in debt "to such an absurd degree that it is starting to create banking problems; if oil reaches \$35 a barrel, it isn't Brazil that will take the initiative to renegotiate the debt—the whole world will have to sit down" and tackle the problems.

#### A SHOWDOWN SOON?

With service charges on foreign debt chewing up more than half of many countries' export earnings, analyst Ming believes that such a showdown is coming soon. "It's a world-wide situation, and it is so bad that the whole world will have to adjust," he says. "Only then can Brazil adjust to the new situation."

Meanwhile, President Joao Baptista Figueiredo has tightened Brazil's fiscal policies—indicating, however, that there isn't much more that Brazil can do. "Our problem," he said in a December speech, "is creating conditions to sustain the flow of resources (loans) that will finance our deficit."

A representative, of a U.S. bank here complains that President Figueiredo "talked, as if continuing to borrow were only a Brazilian decision, but their loans are so big that the big banks can't roll them over alone." This source says that many major U.S. banks are already approaching their legal limit on loans to Brazil—no more than 10% of a bank's capital may be lent to any one borrower.

"We have to get the participation of second-tier banks that aren't already committed to Brazil," he says, "and there isn't any reason why they must participate."

Japan has already warned its bankers against extending more credit to financially strapped Third World countries. But European bankers told *Gazeta Mercantil*, Brazil's most influential business daily, that Brazil can probably get the \$15 billion it needs if it is willing to accept shorter payment terms and higher interest rates.

Since the 1960s, Brazil has made up for a lack of local capital by taking in foreign funds, in the form of capital investment and loans. The economic planners basically used two methods to keep the debt load from becoming a burden: They carefully programmed the repayments, and they pushed dollar-producing exports of manufactured goods by giving subsidies and tax breaks to local companies.

Through the early 1970s, this program produced year after year of rapid economic growth that came to be called "the Brazilian miracle." The quadrupling of world oil prices brought an end to the miracle in 1974.

Brazil, which has to import 80% of its oil needs, saw its oil-import bill climb from less than \$2 billion in 1973 to nearly \$7 billion last year. The effects were masked at first by the record prices that Brazil was getting for its exports of sugar, soybeans and coffee. The planners were lulled, too, by the ease with which they could borrow the so-called petrodollars that the newly affluent oil-exporting countries were recycling through the major banks. The government of former President Ernesto Geisel, says the economist of a U.S. bank's Rio de Janeiro branch, "made the monumental error of thinking that Brazil was going to be an island of tranquility in a sea of turmoil."

#### GROWTH STILL STRESSED

Pressured by a population growing at nearly 3 percent a year (to 124 million last year), which creates a need for 1.2 million new jobs a year, policy remained locked on growth. No one was particularly concerned

when the debt reached \$35 billion by 1978. Businessmen—who owe about 40 percent of Brazil's foreign debt—were even encouraged by tax incentives to borrow as many Eurodollars as they could.

"They (the government) focused on big projects in all areas when they should have aimed at priority in energy substitution and building railroads to replace trucks," says Claudio Haddad, economist for a Rio investment firm. "They simply wouldn't recognize the need or they thought we could do everything at once."

The hard facts finally made themselves clear after President Figueiredo took office last year. At the outset of his administration, his economists said they would cut inflation back from 40 percent; instead, it surged to 80 percent. They would hold the increase in the money supply to 30 percent; it swelled by more than 60 percent. They would reduce foreign borrowing; they had to increase it.

Rising oil prices and weather-caused short-falls in critical crops helped trip the planners up, but it was also apparent that no one was in control of the vast federal structure.

Huge government companies in banking, oil, power, nuclear energy and steel operate practically without supervision and subject to none of the restraints on importing and borrowing that limit private firms.

The budget defies analysis and is shot through with hidden deficits. They are caused mainly by a ponderous bureaucracy that administers a bewildering maze of permits and subsidies to business. The main subsidy is low-cost loans.

Originally intended to stimulate investment in government-targeted areas, the system has become the principal engine of inflation: 80 percent of all domestic credit is granted with some kind of subsidized interest rate far below regular bank rates, and the government creates money to make the loans.

After seeing his 1979 economic policy fail, President Figueiredo ousted the head of his economic team in August and replaced him with Antonio Delfim Netto. It was Mr. Delfim who, as finance minister in the early 1970s, got credit for engineering the late Brazilian miracle. He also created the tangled web of costly subsidies that he now is supposed to untangle.

"Delfim is a power politician," says a longtime friend. "He will cut off guys who get in the way, and he's willing to take chances." In characteristic style, Mr. Delfim has promised to reduce bureaucracy, put controls on the state companies, end the subsidies, cut inflation (to 52% this year) and expand imports while he keeps the economy growing without a recession.

These measures, first outlined over nationwide television by President Figueiredo in December, are being phased in over at least two years. But also wrapped up in the bright-sounding package was an immediate 30% devaluation of the cruzeiro. As a result, the cruzeiro was worth 2.4 cents at the end of 1979, compared with 4.9 cents a year earlier.

The announced aims of devaluation are to lower the price of Brazil's manufactured exports so that they can undersell foreign competitors without getting government subsidies, and to slow imports by making them more expensive in local currency. But the immediate impact was to vastly increase the debt of the hundreds of companies with Eurodollar loans; suddenly it took many more cruzeiros to obtain the dollars to make repayments with.

"We were seduced by the government into taking the loans, and now we are betrayed," charges the head of the industry association of the southern city of Porto Alegre. Mr. Delfim promises that the government will aid companies seriously hurt by the devaluation.

Economists like Mr. Haddad don't think Mr. Delfim has enough up his sleeve to work any kind of miracle this year. Mr. Haddad forecasts another round of inflation followed by recession. He expects unemployment to rise as firms cut back on manpower to help absorb the devaluation blow and the economy fails to produce enough new jobs to keep up with unchecked population growth. ●

#### AN "F" FOR COMMON CAUSE?

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Common Cause, one of the most respected public interest organizations, has just published an intriguing booklet entitled "The Government Subsidy Squeeze." It criticizes what it calls the "special interest state, where public policy is dominated by those with direct and narrow economic interests." It attempts to document specific instances where Congress and the President have caved in to special interests seeking Federal subsidies and other favors. And it even issues an overall report card, in which it gives the House of Representatives an "F" for its work on the budget.

I was reading that booklet the other day—even nodding agreement with many of its criticisms and its recommendations. Then I got to page 64, which describes what it calls a "striking example" of how the House subverted its own budget process by voting in May 1979, "to end the revenue sharing program" and, the very next month, failing "to even decrease funding for revenue sharing when the appropriations bill came before them." In its accompanying press release, Common Cause denounced the House "for its hypocritical voting and game-playing with the budget process when it considered revenue sharing."

Intrigued, I turned to appendix III, page 100, to find out just who those reprobrates were. And there I was, listed among the 90 Members condemned for "playing games with the budget process."

Well, I have done a few minutes homework—more, apparently, than Common Cause did—and I have to tell my friends there that they are not quite ready to go to the head of the class.

The first vote, on May 7, 1979, was on an amendment to the first budget resolution. It would have added to the budget \$2.3 billion, for revenue-sharing payments made only to State governments. Many of us have criticized those State payments—in contrast to payments to local governments—since we here are trying to balance the Federal budget while many State governments are luxuriating in budget surpluses. I, with the majority, voted "no."

The second vote, on June 27, was a different matter altogether; it would have reduced appropriations for revenue-sharing payments to States by \$228 million, and reduced revenue-sharing payments to local governments by \$457 million. That is very different. As every property taxpayer knows, local govern-

ments are hard-pressed for cash, and Congressman Ed BOLAND, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which had reported that part of the bill, pointed out that difference several times in the course of the June 27 debate. He also pointed out that it would take a change in the revenue-sharing formula to eliminate revenue-sharing allocations to State governments while safeguarding payments to local governments; that change may well come in the authorization bill the House will consider this year. So the June 27 amendment was overwhelmingly defeated; I, with the majority, voted "no."

Inconsistent to vote "no" on both amendments? Not at all. Playing games with the budget process? Hardly.

Will Common Cause award itself an F? ●

#### TRIGGER-HAPPY FEC

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I call attention to a recent regulatory decision that threatens to choke robust debate between two candidates for the Presidential nomination.

Ronald Reagan and George Bush will probably lock horns once more before next week's New Hampshire primary—despite the best efforts of a Washington bureaucracy to squelch a public debate.

I find it to be not only ironic, but deeply distressing that a democratic government has created laws and agencies which seem to be intent on capping democracy's life blood: The freedom to cast an informed vote.

And yet the Federal Election Commission seems to be determined to do just that. This week, the FEC ruled that a Nashua, N.H., newspaper would violate FEC rules if it did indeed sponsor a debate between Reagan and Bush. According to the FEC, a two-candidate debate is a partisan debate; and, under proposed FEC rules, news organizations may sponsor only nonpartisan debates—that is, forum open to all candidates for an office.

As a result of these rules, Ronald Reagan is financing the debate himself. More important, the FEC has appropriated for itself the authority to determine which candidates the public will hear—or if they will hear any candidates at all.

Once upon a time, we could expect only one Government agency to claim such power. The Federal Communications Commission, by virtue of its authority over broadcasters, could dictate the conditions under which the public airwaves would be used for the public and candidates to "meet." But times change and bureaucracies grow. This week, the FEC is flexing its muscles. Next week, the FCC could rule that any broadcaster carrying the Reagan-Bush debate violated the equal-time provisions of the 1934 Communications Act. And the following

week, the FTC might jump in the act, claiming that since Reagan paid for the debate and broadcasters carried it, the debate was really a commercial, subject to the full panoply of FTC rules governing advertisements.

The scenario may be far-fetched, but it is not impossible in these days of creeping bureaucracy.

Excessive rules and regulations waste taxpayers' money. But when they also threaten the public's access to information about Presidential candidates, Congress must act. Democracy itself is threatened.

The record shows that this body never contemplated giving the FEC the power it exercised this week in the New Hampshire decision.

Congress has an obligation to clarify its intentions regarding the Federal Election Commission.

Congress also has an opportunity to pass some new legislation which would insure robust, wide-open debate. I have introduced a bill which would remove the present "equal-time" restraints for broadcast coverage of Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates. H.R. 6103 is limited to the Presidential race, but most important it would give our broadcast news operations full freedom to produce debates, documentaries, special interviews or any other kind of news programming that will give the public a chance to see the candidates and the candidates a chance to reach the public.

A recent poll showed that most Americans do not even know what the first amendment is. Are America's leaders just as ignorant?

I cannot believe they are. This Congress has an obligation to protect the first amendment rights of all Americans—whether our fellow countrymen are aware of those rights or not.

I deplore the FEC's recent decision and urge the Members of this Congress to act quickly and responsibly. Clarify the FEC's power and strike those provisions in the Communications Act that restrain the public's access to the Presidential candidates in an election year. ●

#### TO AMEND THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Colorado River Basin Project Act extending, governmentwide, the current prohibition which bans the Secretary of the Interior from engaging in any study of alternatives for diverting water into the Colorado River Basin from the Pacific Northwest. Senator CHURCH has recently introduced a similar measure in the Senate, and I am pleased to join with him in this effort.

This amendment to the Colorado River Basin Project Act is totally consistent with the intent which Congress expressed 2 years ago in enacting the 10-year moratorium currently prohibiting the Secre-



tary of the Interior from studying such interbasin water transfers. At that time we felt it was extremely unwise to study alternatives for diverting water away from our region when we were, at the same time, facing critical problems allocating water among competing uses within our region. The Congress agreed with that argument.

It has now become apparent that limiting the moratorium to studies only undertaken by the Department of the Interior will not serve the basic intent of the act—which is to prohibit such interbasin transfer studies, period. I am now advised that the Environmental Protection Agency has issued a draft study examining the potential for diverting water from the Columbia River Basin to the Colorado River Basin.

In addition, we hear from time to time of possible water diversion studies being undertaken for the purposes of the Department of Energy or the Department of Defense. I believe this would be most unwise and I urge my colleagues to make this current law applicable to other Federal agencies as it is to the Department of the Interior.

Our water problems, if anything, have only grown more critical in the Northwest since the passage of the moratorium. The Pacific Northwest currently stands on the brink of a regional energy war because the Columbia River system is no longer able to provide sufficient hydroelectric power to heat our homes, and run our businesses and factories. Our multimillion-dollar anadromous fishery resource has been seriously jeopardized by critically low streamflows, and our continued ability to provide water for irrigation, which has nurtured the desert into productive croplands, has been cast into doubt.

We must come to grips with these problems within our region before we begin examining ways to export this critical resource outside the region, and I believe every agency in our Government must recognize this problem.●

#### DOROTHY L. STARBUCK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, the very able Dorothy L. Starbuck, was recently presented the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service, the highest award that can be granted to Federal civilian employees. The citation accompanying the award praised Ms. Starbuck for being "an able administrator and inspiring leader in the Department of Veterans Benefits, who has shown dedication to and compassion for the welfare of all veterans and their families."

Mr. Speaker, I want to join the President and others in recognizing the outstanding work of Dorothy Starbuck. She is a career employee of the Veterans' Administration which confirms her commitment for the well-being of our Nation's veterans. She became head of the

Department of Veterans Benefits in May 1977. She heads a department whose annual appropriation is more than \$14 billion and accounts for about two-thirds of the Veterans' Administration's yearly expenditures. Throughout her career Dorothy Starbuck has been honored by awards and citations from public service organizations and the private sector as well. They are too numerous to mention.

Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Starbuck enjoys her work with the Veterans' Administration. She started her career with the Agency as a clerk in the Chicago regional office, the same year she left the Army. She served 2 years in France and Germany during World War II and was separated in 1946 with the rank of captain. She has devoted her entire life to the defense of our Nation and its veterans. She is highly respected by members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. She takes great pride in her work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud the President has recognized Dorothy Starbuck for her great work and I join her many friends who wish her continued success as she administers programs so vital to our Nation's veterans and their dependents.●

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous matter on the life, character, and public service of the late William McCulloch, the subject of the 1-minute speech today of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GUYER).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 643

Mr. RODINO submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 643) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to revise the procedures for the admission of refugees, to amend the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 to establish a more uniform basis for the provision of assistance to refugees, and for other purposes.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 96-781)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 643) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to revise the procedures for the admission of refugees, to amend the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 to establish a more uniform basis for the provision of assistance to refugees, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Refugee Act of 1980".

#### TITLE I—PURPOSE

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress declares that it is the historic policy of the United States to respond to the urgent needs of persons subject to persecution in their homelands, including, where appropriate, humanitarian assistance for their care and maintenance in asylum areas, efforts to promote opportunities for resettlement or voluntary repatriation, aid for necessary transportation and processing, admission to this country of refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States, and transitional assistance to refugees in the United States. The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to encourage all nations to provide assistance and resettlement opportunities to refugees to the fullest extent possible.

(b) The objectives of this Act are to provide a permanent and systematic procedure for the admission to this country of refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States, and to provide comprehensive and uniform provisions for the effective resettlement and absorption of those refugees who are admitted.

#### TITLE II—ADMISSION OF REFUGEES

SEC. 201. (a) Section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 (a)) is amended by adding after paragraph (41) the following new paragraph:

"(42) The term 'refugee' means (A) any person who is outside any country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, is outside any country in which such person last habitually resided, and who is unable or unwilling to return to, and is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of, that country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, or (B) in such special circumstances as the President after appropriate consultation (as defined in section 207(e) of this Act) may specify, any person who is within the country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, within the country in which such person is habitually residing, and who is persecuted or who has a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The term 'refugee' does not include any person who ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion."

(b) Chapter 1 of title II of such Act is amended by adding after section 206 (8 U.S.C. 1156) the following new sections:

#### "ANNUAL ADMISSION OF REFUGEES AND ADMISSION OF EMERGENCY SITUATION REFUGEES"

"SEC. 207. (a) (1) Except as provided in subsection (b), the number of refugees who may be admitted under this section in fiscal year 1980, 1981, or 1982, may not exceed fifty thousand unless the President determines, before the beginning of the fiscal year and after appropriate consultation (as defined in subsection (e)), that admission of a specific number of refugees in excess of such number is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (b), the number of refugees who may be admitted under this section in any fiscal year after fiscal year 1982 shall be such number as the President determines, before the beginning of the fiscal year and after appropriate consultation, is justified by humani-

tarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.

"(3) Admissions under this subsection shall be allocated among refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States in accordance with a determination made by the President after appropriate consultation.

"(b) If the President determines, after appropriate consultation, that (1) an unforeseen emergency refugee situation exists, (2) the admission of certain refugees in response to the emergency refugee situation is justified by grave humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest, and (3) the admission to the United States of these refugees cannot be accomplished under subsection (a), the President may fix a number of refugees to be admitted to the United States during the succeeding period (not to exceed twelve months) in response to the emergency refugee situation and such admissions shall be allocated among refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States in accordance with a determination made by the President after the appropriate consultation provided under this subsection.

"(c) (1) Subject to the numerical limitations established pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), the Attorney General may, in the Attorney General's discretion and pursuant to such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe, admit any refugee who is not firmly resettled in any foreign country, is determined to be of special humanitarian concern to the United States, and is admissible (except as otherwise provided under paragraph (3)) as an immigrant under this Act.

"(2) A spouse or child (as defined in section 101(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), or (E)) of any refugee who qualifies for admission under paragraph (1) shall, if not otherwise entitled to admission under paragraph (1) and if not a person described in the second sentence of section 101(a)(42), be entitled to the same admission status as such refugee if accompanying, or following to join, such refugee and if the spouse or child is admissible (except as otherwise provided under paragraph (3)) as an immigrant under this Act. Upon the spouse's or child's admission to the United States, such admission shall be charged against the numerical limitation established in accordance with the appropriate subsection under which the refugee's admission is charged.

"(3) The provisions of paragraphs (14), (15), (20), (21), (25), and (32) of section 212(a) shall not be applicable to any alien seeking admission to the United States under this subsection, and the Attorney General may waive any other provision of such section (other than paragraph (27), (29), or (33) and other than so much of paragraph (23) as relates to trafficking in narcotics) with respect to such an alien for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest. Any such waiver by the Attorney General shall be in writing and shall be granted only on an individual basis following an investigation. The Attorney General shall provide for the annual reporting to Congress of the number of waivers granted under this paragraph in the previous fiscal year and a summary of the reasons for granting such waivers.

"(4) The refugee status of any alien (and of the spouse or child of the alien) may be terminated by the Attorney General pursuant to such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe if the Attorney General determines that the alien was not in fact a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42) at the time of the alien's admission.

"(d) (1) Before the start of each fiscal year the President shall report to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate regarding the foreseeable number of refugees who will be in need of resettlement during the fiscal year

and the anticipated allocation of refugee admissions during the fiscal year. The President shall provide for periodic discussions between designated representatives of the President and members of such committees regarding changes in the worldwide refugee situation, the progress of refugee admissions, and the possible need for adjustments in the allocation of admissions among refugees.

"(2) As soon as possible after representatives of the President initiate appropriate consultation with respect to the number of refugee admissions under subsection (a) or with respect to the admission of refugees in response to an emergency refugee situation under subsection (b), the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate shall cause to have printed in the Congressional Record the substance of such consultation.

"(3) (A) After the President initiates appropriate consultation prior to making a determination under subsection (a), a hearing to review the proposed determination shall be held unless public disclosure of the details of the proposal would jeopardize the lives or safety of individuals.

"(B) After the President initiates appropriate consultation prior to making a determination, under subsection (b), that the number of refugee admissions should be increased because of an unforeseen emergency refugee situation, to the extent that time and the nature of the emergency refugee situation permit, a hearing to review the proposal to increase refugee admissions shall be held unless public disclosure of the details of the proposal would jeopardize the lives or safety of individuals.

"(e) For purposes of this section, the term 'appropriate consultation' means, with respect to the admission of refugees and allocation of refugee admissions, discussions in person by designated Cabinet-level representatives of the President with members of the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and of the House of Representatives to review the refugee situation or emergency refugee situation, to project the extent of possible participation of the United States therein, to discuss the reasons for believing that the proposed admission of refugees is justified by humanitarian concerns or grave humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest, and to provide such members with the following information:

"(1) A description of the nature of the refugee situation.

"(2) A description of the number and allocation of the refugees to be admitted and an analysis of conditions within the countries from which they came.

"(3) A description of the proposed plans for their movement and resettlement and the estimated cost of their movement and resettlement.

"(4) An analysis of the anticipated social, economic, and demographic impact of their admission to the United States.

"(5) A description of the extent to which other countries will admit and assist in the resettlement of such refugees.

"(6) An analysis of the impact of the participation of the United States in the resettlement of such refugees on the foreign policy interests of the United States.

"(7) Such additional information as may be appropriate or requested by such members.

To the extent possible, information described in this subsection shall be provided at least two weeks in advance of discussions in person by designated representatives of the President with such members.

#### "ASYLUM PROCEDURE

"SEC. 208. (a) The Attorney General shall establish a procedure for an alien physically present in the United States or at a land border or port of entry, irrespective of such alien's status, to apply for asylum, and the alien may be granted asylum in the discretion of the Attorney General if the Attorney

General determines that such alien is a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A).

"(b) Asylum granted under subsection (a) may be terminated if the Attorney General, pursuant to such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe, determines that the alien is no longer a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A) owing to a change in circumstances in the alien's country of nationality or, in the case of an alien having no nationality, in the country in which the alien last habitually resided.

"(c) A spouse or child (as defined in section 101(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), or (E)) of an alien who is granted asylum under subsection (a) may, if not otherwise eligible for asylum under such subsection, be granted the same status as the alien if accompanying, or following to join, such alien.

#### "ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS OF REFUGEES

"SEC. 209. (a) (1) Any alien who has been admitted to the United States under section 207—

"(A) whose admission has not been terminated by the Attorney General pursuant to such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe.

"(B) who has been physically present in the United States for at least one year, and

"(C) who has not acquired permanent resident status, shall, at the end of such year period, return or be returned to the custody of the Service for inspection and examination for admission to the United States as an immigrant in accordance with the provisions of sections 235, 236, and 237.

"(2) Any alien who is found upon inspection and examination by an immigration officer pursuant to paragraph (1) or after a hearing before a special inquiry officer to be admissible (except as otherwise provided under subsection (c)) as an immigrant under this Act at the time of the alien's inspection and examination shall, notwithstanding any numerical limitation specified in this Act, be regarded as lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of such alien's arrival into the United States.

"(b) Not more than five thousand of the refugee admissions authorized under section 207(a) in any fiscal year may be made available by the Attorney General, in the Attorney General's discretion and under such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe, to adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence the status of any alien granted asylum who—

"(1) applies for such adjustment,

"(2) has been physically present in the United States for at least one year after being granted asylum.

"(3) continues to be a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A) or a spouse or child of such a refugee,

"(4) is not firmly resettled in any foreign country, and

"(5) is admissible (except as otherwise provided under subsection (c)) as an immigrant under this Act at the time of examination for adjustment of such alien.

Upon approval of an application under this subsection, the Attorney General shall establish a record of the alien's admission for lawful permanent residence as of the date one year before the date of the approval of the application.

"(c) The provisions of paragraphs (14), (15), (20), (21), (25), and (32) of section 212(a) shall not be applicable to any alien seeking adjustment of status under this section, and the Attorney General may waive any other provision of such section (other than paragraph (27), (29), or (33) and other than so much of paragraph (23) as relates to trafficking in narcotics) with respect to such an alien for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest."

(c) The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 206 the following new items:

"Sec. 207. Annual admission of refugees and admission of emergency situation refugees.

"Sec. 208. Asylum procedure.

"Sec. 209. Adjustment of status of refugees."

Sec. 202. Section 211 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1181) is amended—

(1) by inserting "and subsection (c)" in subsection (a) after "Except as provided in subsection (b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to an alien whom the Attorney General admits to the United States under section 207."

Sec. 203. (a) Subsection (a) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27), immediate relatives specified in subsection (b) of this section, and aliens who are admitted or granted asylum under section 207 or 208, the number of aliens born in any foreign state or dependent area who may be issued immigrant visas or who may otherwise acquire the status of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, shall not in any of the first three quarters of any fiscal year exceed a total of seventy-two thousand and shall not in any fiscal year exceed two hundred and seventy thousand."

(b) Section 202 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and the number of conditional entries" in subsection (a);

(2) by striking out "(8)" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "(7)";

(3) by striking out "or conditional entries" and "and conditional entries" in subsection (e);

(4) by striking out "20 per centum" in subsection (e)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "26 per centum";

(5) by striking out paragraph (7) of subsection (e);

(6) by striking out "(7)" in paragraph (8) of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "(6)"; and

(7) by redesignating paragraph (8) of subsection (e) as paragraph (7).

(c) Section 203 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or their conditional entry authorized, as the case may be," in subsection (a);

(2) by striking out "20 per centum" in subsection (a)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "26 per centum";

(3) by striking out paragraph (7) of subsection (a);

(4) by striking out "and less the number of conditional entries and visas available pursuant to paragraph (7)" in subsection (a)(8);

(5) by striking out "or to conditional entry under paragraphs (1) through (8)" in subsection (a)(9) and inserting in lieu thereof "under paragraphs (1) through (7)";

(6) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) of subsection (a) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively;

(7) by striking out "(7)" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "(6)"; and

(8) by striking out subsections (f), (g), and (h).

(d) Sections 212(a)(14), 212(a)(32), and 244(d) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(14), 1182(a)(32), 1254(d)) are each amended by striking out "section 203(a)(8)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 203(a)(7)".

(e) Subsection (h) of section 243 of such

Act (8 U.S.C. 1253) is amended to read as follows:

"(h)(1) The Attorney General shall not deport or return any alien (other than an alien described in section 241(a)(19)) to a country if the Attorney General determines that such alien's life or freedom would be threatened in such country on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any alien if the Attorney General determines that—

"(A) the alien ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion;

"(B) the alien, having been convicted by a final judgment of a particularly serious crime, constitutes a danger to the community of the United States;

"(C) there are serious reasons for considering that the alien has committed a serious nonpolitical crime outside the United States prior to the arrival of the alien in the United States; or

"(D) there are reasonable grounds for regarding the alien as a danger to the security of the United States."

(f) Section 212(d)(5) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(5)";

(2) by inserting ", except as provided in subparagraph (B)," after "Attorney General may"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B) The Attorney General may not parole into the United States an alien who is a refugee unless the Attorney General determines that compelling reasons in the public interest with respect to that particular alien require that the alien be paroled into the United States rather than be admitted as a refugee under section 207."

(g) Section 5 of Public Law 95-412 (8 U.S.C. 1182 note) is amended by striking out "September 30, 1980" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1980".

(h) Any reference in any law (other than the Immigration and Nationality Act or this Act) in effect on April 1, 1980, to section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be deemed to be a reference to such section as in effect before such date to sections 207 and 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

(i) Section 203(g) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(g)), section 101(a)(3) of Public Law 95-145, and the first section of Public Law 89-732 are each amended by striking out "two years" and inserting in lieu thereof "one year".

Sec. 204. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1979.

(b) (1) (A) Section 207(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as added by section 201(b) of this Act) and the amendments made by subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 203 of this Act shall take effect on April 1, 1980.

(B) The amendments made by section 203(f) shall apply to aliens paroled into the United States on or after the sixtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) The amendments made by section 203 (1) shall take effect immediately before April 1, 1980.

(2) Notwithstanding sections 207(a) and 209(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as added by section 201(b) of this Act), the fifty thousand and five thousand numerical limitations specified in such respec-

tive sections shall, for fiscal year 1980, be equal to 25,000 and 2,500, respectively.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, for fiscal year 1980—

(A) the fiscal year numerical limitation specified in section 201(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be equal to 280,000, and

(B) for the purpose of determining the number of immigrant visas and adjustments of status which may be made available under sections 203(a)(2) and 202(e)(2) of such Act, the granting of a conditional entry or adjustment of status under section 203(a)(7) or 202(e)(7) of such Act after September 30, 1979, and before April 1, 1980, shall be considered to be the granting of an immigrant visa under section 203(a)(2) or 202(e)(2), respectively, of such Act during such period.

(c) (1) The repeal of subsections (g) and (h) of section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, made by section 203(c)(8) of this title, shall not apply with respect to any individual who before April 1, 1980, was granted a conditional entry under section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (and under section 202(e)(7) of such Act, if applicable), as in effect immediately before such date, and it shall not apply to any alien paroled into the United States before April 1, 1980, who is eligible for the benefits of section 5 of Public Law 95-412.

(2) An alien who, before April 1, 1980, established a date of registration at an immigration office in a foreign country on the basis of entitlement to a conditional entrant status under section 203(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as in effect before such date), shall be deemed to be entitled to refugee status under section 207 of such Act (as added by section 201(b) of this title) and shall be accorded the date of registration previously established by that alien. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude the acquisition by such an alien of a preference status under section 203(a) of such Act.

(3) The provisions of paragraphs (14), (15), (20), (21), (25), and (32) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable to any alien who has entered the United States before April 1, 1980, pursuant to section 203(a)(7) of such Act or who has been paroled as a refugee into the United States under section 212(d)(5) of such Act, and who is seeking adjustment of status, and the Attorney General may waive any other provision of section 212(a) of such Act (other than paragraph (27), (29), or (33) and other than so much of paragraph (23) as relates to trafficking in narcotics) with respect to such an alien for humanitarian purposes, to assure family unity, or when it is otherwise in the public interest.

(d) (1) Notwithstanding section 207(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as added by section 201(b) of this title), the President may make the determination described in the first sentence of such section not later than forty-five days after the date of the enactment of this Act for fiscal year 1980.

(2) The Attorney General shall establish the asylum procedure referred to in section 208(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as added by section 201(b) of this title) not later than June 1, 1980.

(e) Any reference in this Act or in chapter 2 of title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act to the Secretary of Education or the Secretary of Health and Human Services or to the Department of Health and Human Services shall be deemed, before the effective date of the Department of Education Organization Act, to be a reference to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare or to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare respectively.

**TITLE III—UNITED STATES COORDINATOR FOR REFUGEE AFFAIRS AND ASSISTANCE FOR EFFECTIVE RESETTLEMENT OF REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES**

**PART A—UNITED STATES COORDINATOR FOR REFUGEE AFFAIRS**

SEC. 301. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States Coordinator for Refugee Affairs (hereinafter in this part referred to as the "Coordinator"). The Coordinator shall have the rank of Ambassador-at-Large.

(b) The Coordinator shall be responsible to the President for—

(1) the development of overall United States refugee admission and resettlement policy;

(2) the coordination of all United States domestic and international refugee admission and resettlement programs in a manner that assures that policy objectives are met in a timely fashion;

(3) the design of an overall budget strategy to provide individual agencies with policy guidance on refugee matters in the preparation of their budget requests, and to provide the Office of Management and Budget with an overview of all refugee-related budget requests;

(4) the presentation to the Congress of the Administration's overall refugee policy and the relationship of individual agency refugee budgets to that overall policy;

(5) advising the President, Secretary of State, Attorney General, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on the relationship of overall United States refugee policy to the admission of refugees to, and the resettlement of refugees in, the United States;

(6) under the direction of the Secretary of State, representation and negotiation on behalf of the United States with foreign governments and international organizations in discussions on refugee matters and, when appropriate, submitting refugee issues for inclusion in other international negotiations;

(7) development of an effective and responsive liaison between the Federal Government and voluntary organizations, Governors and mayors, and others involved in refugee relief and resettlement work to reflect overall United States Government policy;

(8) making recommendations to the President and to the Congress with respect to policies for, objectives of, and establishment of priorities for, Federal functions relating to refugee admission and resettlement in the United States; and

(9) reviewing the regulations, guidelines, requirements, criteria and procedures of Federal departments and agencies applicable to the performance of functions relating to refugee admission and resettlement in the United States.

(c) (1) In the conduct of the Coordinator's duties, the Coordinator shall consult regularly with States, localities, and private nonprofit voluntary agencies concerning the sponsorship process and the intended distribution of refugees.

(2) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education shall provide the Coordinator with regular reports describing the efforts of their respective departments to increase refugee access to programs within their jurisdiction, and the Coordinator shall include information on such programs in reports submitted under section 413(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

**PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR EFFECTIVE RESETTLEMENT OF REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES**

SEC. 311. (a) Title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the title heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

**"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE**

**"CHAPTER 1—MISCELLANEOUS";** and by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

**"CHAPTER 2—REFUGEE ASSISTANCE**

**"OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT**

"SEC. 411. (a) There is established, within the Department of Health and Human Services, an office to be known as the Office of Refugee Resettlement (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Office'). The head of the Office shall be a Director (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Director'), to be appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Secretary').

"(b) The function of the Office and its Director is to fund and administer (directly or through arrangements with other Federal agencies), in consultation with and under the general policy guidance of the United States Coordinator for Refugee Affairs (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the 'Coordinator'), programs of the Federal Government under this chapter.

**"AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PROGRAMS FOR DOMESTIC RESETTLEMENT OF AND ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES**

"SEC. 412. (a) CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS.—(1) In providing assistance under this section, the Director shall, to the extent of available appropriations, (A) make available sufficient resources for employment training and placement in order to achieve economic self-sufficiency among refugees as quickly as possible, (B) provide refugees with the opportunity to acquire sufficient English language training to enable them to become effectively resettled as quickly as possible, (C) insure that cash assistance is made available to refugees in such a manner as not to discourage their economic self-sufficiency, in accordance with subsection (e) (2), and (D) insure that women have the same opportunities as men to participate in training and instruction.

"(2) The Director, together with the Coordinator, shall consult regularly with State and local governments and private nonprofit voluntary agencies concerning the sponsorship process and the intended distribution of refugees among the States and localities.

"(3) In the provision of domestic assistance under this section, the Director shall make a periodic assessment, based on refugee population and other relevant factors, of the relative needs of refugees for assistance and services under this chapter and the resources available to meet such needs. In allocating resources, the Director shall avoid duplication of services and provide for maximum coordination between agencies providing related services.

"(4) No grant or contract may be awarded under this section unless an appropriate proposal and application (including a description of the agency's ability to perform the services specified in the proposal) are submitted to, and approved by, the appropriate administering official. Grants and contracts under this section shall be made to those agencies which the appropriate administering official determines can best perform the services. Payments may be made for activities authorized under this chapter in advance or by way of reimbursement. In carrying out this section, the Director, the Secretary of State, and any such other appropriate administering official are authorized—

"(A) to make loans, and

"(B) to accept and use money, funds, property, and services of any kind made available by gift, devise, bequest, grant, or otherwise for the purpose of carrying out this section.

"(5) Assistance and services funded under this section shall be provided to refugees without regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, or political opinion.

"(6) As a condition for receiving assistance under this section, a State must—

"(A) submit to the Director a plan which provides—

"(i) a description of how the State intends to encourage effective refugee resettlement and to promote economic self-sufficiency as quickly as possible,

"(ii) a description of how the State will insure that language training and employment services are made available to refugees receiving cash assistance,

"(iii) for the designation of an individual, employed by the State, who will be responsible for insuring coordination of public and private resources in refugee resettlement,

"(iv) for the care and supervision of and legal responsibility for unaccompanied refugee children in the State, and

"(v) for the identification of refugees who at the time of resettlement in the State are determined to have medical conditions requiring, or medical histories indicating a need for, treatment or observation and such monitoring of such treatment or observation as may be necessary;

"(B) meet standards, goals, and priorities, developed by the Director, which assure the effective resettlement of refugees and which promote their economic self-sufficiency as quickly as possible and the efficient provision of services; and

"(C) submit to the Director, within a reasonable period of time after the end of each fiscal year, a report on the uses of funds provided under this chapter which the State is responsible for administering.

"(7) The Secretary, together with the Secretary of State with respect to assistance provided by the Secretary of State under subsection (b), shall develop a system of monitoring the assistance provided under this section. This system shall include—

"(A) evaluations of the effectiveness of the programs funded under this section and the performance of States, grantees, and contractors;

"(B) financial auditing and other appropriate monitoring to detect any fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in the operation of such programs; and

"(C) data collection on the services provided and the results achieved.

"(8) The Attorney General shall provide the Director with information supplied by refugees in conjunction with their applications to the Attorney General for adjustment of status, and the Director shall compile, summarize, and evaluate such information.

"(9) The Secretary and the Secretary of State may issue such regulations as each deems appropriate to carry out this chapter.

"(10) For purposes of this chapter, the term 'refugee' includes any alien described in section 207(c) (2).

**"(b) PROGRAM OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT.—**

(1) (A) For—

"(i) fiscal years 1980 and 1981, the Secretary of State is authorized, and

"(ii) fiscal year 1982 and succeeding fiscal years, the Director (except as provided in subparagraph (B)) is authorized,

to make grants to, and contracts with, public or private nonprofit agencies for initial resettlement (including initial reception and placement with sponsors) of refugees in the United States. Grants to, or contracts with, private nonprofit voluntary agencies under this paragraph shall be made consistent with the objectives of this chapter, taking into account the different resettlement approaches and practices of such agencies. Resettlement assistance under this paragraph shall be provided in coordination with the Director's provision of other assistance under this chapter. The Secretary of State and the Director shall jointly monitor the assistance provided during fiscal years 1980 and 1981 under this paragraph.

"(B) The President shall provide for a study of which agency is best able to administer the program under this paragraph and shall report, not later than March 1, 1981, to

the Congress on such study. If the President determines after such study that the Director should not administer the program under this paragraph, the authority of the Director under the first sentence of subparagraph (A) shall be exercised by such officer as the President shall from time to time specify.

"(2) The Director is authorized to develop programs for such orientation, instruction in English, and job training for refugees, and such other education and training of refugees, as facilitates their resettlement in the United States. The Director is authorized to implement such programs, in accordance with the provisions of this section, with respect to refugees in the United States. The Secretary of State is authorized to implement such programs with respect to refugees awaiting entry into the United States.

"(3) The Secretary is authorized, in consultation with the Coordinator, to make arrangements (including cooperative arrangements with other Federal agencies) for the temporary care of refugees in the United States in emergency circumstances, including the establishment of processing centers, if necessary, without regard to such provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951 and section 414(b) of this chapter) regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts and the expenditure of funds of the United States Government as the Secretary may specify.

"(4) The Secretary, in consultation with the Coordinator, shall—

"(A) assure that an adequate number of trained staff are available at the location at which the refugees enter the United States to assure that all necessary medical records are available and in proper order;

"(B) provide for the identification of refugees who have been determined to have medical conditions affecting the public health and requiring treatment;

"(C) assure that State or local health officials at the resettlement destination within the United States of each refugee are promptly notified of the refugee's arrival and provided with all applicable medical records; and

"(D) provide for such monitoring of refugees identified under subparagraph (B) as will insure that they receive appropriate and timely treatment.

The Secretary shall develop and implement methods for monitoring and assessing the quality of medical screening and related health services provided to refugees awaiting resettlement in the United States.

"(c) **PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR SERVICES FOR REFUGEES.**—The Director is authorized to make grants to, and enter into contracts with, public or private nonprofit agencies for projects specifically designed—

"(1) to assist refugees in obtaining the skills which are necessary for economic self-sufficiency, including projects for job training, employment services, day care, professional refresher training, and other recertification services;

"(2) to provide training in English where necessary (regardless of whether the refugees are employed or receiving cash or other assistance); and

"(3) to provide where specific needs have been shown and recognized by the Director, health (including mental health) services, social services, educational and other services.

"(d) **ASSISTANCE FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN.**—(1) The Director is authorized to make grants, and enter into contracts, for payments for projects to provide special educational services (including English language training) to refugee children in elementary and secondary schools where a demonstrated need has been shown.

"(2) (A) The Director is authorized to provide assistance, reimbursement to States, and grants to and contracts with public and pri-

vate nonprofit agencies, for the provision of child welfare services, including foster care maintenance payments and services and health care, furnished to any refugee child (except as provided in subparagraph (B)) during the thirty-six month period beginning with the first month in which such refugee child is in the United States.

"(B) (1) In the case of a refugee child who is unaccompanied by a parent or other close adult relative (as defined by the Director), the services described in subparagraph (A) may be furnished until the month after the child attains eighteen years of age (or such higher age as the State's child welfare services plan under part B of title IV of the Social Security Act prescribes for the availability of such services to any other child in that State).

"(ii) The Director shall attempt to arrange for the placement under the laws of the States of such unaccompanied refugee children, who have been accepted for admission to the United States, before (or as soon as possible after) their arrival in the United States. During any interim period while such a child is in the United States or in transit to the United States but before the child is so placed, the Director shall assume legal responsibility (including financial responsibility) for the child, if necessary, and is authorized to make necessary decisions to provide for the child's immediate care.

"(iii) In carrying out the Director's responsibilities under clause (ii), the Director is authorized to enter into contracts with appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies under such conditions as the Director determines to be appropriate.

"(iv) The Director shall prepare and maintain a list of (I) all such unaccompanied children who have entered the United States after April 1, 1975, (II) the names and last known residences of their parents (if living) at the time of arrival, and (III) the children's location, status, and progress.

"(e) **CASH ASSISTANCE AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES.**—(1) The Director is authorized to provide assistance, reimbursement to States, and grants to, and contracts with, public or private nonprofit agencies for up to 100 per centum of the cash assistance and medical assistance provided to any refugee during the thirty-six month period beginning with the first month in which such refugee has entered the United States and for the identifiable and reasonable administrative costs of providing this assistance.

"(2) Cash assistance provided under this subsection to an employable refugee is conditioned, except for good cause shown—

"(A) on the refugee's registration with an appropriate agency providing employment services described in subsection (c)(1), or, if there is no such agency available, with an appropriate State or local employment service; and

"(B) on the refugee's acceptance of appropriate offers of employment; except that subparagraph (A) does not apply during the first sixty days after the date of the refugee's entry.

"(3) The Director shall develop plans to provide English training and other appropriate services and training to refugees receiving cash assistance.

"(4) If a refugee is eligible for aid or assistance under a State plan approved under part A of title IV or under title XIX of the Social Security Act, or for supplemental security income benefits (including State supplementary payments) under the program established under title XVI of that Act, funds authorized under this subsection shall only be used for the non-Federal share of such aid or assistance, or for such supplementary payments, with respect to cash and medical assistance provided with respect to such refugee under this paragraph.

"(5) The Director is authorized to allow

for the provision of medical assistance under paragraph (1) to any refugee, during the one-year period after entry, who does not qualify for assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act on account of any resources or income requirement of such plan, but only if the Director determines that—

"(A) this will (1) encourage economic self-sufficiency, or (ii) avoid a significant burden on State and local governments; and

"(B) the refugee meets such alternative financial resources and income requirements as the Director shall establish.

#### "CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

"Sec. 413. (a)(1) The Secretary, in consultation with the Coordinator, shall submit a report on activities under this chapter to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate not later than the January 31 following the end of each fiscal year, beginning with fiscal year 1980.

"(2) Each such report shall contain—

"(A) an updated profile of the employment and labor force statistics for refugees who have entered under this Act since May 1975, as well as a description of the extent to which refugees received the forms of assistance or services under this chapter during that period;

"(B) a description of the geographic location of refugees;

"(C) a summary of the results of the monitoring and evaluation conducted under section 412(a)(7) during the period for which the report is submitted;

"(D) a description of (i) the activities, expenditures, and policies of the Office under this chapter and of the activities of States, voluntary agencies, and sponsors, and (ii) the Director's plans for improvement of refugee resettlement;

"(E) evaluations of the extent to which (i) the services provided under this chapter are assisting refugees in achieving economic self-sufficiency, achieving ability in English, and achieving employment commensurate with their skills and abilities, and (ii) any fraud, abuse, or mismanagement has been reported in the provisions of services or assistance;

"(F) a description of any assistance provided by the Director pursuant to section 412(e)(5);

"(G) a summary of the location and status of unaccompanied refugee children admitted to the United States; and

"(H) a summary of the information compiled and evaluation made under section 412(a)(8).

"(b) The Secretary, in consultation with the Coordinator, shall conduct and report to Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this chapter, an analysis of—

"(1) resettlement systems used by other countries and the applicability of such systems to the United States;

"(2) the desirability of using a system other than the current welfare system for the provision of cash assistance, medical assistance, or both, to refugees; and

"(3) alternative resettlement strategies.

#### "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 414. (a)(1) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of providing initial resettlement assistance, cash and medical assistance, and child welfare services under subsections (b)(1), (b)(3), (b)(4), (d)(2), and (e) of section 412.

"(2) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1980 and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years \$200,000,000, for the purpose of carrying out the

provisions (other than those described in paragraph (1)) of this chapter.

"(b) The authority to enter into contracts under this chapter shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts."

SEC. 312. (a) The table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the item relating to title IV and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

"CHAPTER 1—MISCELLANEOUS";  
and

(2) by adding at the end the following new items:

"CHAPTER 2—REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 411. Office of Refugee Resettlement.

"Sec. 412. Authorization for programs for domestic resettlement of and assistance to refugees.

"Sec. 413. Congressional reports.

"Sec. 414. Authorization of appropriations."

(b) (1) Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (22 U.S.C. 2601) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) through (6) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) for contributions to the activities of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for assistance to refugees under his mandate or persons on behalf of whom he is exercising his good offices, and for contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and to other relevant international organizations; and

"(2) for assistance to or on behalf of refugees who are outside the United States designated by the President (by class, group, or designation of their respective countries of origin or areas of residence) when the President determines that such assistance will contribute to the foreign policy interests of the United States."

(2) Subsection (c) (2) of such section is amended by striking out "\$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

(c) The Indochina Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-23) is repealed.

SEC. 313. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this part shall apply to fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1979.

(b) Subject to subsection (c), the limitations contained in sections 412(d) (2) (A) and 412(e) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the duration of the period for which child welfare services and cash and medical assistance may be provided to particular refugees shall not apply to such services and assistance provided before April 1, 1981.

(c) Notwithstanding section 412(e) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and in lieu of any assistance which may otherwise be provided under such section with respect to Cuban refugees who entered the United States and were receiving assistance under section 2(b) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 before October 1, 1978, the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement is authorized—

(1) to provide reimbursement—

(A) in fiscal year 1980, for 75 percent,

(B) in fiscal year 1981, for 60 percent,

(C) in fiscal year 1982, for 45 percent, and

(D) in fiscal year 1983, for 25 percent,

of the non-Federal costs of providing cash and medical assistance (other than assistance described in paragraph (2)) to such refugees, and

(2) to provide reimbursement in any fiscal year for 100 percent of the non-Federal costs associated with such Cuban refugees with respect to whom supplemental security income payments were being paid as of September 30, 1978, under title XVI of the Social Security Act.

(d) The requirements of section 412(a) (6) (A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall apply to assistance furnished under chapter 2 of title IV of such Act after October 1, 1980, or such earlier date as the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement may establish.

TITLE IV—SOCIAL SERVICES FOR CERTAIN APPLICANTS FOR ASYLUM

SEC. 401. (a) The Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement is authorized to use funds appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to reimburse State and local public agencies for expenses which those agencies incurred, at any time, in providing aliens described in subsection (c) of this section with social services of the types for which reimbursements were made with respect to refugees under paragraphs (3) through (6) of section 2(b) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) or under any other Federal law.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized to grant to an alien described in subsection (c) of this section permission to engage in employment in the United States and to provide to that alien an "employment authorized" endorsement or other appropriate work permit.

(c) This section applies with respect to any alien in the United States (1) who has applied before November 1, 1979, for asylum in the United States, (2) who has not been granted asylum, and (3) with respect to whom a final, nonappealable, and legally enforceable order of deportation or exclusion has not been entered.

And the House agrees to the same.

PETER W. RODINO, JR.,  
ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN,  
GEORGE E. DANIELSON,  
SAM B. HALL, JR.,  
HERBERT E. HARRIS II,  
MICHAEL D. BARNES,  
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
DANTE B. FASCELL,  
HAMILTON FISH, JR.,  
JOHN BUCHANAN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
BRICH BAYH,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
STROM THURMOND,  
AL SIMPSON,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE  
COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 643) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to revise the procedures for the admission of refugees, to amend the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 to establish a more uniform basis for the provision of assistance to refugees, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the Senate bill, the House amendment, and the substitute agreed

to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

DEFINITION OF "REFUGEE"

The Senate bill incorporated the internationally-accepted definition of refugee contained in the U.N. Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. It also covered persons who are in their own country displaced by military or civil disturbances or who are uprooted by arbitrary detention and unable to return to their usual place of abode.

The House amendment incorporated the U.N. definition, as well as Presidentially-specified persons within their own country who are being persecuted or who fear persecution. The House amendment specifically excluded from the definition persons who themselves have engaged in persecution.

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision. It is the expectation of the Conferees that a determination of whether a refugee is "firmly resettled" under the statutory definition should be governed by regulations promulgated by the Attorney General in consultation with the Secretary of State. The Conferees also direct the Attorney General to submit periodic reports detailing the numbers, country of origin, and factual circumstances concerning those refugees who are denied admission under the "firmly resettled" criteria or who are admitted to the United States after having travelled to another country for resettlement.

NUMERICAL LIMITATION ON NORMAL FLOW

The Senate bill provided for an annual flow of refugees of 50,000 for fiscal years 1980, 1981 and 1982, with a limitation thereafter to be determined as the result of consultation with the Congress.

The House amendment provided for an annual flow of refugees of 50,000 for fiscal years 1980, 1981 and 1982, with an annual limit of 17,400 thereafter.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision. It is the intent of the conferees that prior to fiscal year 1983, Congress will review the 50,000 annual numerical limitation and take appropriate action to retain or adjust this figure.

COMMITTEE/CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES ON  
ADMISSIONS OF REFUGEES

The Senate bill required a hearing and report by the Judiciary Committees within thirty days of a continuous session of Congress on proposals to increase refugee admission beyond the 50,000 normal flow.

The House amendment requires the substance of consultations between the Attorney General and the Judiciary Committees on proposals to increase the normal flow, as well as in emergency situations, to be printed in the Congressional Record. The House amendment also requires a hearing on proposals to increase the normal flow, and, if possible, in emergency situations, and provided for a one-house veto of a Presidential determination to increase the normal flow of refugees beyond 50,000.

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision concerning the printing of the substance of consultations and the conduct of hearings, but deletes the one-house veto procedure.

ASYLUM AND WITHHOLDING OF DEPORTATION

The Senate bill provided for withholding deportation of aliens to countries where they would face persecution, unless their deportation would be permitted under the U.N. Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees.

The House amendment provided a similar withholding procedure unless any of four specific conditions (those set forth in the

mentioned international agreements) were met.

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision with the understanding that it is based directly upon the language of the Protocol and it is intended that the provision be construed consistent with the Protocol. The Conferees direct the Attorney General to establish a new uniform asylum procedure under the provisions of this legislation.

#### LIMITATION ON PAROLE

The House amendment limited the use of parole to individual refugees and required that in utilizing parole, the Attorney General must determine that "compelling reasons in the public interest . . . require that the alien be paroled into the United States rather than be admitted as a refugee."

The Senate bill had no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute adopts the House version and provides for a sixty day delayed effective date on the parole limitation. The Conferees, in accepting the House limitation on the parole of refugees, recognize that it does not affect the Attorney General's authority under section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to parole aliens who are not deemed to be refugees. In adopting the delayed effective date, the Conferees wish to make it clear that existing refugee parole programs will continue until a consultation on future refugee admission programs is held under the terms of this legislation.

#### ADMISSION STATUS OF REFUGEES

The Senate bill provided that refugees entering the United States under normal flow or additions to normal flow procedures would be admitted as lawful permanent residents. Those entering in emergency situations would be admitted conditionally or as lawful permanent residents in the discretion of the Attorney General.

The House amendment provided that all refugees entering the United States be admitted conditionally as "refugees" with retroactive adjustment of status to lawful permanent residents after two years.

The Conference substitute adopts the House version with adjustment of status permitted after a period of one year. It is the intent of the Conferees, in creating this new "refugee" status, that such individuals not be subjected to employment discrimination as a result of state or local licensing laws and that for purposes of such laws, they should be viewed as having the status of permanent resident aliens.

#### U.S. COORDINATOR FOR REFUGEE AFFAIRS

The House amendment provided for the establishment of a statutory Office of Refugee Policy in the Executive office of the President responsible for the development and coordination of U. S. refugee policy.

The Senate bill had no comparable position and would have permitted the status quo. (At the current time, under Presidential directive, the Office of the U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, headed by an Ambassador at Large, is located within the Department of State.)

The conference substitute provides for a statutory U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs with the rank of Ambassador at Large, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Given the various agencies involved in refugee assistance, both foreign and domestic, the conferees request that the President review the question of the location of the office of the U. S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, and advise the Congress within one year of date of enactment of this legislation of his decision concerning the appropriate location for such office.

#### HEW OFFICE OF REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT

The House bill established an Office of Refugee Resettlement within the Department of HEW (Health and Human Services).

The Senate had no comparable provision and would have permitted the President under existing law to designate which agency should be responsible for refugee resettlement activities.

The Conference substitute follows the House provision, but does not require that the Director report directly to the Secretary. However, it is the intention of the conferees that the Director should, unless and until a reorganization of the Department occurs, report directly to the Secretary; the conferees desire to maintain some flexibility in the statute for future administrative changes justified by experience. The conferees have provided that the function of the Office and its director are to be carried out in consultation with and under the general policy guidance of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs.

#### PROGRAM OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT

The Senate bill retained contracting authority for reception and placement grants in the Department of State.

The House amendment transferred the authority for resettlement and placement grants from the Department of State to the Department of HEW (Health and Human Services) in FY 1982. During FY 1980 and FY 1981 the House required coordination between the Department of State and the Department of HEW.

The Conference substitute adopts the House amendment with the following addition: The President is required to provide for a study of which agency is best able to administer the resettlement grant program and to report, not later than March 1, 1981, to the Congress on such study. If the President determines after such study that the Director should not administer the program he is authorized to designate the appropriate agency and/or official to carry out this responsibility.

#### SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

The Senate bill authorized necessary funds for projects and programs designed to assist refugees in becoming self-reliant (including English language and other training, and social and employment services.) The Senate bill also allocated \$40 million annually for special projects.

The House amendment authorized \$200 million over two fiscal years to fund refugee services, such as English language training, employment and social service training, health, social, and educational services.

The Conference substitute authorizes \$200 million annually for supportive services to be funded through discretionary grants and contracts. The Conferees intend that, wherever appropriate, the Director may expend certain of these funds through special projects which provide essential, coordinated, and effective resettlement services. It is the intent of the Conferees that the term "public or private non profit agencies" shall include state and local government agencies, private voluntary agencies, post-secondary educational institutions, as well as other qualified private non profit agencies.

#### CASH AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

The Senate bill authorized federal reimbursement for cash and medical assistance provided to refugees for two years after the refugee's arrival. The two year limitation did not apply during fiscal year 1980.

The House amendment authorized similar reimbursement for a four year period after the refugee's arrival and the limitation did not apply during fiscal years 1980 and 1981.

The Conference substitute adopts a reimbursement period of three years following the

refugee's arrival and the three year limitation does not apply for fiscal year 1980 and the first six months of fiscal year 1981.

The Conferees intend to provide the Director sufficient flexibility, in providing cash and medical assistance and other assistance, to respond to the different problems and needs of the various refugee groups and to utilize proven resettlement techniques such as the current resettlement program for Soviet Jews.

#### CUBAN REFUGEE PROGRAM

The Senate bill provided for the continued phase down of the Cuban refugee program through fiscal year 1983.

The House amendment had no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

#### AUTHORIZATION PERIOD

The Senate bill provided for an open-ended authorization of funds for domestic resettlement activities.

The House amendment provided for a two year authorization of funds for domestic resettlement activities.

The Conference substitute adopts a three year authorization period.

#### SOCIAL SERVICES FOR CERTAIN ASYLUM APPLICANTS

The House amendment authorized reimbursement of State and local public agencies for assistance provided to aliens who applied for asylum before November 1, 1979 and who are awaiting determination of their claims. The House amendment also authorized the Attorney General to grant permission to engage in employment to these individuals pending determination of their claims.

The Senate bill had no comparable provision.

The Conference substitute adopts the House provision.

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,  
ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN,  
GEORGE E. DANIELSON,  
SAM B. HALL, Jr.,  
HERBERT E. HARRIS II,  
MICHAEL D. BARNES,  
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
DANTE B. FASCELL,  
HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,  
JOHN BUCHANAN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,  
BIRCH BAYH,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
STROM THURMOND,  
AL SIMPSON,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. THOMPSON, for February 25, on account of official business.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. NELSON (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GUDGER (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

Ms. FERRARO (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CHAPPELL (at the request of Mr. BENNETT), on account of official business in district.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, for 60 minutes, on Thursday, February 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CAVANAUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OTTINGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, for 60 minutes, February 26, 1980.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.

Mr. PAUL.

Mr. KEMP in two instances.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. DOUGHERTY.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. PRITCHARD.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. WAMPLER.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. CORCORAN.

Mr. LEE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAVANAUGH.

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. CONYERS in two instances.

Mr. ALEXANDER in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. GUARINI in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. HARKIN.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. ECKHARDT.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. GAYDOS.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. PEYSER.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. FARY.

Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. LEVITAS.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1390. An act to promote highway safety, to reduce highway fatalities and injuries, to minimize property damage by encouraging the safe operation and maintenance of commercial motor vehicles, to minimize dangers to the health of operators when operating commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3757. An act to establish the Channel Islands National Park, and for other purposes.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 214. An act for the relief of Rocio Edmondson.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 25, 1980, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3543. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the restrictions being imposed on the export of fertilizer to the Soviet Union in response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, pursuant to section 6(e) of Public Law 96-72; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3544. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller-Administration), transmitting a proposed new records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3545. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 113 of title 28, United States Code, to place the Federal Correctional Institution at Butner, N.C., entirely within the eastern district of North Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3546. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning the claim of James A. Schultz, for relief from

liability for a valid debt owed to the United States which resulted from his receipt of an erroneous overpayment of travel and relocation expenses, pursuant to the act of April 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 413, 31 U.S.C. 236); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3547. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

3548. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and for other purposes; Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 643 (with amendment, Rept. No. 96-781). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 6291. A bill to amend the Emergency Agricultural Credit Adjustment Act of 1978 and the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to extend and increase certain agricultural loan programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 96-782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREAUX:

H.R. 6571. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to temporarily continue the present duty-free status of the cost of fish net and netting purchased and repaired in Panama; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon (for himself and Mr. ULLMAN):

H.R. 6572. A bill to amend the Colorado River Basin Project Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6573. A bill to provide a bonus payment of \$10,000 for each veteran of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 6574. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the offset against social security benefits which is presently imposed in the case of spouses and surviving spouses receiving certain Government pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFNER:

H.R. 6575. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain practices in administering and using polygraph examinations for purposes of hiring, demoting, promoting, disciplining, and dismissing employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6576. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$255 to \$750 the lump sum death payment which will be made in the case of an insured in-



dividual who dies leaving a relatively small estate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

H.R. 6577. A bill requiring the Secretary of Commerce, in each decennial census, to specify the number of aliens in each State, and providing that illegal aliens shall not be counted for purposes of the apportionment of Representatives in Congress; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 6578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a Federal income tax credit for tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 6579. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain practices in administering and using polygraph examinations for purposes of hiring, demoting, promoting, disciplining, and dismissing employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL) (by request):

H.R. 6580. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to authorize small issuers to sell securities to accredited investors without filing a registration statement under such act, and to grant an exemption from section 5 of such act for resale of such securities by accredited investors to other accredited investors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WAMPLER (for himself, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HOPKINS, and Mr. THOMAS):

H.R. 6581. A bill to protect agricultural producers from the adverse effects of the embargo on the export of agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and distribute food as needed to assist other nations to meet urgent humanitarian and other food needs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 6582. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in Lane County, Oreg., to certain persons who purchased and held such land in good faith reliance on an inaccurate surveyor's map; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.J. Res. 501. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 8 of each year as "National Cancer Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of Federal Election Campaign Laws relating to the United States House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of title XXII, a memorial was presented and referred, as follows:

351. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to proposed registration or drafting of women in the selective service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOGGS:

H.R. 6583. A bill for the relief of Guadalupe Socorro Carrillo Gibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 6584. A bill for the relief of Christina A. Macon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2707: Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon.

H.R. 3493: Mr. HOWARD.

H.R. 4169: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4170: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4171: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 4782: Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.R. 5134: Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland.

H.R. 5407. Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. RINALDO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FROST, Mrs. CHISHOLM, and Mr. CORCORAN.

H.R. 5509. Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. WINN, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 5989. Mr. HINSON and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 6016. Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MATTOX, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. BINGHAM, and Mr. ROSENTHAL.

H.R. 6065. Mr. WOLPE and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 6239. Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, and Mr. WHITLEY.

H.R. 6380. Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. PREYER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 6461. Mr. WINN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEACH of Louisiana, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. HINSON, and Mr. GUYER.

H.R. 6494. Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DAN DANIEL, and Mr. GRAY.

H.R. 6549. Mr. WINN.

H.J. Res. 145. Mr. AKAKA, Mr. YATRON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STEED, and Mr. MAVROULES. H.J. Res. 220. Mr. PREYER, Mr. GUYER, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. SNOWE, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.J. Res. 263. Mr. BLANCHARD.

H.J. Res. 372. Mr. MICA, Mr. WINN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. EVANS of Delaware, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. CONTE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. GUYER, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 445. Mr. MATHIS, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HEFTEL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CARR, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. MAGUIRE.

H. Con. Res. 282. Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. DODD.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6081

By Mr. LENT:

—Page 5, immediately after line 8 insert the following new subsection:

"(k) (1) Within thirty days after the date of enactment of this provision, the President shall refer to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States any claims submitted to him, before the expiration of that thirty-day period, arising from any actions described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of Section 620(e) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, taken by the Government of Nicaragua, or its agencies or instrumentalities.

(2) Within ninety days after the date of referral of such claims, the Commission shall render an advisory report to the President regarding the validity and value of such claims.

If the Government of Nicaragua has not discharged its obligations under international law to compensate such claimants or otherwise provide appropriate relief within ninety days after the Commission renders its advisory report to the President, the outstanding balance of any loans to the Government of Nicaragua, or any of its agencies or instrumentalities, of funds authorized to be appropriated under this chapter shall become immediately due and payable.

The provisions of this subsection shall not be waived with respect to Nicaragua unless the President determines and certifies that such a waiver is important to the national interests of the United States. Such certification shall be reported immediately to Congress."

SENATE—*Friday, February 22, 1980*

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1980)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. DENNIS DECONCINI, a Senator from the State of Arizona.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON).

The second assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1980.  
To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DENNIS DECONCINI, a Senator from the State of Arizona, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. DECONCINI thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECESS TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1980

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until Tuesday, February 26, 1980, at 10 a.m.

Thereupon, at 12:01 p.m., the Senate recessed, under the order of Thursday, February 21, 1980, until Tuesday, February 26, 1980, at 10 a.m.

---

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN  
JOHN BRADEMÁS, ANNUAL CON-  
VENTION, AMERICAN ASSOCI-  
ATION OF SCHOOL ADMINIS-  
TRATORS

## HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, on February 18, 1980, I had the privilege of delivering an address at the 10th Annual Federal Relations Breakfast of the American Association of School Administrators during the annual meeting of that organization which was this year held in Anaheim, Calif.

I insert the text of my remarks on this occasion at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS,  
ANNUAL CONVENTION, AMERICAN ASSOCI-  
ATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

I am delighted to have been invited to speak at the Tenth Annual Federal Relations Breakfast of the American Association of School Administrators.

I am glad to be here for several reasons, but among them are three:

First, I have an opportunity to pay tribute to a good friend and constituent and the new president of AASA, Richard Miller of Elkhart, Indiana.

Dick Miller has served with distinction for 7 years as the superintendent of the schools at Elkhart. My home Congressional District and the State of Indiana are honored by your selection of Dick to be your new president, and I know he will give splendid leadership in this national responsibility as he has done in Indiana.

So, too, I am pleased that Jim Scamman, Superintendent of Schools of my home town of South Bend, is here. In the short time he has held that position, Jim has effectively demonstrated his outstanding talents. It is in large part because of his leadership that this month you were able to read that South Bend's is the first school system in the North to integrate its schools by consent agreement without disruption and without the need for court involvement.

## ALBERT QUIE GOLDEN KEY RECIPIENT

Finally, I rejoice to renew a friendship of over twenty-one years with one of the ablest persons with whom I have ever served in Congress, Albert Quie, now the Governor of Minnesota.

Al and I worked closely together for over two decades on legislation for education, libraries, the arts and humanities, the elderly and the handicapped. We miss his constructive and reasonable, albeit Republican, voice in the House of Representatives. I am delighted that the AASA has awarded Al your coveted Golden Key this year.

Although I am by vocation a politician, I feel completely at home with a group of educators. My late grandfather was for many years a high school principal and superintendent and college teacher in Indiana. For nearly half a century, my mother taught music and art to third- and fourth-

graders in the schools of Indiana and Michigan. For a time, between elections, I was a professor of political science at St. Mary's College in my home community.

But perhaps more to the point, I have for over twenty-one years, served on the Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives with chief responsibility for education legislation.

My service on the Committee on Education and Labor was not accidental.

One of the most important of all decisions to a newly elected Congressman is his committee assignment. Having first won election to the House in 1958, the year the National Defense Education Act became law, I felt strongly that the time had come for the Federal government to provide greater support for education in the United States. This was the year after the Soviets launched the first Sputnik and thereby shocked Americans into a reevaluation of the state of education in our country.

I had concluded that the best way to play a part in a burgeoning Federal role in education was to become a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

## ON MEETING SPEAKER RAYBURN

Shortly after the election of 1958, I telephoned then Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn of Texas, who lived in the little town of Bonham, up near the Oklahoma border. I flew to Dallas, rented a car, and drove to Bonham to call on the Speaker, who lived in a white frame house just off the side of the road. After lunch, sitting in a rocker in his living room, Speaker Rayburn said to me with blunt friendliness, "I s'pose you want to talk about your Committee?"

"Yes, sir," I told him, "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be on the Education and Labor Committee."

"Hot potato committee, hot potato committee!" the Speaker said.

I said I knew that but I felt it was an important assignment nonetheless because the issues the Committee would be considering would have a major impact on the people I represented in Northern Indiana and, moreover, I believed the Federal Government would be giving much more attention to education in the years ahead.

Speaker Rayburn was not in the habit of giving guarantees to freshmen Congressmen—and there were fifty Democrats elected that year—but I can tell you that when committee assignments were finally made, I drew Education and Labor and have remained on that Committee for over twenty years. As a consequence, I have had the privilege over the past two decades of helping to write nearly every major piece of legislation aimed at aiding schools, colleges, universities, and other institutions of learning and culture in our country. I was with Al Quie, chief sponsor of the law creating the National Institute of Education, the principal Federal agency supporting educational research in our country; again with Al, of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act; and with him and Senator Pell of Rhode Island, of the legislation that authorizes the National Arts and Humanities Endowments; and of several acts to provide financial aid to college students as well as to colleges and universities.

So years later I have come to appreciate how worthwhile my expedition to Bonham, Texas, was.

For all these reasons, then, I feel at home with you.

## SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

"Not only is there an art in knowing a thing," Cicero wrote more than 2,000 years ago, "but also a certain art in teaching it."

And, I would add, there is yet another art in making possible, as you administrators do, both the teaching and the learning of which Cicero wrote.

What is the state of the arts—and, I suppose we should add, sciences—of teaching and learning today?

This is, I believe, a particularly appropriate moment to put such a question. We observe AASA's tenth annual breakfast this morning—a milestone of sorts.

And there are other milestones: the start of a new decade; the fifteenth anniversary of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, probably the single most important piece of legislation ever enacted in support of education; the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education; and the submission of a new education budget for the coming fiscal year.

So how are we doing?

In several ways, I think we are much better off than we were in, say, 1965. Clearly there has been an increased commitment on the part of all levels of government to support public education. On the Federal level alone, education funding has grown from \$4.3 billion in fiscal year 1966 to \$15.4 billion in fiscal year 1980—and President Carter has proposed adding \$1.1 billion more for fiscal year 1981.

Nor has it simply been a matter of throwing money at our schools and colleges. We have also made great progress in the past fifteen years in distributing the benefits of that support, providing equal educational opportunities for all our school-age children, regardless of race, language, or handicapping condition. We have also been able to ensure that all qualified students, regardless of their economic condition, can now find adequate financial support for a college education.

This effort continues, and there is much yet to do. Still, we can, I think, be proud of all we have accomplished thus far.

Having said this, however, I am obliged to paint the other half of the picture; and that half, sad to say, is not nearly as bright.

## ON ENTERING THE 1980'S

Here are just some of the problems, the difficulties, that shape the climate of Education in America as we enter the 1980's:

1. The spiraling cost of energy, which has placed an unexpected squeeze on school and university budgets;
2. The leveling off of Federal spending for education and other human resource programs;
3. The growing tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, and the increased pressure for military, rather than domestic spending that results;
4. Rising resistance, at the state and local level, to bond issues and new school taxes—the so-called balanced budget movement;
5. Sharp criticism of federal rules and regulations;
6. Declining enrollments, as the baby boom peaks and the children of the boom defer their own child-bearing;
7. Limited job opportunities for teachers, as the drop in numbers of students compels

the closing of some schools and the consolidation of others;

8. An aging faculty, as turnover nearly disappears—and disappearing, too, will be an entire generation of new, young teachers.

9. More and more families who have no children of school age and minimal interest in seeing their tax dollars support education;

10. Increasing numbers of minority students, who bring with them to the schools an array of difficult cultural, economic and language problems; and

11. A growing underclass of the unemployed (some say unemployable), disproportionately young and black and Hispanic, whose inability to take part in society is like a time bomb ever closer to detonation.

#### STATUS OF SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS

Let me take a moment here to underscore one of the factors I have cited, because it is at the root of so many of the others—the decline in enrollments.

According to the United States Census Bureau, elementary school enrollment peaked in 1969 at 36.8 million students and is expected to continue falling to 30.2 million in 1984, when a slow rise will begin.

The number of secondary school students reached 15.8 million in 1976, but has already dropped to 15.2 million and will continue to fall at least through 1988, when the figure will be 12.7 million.

The practical effect of these changing numbers is enormous.

The median age of Americans is rising two years every decade.

In 1900, there were ten youths under age 18 for every person 65 and over; by 1977, the ratio had fallen to three to one.

During the next decade, the number of 18-year-olds will decline by 20 percent.

Meanwhile, our elderly population will rise dramatically in the years ahead, from only 10.7 percent of all Americans to as much as 22 percent in the year 2030.

As Dr. Samuel H. Halperin, the Director of George Washington University's Institute for Educational Leadership, points out, "from the viewpoint of public expenditures, this aging population is an expensive one: roughly three times as expensive as per capita public expenditures for youth."

"Moreover," Halperin notes, "the expense is not borne proportionately by the different levels of government. Education, we know, is primarily financed by the states and localities while most public spending for the elderly is Federally funded. Already, Federal funds for the elderly account for a quarter of Washington's total budget. If continued, by 2025, expenditures for senior citizens could amount to 40 percent of a proportionally larger Federal budget."

Halperin concludes this way: "The implications of these facts, among many, for vastly larger Federal spending for education seem obvious, if not incontrovertible."

#### FIRST STRATEGY IS REALISM

As I said earlier: The picture is not a bright one.

How are we to respond, those of you who administer our schools, and those of us who help set Federal policy in support of those schools to the conditions I have outlined for you? The answer is clearly not by throwing up our hands and leaving the field to others less inclined to fight for education. There is far too much at stake.

On the other hand, these conditions require new ground rules and so, if we hope to accomplish our objectives, new strategies.

Let me suggest, from my perspective as a practicing politician, several of these strategies, and bear in mind here that I shall try to be instructive rather than exhaustive.

The first strategy is realism. Even as we recognize the message contained in the

birth of past years, we must recognize the message of vote tallies and military budgets. This is not the time to be writing major new programs in support of education, or for many other programs either, for that matter. We are in a time of cutback and trim and must attempt to ride the various cross-currents of politics and policy both in Washington and in your local communities.

In a similar vein, it would be most unrealistic, even for those who strongly supported the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Education, to expect rapid changes in the way Federal education policy is carried out. The Department will at last count be overseeing 152 programs that were formerly handled by six different Federal agencies. It will take time to shake down so large a ship and make it truly seaworthy. So a little patience will be in order there.

As one who has only recently become acquainted with Shirley Hufstедler, the first Secretary of Education, I must tell you what those of you who know her distinguished record as a judge here in California already know that Shirley Hufstедler is a person of broad vision, keen intelligence and unquestioned dedication to a vigorous and vital place for education in American life. I commend President Carter for a wise choice for this significant responsibility.

#### THE STRATEGY OF ADVOCACY

Having extolled the virtues of pragmatism and lowered expectations, I may surprise you with my second suggested strategy, and that is advocacy. You should be more active than ever before in fighting for support of education, and you should press your fight at all levels of government—local, state and Federal.

I have several points in mind here.

I am frank to tell you, first of all, of my distrust at the behavior of many officials with respect to the balanced budget movement. I am all for eliminating wasteful or unnecessary spending and for insuring that America's tax dollars are used for the purposes for which they are intended. In fact, these last several weeks, in my capacity as Chairman of the House Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the budget of the Committees of the House, I have been asking tough questions of Committee Chairmen; and in most cases, our Subcommittee has been cutting budgets.

Let me, however, make this observation. For state officials with surpluses in their state treasuries to demand increased Federal funds for the states while attacking Congress as profligate and free spending is really irresponsible. Such charges are all the more irresponsible. I would suggest, when officials in some states prove unwilling to provide sufficient support for education from state tax dollars. You the education leaders, must be active in resisting this illogical and, to repeat, irresponsible position.

Similarly, you must contend with efforts on many fronts to limit so-called "non-essential" government spending for education. In the conflict between heightened consciousness and tightened pocketbooks, there are no clear winners. But I believe the "cutback and trim" and "back to basics" forces often, in seeking to slash education benefits misdirect their energies. Nothing could be more basic than that our schools help develop complete human beings, children who can read and write, think and feel.

We need people with a sense of both the universe outside the classroom and the universe inside each student. I would ask you then to protect programs like arts education and education about foreign cultures and issues in international affairs. These are not frills but part of the core of education.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

My third strategy is one with which you should be right at home, and it is this: more and better teaching and learning about the processes of teaching and learning. There is simply too much about education that we do not know, and I here include school administrators and Members of Congress as well as the general public.

We must learn more about how people teach and learn. One of my legislative accomplishments in which I take greatest pride—and I know Al Quie does too—is the creation of the National Institute of Education, the Federal agency with principal responsibility for research and development in education.

Our national interest in an effective and sound educational system requires that state, local and Federal investments in education be made with the greatest possible understanding of the education process. NIE helps us achieve that understanding. I cite three examples:

NIE's studies of model programs for actual and potential school dropouts as well as of organizational factors associated with successful schools contributed to President Carter's recently proposed Youth Unemployment Initiative.

NIE's studies of competency testing, test construction and cultural and linguistic biases will lead to more meaningful measurements of what children learn.

Finally, NIE's work in language acquisition and development have led to new initiatives with respect to student illiteracy, the education of bilingual children and the needs of youngsters speaking Black English.

Beyond these activities of NIE are others, equally valuable, dealing with school finance, the teaching of mathematics, teacher improvement, technology in education, and non-school learning, to name several.

The results of NIE's efforts can be immensely helpful to local, state and Federal officials, school administrators, teachers and parents—and ultimately, of course, to our students. The National Institute of Education is an organization deserving of your strongest support.

When I spoke a moment ago about the need for more learning and teaching, however, NIE was not all I had in mind. President Carter has just proposed a new \$3,000,000 program to establish a variety of training programs for school administrators.

The Administration hopes through this program to provide school administrators management expertise better to enable them "to respond to political and social changes affecting the school environment, tighter budgets, legislative mandates" and better to manage Federal, state and locally funded education programs.

In undertaking this effort, surely it is clear that you as school administrators must do more to educate the public about education.

You need in particular to educate policy-makers, and not only about your activities and your problems, but also about your accomplishments. As Sam Halperin said to me the other day, "Lots of people are learning in this country." He is right, and the country needs to hear more about these success stories. First, successes can often be replicated. Second, people who see a return on their investment are more likely to want to continue to invest.

Finally, I think we need a more thoughtful discussion about the burdens and benefits of the Federal role in education. I am well aware of the discontent and resentment that administrators feel as they wade through one more set of Federal regulations they believe hamstring a well-intentioned Federal program.

I must warn you that I believe there are important and essential decisions of policy in many of those regulations. Still, it is in our common interest to modify or eliminate those requirements which are unduly burdensome or which have long since outlived their *raison d'être* if, indeed, they ever had one.

What we need, in short, is a more systematic effort to find out where the shoe pinches. Conferences such as this one can go a long way toward advancing that effort, but the process should be an ongoing one. For example, I would like to see a series of dialogues between and among all those concerned with the implementation of the Education of Handicapped Children Act—the parents, the teachers, state and local administrators, representatives of the handicapped children, governors and state legislators, and Federal education officials. After all, our common objective is to educate the millions of America's children who are handicapped. Let us ask how well we are doing and how we can do better.

My fourth and final strategy suggestion is this one: Creative politics. Those of you who support education these days face a country whose citizens, statistically speaking, have less direct interest in education than ever before. You face a country deeply distrustful of the educational establishment, distrustful, too, of a Department of Education that many viewed, rightly or wrongly, as the plaything of one portion of that establishment.

#### NEW COALITIONS FOR EDUCATION

How do you deal with this situation? For starters, you must do all you can to forge new alliances, to forge new coalitions in support of education.

You must convince people who no longer have children of school age, or may not have them for some time to come, that education serves the needs of all of society.

You must convince business leaders that closer cooperation in designing and implementing vocational training programs is in their best interest.

You must convince cultural organizations of all types to make common purpose with you in support of expanded curricula in the arts.

You must convince local officials that unemployed teenagers and those who soon will be can be salvaged—for their good and for the good of their community.

You must involve state officials, who in many states provide an increasing share of education funds and at any rate have much to do with the distribution of Federal funds, more deeply in the policy-making process. For all my criticism of some state officials several moments ago, they are still by and large people who want to do the best job they can to meet human needs.

And finally, to make policy-makers aware of the importance you assign to education, you must mobilize. It would be a great mistake for public officials at any level to underestimate the degree of public support that does exist for education and for its indispensable role in providing social cohesion in an increasingly fragmented period in our national life. Surely it is the responsibility of the advocates of education to articulate that conviction to their representatives in government.

These, then, are only some suggestions I would offer as we enter a troubling but exciting decade. Much of what I have said may appear to be political in nature, but I have not attempted to be partisan. The future of education is in large measure a question of public policy and so will require the building of coalitions and the mobilization of constituencies.

I do not, however, despair over the state of education, and I do not believe you do either. Otherwise none of us would be here today. As a young Congressman, I remember still the words of a young President, John F. Kennedy, nearly twenty years ago. "Education," he said, "is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress."

I believed that then, I believe it still, and I know that you do, too.

Thank you.●

#### SUPPORT FOR H.R. 6380

#### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, once again I bring to the attention of my colleagues the tremendous support Members have expressed for my bill H.R. 6380, to establish a Commission on More Effective Government. On February 12 I listed an initial 61 cosponsors for the bill which I introduced on January 31. Today I am adding an additional 28 Members as cosponsors. I am very pleased that so many Members agree that we must undertake a comprehensive review of the structure of our Government and that we must make some rational decisions on how to make Government work for all people.

#### A LIST OF THE NEW COSPONSORS

Thomas L. Ashley; Anthony C. Bellenson; James C. Cleveland; Tony Coelho; William R. Cotter; George E. Danielson; Vic Fazio; Willis D. Gradison, Jr.; William H. Gray III; Sam B. Hall, Jr.; Richard H. Ichord; Claude (Buddy) Leach (LA); William Lehman; Trent Lott; Edward R. Madigan; Stewart B. McKinney; Donald J. Mitchell (NY); Parren J. Mitchell (MD); James L. Oberstar; Richard L. Ottinger; Edward J. Patten; Jerry M. Patterson; Richardson Preyer; Matthew J. Rinaldo; Robert A. Roe; Norman D. Shumway; Charles Wilson (TX); and Sidney R. Yates.●

#### OSHA AND INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of months many of our fellow citizens were enjoying the holiday season. Unfortunately, during this period, many workplaces were plagued with serious industrial accidents resulting in a number of serious injuries and fatalities. These tragic accidents resulted from explosions, exposure to dangerous chemicals, and mechanical defects in operating equipment. In many cases, the accidents might have been avoided by effective monitoring of hazardous areas or preventive maintenance. However, one conclusion is apparent. Workplaces are still plagued by serious occupational safety and health problems which continue to occur at any given time or place.

Since 1970, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration has been attempting to reduce the number of occupational safety and health problems affecting the workplace. While there has been progress in this effort, there still remains a strong and continuing need for effective regulation of the workplace. As these examples indicate, too many employers just will not make the effort to rid their workplaces of occupational safety and health problems.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I have been monitoring the occurrence of serious accidents in the workplace. I now provide for the RECORD information on recent serious accidents in the workplace.

On December 3, 1979, an explosion ripped through a manufacturing plant in Tulare County, Calif., critically injuring one man.

On December 13, 1979, a 21-year-old worker spraying herbicide in a northern California forest became partially paralyzed because of exposure to the chemical 2-4-D.

On December 19, 1979, a pipe carrying highly flammable hydrogen ruptured and escaping gas ignited, killing a 41-year-old employee and seriously burning a 32-year-old worker at an oil refinery in Tulsa, Okla.

On December 28, 1979, 6 employees were killed and 12 others injured after a carbon monoxide leak at a steel plant in East Chicago, Ind. The carbon monoxide leaked into an area around a blast furnace when a fan became inoperative.

The accidents mentioned above are just a few select examples and are intended to demonstrate that serious accidents continue to occur at any time and in different types of workplaces. Hazardous workplaces can be controlled by employers who conscientiously monitor hazardous conditions and engage in preventive maintenance. However, there remains a continual need for effective enforcement of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. This law, with its inspection and penalty mechanisms, serves as a key device for compelling employers to regularly examine their workplaces for hazardous conditions and correcting such situations. As these examples and others that I have previously put into the RECORD indicate, too many employers have just not made an effective effort to assure a safe and healthful workplace for their employees.●

#### NICARAGUA AFTER SOMOZA

#### HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. ROBERT DRINAN, recently visited Central America, in-

cluding Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala. His thoughtful analysis of the prospects for social justice and democracy in Nicaragua are particularly pertinent in light of our consideration of reconstruction aid for that war-devastated country. I submit his views on this important matter for the edification of my colleagues in the Congress.

The analysis follows:

#### NICARAGUA AFTER SOMOZA

Can the revolutionary Government that took over Nicaragua after the July 1979 coup against the hated President Anastasio Somoza bring forth a stable and democratic state? That was the question I investigated as a member of a study group, financed by the Unitarian-Universalist Service Committee, that visited Nicaragua in early January 1980.

My answer is optimistic and hopeful. The junta that followed 43 years of Somoza dictatorship and a sanguinary 18-month revolution enjoys almost incredibly widespread support. It is open and searching; it candidly acknowledges its debt to Cuba and the presence in Nicaragua of hundreds of Cuban teachers. It asserts, sometimes ambiguously, that it is neither another Cuba nor another capitalist Central American country to be exploited by American corporations.

The revolution in Nicaragua is unique in that it appears to be a truly populist revolt inspired to a surprising degree by the Catholic social activists. Some persons in Managua claim that the new Government in their country is the first fruit of Medellín and the cry of Latin America's 300 bishops for a just economic order. Priests and nuns in Nicaragua even suggested that their revolution might become the model for Latin America. Four priests hold cabinet or high positions in the new Government: One of them is foreign minister, Father Miguel D'Escoto, a Maryknoll priest trained in the United States.

Everything converged happily in Nicaragua to bring about the fall of President Somoza. He had so little constituency toward the end of his rule that his Government and even the army fell before a people's crusade organized around the sayings of Augusto César Sandino, a guerrilla leader of the 1920's who was assassinated by a previous Somoza government. The murder of the renowned journalist Pedro Joaquín Chamorro in January 1978 seems to have been the final event needed to solidify the revolution that has been forming for at least a generation.

Added to all of these elements was the presence of a united Catholic hierarchy of seven bishops and a few hundred priests and nuns, mostly from outside of Nicaragua. Working along parallel lines, Catholic social activists and Cuban publicists united the people in their desire to rid themselves of a tyrannical and corrupt government.

In my talks with bishops, priests and nuns, I was regularly surprised but encouraged at their universal feeling that finally a Latin American nation had achieved a government capable of avoiding that violence and polarization that seems so endemic to societies in South America. One priest told me that Catholic teachers in Nicaragua had fulfilled precisely the February 1979 Puebla mandate of the Latin American bishops: "We ask all Christians to collaborate in the changing of unjust structures. . . ." At a Mass on Epiphany, which I concelebrated, the pastor, in his homily, compared the revolutionaries of Nicaragua with the Magi because both, he said, searched for and found the truth.

The bishops of Nicaragua have issued two pastorals since the change of government in

July. Both letters are carefully nuanced in their qualified endorsement of Christian socialism. Both messages condemn Communism and the abuses of capitalism. Both of the widely discussed statements make it clear that Catholics should support the new Government and not undermine it by any unreasonable fear of Communist influences.

But the buoyancy in Nicaragua over the new Government is restrained by the knowledge of its enormous problems. Up to 50,000 of Nicaragua's most educated citizens may have left the country, its external debt is gigantic, its agricultural produce is sharply off as a result of the civil war, and other nations are hesitant about investing in a country whose government is still on probation.

The U.S. Congress will have to decide in the near future whether it desires to give Nicaragua the \$75 million in economic assistance strongly recommended by the Carter Administration. The vote will clearly be a referendum on whether the Congress thinks that Nicaragua will be another Cuba. The invasion of Afghanistan is logically unconnected with the merits of the \$75-million grant to Nicaragua, but it may nonetheless dominate the debate. I informed the highest leaders of Nicaragua of this and urged them to join the overwhelming majority of nations that have condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. They bristled sharply at the perceived condition of American aid. But they had to admit that if they were silent, this would be seen as an implicit condition of their receiving aid from Cuba and the socialist nations of Eastern Europe.

On Jan. 14, 1980, Nicaragua was one of 18 nations in the General Assembly of the United Nations that abstained from condemning the Soviet Union for invading Afghanistan. That vote will not help Nicaragua with the U.S. Congress.

One of the impressive developments in the new Nicaragua is the vibrant campaign to overcome the illiteracy that affects 840,000 persons over the age of 10, or 53 percent of the adult population. The director of this program, Rev. Fernando Cardenal, S.J., asserts that the structures of the Somoza regime institutionalized illiteracy as a method of preventing participation by the people in their government. There can be no economic or human development without literacy. Father Cardenal insisted to my group. Indeed, he asserted, the entire future of Nicaragua as a democracy depends upon the elimination of illiteracy.

Despite the undeniably broad support for the new Government of Nicaragua, its future is clouded. In El Salvador and Guatemala, I heard leaders almost tremble in fear as they referred to the new "Communist nation" of Nicaragua next door. An invasion of Nicaragua by rightwing elements of Guatemala and El Salvador is not an impossibility. This would become more possible if Nicaragua moves to the left in land reform and in the nationalization of industry. The near-paranoid fear of Communism that pervades the mentality of those in power in Latin America seems sometimes to be so powerful that it could erupt in counterrevolutionary measures against the Sandinistas in Nicaragua.

The future of the post-Somoza Government will depend in important ways on the attitude of Americans. If the Congress votes down the \$75 million, a deep-seated resentment against America present everywhere in Central America will surge. The people of Nicaragua feel that the Somoza regime could never have survived for more than 40 years without substantial U.S. support. In their more bitter moments, the people of Nicaragua demand restitution; in their more realistic moods, they want a continuation of that aid which, after the 1976 earthquake, the Congress gave somewhat generously. A

reversal of that policy, brought about possibly by the antidétente mood following the invasion of Afghanistan, would surely be looked upon as unjust.

The priests and nuns of Nicaragua expressed to me in several ways their desire for solidarity and support from American Catholics. They are proud of the liberation they helped to bring to Nicaragua. They want the new Government to flourish. But this is simply not possible without the good will of the United States. The Catholic leaders of Nicaragua want the American Catholic community to educate the country and to lobby the Congress about the urgent needs of Nicaragua. They made a direct, simple and prayerful plea. America's response may well have an enormous impact on the future of Christian democracy and social justice in Latin America. ●

#### FHA/HERO WEEK

### HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, this past week commemorated National FHA/HERO Week, and I am proud to say that these organizations are viable, active, and productive in my home State of Michigan. There are 150 chapters in Michigan's high schools with a total membership of over 4,000 young men and women. Nationwide, FHA/HERO represents over 450,000 young people working in areas of personal growth, family life, vocational preparation, and community involvement.

The Future Homemakers of America organization was founded in 1945, and has since teamed up with HERO (Home Economics Related Occupations) to help young people recognize a commitment to family life, consumer education, child development, and careers in home economics.

At the Michigan State FHA/HERO leadership conference each year 14 State officers compose the executive council which is the governing body for the organization. Together with the local chapter presidents, they lead this group by example toward the goals of the organization.

The purposes of FHA/HERO are:

First, to provide opportunities for self-development and preparation for family and community living and for employment.

Second, to strengthen the function of the family as a basic unit of society.

Third, to encourage democracy through cooperative action in the home and community.

Fourth, to encourage individual and group involvement in helping achieve worldwide brotherhood.

Fifth, to institute programs promoting greater understanding between youth and adults.

Sixth, to provide opportunities for decisionmaking and for assuming responsibility.

Seventh, to become aware of the multiple roles of men and women in today's society.

Eighth, to develop interest in home economics, home economics careers, and related occupations.

I am convinced that FHA/HERO is accomplishing its above goals, and I am hopeful that this week of recognition by the people of the United States will serve as a catalyst for future achievement. ●

#### REFINERIES—NEW ENGLAND

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have been fighting the energy battle. Six years ago we imported \$3 billion in oil. This year the United States will import \$90 billion of OPEC oil. We need to be producing oil here in the United States and also building refineries.

During years of price control on oil, it was frequently a losing proposition to build more refining capacity. Now that prices have inevitably risen, we bring in a windfall profits tax which can only sharply curtail capital formation. Remember the windfall tax is 70 percent on American oil companies and zero percent on OPEC oil companies. This will again be an obstacle to building refinery capacity.

Between price control environment regulations and heavy taxes, we have become our own worst enemy in the battle for energy. But that is not all. I have lately received a summary of the major nonnuclear energy facility projects that have been terminated. The summary was compiled from documents published by the Department of Energy and Federal agencies and from research by the American Gas Association, the American Petroleum Industry, the National Petroleum Refiners Association, the Edison Electric Institute, and others.

It shows that 18 oil refineries, 8 coal gasification projects, 3 liquefied natural gas import projects, 1 coal liquefaction project, 2 oil terminals and pipelines, and 7 nonnuclear electric power generating plants have been terminated, canceled, or abandoned after substantial funds were expended to try to put them into effect.

These projects were aborted because of litigation, Federal and State regulatory and permit delays, and economic, market, and environment problems. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States points out that the high rate of cancellations for these causes in the decade of the 1970's has forced many responsible and prudent energy company managers to seek diversification, alternative projects, and offshore opportunities as better investments of their shareholders' money. The many millions of dollars fruitlessly spent on these lost projects is no doubt dwarfed by the larger funds never committed when it became so obvious that the mood of all levels of government as

well as of pressure groups is to stall energy projects.

The 18 refineries that never happened had a potential capacity of 3.36 million barrels of crude oil per day. That is more than Iran or Kuwait produced last year and is equal to the combined production of Algeria and Nigeria. The coal gasification projects that had to be terminated had a capacity equivalent to 300,000 barrels of crude oil per day, more than is produced in Ecuador.

I cite these figures to illustrate the great loss to our refining capacity, to the technical upgrading of our oil facilities, to the efficiency, competitiveness, and employment of a major American industry.

But the loss of capacity brings us back to the restriction of supply of crucial products such as heating oil and gasoline at times of peak demand. This raises a puzzling question as to why 9 of the 18 lost refineries should have been canceled by New England. Every State in the region except Vermont canceled at least one refinery. Do we not regularly hear complaints from New England that it does not get its fair share of gasoline and home heating oil? Whether this is true or not, the lost refineries' capacity for New England was 1.81 million barrels of crude oil per day. This is beyond question a tremendous factor for New England, whose total demand for residual, distillate, other oils, and gasoline was, according to figures I have seen for the year 1976, approximately 1.17 million barrels per day.

Is New England pragmatic or how long must it continue to deprive itself of abundant, flexible, modern, locally controlled refining capacity? ●

#### TRIBUTE TO RICK NOLAN

### HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 12, 1980

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the gentleman from Minnesota, my friend and colleague, RICK NOLAN. By his decision to retire from the Congress, farmers, rural Americans, and the hungry peoples of the world lose an articulate, dedicated, and passionate champion here in the Congress.

RICK NOLAN will be warmly remembered by many people for many accomplishments.

Farmers will recall that it was he who consistently advocated parity prices for farmers, not because he believed they could be achieved but because he believed it was right. He called attention to large corporate farm ownership because he believed it posed a threat to the family farm. He first started hearings on the status of the family farm, which helped to bring about a nationwide debate on the structure of agriculture.

A wider audience will remember RICK NOLAN's call for a comprehensive Federal policy for rural America. It was he who helped draw the attention of Congress to foreign ownership of land and the loss of prime agricultural land.

They will recall his leadership role in convincing Congress and the administration to convene a Presidential Commission on World Hunger.

Finally, his colleagues here in the House will remember him in his many roles, as a member of the Congressional Family Farm Task Force, as a leader of the Congressional Rural Caucus, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Family Farms and Rural Development. RICK NOLAN has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues, particularly those of us on the Agriculture Committee.

While we can appreciate his own important personal reasons for retiring from this House, Mr. Speaker, I join with others who have expressed regret at his decision; and I urge RICK NOLAN to continue in the future to play the role of public leadership that has so distinguished him in the past. ●

#### WEAPONS GAP

### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the noted conservative writer and nationally syndicated columnist, John Chamberlain, recently wrote an important article on the relevance of the draft to our military situation. In it he quotes Phyllis Schlafly.

As Mr. Chamberlain and Mrs. Schlafly note, the draft is not needed and will—with the presence of women—prove militarily and socially destructive; and the courts will not allow Congress to exclude women.

I would like to call the remarks of these two great Americans to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Feb. 16, 1980]

#### WEAPONS GAP MORE SIGNIFICANT THAN DRAFT

Registration and the draft are going to be profoundly divisive influences in the primaries from here on in, and not only because of draft-opponent Gov. Jerry Brown's respectable third-place showing in Maine. The chief harbinger of trouble is that registration of women has gotten mixed up in the draft revival business now confronting Congress.

Listen to Rep. Ron Paul of Texas. He points out, correctly, that if women aren't included in the draft there will be court action. Even without the Equal Rights Amendment the Constitution says the privileges and immunities of the citizens (male and female) are equal. But Congress just isn't going to call for including women in registration. That would be suicidal in too many congressional districts. That may not stop a male registration bill from passing, but there will be a big uproar about the inequality involved in it. And the spillover in

the states is bound to affect the election campaigns.

Phyllis Schlafly, the woman who, almost singlehandedly, stopped the Equal Rights Amendment from passing in enough states to become law in the originally specified time, made a blockbuster of a speech on the women's draft at the midwinter Conservative Political Action Conference in Washington last week. The drafting of women, she said, has been tried in history. It has always failed. The Russians gave up on it. The Israelis, lacking manpower, have had to fall back on it, but the results were never good. As for Joan of Arc, she was a volunteer.

Mrs. Schlafly went right to the fundamentals. The record shows, she said, that when women are mixed with men in the military, the result is a 15 percent pregnancy rate. There are also the rape statistics, usually suppressed. An army including women poses a unique problem: Some way has to be found to protect women soldiers against the males in their own battalions before they ever come up against the dreadful possibility of being captured—and, of course—raped by the enemy.

This was lurid stuff as Mrs. Schlafly spelled it out, but she carried her audience with her. She is a tremendous speaker, and what she has to say will be heard on Capitol Hill. It is her conviction that no presidential candidate supporting the draft of women can be elected. With Phyllis Schlafly getting into the campaign, this could be a self-fulfilling prophecy.

It could be argued against Phyllis Schlafly that women might be registered and drafted to do rear-echelon jobs in the military, thus making men available for more onerous and dangerous front-line duty. But this would involve an unequal treatment of supposedly equal citizens. It would be sure to get into the courts.

Why Jimmy Carter has chosen to stir up the animals on the subject of male and female registration is beyond me. The Pentagon argument is that a male draft is needed in order to meet a sudden emergency.

The 13th Amendment prohibits involuntary servitude, but compulsory army service in a time of total war has always been accepted. This is not to say that the draft is needed now.

Our present problem in taking on the defense of the Middle East is one of confronting logistical difficulties that can't be handled until we have ships and a whole array of weapons that Congress hasn't even talked about providing. We lack a merchant marine. We need nuclear carriers to sustain any ongoing war in the Indian Ocean and still have enough plane- and missile-carrying ships to prevent the Russians from seizing the Mediterranean and menacing Japan. We need the B1 bomber, or at least a modification of the B1 that could deliver cruise missiles at crucial targets. Wars are fought with men, but of what use are men who can't be ferried to critical points and supplied for long periods of struggle?

What the United States needs above all is a foreign policy pitched to the one big end of depriving Soviet Russia of the support it gets from its so-called allies. The quickest way of defending the oil fields of Saudi Arabia would be to cut the connection between Castro's Cuba and the Castro minions in Africa and in South Yemen at the tip of the Arabian peninsula. Without Cubans and East Germans, Soviet policy in Angola on the Atlantic side of Africa would collapse.

We need time to build ships and cruise missiles. Our debates should center on a policy designed to give us this time. Arguments about military manpower—and military woman power—must come, but they are bound to be distracting if they take pri-

ority over the industrial mobilization that is a first consideration.●

#### RED CROSS AWARD TO ELVA CIPPERLY

#### HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a noteworthy act of mercy undertaken by one of my constituents, Elva Cipperly, of Hoosick Falls, N.Y.

On May 8, 1979, a fellow student in Elva's school began to choke on some food. After determining that the victim could not breathe, Elva employed her Red Cross first aid training by bending the victim at the waist and administering a series of maneuvers which eventually relieved the obstruction of the victim's airway. Without a doubt, Elva Cipperly's actions saved the student's life.

Elva has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit and accompanying pin for exemplifying the highest ideals of one human being's concern for another in distress. The example provided by Elva reinforces the conviction that the Red Cross training program indeed saves lives.

I would like to share with all of my colleagues my respect for this young woman's humanitarianism. She certainly is to be congratulated both for her foresight in undergoing the training necessary to prepare her for emergencies and for her courage and skill when confronted with this potential disaster. Our country is made great by people of her caliber.●

#### RESPECT AMERICA WEEK

#### HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the week of December 10 to 16, 1979, a number of organizations sponsored and participated in "Respect America Week." The groups joined together as part of the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism.

News conferences were held regarding this special week on December 6 and 7 in Washington, D.C., Newark, N.J., and Scranton, Pa. In Washington, D.C., the press conference was held at Ketchum Hall of the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and the speaker was Col. Phelps Jones of the VFW. About 20 veterans' organizations, numerous labor organizations, patriotic and fraternal organizations, and the National Conference of American Ethnic Groups (NCAEG) participated, and the event was well attended by the Washington press corps. Dr. Z. Michael Szaz, executive vice president of the NCAEG represented the organization there.

In Newark, N.J., at the Gateway Hilton Hotel the National Committee for Responsible Patriotism under the chairmanship of Mr. Charles Wiley was ably assisted by the vice president of NCAEG, Mr. Joseph Plonski who is also commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans. Ms. June A. Nordahl, vice chairman of the National Assembly of Representatives of NCAEG officially represented our group. In her remarks she emphasized that NCAEG will do everything in its power to secure congressional support in Washington, D.C., for Respect America Week.

In Scranton, Pa., Col. Albert Soma, chairman of the Resolution Committee of NCAEG, sponsored the event on Friday, December 7, 1979, with the participation of university officials, ministers, prelates, and rabbis and, of course, with the highest representatives of the local veterans organizations. Soma also published a press release endorsing the Respect America Week principles and suggestions. Dr. Karol H. Sitko, vice president of NCAEG also participated in the observance.

The major recommendations of the Respect America Week organizers were:

First, flying the American flag 24 hours a day, and spotlighting the flag at night;

Second, public acts of community support for the hostages in Iran;

Third, prayer services in churches and synagogues for the hostages;

Fourth, on Sunday, December 16, singing of the National Anthem at football and basketball games to be dedicated to the hostages in Iran.

NCAEG organizations in the various cities contributed greatly to the successful implementation of the recommendations of Respect America Week.

The following is a statement made by Col. Phelps Jones, USA, retired, of the VFW on December 6, 1979:

My colleagues from veterans', fraternal, trade unions, and patriotic organizations, and members of the press:

My name is Phelps Jones. My job is to serve the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States as their Director of National Security and Foreign Affairs.

My boss, Howard E. Vander Clute, Jr., our National Commander-in-Chief, currently on a fact-finding visit to selected Central American nations and U.S. Naval bases in the Caribbean, has asked me to meet with you this morning. We appreciate your attendance.

My purpose is to outline what "Respect America Week, 10-16 December, 1979" is all about.

If the sickening events in Teheran, and to a degree, elsewhere in the Moslem world, have had any helpful—if unintended—result, it has been in the explosion of popular patriotism in every section of this country and among all age groups.

American students, like the rest of us, are angry and frustrated. There is no "generation gap" about the events in Teheran. We are as one nation.

We Americans, while united in patriotic frustration, have reacted, however understandably, in negative terms; burning Ira-



nian flags; shouting down non-studying Iranian "students," etc.

What "Respect America Week" offers is to move away from these spasmodic and frustrated acts of negativism—again understandable—to a nation-wide pattern of positive and responsible patriotism.

The idea for this week, I am told, was born in the New Jersey Council of Veterans' Organizations, representing some twenty-plus veterans and patriotic organizations in that state. Press conferences today in New York and New Jersey will parallel this effort. The Longshoremen and the International Association of Firefighters, along with other trade unions, are supporting this effort.

Specific actions suggested for "Respect America Week" are limited only by the imaginations of our citizens, but could, illustratively, include:

Flying the American flag 24 hours per day, spot-lighting the flag at night;

Displaying the flag on vehicle radio antennas;

Wearing white arm bands depicting support for our hostages in Teheran;

Ringling of church bells or carillons;

Public acts of community support for nearby active duty and reserve military, naval and air bases;

On Sunday, December 16, dedicate the singing of the National Anthem at professional football and basketball games to the hostages in Iran; and

To culminate "Respect America Week," on the weekend of December 15-16, turn on vehicle head-lights during daylight hours.

This observance is non-political and implies neither support for, nor criticism of, American foreign policy.

Surely, we all must support the President in his tactical, day-to-day handling of the hostage situation in Iran.

Attached, for your information, is an earlier V.F.W. Press Release on this observance, "V.F.W. Leader Hails 'Respect America Week,'" and a list of the national organizational representatives who accepted invitations for this meeting.

I will now call upon these representatives to identify themselves and the organization they are here to represent.

Following these introductions, we will answer such questions as you may raise.

Thank you.●

## ON THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARTYRDOM OF CARDINAL ALOYSIUS STEPINAC

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, for many of his 91 years, Cardinal Stepinac was a man who devoted his life to humanity through religion and compassion.

As a religious and national hero, he fearlessly withstood Communist attempts to silence him and destroy the unity of the Croatian people. Because of his lifelong struggle against Communist tyranny as well as religious and national persecution, I hope that His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, will take steps necessary to canonize Cardinal Stepinac.

For the sake of the thousands of Croatian political prisoners in Yugoslav prisons as well as the Croatian

people in their homeland, the good works and memory of Cardinal Stepinac must never be forgotten. The designation of 41st Street west of 10th Avenue as Cardinal Stepinac Place, is a fitting tribute to one who was so dedicated to the freedom and well-being of his people.●

## MONETARY MORASS NO. 2

HON. JOHN J. CAVANAUGH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. CAVANAUGH. Mr. Speaker, the recently completed United Nations report on the Independent Commission on International Development Issues under the chairmanship of Willy Brandt is beginning to attract increasing attention and commentary. As the determination of the international economic order continues it becomes increasingly urgent for the United States to provide vigorous and imaginative new leadership in constructing a new system of economic relationships more appropriate to the post-1973-74 realities of our world. The Brandt Commission report provides a most comprehensive analysis of current international economic conditions as well as the most complete digest of the policy options available. On February 21, 1980, a column by Colman McCarthy appeared in the Washington Post in which the essence of the Brandt report is cogently summarized. Mr. McCarthy observes:

What is required is intellectual reorientation, serious steps toward structural change, increased practical cooperation. Historians tell us that no nation has ever willingly altered its style of living for the benefit of another. What is eerie about the wealthy nations of 1980 is their apparent unwillingness to change—by imposing ethical values on their economic strategies—even when it means benefiting themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the entire article follows:

### MORE THAN A TRICKLE

A few years ago, Michael Harrington—the socialist leader whose ideas are as valuable to America as were those of earlier socialists like Eugene Debs and Norman Thomas—prepared for a trip to India.

He worried about being another Westerner going to "the human Calvary of Calcutta" as "a tourist of misery." But his moral anguish centered less on the cosmic than the trivial. While packing, he was nagged by the question of whether or not to take his tennis racket. He was an avid player, as they say of tennis addicts, and his itinerary included Gopalpur-by-the-Sea, an Indian resort where he would take part in a Fulbright seminar. It would surely have a court on which the scholars and academics could take a break from their heavy thinking.

Harrington left his racket at home: "I could not see myself boarding a plane, carrying a tennis racket, on my way to what could be for me the heart of darkness, the horror." He would have felt like a hypocrite, he said.

In the end, though, in what Harrington called the "most blatant evasion possible," he did pack his tennis shorts and shoes. At

the courts in India, he could borrow a racket.

I thought back to this small incident in Harrington's life—which he tells about in "The Vast Majority: A Journey to the World's Poor"—when I read last week the report of the Brandt Commission. Under the direction of Willy Brandt, the former chancellor of West Germany, the members of the commission describe the death, disease and poverty that afflict hundreds of millions in the Third World.

Not surprisingly, the report is heavy with shoulds and musts. "Priority must be given to the needs of the poorest countries and regions." "The commercial banking system should continue to lend to the developing world." "The world must aim to abolish hunger and malnutrition by the end of the century." And all of these exchanges between the rich and the poor must be done as a matter of "mutual survival." All nations will be stronger as a result.

These are the unarguable calls for social justice—based on the soundest impulses of Western liberalism—that others have long stressed, from leaders like Pope Paul VI to Wassily Leontiev in "The Future of the World Economy."

But what about the tennis racket? Who among the comfortable and secure is willing to make a political act out of putting aside his games and facing the reality that 800 million human beings live in absolute poverty? Many are willing to get involved as a matter of charity. But trickle-down benevolence is an act of mercy, whereas what the Brandt report calls for is sterner: "The world requires a new system of economic relationships." A new order of "world economics" is mandatory. Self-interest is also involved. The industrialized countries are learning that their own survival depends on world stability.

A redistribution of the world's wealth is a tolerable necessity if left in the vague "out there" of global problems. The moral fog lifts when it becomes personal. The Post reported last week on the reaction of some 1,000 citizens in Potomac, Md., one of the country's wealthiest communities, to a proposal for 60 units of public housing in their midst. No, said the rich at a town meeting: the land is needed for soccer fields, not housing for the poor.

If I lived in Potomac, I might have voted for the soccer fields also or, better yet, a golf course or jogging track. Besides, how would the poor feel living among Potomac's \$300,000 homes? They would be lonesome for their own kind.

These are the common rationalizations, and in part they can be defended. Who knows, perhaps the person who was loudest in support of the soccer field is someone who volunteers two nights a week to teach reading to the illiterate—in the same way that when earthquakes devastate some Third World country, it is the United States that sends in the money and food.

Unsettlingly, this crumbs-from-the-table generosity isn't what the Brandt report or the several others like it are talking about. "What is required," Brandt writes, "is intellectual reorientation, serious steps toward structural change, increased practical cooperation."

Historians tell us that no nation has ever willingly altered its style of living for the benefit of another. What is eerie about the wealthy nations of 1980 is their apparent unwillingness to change—by imposing ethical values on their economic strategies—even when it means benefiting themselves.●

**LET US NOT NEGLECT  
NONPUBLIC EDUCATION**

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court on Wednesday struck an important blow for private and parochial schools in my State of New York and in the Nation. By upholding a New York State law that allows States to reimburse private schools for certain expenses, the Court reaffirmed its support for certain forms of aid to these schools.

I believe it is time, then, that we stop obfuscating the tuition tax credit issue. Our Constitution does not, as Wednesday's decision indicates, forbid all State relief for private and parochial schools. So my purpose today is to talk openly and honestly about the tuition tax credit proposal on its own merits.

The coexistence of public and private schools has always been an important element in America's diversity and freedom of choice. In his poem "I hear American Singing," Walt Whitman heard in America a chorus of "varied carols." Ours has always been a nation of many voices. And it is to our credit that we have allowed—indeed encouraged—them to be heard.

In this regard, Americans have been free to choose different schools and educational programs which reflect their own values. Most of us choose public schools, and I applaud the fine efforts of our public educators. But we made our decisions knowing that we had alternatives—alternatives which, in fact, helped discipline our public schools, and kept them responsive to the communities they served.

Today, for many Americans, this choice in education is disappearing. Low- and middle-income families in particular can now only dream of affording even the modest tuition costs of nonpublic education. After all, parents who send their children to private and parochial schools not only pay tuition; they must also pay today's rising tax rates that finance the public school system. Furthermore, as inflation eats into their real income, families are forced into higher tax brackets. This further erodes their financial base, and makes it more difficult for them to afford private and parochial schools.

For these, and other reasons, we are today seeing a crisis in nonpublic education; private primary and secondary schools are dropping like flies. In my own city of Buffalo, 43 parochial schools have been forced to shut their doors in the last decade. Catholic school enrollment alone is down 40 percent. And these figures are repeated across the State of New York and the Nation as well. Today New York State Catholic school enrollment is down 40 percent; nationwide it is down 34 percent.

But I am talking not just about Catholic schools. Christian schools and Jewish schools and independent schools and experimental schools—all are hard hit by inflation, declining family incomes, and rising costs.

The same is true at the college level. Fewer and fewer families can meet the skyrocketing costs of private and even public higher education. Middle-income families are especially hard hit, as they are often too poor to afford college, but too well off to receive Government aid. Many parents must go deeply into debt to provide higher education for their children.

I think it is time that Congress act to protect educational diversity and freedom of choice in education. We have a real crisis before us in many areas of private education. But we also have a tool at hand to deal with the problem. Tuition tax credits would provide a simple, direct, and effective means of financial relief to the American family which supports private education. Educational tax credits would also encourage competition within our educational system—competition which can only improve the quality of public education. And perhaps most important, tuition tax credits would help restore the freedom of educational choice to lower and middle income families.

This is why I am today reintroducing a tuition tax credit bill, which would permit taxpayers to subtract half of the tuition they pay, up to \$500 maximum for postsecondary students, from their income taxes. The credit would be available for tuition paid to an elementary or secondary school, a college or university, a vocational or technical school, and an accredited business or trade school.

But today I am not so much concerned about arguing the specific details of my proposal as I am in reopening the debate. I want to see Congress once again concentrate on the importance of educational diversity and freedom of choice in education.

As a sponsor of a tuition tax credit plan 2 years ago, I said in this chamber that tax credits—

Would help us honor our tradition of plurality and freedom of choice in directing the education of our children.

Shortly thereafter the Carter administration and some Members of the Senate killed a tuition tax credit bill—which had been passed by the House—I heard it said that this was an anti-Catholic sentiment. I think it was more than that. I call it an antifamily sentiment as well, because every American family, no matter what race or religion, will lose out if we allow the option of participating in the richness of private and parochial education to fall by the wayside.

In my own State of New York, where 20 percent of all elementary and secondary students attend private and parochial schools, families have already been losing out in the 2 years since this proposal was killed. And our Nation has been losing out as well. As

Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN—a witty and forceful defender of tuition tax credits—has pointed out, the vote against tuition tax credits was—

A loss to pluralism, and yet another instance of the conquest of the private sector by the public sector.

We are quickly losing our freedom to choose. And it is a loss we can ill afford.

At this time I would like to introduce a bill to provide credits for private education. ●

**THE 62D ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF  
ESTONIA**

**HON. NORMAN F. LENT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a most important anniversary which will be observed on February 24, 1980. That date will mark the 62d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia, an event which climaxed years of struggle for freedom on the part of the Estonian people. The struggle has continued without surcease since then, save for an all-too brief period of just 20 years. From 1920 to 1940, the Republic of Estonia flourished and the Estonian people demonstrated with tremendous success what a small nation can achieve in all fields of life and culture when it enjoys peace and freedom.

Estonia's peace and freedom were destroyed with brutal force in 1940 when, as it has done so often, Communist Russia violated its own solemn treaties and invaded and conquered Estonia, and Estonia's Baltic neighbors Latvia and Lithuania.

Since that terrible act of aggression, Soviet Russia has persecuted and oppressed the Estonian people, denying them the basic human rights stipulated in the Helsinki Final Act, signed with so much ceremony by the Soviet Union nearly 5 years ago.

But the courageous Estonians continue their heroic struggle against the brutal Soviet regime. An Estonian scientist, Juri Kukk last month made public two documents signed by 30 Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. One, addressed to Leonid Brezhnev, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and to the United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and noted the tragic parallel between that act of aggression and the Soviet military invasion of the Baltic States. The latest Russian intervention brutally shattered a 1933 Soviet-Afghan friendship agreement, just as the Soviets violated nonaggression treaties with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1940. "That's why Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian people

know the aims and results of such actions," the document declared.

The second document is an appeal to the International Olympic Committee and to the national Olympic committees of a number of nations, including the United States, asking that the 1980 summer Olympic games be moved outside the Soviet Union. That document, Mr. Speaker, cites a most compelling reason for moving the games, in addition to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The document points out that the Olympic regatta has been scheduled for Tallinn, the capital of Soviet-occupied Estonia. To hold a world sports event in a city occupied by an invading foreign government "tramples on the principles of the Olympic games," as the document states.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon our President to continue to exert every effort to move the summer Olympic games out of the Soviet Union. The President already has called on the American Olympic Committee to boycott the summer games if they cannot be moved. The American committee must follow the President's request. To do otherwise would be to provide a de facto recognition of Russia's forcible annexation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, an annexation which the United States has never recognized.

Mr. Speaker, as we observe the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Estonia on February 24, let each one of us in the U.S. Congress reaffirm our support for the tremendous struggle for freedom being waged by the heroic Estonian people. Let us encourage the continuation of their efforts to gain success in that struggle for their basic human rights and the independence of their proud nation. We salute the great courage and determination of those Estonians who risk their lives by challenging the power of the Kremlin rulers, but who, nevertheless, continue their brave battle for freedom. ●

#### MY ROLE IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

### HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. The contest theme this year was "My Role in America's Future."

I am very pleased that the 1980 winning contestant from Virginia, Miss Lisa Foley of Mount Sidney, Va., resides in my congressional district. I call to your attention her award winning speech which follows:

LISA FOLEY, VIRGINIA WINNER, 1979-80 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

America: my country, my home, my responsibility. Immigrants, who have come to

live in our country, have a better idea of how special our government is than those of use who were born here, but all of us need to be much more aware of how privileged our way of life is and what a shame it would be if we lost it because of inactivity and lack of concern. We are guaranteed religious, political, and individual freedom. It is not freedom to do as we wish or to sit back while others determine our futures for us; instead, it is freedom to take an active role in shaping America's growth.

Our founding fathers, along with thousands of men after them, fought for our right to live in a country where people are equal and government is fair. Like those men, we, too, need to pledge our cooperation, our concern, and our lives to our country's defense.

Voting, considered one of the privileges of Americans, is actually the duty of every American who has and enjoys our standard of living. I will vote in the next presidential election because my vote represents my belief and ideas. Democracy is a government of the people and for the people; it cannot function if its citizens are too apathetic to go to the polls and support their leaders. If we fail to voice our political opinions, democracy will fade and it will be replaced by monarchy.

The occupation I choose will help determine my role in America's future. If I choose to be a scientist, I will help America's technology. If I choose to be a farmer, I will feed America's people. If I choose to be a laborer, I will help to maintain America's strength in industry. If I choose to be a mother, I will shape America's future adults. Regardless of what career I choose, there will be a place for me to improve my country. America needs each one of its citizen's contributions to remain strong and prosperous.

The biggest problem facing American today is the energy shortage, a problem we all have to face. The President has asked us to conserve and we must in order to have fuel for years to come. We all ask: "What can I do?" Well, I will turn down my thermostat to sixty-eight degrees, and I'll still be comfortable. I will plan my errands carefully so that I use less gas for my car. I will support all programs devised for saving our resources and creating new ones.

However, in conserving and creating fuel sources, we must not risk our wildlife, air and water. America is not only its people but also its wildlife and land. I will always be conscious of my actions to see that I don't mar the beauty of our country.

Above all, I need to be a patriot. I can vote, do my job well, conserve energy, and protect the environment, but if I don't love my country, I will be of little help. Extreme nationalism has been the underlying cause for many wars; however, without rational nationalism a country cannot exist. Americans have a history of patriots (George Washington, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt); we must also have a future of patriots.

It is time Americans begin to work together to promote the rights, privileges, and freedoms we share. I, as well as every other citizen, will play an active part in America's future because we are America. ●

#### PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM IN EGYPT

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of

my colleagues some correspondence Chairman ZABLOCKI of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I had with the Department of Agriculture regarding the size of the Public Law 480 program in Egypt and the implementation of the self-help provisions contained in the United States-Egyptian Public Law 480 agreement.

Egypt is a major recipient of American foreign aid and Public Law 480 assistance. It has received between one-quarter and one-third of the entire Public Law 480, title I assistance over each of the last few years. Given the size of the program and congressional interest in the implementation of the self-help provisions, the committee will continue its careful oversight of this program.

Following is a copy of the self-help provisions of the fiscal year 1980 United States-Egyptian Public Law 480 agreement and our correspondence with the Department of Agriculture. These self-help provisions are identical to those in previous agreements but the target dates for completion of the actions and studies contemplated have been considerably extended.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1979.

HON. BOB BERGLAND,  
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Two communications recently received from your Department raise some serious questions concerning the Food-for-Peace program in Egypt.

One involves the initial allocations for Public Law 480 Title I (concessional sales) for fiscal year 1980. The allocations include 1.6 million tons of wheat and flour equivalent for Egypt, an increase of 100,000 tons above the amount in the fiscal year 1980 Congressional Presentation originally given to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The allocation for Egypt this fiscal year thus amounts to more than one third of all Public Law 480 Title I food assistance provided worldwide, which is many times the amount of Title I food aid the United States sends to any other country. Furthermore, as you know, Egypt already has a higher nutritional intake per capita than many developing countries, and there are a number of requests from such countries for food assistance in excess of the amounts available under the fiscal 1980 ceiling for Title I.

This allocation for Egypt raises several questions:

Why is the Public Law 480 Title I aid to Egypt being increased?

If the assistance is being provided for foreign policy reasons, rather than relative nutritional need as compared with other claimants on Public Law 480, why does the United States not provide the aid through funding rather than through food for which there appears to be greater need elsewhere?

If the large amounts of funding already voted for Egypt by Congress are insufficient, why does the Executive branch not request more funds or reprogram from other accounts rather than using food drawing on the limited amounts available?

Second, the material which has been submitted to this Committee concerning the new Public Law 480 Title I agreement with Egypt indicates that little emphasis is being applied to the self-help provisions of Title I aid to Egypt. A number of the provisions in the fiscal year 1980 agreement are similar to

those in last year's agreement and provide for measures which the Egyptian government should be undertaking, and presumably would be undertaking, whether or not it receives 1.6 million tons of Public Law 480.

Additionally, several provisions in the new agreement appear to be identical to those in last year's agreement under which the Egyptian government agreed to have certain reviews, planning, and analyses completed this year, but whose completion dates are now scheduled for next year. Meanwhile the level of Public Law 480 aid to Egypt is continued at a high level and, indeed, increased.

We ask, would a more effective use of this large Public Law 480 program be to relate it in a meaningful way to self-help measures by Egypt, possibly including a linkage between the level of Title I assistance and Egypt's performance under the agreement?

We strongly support U.S. aid to Egypt and the contribution of President Sadat toward a lasting peace in the Middle East. By the same token, we believe it to be both in the interest of the United States and of Egypt to help ensure that Egypt move as rapidly as possible to a position of economic independence and self-sustaining growth.

We are asking these questions of you, Mr. Secretary, because the communications which gave rise to them came from your Department. If, however, you believe the responses should come to us from elsewhere in the Executive branch, please indicate where and we shall be glad to submit our inquiry there.

With best wishes, we remain  
Sincerely yours,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
Chairman.

LEE H. HAMILTON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe  
and the Middle East.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1980.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and  
the Middle East, House of Representa-  
tives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: I apologize for the delay in this further response to your joint letter with Chairman Zablocki of October 30 concerning the Public Law 480 Food for Peace program in Egypt.

The high level of Public Law 480 assistance in fiscal year 1980 is an integral component of the overall U.S. economic assistance package being provided to Egypt. This economic assistance level is viewed as necessary support for President Sadat's peace initiatives for a comprehensive Middle East peace settlement. It is our belief that President Sadat's efforts will be enhanced by an Egyptian economy which continues to experience substantial rates of growth and increasingly provides greater opportunities and benefits to all Egyptians so they can achieve a better standard of living.

Over the past two years the Egyptian Government has maintained a high level of domestic investment activities, stabilized their balance of payments situation and continued to experience a significant rate of economic growth. However, Egypt's consumption requirements for food and agricultural commodities continue to increase substantially due to population increases and a limited arable land base. Although a stable balance of payments situation has been restored from the worsening trend of earlier years, Egypt's current account deficit is expected to remain very large in 1980—about \$1.8 to \$1.9 billion. Thus, Egypt currently is not in a position to finance essential food im-

ports and maintain a high level of domestic investment activities without the present level of concessional financing from the United States and other donors, which includes food aid.

In your letter you raised the question about insufficient funds for Public Law 480 programming and initial allocations under Title I. The initial allocation table transmitted to Congress was based on a fiscal year 1980 budget amendment which would have provided \$102.8 million in additional funding for Title I programs. The additional allocation for Egypt was considered appropriate in light of this requested increase. However, only \$58.7 million of the additional funds were actually appropriated. Although some of the initially requested increase in Title I funds was subsequently needed to provide for unanticipated emergency needs under Title II, a supplemental request for \$24.1 million for Title I is still pending and additional funds will be sought as a result of the Soviet grain shipment suspension and to meet food and development program needs in all the countries benefiting from Public Law 480 assistance.

In response to your questions about the Government of Egypt's self help measures in the fiscal year 1979 Title I agreement, the U.S. Embassy in Cairo advised that the annual report, which will detail progress realized against each measure, is expected in February. Based upon our own preliminary assessment, however, we believe the government's overall performance to be generally satisfactory.

Of the nine measures included in the fiscal year 1979 Title I agreement, our judgment is that progress has been sufficient in all but one and in this latter instance (analysis of the family planning program) administrative changes in the Ministry of Health have caused a delay in implementation. Additional work with the Ministry will be required this year. In the case of two measures (storage and irrigation), we believe the government's programs are fully adequate and, therefore, are not incorporated in the fiscal year 1980 agreement in order to encourage more work be concentrated on the analytical base measures. In several instances, e.g. in the case of the input-output study and statistical analysis measures, AID projects were to have been important vehicles for implementation of studies. However, these projects were not developed as rapidly as anticipated last year and consequently the measures were carried over for further implementation this year. In short, while additional self-help efforts will be required on most of the fiscal year 1979 measures, important progress has been realized.

Sincerely,

BOB BERGLAND.

Enclosure.

#### SELF-HELP MEASURES

A. In implementing these self-help measures specific emphasis will be placed on contributing directly to development progress in poor rural areas and enabling the poor to participate actively in increasing agricultural production through small farm agriculture.

B. The Government of Egypt agrees to undertake the following programs and to provide adequate financial, technical and managerial resources for their implementation:

1. To encourage establishment of self sufficient private sector agriculture cooperatives and to encourage the use of improved technologies through the cooperative system. Emphasis should initially be placed on training that includes an operational orientation towards the management and planning of cooperative activities;

2. To improve further the management and efficient use of water by rehabilitation of lands that are affected by salinity problems and by encouraging good water management practices. These efforts should include the training of farmers and agricultural technicians in basic water management skills;

3. To have completed by September 30, 1980, a review and analysis of pricing policies for agricultural inputs, e.g., fertilizer, and for agricultural outputs that provides a basis for possible changes in the system of output incentives and in systems for the allocation and the use of inputs.

4. To develop firm plans by June 30, 1980, for improving the GOE's capacity within the agricultural sector for data collection, analyses and the use of results in planning developmental programs and in determining production, pricing and marketing policies.

5. Within the framework of the five-year plan to have completed for use in the 1980 budget process, a reassessment of agricultural sector investment levels with particular focus on investment level targets for improvement of existing agricultural lands as well as development of marginal lands. This includes, as part of this process, the study of alternative options for land use in those lands presently under cultivation such as use of improved seeds, fertilizers or a change in the cropping patterns, at the same time encouraging pilot projects in marginal lands not yet under cultivation.

6. Utilizing the results of the agricultural mechanization feasibility study, and other relevant information that may be available, to undertake the formulation of a national agricultural mechanization policy which would encourage the development and application of appropriate technology and small farm machinery including tractors. This effort should include the training of mechanics and drivers and the establishment of a maintenance and spare parts system.

7. To undertake a comprehensive review of subsidies on food items with a view toward developing a plan by September 30, 1980, for gradual rationalization of subsidies that will protect lower-income groups from harmful price increases on basic food items.

8. To undertake an analysis of the present public and private family planning program with the aim of identifying key bottlenecks and developing a strategy for overcoming these by September 30, 1980. ●

#### NATIONAL CANCER DAY

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution designating September 8 as National Cancer Day. The purpose of this proposed commemorative day is to increase public awareness of the problems created by cancer and to stimulate interest which I hope might ultimately lead to increased research and, eventually, a cure.

I urge your support for this cancer prevention measure and vitally needed piece of legislation since cancer will strike 750,000 this year and by the year 2000, deaths from cancer may number 8 million annually as reported by the World Health Organization.

National Cancer Day is proposed as a unique and high energy motivating factor to sensitize the public mind for an early cancer checkup. This resolution would set aside 1 day each year to motivate the public consciousness for an early cancer checkup and to disperse cancer related material.

I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this most significant and worthwhile day.●

**VOICE OF DEMOCRACY  
CONTEST**

**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This year more than 250,000 secondary school students participated in the contest, and a winning contestant from each State has been selected to compete in the final judging here in Washington.

The contest theme this year was "My Role in America's Future," and it is with great pride that I am able to share the winning speech from the State of Missouri with my colleagues. The author, Miss Anne Elizabeth Gagnon, is a constituent of mine from Independence, Mo., and is presently a junior at St. Mary's High School. Miss Gagnon's theme clearly displays her understanding of and her willingness to accept her role in America's future. I commend Miss Gagnon on this fine piece, and I submit her essay here today in the hopes that it will serve all of us as a reminder of our duties and responsibilities as American citizens.

Miss Gagnon's theme reads as follows:

ANNE ELIZABETH GAGNON, MISSOURI WINNER, 1979-80 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

My role in America's future, whether it be President of the United States, housewife, athlete, plumber or your local radio station's disc jockey, affects myself, my family and my country. My role in America's future as an individual is very important. My role or my job shouldn't be one that is taken lightly. I shouldn't play it or take it as a job that's at the office and when I go home it stays at the office; or something I can put on the shelf in the closet and when I want, open the door and take it out and put it on. No I should believe my role, live it, be it and show it.

My role in America's future consists of my morals, values, beliefs, trustworthiness, loyalty and participation in the government. My morals, values and beliefs are what I perceive to be right or wrong; and if they are used correctly, they won't decide whether my child will watch some show that will be harmful to his or her intellect, but they will decide whether that harmful show will be on the TV to tempt my child to watch it. They will decide things beyond our imagination. Because we're talking about the future, we don't know what's in store for us, but if we keep our morals in tune, if we

always understand the difference between right and wrong, we'll be alright.

My role in America's future isn't only what I'll benefit from it, but also what I put into it. "Every nation gets the government it deserves", so my trust and loyalty to my Country is a necessity. In the future I will be putting people into office; people who will represent my Country, the people in it, what we stand for, what we believe in and in what direction we're heading. So it's not only my duty to elect these people and put them into office, but it's also my duty to stand behind them; not tear them down but build them up.

The key to making my role a success is to participate. Participation is the key element of my role. Participation will throw open the doors of the future. It will introduce new thoughts and ideas. It will bring new successes. Participation ties together what I believe and what I stand for. I myself will always know my morals, values, beliefs and know that I am trustworthy and loyal, but participation gives me the chance to share with others my own viewpoints and feelings.

Participation is Democracy! Our government was formed by our forefathers. The Constitution was drawn up by some of the best and most famous leaders we have ever had. Leaders such as Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington and James Madison who was known as the Father of the Constitution. This was all done so I could have the opportunity to express how I feel; so I could have a voice in democracy; so I could participate. My role is to participate, to let people know I care, to stand up and state what I think is right and where I stand.

Our Country is run by the people through the government. Our laws are of the People, by the People and for the People; and I am one of these People! I will help decide whether America will rise to the heights, or fall to the depths. It's up to me to give my all, to have faith and believe in my Country.

In the future there will be mountains to climb and skyscrapers to build, and I will be there to help pull that rope and lay that brick. Now you are laying the path for tomorrow, the tomorrow I will live in. And then it will be my turn to lay the future for my children. It's my responsibility to set an example for them to follow; something they can latch onto and learn from. My role in America's future might very well be that of President or housewife, but it's not so much my occupation as it is how I live my everyday life; what I give my Country. I want America to go far! And it is for us as Americans to be dedicated to the great task of assuring that "this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that the government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from this earth." My role is to help this dream come true; to exercise my freedom of speech, and to participate. In the future, I hope my fellow Americans will do the same! "America is a chorus, it must be sung together."●

**REPEAL SOCIAL SECURITY  
OFFSET**

**HON. FRANK J. GUARINI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to eliminate the offset against social security benefits which is presently imposed in the case of spouses and surviving spouses

receiving certain Government pensions.

As you know, the public pension offset was included in the Social Security Amendments of 1977. In general, the law now requires the reduction of a social security spouse's or surviving spouse's benefits if a beneficiary receives a public pension based on his or her own work in Government employment that is not covered under social security.

While the concept was well-intentioned, to help shore up the financially shaky social security system, it was structured in such a way that it can only work a hardship against significant numbers of women, particularly widows in their late fifties, who are either drawing pensions or who will be eligible for retirement in the next few years. It will be impossible for these women to change their life strategy at this late date, yet they have been preparing for retirement based on the assumption that they would be eligible for a full wife's or widow's share under social security. In addition, if they are displaced homemakers and did not work outside the home until the death of their husbands, they often have not sufficient work credits on their own account to yield a decent benefit under social security.

Divorced women and men, married 10 years but not 20 years, and eligible for benefits in January 1979 or later, are immediately affected by this change in the law. All others have until 1982 before the offset takes effect.

It is understandable that Congress wished to provide some relief for the financially ailing social security system when it enacted the Social Security Amendments of 1977, but it is also clear that in practice, the law will work a harsh and clearly unintended effect upon thousands of working men and women. Caught in the crunch caused by this change in the law, they look to Congress to remedy the unfortunate and unforeseen consequence of that legislation.

I would urge my colleagues to join with me in eliminating the offset. Certainly, there must be a way to protect the financial integrity of the social security system without jeopardizing the retirement plans of so many working men and women.

Thank you.●

**YEAR OF THE COAST—1980**

**HON. GERRY E. STUDDS**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues in "The Year of the Coast" is the conflict between public access to and private ownership of our coastal beaches. Excessive use, including the opening of beaches to vehicular traffic, has destroyed much of our shoreline in recent years. This deterior-

ration has been intensified by the overdevelopment of our coastal regions, and as a result, many of our shorelines have been irreparably damaged.

Therefore, I would like to submit, for my colleagues' information, another article in a series by Jack Thomas of the Boston Globe. The article discusses the battle between public and private use of beaches in the States of Texas, Oregon, and California, as well as some of the efforts which have been made to protect our coastal environment in these areas. The principal focus of our efforts on the Subcommittee on Oceanography during 1980—"The Year of the Coast"—will be the continuation and improvement of these kinds of protections.

A copy of the article follows:

A WEST COAST TUG-OF-WAR—"ACCESS TO BEACH" A CALIFORNIA BATTLE CRY  
(By Jack Thomas, Globe staff)

It's a clear, sunny day here on Drakes Beach, just north of Santa Barbara, Calif., and the view of the Pacific Ocean is stunning.

The water is warm, too, but there's no one swimming. Nobody's fishing, either, or surfing or walking along the beach or lying in the sun, and there are no children playing in the tidal pools or making sand castles. There's nobody in sight for miles in either direction.

Where is everybody?

With 22 million people living in California, and 18.5 million of them crowded into a 30-mile strip along the coast, how is it possible that on a sunny summer day, one of the more beautiful beaches on the West Coast is deserted?

The answer is that Drakes Beach is part of Hollister Ranch, owned by a powerful consortium of wealthy landowners who have paid up to half a million dollars each for 100-acre lots around Drakes Beach, and who have shut off public access to an 8.5 mile stretch of the Pacific Ocean.

It's a problem in every coastal state. Americans have trouble these days finding a path to the sea.

"Even more important than who owns the coastline is who has access to it," says Roger Revelle, former director of the Scripps Institution for Oceanography in La Jolla.

The actions of the Hollister Ranch Assn. are illegal, according to the California Coastal Commission, because they violate the state constitution, which guarantees public ownership and public access to the California shoreline from Mexico to Oregon.

Who really owns the nation's 88,633-mile coastline, anyway?

The coast of the United States is made up of some of the more beautiful real estate in the country, but, obviously, there's only a limited amount of it.

Should the shoreline, therefore, be considered public property, as the California constitution says, with access for everybody?

Or should it be available only to those who can afford to own it—as in Maine, where 97 percent of the coastline is privately owned, and inaccessible to the public?

As the population has increased and as the value of real estate has climbed steadily since World War II, so, too, has the nation's coastline become an enclave for the rich and privileged.

And as the beaches become more crowded and more restricted, those who cannot get to the shoreline are becoming increasingly resentful of those who own and close off the

beaches. It is an issue marked by the bitterness customarily associated with any class struggle.

"In the United States," explains Revelle, "the concept of private property is very strong. Americans say, 'No one's going to tell me what to do with my land.' But the coastline is a limited resource, even more limited than oil, and in that sense, perhaps more of it should be made available to more people."

Sue Nelson, of Los Angeles, head of an environmental group called Friends of Santa Monica Mountains, put it even more strongly. "You're damn right we think every beach should be public."

A favorite example is Malibu, a community popular among movie stars, the home of Cary Grant, Linda Ronstadt, and Olivia Newton-John, where the wealthy have bought most of the coastline and where the Pacific Ocean has been virtually walled off for long stretches by means of guards in gatehouses, electronically sensitive doors, tall bushes, and taller walls. Indeed, one can drive for miles along Route 101 in Malibu without realizing the shore is a few feet from the highway.

The problem is not unique to California.

Nationally, an estimated 90 percent of the shoreline is owned privately, and 3 percent by the military, according to studies by the Army Corps of Engineers, leaving less than 7 percent available for public recreation.

In Massachusetts, along the exclusive North Shore, large stretches of shoreline are not even visible to the public. Of South Carolina's 3,063-mile coast, only 3 percent is set aside for public recreation. In Florida, with the exception of Everglades National Park, less than 1 percent of the shore is devoted to public parks.

The issue is complex.

On one side is the notion that the public ought to be able to use the nation's seashore for recreation, that the oceans belong to everybody.

On the other is the traditional American belief that private property ought to be just that—private, and suggestions to the contrary are considered seditious and socialist.

Public access to the beach is least agreeable to the man who owns the beach.

How, for example, do you explain to the family that has invested its life savings in a summer cottage on the shoreline that now it must open its beach to sunseekers, swimmers, fishermen, surfers, skindivers, sailors, photographers, ballplayers, frisbee enthusiasts, power boaters, picnickers, and dune buggy drivers?

"It's just not as easy as it sounds," says William Painter, director of the Coast Alliance in Washington. "You can't just advocate a national open beach law around the nation. If you tried it in New England, where the concept of private property runs deep, you'd get exactly nowhere."

The fight for public access to America's beaches has been led by three states: Texas, Oregon, and California.

In the late 50's, Texas passed an Open Beaches Law that said the wet sand was publicly owned, that the public had a presumed right to pass through public property to get to the beach, and even a right to drive automobiles on the sand.

The law is enforced, too.

Two years ago, according to Richard Lowerre, of the Texas Attorney General's office, the state went to court to force the owner of a motel to move his building because it obstructed the public right of way to the beach.

On weekends, traffic on Galveston beaches is bumper to bumper, just the way it is in Houston on weekdays, and environmental-

ists now want to ban automobiles from the beach, saying they pack sand, pollute water, kill dune grasses, endanger the dunes and threaten wildlife.

Since most Texas beaches are surrounded by marshes and therefore, accessible only by automobile, the move to ban vehicles is seen, in effect, as a repeal of the Open Beaches Law, and a return of the beaches to private property owners.

"There was a fear here in Texas," said Michael McElroy, of Austin, Tex., a legislative aide, "that property in Galveston and Padre Islands was being bought up too fast, that people were putting up 'No Trespassing' signs, and that eventually, there'd be no place for the public to go. People were worried we'd end up looking like Miami Beach, so we passed a law saying all beaches in Texas are public, and shoreline owners must provide access. As far as we're concerned, it's working just fine."

Oregon followed in 1969, when the legislature voted to formalize a tradition that the State's 1410 miles of shore from California to Washington belonged to the public.

"We're selfish with our coast," said Carol Tremblay, 50, a waitress who works in a Garibaldi, Ore., restaurant across the street from the Pacific Ocean. "Don't tell people how nice it is here."

Her attitude is not unusual. No State is more protective of her coastline than Oregon.

"There's a very definite statewide determination that Oregon is not going to make the same mistakes that California did," said J. W. Forrester, president of a publishing company in coastal Astoria.

"People here place a very high value on the environment, and that's why the developers have never gotten in here to ravage our coast the way they did California. And as far as public access goes, people here in Oregon don't have to be reminded that we own the beaches. We know we own them."

Federal figures on the amount of shoreline available to the public are misleading.

"A lot of so-called public land is not usable by the public," says William Lienesch, of the National Parks and Conservation Assoc. in Washington.

"Some coastal towns restrict their beaches to residents," he said. "About 3 percent of the federal land is owned by the military, and a lot of public beaches, particularly in the cities, are closed because of urban pollution."

In many States, the rights of way to beaches are based as much on hearsay and memory as they are on deeds. Rhode Island, worried that colonial fights of way to the beach would be lost through misuse, has undertaken a four-year, \$100,000 study to trace the authority for the State's 165 rights of way.

But no State has been more bold than California in demanding access to the beach for her citizens.

"California is built on her coastline," says John Clark of the Conservation Foundation in Washington, "and when you talk about access in California, at least in the southern part of the state, you're talking about land that sells for \$400,000 an acre, so private owners will be very, very slow in yielding."

Even before the federal government took its first small step in 1974 to protect the nation's coastline, California already had recognized the deterioration, and in 1972, by referendum, voters declared the California coast to be a "distinct and valuable resource belonging to all the people, its permanent protection a permanent concern to be protected for the enjoyment of the current and succeeding generations."

The new California Coastal Commission assumed responsibility for a 3427-mile coast

whose condition was chaotic because it had been regulated to some extent by 53 coastal communities, 42 state organizations, 70 federal agencies and dozens of state sanctioned special districts set up to promote limited purposes such as development of ports.

Coastlines, for a variety of reasons, are more vulnerable ecologically than other environments, and California's shore had been badly bruised by the millions who moved West after World War II in one of the great human migrations in history.

The pressures continue today. San Jose, for example, is reeling from a decade of growth. The median price of a house is \$97,000, and last summer, a study committee recommended severe restrictions on industrial expansion until services, man-made and environmental, can catch up.

Anyone who has visited the California coast knows its allure. A few weeks ago, for example, Margaret Bennett, a social worker from New York, was walking San Simeon beach at twilight, gathering driftwood. "This is my second trip to the California coast," she said, "and I've decided to move out here. I don't know why I shouldn't surround myself with this beauty."

The growth took its toll on the coast. Already, the 381,000 square miles of wetlands necessary to support hundreds of varieties of mammals, fish, reptiles and birds, has been reduced to 125,000 square miles.

With the establishment of the Coastal Commission, though, California, which had seemed hell-bent on destroying its coast, suddenly became determined as hell to preserve it.

The procedure is simple. Within the coastal zone, the primary goal is conservation, and approval by the commission is required for all construction, for homes, hotels, motels and condos, everything from seawalls to supertanker ports.

In Monterey, permission for construction was granted only after assurances there'd be special protection for the Monterey Cypress.

In Santa Cruz County, construction permits have hinged on the safety of the long toed salamander of Valencia Lagoon.

In Santa Cruz, Marina del Rey, Santa Barbara and Monterey, projects were rejected because they overcommercialized the shoreline.

At Solano Beach, residents of Surfsong, a condominium of 72 units ranging in value to \$750,000, were embittered that they had to provide a one-acre lot and access to the beach.

"This was legal blackmail," said William Gabriel, representing Surfsong. "Why should we have to maintain a lot, pay taxes and insure it in the public interest? It's ridiculous."

In its effort to make the coastline available to more people, the coastal commission in many cases will not approve construction of housing developments, apartment buildings, and even motels unless 20 percent of the facilities are reserved at lower cost for low and moderate income families.

Looking out the window of his San Francisco office, director Michael Fischer nods in agreement. "Yes, I guess we're pretty unpopular."

Indeed, he and his commission have been denounced as blackmailers by builders and coastline residents.

"(They) elevate extortion tactics to a level of public policy," says Joseph Mastroianni. "The surrender of property or property rights as a condition of granting permits is extortion, no matter how noble the intent of the extortion."

Nevertheless, polls show the voters support the commission, and with the muscle

provided by the legislature, Fischer is confident that even the Hollister Ranch Assoc. eventually will open up Drakes Beach.

"Public access," he says, "is the biggest battle in our state."

And the commission seems to be winning. Last year, more than 125 access easements were won along the coast, more than a dozen of them in exclusive Malibu.

"The law hasn't stopped development," said Fischer. "Hell, we grant more than 97 percent of the applications. What the law has done is change the character of development along our coast. Our big contribution is preventive. If somebody's got 100 acres in Big Sur and he wants to chop it up into little lots, he won't even bother applying. He knows he would have a snowball's chance in hell of getting us to approve it."

The Hollister Ranch Assn., however, remains a conspicuous holdout. Last summer, the coastal commission notified the association and its 130 members that it would authorize no more development within the ranch until the association grants the public access to the beach, including permission for shuttle buses and pedestrian paths along the bluff and beach.

Charles Eckberg, manager of the ranch, sits at a picnic table, sounding very much like a man who knows the fight has been lost.

"This was never a question of elitism," he said. "But this is one of the most fragile environments on the coast, and we're obliged to protect it."

"But what do you think will happen to all this when they start running shuttle buses through here, and 400 people a day, and the litter and noise and the danger of fire?"

Eventually, when the 68 coastal communities have adopted their own coastal programs, the responsibility for issuing permits will revert from the state back to the communities, but environmentalists worry that local officials will not have the fortitude shown by the state in rejecting developers.

"It's possible," says Fischer, "that this thing will get screwed up when it returns to the local level. It's easier for us to say 'no' than it is for local officials."

"But we're hoping to leave a legacy of access to our beaches. That will be a substantial contribution, don't you think? Do you realize that if our program succeeds, there'd be no such thing in California as a private beach?"

#### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, February 24, marks the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Baltic Republic of Estonia. This anniversary is particularly significant in light of the recent Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. As in the case of Estonia, one sees the same pattern emerging in Afghanistan of invasion and the establishment of a subservient puppet regime there.

As in the case of Afghanistan, Estonia was once a free country, having signed a 1918 peace treaty with the Russians in which the latter explicitly renounced all rights of sovereignty over the Estonian people and territory

and recognized the independence of Estonia. The Baltic State's independence lasted for some 20 years during which time the social, cultural, and economic life of this small nation flourished, successfully demonstrating what can be achieved under peace and freedom. This situation changed abruptly in 1940 following the notorious Stalin-Hitler pact of August 23, 1939, in which Hitler agreed to consider parts of Eastern Europe—including Estonia—as belonging to Soviet Russia's so-called sphere of influence. Still officially recognized as an independent country by the United States, Estonia was forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940 and has remained under her domination and control since that time.

Despite nearly 40 years of occupation, Estonia has demonstrated a remarkable resilience in its struggle for freedom and justice. A recent indication of this nationalistic feeling is illustrated by the publication of two documents of public criticism of the Kremlin on extremely sensitive issues by Estonian scientist Jurii Kukk. One, an open letter to Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev and to United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, condemned the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. It drew a parallel with the Soviet troops that marched into the Baltic States in 1940. It was signed by 5 Estonians and 25 Lithuanians and Latvians.

The second document was an appeal to the International Olympic Committee and the National Olympic Committees of several states including the United States, asking that the summer games be moved outside the Soviet Union. In commemoration of their anniversary and of our support of the Estonian people's struggle for freedom, we can say that the American people, the Congress, and the President wish to comply with this position and will refuse to participate in the summer Olympic games in Moscow.

With the 62d anniversary of independence approaching, we wish to commemorate with Estonians throughout the United States their national holiday on February 24. With them we support Estonia's quest for freedom, justice, and independence. ●

#### ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD today an editorial which explains the fine example of a corporation which has taken substantial steps to live up to its public responsibility to conduct its operations in an environmentally safe manner.

The editorial explains the important programs which Allied Chemical Co.

has initiated to insure worker safety and to control the risks associated with the hazardous substances it produces.

Allied is to be congratulated for its farsighted approach, and I am pleased that many other companies as well are recognizing their obligations in this area. The level of environmental awareness among corporations is improving and this should have positive effects upon governmental efforts to develop a program to insure the safe disposal of hazardous waste in the future, and to clean up and contain old inactive and abandoned dump sites which presently threaten the public health and pollute our environmental resources.

Legislation is urgently needed to provide the authority to respond to those sites which are presenting a serious danger to the public and funds are needed to clean up and contain these sites. Many corporations involved in the production of hazardous waste have recognized the need for such remedial legislation and I invite and welcome their support as we move forward with this legislation.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 28, 1980]  
PRAISE FOR AN EX-POLLUTER

Only a few years ago, Allied Chemical Company was an industrial polluter of the public-be-damned type. One of its satellite companies that manufactured the pesticide Kepone turned out to have been unbelievably careless. It let workers become coated with hazardous dust that sickened them. Allied itself despoiled the Virginia country side by illegally dumping the toxic chemical into a tributary of the James River. That forced health officials to ban fishing; dangerous residues may remain for decades. Ultimately, Allied was hit with one of the stiffest pollution fines ever levied. It has already paid out more than \$15 million in fines, donations and claim payments, and a major class-action suit is still pending. The damage to Allied's reputation was also serious.

But sinners can repent and old dogs learn new tricks: it is a pleasure to report that Allied seems to have been converted into an environmental good guy. As reported in The Times's business pages the other day, Allied has overhauled its safety and environmental programs. A high corporate officer is now in charge. Plant managers are rewarded for good safety records and replaced if they can't handle their new responsibilities. A committee of experts assesses the potential hazards of everything Allied produces; several risky products have abandoned or delayed.

Federal regulators are delighted. The Environmental Protection Agency praises the caliber of Allied's new safety managers and the company's cooperative spirit. The agency even touts Allied's committee for risk assessment as a model for other companies. Allied's once dismal record of injury and illness is now far better than the industry average.

No one can guarantee that there won't be another major mishap. But Allied Chemical deserves recognition for an impressive corporate turnaround.●

### UNAVOIDABLY ABSENT

#### HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House of Representatives on Wednesday, February 13, 1980. Had I been present, I would have voted: "aye" on Roll No. 52, House Joint Resolution 469, designating February 19, 1980, as Iwo Jima Commemoration Day; "no" on Roll No. 53, on an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4119, Federal crop insurance, seeking to present certain disaster payments programs for the 1980 and 1981 crop years; "aye" on Roll No. 54, final passage of H.R. 4119, to expand and improve the Federal crop insurance program; "no" on Roll No. 55 to order the previous question on House Joint Resolution 578, directing the Committee on Rules to inquire into the accuracy of certain newspaper accounts; "aye" on Roll No. 56, final passage of House Joint Resolution 578.●

### HELP FOR NICARAGUA'S MODERATES

#### HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, a recent Wall Street Journal article highlights the importance of the upcoming House vote on aid to Nicaragua. Since 60 percent of the aid package will go to Nicaragua's private sector, H.R. 6081 will encourage businessmen who have been reluctant to invest in Nicaragua's economy to do so. In financial terms, of course, the \$75 million will contribute only modestly to the rebuilding of Nicaragua's devastated economy. But the bill's psychological impact is crucial. Rejection would strike a blow at those in Nicaragua who seek gradual political and economic change. For Members who have not read this telling editorial, I place it in the RECORD:

#### CENTRAL AMERICAN CHANCE

Seven months ago, Sandinist rebels overthrew the Nicaraguan regime of Anastasio Somoza. At the time there were two competing views here in the U.S. about what it was all going to mean. One was that nothing was going on except a justifiable rebellion by indigenous freedom fighters against Somoza's U.S.-supported corruption. The other was that Nicaragua had had a Cuban-sponsored revolution and was on its inexorable way to Cuban-style Communism. Events still haven't provided a judgment on which version was correct. But soon we're going to have to make some decisions about our policy towards Nicaragua anyway.

Right now there's an administration-sponsored bill in the Congress to lend the Nica-

raguans \$70 million and give them another \$5 million in grants. The aid is meant to enable the country, especially its still-substantial private sector, to restore an economy ravaged by the civil war. The authorization bill has passed the Senate but is in some trouble in the House: A number of Representatives are gloomily contending that the money can't stop Nicaragua from becoming a totalitarian state and America's enemy. They point to the Sandinists' recent abstention in the UN vote on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the anti-American rhetoric that the Nicaraguans delivered along with their expression of neutrality.

Those in favor of the aid package answer that Nicaragua isn't Castroite now, but it may well become so if we don't help out with the economic crisis. It's nice to see that for once both sides in the debate are admitting the existence of Communist designs and the possibility of a Communist triumph. But so far the evidence is still mixed.

On the one hand, even apart from the anti-U.S. language there are some disturbingly familiar signs: substantial expropriations of businesses and personal wealth, a steady exodus by the middle classes, the presence of Cuban "reading teachers," continued postponement of elections, and the appearance of powerful Sandinist Defense Committees, a network of neighborhood "cells" on the Cuban model that dispense supplies and propaganda and enforce mandatory attendance. On the other, the government has avoided massively vindictive revolutionary justice. It continues to express respect for the role of the Church and the private sector, and hasn't really clamped down on freedom of expression. And it hasn't gone into the business of subverting its neighbors.

In short, the future is resolutely uncertain; and, that being the case, there are reasons to go ahead with the aid. For one thing, Nicaragua still has some objective characteristics—its middle class, for instance—that make its prospects brighter than those of other Central American nations. For another, the rising level of conflict in nearby countries like Guatemala and El Salvador make this a specially poor time to cut our ties to the region.

And finally, there is a judgment we have to make about the attitude this country is going to take towards the uncertain course of history in this region—whether we are going to act on the assumption that we have been defeated or whether we will take some chances, even relative long shots, to try and avoid the debacle.●

### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 62d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia. Estonians over the entire globe will be commemorating their national holiday on the 24th. They will be confirming their determination to fight for the restoration of the independence of their native Estonia. At the same time, they hope world public opinion will support them in their struggle for liberty and freedom.



Sixty-two years ago, Estonia proclaimed her independence, thereby establishing the basis for the free and independent Republic of Estonia.

However, Estonian independence was short-lived. Twenty years after declaring its independence, Estonia was again invaded by Soviet troops. Public assembly was banned, censorship imposed, and the Estonian Government was dissolved. The new government took its orders from Moscow. In August 1940, Estonia was incorporated into the Soviet Union. After two decades of self rule, Estonia was once again forced to relinquish its national sovereignty.

The people of Estonia have suffered many human and material losses since the start of the Soviet occupation. Tens of thousands of Estonians from all walks of life have been deported to remote areas of the Soviet Union. In the past, it has been reported, Estonians simply disappeared, or were liquidated by secret execution squads.

At this time, there is a growing air of nationalism in Estonia, as the Estonians are becoming increasingly restless with the present situation. They justly feel they should be set free from the hands of their Soviet captors. There have been many demonstrations in recent months revealing these attitudes.

I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes to the Estonian nation and to all Estonians in our country in their pursuit of individual freedom and personal justice. ●

#### CURRENT STATUS OF THE NATIONAL SICKLE CELL DISEASE PROGRAM IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share the following article, entitled "Reflections on the Current Status of the National Sickle Cell Disease Program in the United States," with my colleagues. This timely and informative article was written by Dr. Roland B. Scott, professor of pediatrics and child health, and director of the Center for Sickle Cell Disease, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, D.C. It provides an appropriate and much needed assessment of current activities which relate to sickle cell anemia research efforts, patient care programs, Federal legislative initiatives and funding. The contents will be of great importance to those of us who are concerned about adequate health care for all citizens:

REFLECTIONS ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE NATIONAL SICKLE CELL DISEASE PROGRAM IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Roland B. Scott, M.D.)

Some clouds of concern now appear on the horizon for the national sickle cell dis-

ease program. There is flagging general attention by the black population and a dilution of interest in and visibility of the sickle cell problem brought about by political maneuvering to bring the program under the legislative umbrella of many other genetic diseases (which occur predominantly in Caucasians). In addition, the federal program has recently phased-out six comprehensive sickle cell centers and imposed budgetary cutbacks in the remaining centers. The victims of this disease, the black population in general, and the researchers and investigators who seek ways to bring this disease under control need reassurance from the current national administration that the sickle cell program will not be permitted to die a slow death from financial attrition, attenuation of interest, and skillful neglect leading to the phasing-out of another "minority project." The national sickle cell program, in the relatively short span of six years, has made significant and notable progress not only in research endeavor but also in improved patient care and community-wide education. In this context, certainly, the positive aspects of the national sickle cell disease program continue to far outweigh any negative ones.<sup>1</sup>

The first slave ships bearing black Africans arrived in the United States in 1619, however, the first recorded case of sickle cell anemia was not described until 1910 by Herrick.<sup>2</sup> Following Herrick's report, the disease was widely described in many clinical, pathological, and hematological medical papers. However, the first major scientific breakthrough did not occur until 1949, when Pauling discovered that the sickling phenomenon was dependent upon the presence of an abnormal hemoglobin which had reproducible electrophoretic properties.<sup>3</sup> Another notable advance occurred in the same year when Neel<sup>4</sup> and Beet<sup>5</sup> independently reported that the disease is transmitted genetically by heterozygous carriers as a Mendelian recessive. Despite these and other stimulating biomedical contributions, the disease suffered from relative neglect by the scientific community and was regarded as an unimportant condition occurring predominantly in Black people.

#### A PRESIDENT RECOGNIZES THE DISEASE

The low profile of scientific and biomedical interest continued until February 1971, when President Nixon, in his message to Congress, indicated that greater attention and support for sickle cell disease should be made available at the national level. Shortly thereafter, in May 1972, Congress passed the National Sickle Cell Anemia Control Act with the resultant formation of a Sickle Cell Disease Branch in the Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Under the auspices and funding of the Sickle Cell Disease Branch, ten comprehensive centers\* were established in existing medical schools with a mandate to develop programs of research, education, improved patient care, screening, counseling, and community involvement. In addition to mission-oriented research, the federal government supported other projects through the media of contracts, investigator-initiated studies, the development of screening and education clinics, and the inauguration of a hemoglobinopathy detection laboratory in the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta. This federal program stimulated basic and clinical investigation in abnormal hemoglobins and generated more than 200 papers that were presented at the first National Symposium on Sickle Cell Disease held in Washington, DC, June 1974, under the auspices of NIH. The news media responded to this biomedical reawakening of interest in sickle cell disease by an outpouring of reports. At long last, interest in

the disease had indeed reached a stage of high visibility!

#### RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Potassium cyanate<sup>6</sup> and urea<sup>7</sup> were heralded in early and preliminary reports as potential antisickling agents that could prevent or control painful sickle cell crises, however, subsequent studies demonstrated the occurrence of toxicity and other untoward effects that essentially eliminated these agents from further consideration.<sup>8</sup> The search continues for safer and less toxic compounds for use in the treatment of this disease. It is possible that some of the agents such as cyanate and alkylating compounds (nitrogen mustard), which are too toxic for direct administration to the human, may be employed through the use of an extracorporeal approach. This involves the *in vitro* mixing of red blood cells from patients who have sickle cell disease with an agent like cyanate and then reintroducing the washed, chemically treated cells to the same donor. This technique may avoid or bypass the toxicity effects but it has the disadvantage of being cumbersome, time consuming, and expensive.<sup>9</sup> It is currently available as an experimental procedure in only a few medical centers.

New methods are being devised for the detection of sickle and other abnormal hemoglobins. It is now possible to diagnose sickle cell disease in the fetus<sup>10-13</sup> and in the newborn infant.<sup>14</sup> The prenatal diagnostic procedures gives parents at risk an option to have offspring who have normal hemoglobins or the trait, but to avoid the birth of sick children with sickle cell disease. In addition to electrophoresis, other methods such as microcolumn chromatography and immunochemical techniques<sup>15</sup> have been developed to diagnose sickle cell disease in the newborn infant. Detection of the disease in early life, before clinical symptoms appear, permits early education and medical surveillance which are helpful in the control of life threatening infection—a chief cause of death in infants and young children.<sup>16</sup> Early diagnosis is particularly important in order to identify those children who can benefit from the new vaccine for prophylaxis against pneumococcal infections.<sup>17</sup>

An animal model has been developed which makes it possible to evaluate the effectiveness of therapeutic agents such as anti-sickling chemical compounds without significant risk to the human subject.<sup>18</sup> This involves pretreatment of an animal such as a rat with biologicals so that the rodent is able to accept and tolerate for a limited time transfused sickled cells from human subjects. Then, the living human sickle cells in the rat's circulatory system can be "treated" with various anti-sickling agents as a test of their therapeutic efficacy.

Newer and different methods of genetic counseling for persons of varied educational and environmental backgrounds are being explored and evaluated in the Medical Genetics Division at Howard University and elsewhere in an effort to improve the effectiveness of this procedure (Murray, R. F., Personal communication, January 1, 1979).

A project involving a cooperative study of the natural history or clinical course of patients of all ages with sickle cell disease is now in progress at Howard University and 23 other medical institutions, under the auspices of the Sickle Cell Disease Branch at the National Institutes of Health. The project should prove to be beneficial to researchers and patients. The study results will be helpful in making long-range plans for treatment and management. In addition, it will provide information that can serve as a basis for the evaluation of present and future therapeutic regimens.

## EDUCATION

In addition to research accomplishments, there has been the development of an on-going program for education directed toward both professional and lay groups. The National Institutes of Health and the federally sponsored Sickle Cell Centers and Clinics have all contributed to this program.<sup>19</sup> As an example, the Center for Sickle Cell Disease of Howard University has presented seven postgraduate conferences dealing with various aspects of this disease. More than 2,000 physicians and allied health workers have attended these meetings.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, the federally sponsored Sickle Cell Centers and Clinics have produced other educational media such as motion pictures, tapes, exhibits, booklets, pamphlets, and scientific publications.

## PATIENT CARE

In addition to participation in research and education, a significant responsibility of the NIH-affiliated sickle cell disease centers is to provide and coordinate comprehensive care for victims of this malady. This includes medical care and supportive services such as social work, psychological evaluation, rehabilitation, and vocational counseling. The Center at Howard University may be used as a prototype. This Center currently provides care for 200 children and 100 adult patients with sickle cell disease and integrates hospital and ambulatory services as well as facilities for accurate screening and counseling for persons with abnormal hemoglobins. A consultative laboratory diagnostic service is also available to physicians in the community. A screening laboratory is located in the Center building and is available to residents of the greater Washington, DC area.

The Howard University Center maintains an active Community Outreach Program which is designed to provide current information and professional services to citizens of the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia and adjacent regions of Maryland and Virginia. The program is implemented through the utilization of a mobile health unit, which was specifically designed and customized to provide, under one roof, compartments for laboratory testing for sickle hemoglobin, iron deficiency (nutritional) anemia, blood pressure determination, audiovisual education, counseling, and referral services. The staff of this unit consists of two laboratory technicians, a counselor, a driver/security officer, and a community aide. This group works under the direct supervision of a community coordinator. To date, the mobile health unit has traveled over 5,000 miles and has given service to over 10,000 persons. This unit was donated to Howard University by the United Black Fund of Washington, DC.

## CONCERNS AND UNMET NEEDS

## Funding

The total federal budget for the Comprehensive Sickle Cell Program was only \$6.9 million for Fiscal Year 1973 and has not exceeded \$20 million in subsequent years. In 1973, the ten existing centers were increased to 15; however, in 1977, six centers were phased out. Subsequently an additional facility was funded thus leaving ten viable centers at present. Two of the discontinued centers were in the state of New York, which has a large black and Hispanic population. The money problem became more acute in 1977, when the budgets of the ten remaining centers were suddenly reduced across the board by 10 to 14 percent of the total awards. Some, if not all, of the centers are finding it necessary to seek supplementary financial support from other sources. For example, the Howard University Center

is almost totally dependent upon grants, donations, and community contributions for its existence and since it is situated in the District of Columbia, there is no source of state supplementation.

## Legislation

The initial National Sickle Cell Anemia Control Act (Public Law 92-924) was signed by the President in May 1972 and expired June 30, 1975. This act authorized designated funds to be appropriated for the three year duration of the Act, however, the appropriations were never actually implemented, thereby leaving the funding level of the national sickle cell program to the discretion of the HEW and NIH administrations. The consequences of weak legislation threaten the security of a "minority program" such as that for sickle cell which has to compete for funds with other programs in the Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute.

With the expiration of the initial National Sickle Cell Anemia Control Act in 1975, Senator Javits of New York proposed the incorporation of the sickle cell program under the umbrella of an omnibus genetics bill. During the hearing for the new legislation, many of the black researchers and center directors testified in favor of a bill that would maintain the integrity of the program under a specific sickle cell control act. This fight was lost and after the hearings and imposed compromise, the sickle cell program became incorporated with other genetic diseases in a new bill (Public Law 94-278), which included Title IV cited as the National Sickle Cell Anemia, Cooley's Anemia, Tay-Sachs, and Genetic Diseases Act.\* This bill expired June 30, 1978 and further legislation is pending.

## Research

There is need for continuous support for research. There is still no cure for this painful, crippling disease which, in the United States, affects predominantly black persons. Research efforts carried out in the USA could also eventually benefit millions of victims of this disease who live in Africa and elsewhere.

## Patient care

While we await the coming of a "magic bullet" which hopefully will bring a cure, there is need to seek better ways to utilize existing facilities for the comprehensive care of these patients. There is need for more effective analgesics for the control of pain without the hazards of iatrogenic drug addiction. There is need in many areas of the United States for a more effective team approach composed of physicians and other health professionals such as nurses, health educators, clinical psychologists, etc., in order to give greater support to these patients whose quality of life is jeopardized not only by a chronic illness, but also by large medical bills, incomplete insurance coverage, interruption of school attendance by children, and lack of full employment opportunities for adults.

## International consideration

This disease has a worldwide distribution and its victims, no doubt, number in the millions. Throughout the world many people who have this disease receive inadequate health care and die prematurely. An International Association for Sickle Cell Disease is now home-based in the Howard University Center. The main goal of this organization is to diminish morbidity and mortality and to improve the well being of the patients wherever they may be found. Achievement of this goal will depend in large measure upon improved communications, education, research, adoption of uniform procedures for treatment, laboratory technique, drug trials, and better financial

support. The effectiveness of the program of this Association is contingent upon the availability of financial support which is solicited from all available sources.<sup>21</sup>

## FOOTNOTES

\*This title established a national program to provide for basic and applied research, training, testing, counseling, information and education programs with respect to genetic diseases including sickle cell anemia, Cooley's anemia, Tay Sachs disease, cystic fibrosis, dysautonomia, hemophilia, retinitis pigmentosa, Huntington's chorea, and muscular dystrophy.

<sup>1</sup>Jackson RE: A perspective of the national sickle cell disease program. Arch Intern Med 133:533-534, 1974

<sup>2</sup>Herrick JB: Peculiar elongated and sickle shaped red blood corpuscles in a case of severe anemia. Arch Intern Med 6:517-521, 1910

<sup>3</sup>Pauling L, Itano HA, Singer SJ, et al: Sickle cell anemia, molecular disease. Science 110:543-548, 1949

<sup>4</sup>Neel JV: The inheritance of sickle cell anemia. Science 110:64-66, 1949

<sup>5</sup>Beet EA: The genetics of the sickle cell trait in a Bantu tribe. Ann Eugen 14:279-284, 1949

<sup>6</sup>Ceram A, Manning JM: Potassium cyanate as an inhibitor of the sickling of erythrocytes in vitro. Proc Natl Acad Sci 68:1180-1183, 1971

<sup>7</sup>Nalbandian RM, Shulz G, Lusher JM, et al: Sickle cell crisis terminated by intravenous urea in sugar solutions—a preliminary report. J Med Sci 261:309-324, 1971

<sup>8</sup>Brewer GJ: A view of the current status of anti-sickling therapy. Am J Hematol 1:121, 1926

<sup>9</sup>International Meeting on the Development of Therapeutic Agents for Sickle Cell Disease sponsored by L'Institut National De La Sante Et De La Recherche Medicale (France), The Fogarty International Center, The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases of the National Institutes of Health, USPHS, Paris, July 19-21, 1978

<sup>10</sup>Nathan DG, Alter BP: Antenatal diagnosis of the hemoglobinopathies. Br J Haematol 31:143-146, 1975

<sup>11</sup>Kan YW, Golbus MS, Trecartin R: Prenatal diagnosis of sickle cell anemia. N Engl J Med 294:1039-1040, 1976

<sup>12</sup>Symposium on Perinatal Approaches to the Diagnosis of Fetal Hemoglobinopathies, Sponsored by Sickle Cell Disease Branch of National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute and Martin Luther King Jr. General Hospital and Charles R. Drew Postgraduate Medical School, Los Angeles, February 23-24, 1978

<sup>13</sup>Kan YW, Dozy AM: Antenatal diagnosis of sickle cell anemia by DNA analysis of amniotic fluid cells. Lancet 2:910-912, 1978

<sup>14</sup>Pearson HA, O'Brien PT, McIntosh S, et al: Routine screening of umbilical cord blood of sickle cell disease. JAMA 227:420-421, 1974

<sup>15</sup>Headings V, Anyabe S, Bhattacharya S, et al: Early diagnosis of Hemoglobinopathies. Pediat Res 12:932-938, 1978

<sup>16</sup>Barrett-Connor E: Bacterial infection and sickle cell anemia. Medicine 50:97-112, 1971

<sup>17</sup>Ammann AJ, Addiego J, Ware D, et al: Polyvalent Pneumococcal-polysaccharide immunization of patients with sickle cell anemia and patients with splenectomy. N Engl J Med 297:897-900, 1977

<sup>18</sup>Castro O, Osbaldiston GW, Aponte L, et al: Oxygen dependent circulation of sickle erythrocytes. J Lab Clin Med 88:732-744, 1976

<sup>19</sup>Proceedings of the First National Sickle Cell Educational Symposium sponsored by Sickle Cell Branch, Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, NIH, Washington, DC, June 1974

<sup>20</sup>Scott RB: How a comprehensive center for sickle cell disease can contribute to continued medical education. J Natl Med Assn 69:67-68, 1977

<sup>21</sup>Howard University Center for Sickle Cell Disease, Washington, DC, Bull Int Assoc Sickle Cell Dis 1:1-4, 1977

## THE 62D ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

## HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 24, Estonians all

over the world will commemorate the anniversary of the proclamation of their independence 62 years ago. The story of the small, proud Baltic nation of Estonia is a tragically familiar one. For 20 short years Estonia knew peace and freedom before falling prey to Soviet domination.

When President Woodrow Wilson declared that all nations have the right to self-determination, Estonia declared herself to be a free and independent nation. Her achievements in all fields of life were miraculous and earned the small new country the respect and admiration of all free nations throughout the world.

A massive invasion by Soviet Russia in 1940 brought a sudden end to Estonian freedom and prosperity, and the people of Estonia have suffered economic exploitation and extreme persecution at the hands of the Soviet Union ever since. Brave champions of freedom and justice inside Estonia who dare to speak out against violations of human rights in their nation are imprisoned or confined to mental hospitals. In spite of the Soviet Union's claims of adherence to the Helsinki agreements, human rights violations in Estonia are commonplace, as they are in other nations under Soviet domination and inside the Soviet Union itself.

The United States has consistently refused to recognize the unlawful Soviet occupation of Estonia. The Estonian American National Council states that this continuing recognition by America of the legal independence of Estonia provides moral support for Estonians throughout the world who continue to hope for the triumph of freedom in their native land. These brave people rely on public opinion to support them in their continuing struggle.

Mr. Speaker, to give moral support to the freedom-loving people of Estonia is the very least we can do and to express our continuing indignation at Soviet aggression in Estonia and other parts of the world is something we must do. On Estonia's National Independence Day we pay special tribute to Estonian people throughout the world who continue to hope, work, and pray for freedom for their homeland. ●

#### STING OPERATIONS ARE EFFECTIVE TOOLS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

### HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Judiciary Committee, by a unanimous vote of 27 to 0, went on record as strongly opposing any effort by the Congress to intrude upon the pending investigation by the Justice Department in connection with the Abscam operation.

Next week when the full House considers this important matter, I urge my colleagues to resist the temptation to get in the way of the Justice Department and allow the Department to proceed with its case.

Concern has been expressed over the Federal Bureau of Investigation's use of sting operations. As a former prosecutor, I am very familiar with the use of sting operations. In my view, properly used, it is one of the most effective tools of law enforcement for crimes in American society that have previously gone unpunished.

A recent editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press addressed this issue of FBI tactics in a manner which I believe is very well taken. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues as the House considers the Peyser resolution:

#### WHY IS THE FBI NOW THE BAD GUY?

Bess Truman was 95 years old last Wednesday, and strangely enough reflections on the dear lady's White House years bring to mind circumstances that led to the FBI's Abscam operations.

Mrs. Truman and husband Harry left Washington on inauguration day 1953. They went home to Independence, Mo., by train. When they arrived at their white frame house just a few tree-shaded blocks down the street from the Truman Museum, reporters asked the former president what was next on his agenda.

"Carry the bags upstairs," said Harry. And he did just that, unaided.

Mrs. Truman celebrated her birthday Wednesday, still in the family home.

What brings the subject of the Trumans around to Abscam is—money. Mr. Truman was the last president to retire from office who did not give much thought to eventually converting his presidency into personal wealth. His four successors, aside from the assassinated John Kennedy, pursued and accumulated substantial income and the trappings that go with it.

The point is not that wealth per se is bad, or that ex-presidents are exclusively and inevitably greedy or venal. On the contrary the poor are no less corruptible than the rich, and it is becoming increasingly apparent that political jobs on all levels are being seen by officeholders as mere footpaths to a steady if not substantial income. The citizen lawmaker has become the professional politician, thus increasing by many times the opportunities to wield power and influence well beyond the norm.

Which brings us to Abscam. Altogether too much scandal and criticism that ought to be directed against those who played the FBI's game are being deflected against the FBI itself. The agency is accused of "manufacturing" crime, of slandering Arabs, of broaching the sacred legislative-executive boundaries.

The cries of entrapment should be ignored. That's a highly technical issue for the courts to decide. And besides, not one of the alleged bribe takers has yet to deny that he visited a strange house in Washington where large sums of money were discussed.

Would those in Congress so outraged by FBI activities be equally distraught if similar tactics had been used to snare car strippers or major drug peddlers? Why do members of Congress, who routinely accept large sums of campaign money from clearly identified influence peddlers, register such surprise that some of their colleagues lack the will to resist obviously tainted cash when it is thrust upon them? Is it too much to ask

of those who take the oath of public office to tell questionable characters to "have a nice day"—and split?

If judgment in a situation like this is open to debate, what, pray tell, are the chances of Congress acting responsibly and scrupulously on far graver matters?

Regardless of the outcome of the legal processes resulting from Abscam, it is obvious that the FBI, in its new war against corruption and white collar crime, will be striking hitherto untouched raw nerves. And the dismay of those in Congress will be but a forerunner of greater pressure the FBI will be experiencing.

The stakes are high. The FBI under J. Edgar Hoover squandered its resources on highly visible crimes like spectacular kidnappings, statistically impressive ones like car theft and politically expedient ones like Communist-inspired subversion. Now it is finally coming around to the core of national lawlessness.

FBI Director William Webster said last week that the agency has 85 undercover operations under way, of which 51 are sophisticated and long-term. He noted that of the \$3 million appropriated by Congress for undercover activities last year, more than \$300 million in misused funds have been recovered "plus over a billion dollars in economic losses." He also said—surprise!—that few organized crime enterprises can exist without accompanying public corruption.

And that's just in cases involving a federal interest. Few doubt that sweetheart deals, friendly "arrangements" and outright corruption on state and local levels of government far exceed anything being done in Washington. The smaller the governmental unit, the less likely is the risk of skilled press and public scrutiny.

By zeroing in on members of Congress as a target of opportunity, the FBI has dramatically announced that those who participate in public corruption and other white collar crime are doing so at greatly increased risk. If there are reasons the FBI should not be doing that, then let the critics say so outright. ●

#### UKRAINIAN WRITER AND HIS TORIAN FACES OPPRESSION

### HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, oppression behind the Iron Curtain is a daily occurrence that we cannot forget. The present troubles facing Ukrainian author Zinovij Mikhailovich Krasivski show that political prisoners in Soviet-dominated countries face government harassment and scrutiny even after they are released from prison.

Krasivski has courageously courted government anger by joining the Helsinki Monitoring Group which provides the world with valuable information on human rights. I would like to share at this point a letter a constituent of mine sent to the State Department in behalf of this courageous man.

Mr. JOHN GREENWALD,  
Department of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GREENWALD: As a member of Amnesty International, I am writing on behalf of Zinovij Mikhailovich Krasivski,

the Ukrainian writer, historian, and former political prisoner, who was released from a psychiatric hospital in July 1978. He now lives in Morshyn near Lwow. Recently he became a member of the Helsinki Monitoring Group. For this reason, his name appears on the Sakharov list of persons in danger of arrest.

Zinovij Krasiwsky is 50 years old. His long and difficult confinements have caused serious damage to his health. He is categorized as insane by the authorities. Therefore, his freedom and privileges are severely restricted. He is under constant surveillance. Effectively, he is a prisoner, though not behind bars.

From my own correspondence with him, and from several first hand accounts, I am convinced that Zinovij Krasiwsky is an extremely intelligent, coherent, normal and personable individual.

Zinovij Krasiwsky and his family have received invitations from Israel. Using these invitations, they have applied for permission to emigrate. This, to date has not been granted. In fact, they have only met with delays and harassment. They have also received written invitations from the United States, copies of which I am enclosing.

I would like to ask you to inquire of the United States Embassy in Moscow whether they could obtain any information about the status of the Krasiwsky family's application to emigrate.

I urge you to look into this matter at your earliest convenience because Zinovij Krasiwsky is in grave danger of being rearrested at any time. For him, another imprisonment is likely to be fatal.

Sincerely,

IRIS AKAHOSHI.●

#### AMEND THE GUN CONTROL ACT OF 1968

#### HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with many of our colleagues in sponsoring H.R. 5225, to amend the Gun Control Act of 1968 so as to eliminate inconsistencies in the law and prevent enforcement abuses. There have been numerous complaints about the enforcement tactics of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Many of these are based on Bureau policy alone; others are founded in a combination of bad law and bad enforcement.

One of the major areas of complaint has involved arrests of licensed firearms dealers under a tactic the Bureau created, known as the strawman case. Bureau policies here are reprehensible.

The Gun Control Act, and the enforcement regulations issued by the Treasury Department, clearly require the purchaser of a firearm from a licensed dealer to complete a form containing certain information about the purchaser. BATF, acting on its own and without publishing any notice of its decision, decided that in some instances the person who filled out the required forms was not in fact the purchaser of the firearm.

The basis of the Bureau decision, and the source of the name of the doctrine, revolved around the question of who was the purchaser when one person purchased a gun for another. This distinction arose out of the fact that under the Gun Control Act, some classes of persons, such as juveniles and out-of-State residents, were prohibited from purchasing—but not possessing—a firearm.

BATF evolved a legal doctrine, kept secret from all persons expected to comply with it, that a purchase by a lawful buyer for one prohibited from purchasing but not possessing was lawful; a purchase by a lawful buyer for one prohibited both from purchasing and possessing was a felony. Moreover, in the former case the dealer should list the name of the initial purchaser in his records; in the latter case he should list the name of the person for whose benefit the purchaser was buying. There distinctions are not drawn in the Gun Control Act nor in any published regulations, nor otherwise disclosed to the dealers. Yet BATF would prosecute on felony charges, anyone who violated this secret doctrine or failed to fill in the paperwork in accordance with it.

The sole guidance offered by BATF in this area was a statement in its instruction book for dealers that a parent might legally purchase a firearm for a juvenile, and that the parent should be recorded as the purchaser even if the dealer clearly knew the firearm was for the juvenile. Having offered this single instruction for the area of sales in which one person might be buying for another, BATF then proceeded to arrest dealers under the following circumstances:

A BATF undercover agent, from out of State, would approach a dealer and indicate that he wanted to purchase a firearm. The dealer would request identification from the agent, who would offer his out-of-State drivers license. The dealer would reject this and refuse the sale, since the Gun Control Act prohibited sales to nonresident's of a dealers' State except under certain limited circumstances. The agent would leave.

He would return some time later with another undercover officer, who would have correct local identification. Inquiry would then be made as to whether the local resident could purchase the gun, to which the dealer, correctly, would reply in the affirmative. The local agent would then fill out the forms required of the purchaser, but the nonresident would pick up the gun after it was paid for. This might be repeated once or twice over a period of several weeks, and BATF would then raid the dealer, arrest him, and announce to the world that a "supplier of guns to the criminal underworld" has been arrested.

The charges would be sales to a nonresident and keeping false records—on the contention that the sale had in fact been to the out-of-State agent.

This setting up of the dealer would proceed despite the fact that the dealer had summarily refused a direct sale to the nonresident. One might have expected that the Bureau would have abandoned its enforcement actions once the dealer refused to make an illegal sale, and gone looking for persons who were selling to criminals. Unfortunately, such was not the case.

If this was all there was to the matter, we would still have a serious problem of a Federal law enforcement agency arresting persons on vague grounds, when the person in question has every reason to believe he was complying with the law. This would be compounded, by allegations, which have yet to be proven or disproven, that the Bureau engaged in a random solicitation of dealers to see who might make such sales; rather than pursuing those whom they had reason to believe were in fact supplying criminals.

Unfortunately, that is not all there is to this sorry story. The Bureau's actions in this area amount to the creation of a body of secret administrative law, in defiance of the Congress and in direct violation of the Freedom of Information Act.

The BATF doctrine of strawman has been in existence since at least early 1975. During March and April BATF approached over 30 dealers in South Carolina in this manner. All made the straw sales and were arrested. In one trial in August of that year, BATF agents testified that the term "strawman sale" had a clearly understood meaning within the Bureau. From South Carolina, strawman arrests spread throughout the country.

Yet in hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, also in the spring of 1975, the head of BATF gave testimony quite different than that given by his agent in the Carolina Federal court. Responding to questions from Senator BAYH, the substance of which was that could a prohibited person not have someone else purchase a gun for him without violating the law? The response of the then-Director of BATF was: "Yes, sir, there is no question that this represents a gap in the law."

A month later, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury McDonald informed the House Subcommittee on Crime that he was proposing amendments to the Gun Control Act "aimed at the 'straw purchases' by which many criminals obtain handguns."

Similarly, as the South Carolina trials progressed, the Federal district judge trying many of the cases became convinced that most dealers did not understand that their conduct was considered to be illegal. He therefore notified the U.S. attorney that he would hear no more cases unless all dealers in the State received a written warning of the standards to which they were expected to adhere in

making sales. BATF sent such a warning to dealers in South Carolina, although not enthusiastically. Such arrests had apparently become an easy means of reporting significant activity to Washington.

Durwood Russell, the special agent in charge in Columbia, S.C. wrote to another agent:

We realize that this may jeopardize your buy, but Judge Chapman feels that a dealer should receive ample warning. . . .

Once the warning was distributed, straw man cases disappeared from South Carolina. Judge Chapman noted, in an opinion setting aside one of the straw man convictions 3 years later:

The beneficial effect of this (warning) letter is quite apparent, since no additional indictments have been returned under section 922(b)(3) in more than 3 years.

One might have thought that a Federal agency interested in protecting the rights of citizens would have responded to this judicial suggestion nationwide. BATF did not, and straw man arrests became even more common outside of South Carolina after the judge's action.

In June 1977, a BATF agent made a formal suggestion that the agency place a warning against straw sales on the form 4473 that all dealers must fill out for each sale. He suggested the form as the obvious location for the warning. He noted that "the addition of this warning would help the honest of unsuspecting citizen from—sic—violating the law."

BATF agreed, but decided to place the warning on the back of the form, in the midst of the other instructions for completing it. Normally, a dealer who had filled out several forms would have no cause to refer back to the instructions on subsequent purchases, inasmuch as it is a simple, self-explanatory form. No notice was given to dealers that the instructions had been revised, and the revised forms themselves were only furnished to dealers who contacted BATF for additional copies as their supplies ran out.

Thus, although BATF had technically warned dealers, there was no reason to believe any dealer—other than perhaps one newly entered into the business—would have any reason to become aware of the warning. Arrests continued unabated.

It is even doubtful if a dealer attempting to secure information on the topic would have been able to receive an answer. A request was made under the Freedom of Information Act in January 1979. The request was for "any rules, statements of policy or interpretations—any final opinions—or instructions to staff, and any internal reports, memorandums, or research, relating to what has become known as the straw man case." The request then

supplied a lengthy description of such a case.

On March 1, 1979, BATF responded that a search had uncovered no records dealing with straw man, other than a draft of an industry circular on the topic which was still under preparation and thus not releasable.

At this point, BATF had been arresting dealers under this doctrine for 4 years; it had engaged in extensive correspondence prior to issuing the 1976 South Carolina warning and had issued the warning; it had conducted the necessary internal procedures to revise the back of form 4473; and had issued numerous final opinions revoking dealer licenses for violation of this doctrine.

A nationwide warning to dealers was finally issued last summer, after the agency was severely criticized in Senate hearings on this issue.

The conduct of BATF throughout this period is inexcusable. I frankly question if it would have been permitted had it been directed against any group other than firearms dealers; one can only imagine the outcry that would arise if police were randomly soliciting citizens in minority neighborhoods to see if anyone would buy drugs, on the grounds that there was a substantial illegal drug trade in the neighborhood and this tactic would uncover violators. Here BATF was not even randomly testing citizens with offenses its own agents created. It was testing them for noncompliance with a doctrine it had kept secret from them, and had in fact encouraged in its one publication on the subject.

First, they were using an interpretation which may be contrary to congressional intent. When the Congress passed the Gun Control Act, it was clearly creating a system which made dealers responsible for initial purchases only. All attempts at registration, which would have involved keeping track of subsequent private transfers, were defeated.

Subsequent requests for legislation to impose further requirements of this nature on dealers, or to codify straw man language, were not enacted. Yet BATF, as they did in 1978 with their proposed firearms regulations, went ahead without congressional action.

Second, they were using an interpretation of law which is not obvious to anyone expected to comply with it. The law and regulations clearly provide that the person filling out the form 4473 is the purchaser of the firearm. There is nothing in law or regulation that would place any responsibility on a dealer for subsequent actions by the purchaser, nor was there any notice that the legally defined purchaser might on occasion not be considered the purchaser by the Government. The only guidance in the entire area was a statement that some persons—parents—could legally purchase a firearm for someone prohibited from

purchasing it himself—a juvenile. There would be no reason for a dealer not to assume that so long as a qualified person signed the proper form the sale was legal.

This is further borne out by the findings of Judge Chapman in South Carolina that dealers did not understand the law, and by the numerous cases in which judges dismissed straw man charges against dealers on the grounds that, since a qualified person had signed the form, no crime had been committed.

Third, by operating on an interpretation of the law that was not published, BATF violated the spirit and intent of the Freedom of Information Act. This law clearly requires all such policy decisions to be made public. Indeed, it is contrary to our entire system of justice for a person to be liable for arrest for an offense the nature of which was only known to the arresting officers. BATF's theory seemed to be that they would arrest people and see if individual courts would uphold the arrest.

Fourth, they clearly violated the Freedom of Information Act by denying the existence of any policy or documents relating to strawman cases. In view of the extensive materials which were subsequently uncovered, there is certainly some doubt as to whether their denial was a result of an inept search.

Only a change in the law can prevent future abuses of this nature. Although the straw man case itself may be eliminated by the warning BATF has finally issued, there is nothing to prevent them from reinterpreting some other section of the law in the future should they again desire a large number of arrests to demonstrate agent productivity.

H.R. 5225 would remove this possibility for good. Section 104(a) would amend the Gun Control Act by inserting the term willfully into the penalty section. This would require the Government to show criminal intent, rather than confusion, before they could convict a citizen under the law. ●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the floor of the House of Representatives yesterday as I was chairing a hearing of the Subcommittee of Energy Development and Applications. Had I been present I would have voted in the following fashion:

Rollcall No. 64, House Resolution 579, the rule providing for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3789, "yea." ●

## SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

## HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to a Presidential proclamation declaring March 2 to 9 as "Save Your Vision Week."

The 96th Congress should encourage preventive health care initiatives of this kind to slow the accelerated rate of inflation in our health care system. Persuading Americans to take more responsibility for their fitness and well-being by getting regular checkups, eating a balanced and moderate diet and exercising regularly may be one of the best "brakes" we can apply to our spiraling health costs.

"Save Your Vision Week" is just such an initiative. It reminds us of the importance of regularly scheduled eye examinations to diagnose and arrest potentially disabling eye conditions before they become difficult and expensive to treat.

Vision care in this country has come a long way since the 18th century when people selected eyewear from a barrel of spectacles. Today it includes a battery of diagnostic tests of many vision skills, a thorough internal and external eye examination to determine the absence or presence of symptoms of eye disease, and when needed, individualized treatment with precise lenses, vision training or both. Vision skills for seeing at close ranges, for using the two eyes together as a team, for perception, for recognizing colors and for seeing to the side without turning can now be tested.

Each year 140,000 workers suffer eye injuries. In addition, many of the 2.3 million disabling injuries workers suffer on the job could be the result of vision problems that cause workers to miss seeing something they should have spotted—a machine's warning light or a step or hole, or other danger.

Vision changes constantly and the changes are usually gradual and subtle. As a result regular vision examinations are important to every person—child, adult, or senior citizen. Yet millions of Americans do not realize they are not seeing as well as they should.

Commonsense tells us that preventive health initiatives such as "Save Your Vision Week" are a sensible way to deal with holding down health care costs. For too long our cost reimbursement hospital-oriented health care system has emphasized treatment of conditions which could have been prevented. We must do whatever we can to reverse this extravagant pattern which has resulted in excessive national expenditures for health care. These expenditures form an ever-increasing share of the gross national product, rising from 6.5 percent in 1968 to roughly 9 percent today.

I conclude my remarks by having reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD President Carter's proclamation on "Save Your Vision Week."

## PROCLAMATION 4718—SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK, 1980

Good vision, like good health generally, contributes much to the enjoyment of life. Our ability to see affects how we learn, how we work and play, how we relate to others, and how well we are able to function in an increasingly complex society. Yet most people take good eyesight for granted. Just as we have come to recognize the need to take a more active role in maintaining the health of our bodies through diet and exercise, we should also take time to consider what can be done to take care of our eyes and to protect our vision. With proper care and attention, many of the serious eye problems that affect both young and old can be prevented.

Prevention of eye disease begins even before birth with adequate nutrition and prenatal care for the mother. During early childhood and later in life, periodic eye examinations can reveal certain potentially blinding eye conditions early enough to permit successful treatment. This is particularly true in families where there is a history of glaucoma or in people who have diabetes. With professional eye care, it is even possible to restore sight to some people who are already blind or to help those with partial sight make the most of their remaining vision.

In addition to obtaining professional eye care when needed, each of us must take responsibility for protecting our eyes from injury. Protective eyeglasses or safety goggles should be worn in hazardous situations at work and while participating in many recreational activities. In the home, precautions should be taken to avoid injury to the eyes from household products, appliances, and cosmetics.

To increase awareness of the importance of good vision and of the ways in which we can help to preserve our eyesight, the Congress, by joint resolution approved December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 629, 36 U.S.C. 169a), has requested the President to proclaim the first week of March of each year as Save Your Vision Week.

Now, therefore, I, Jimmy Carter, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning March 2, 1980, as Save Your Vision Week. I urge all Americans to participate in the observance of this period by pausing to consider what they can do to take care of their eyes. I invite vision care professionals, the communications media, educators, and all public and private organizations that support sight conservation to participate in activities that will teach Americans about eye care and encourage them to take steps to preserve and make the most of their vision.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-eighth day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred eighty, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fourth.

JIMMY CARTER.●

## IN THE COUNTRY'S BEST INTERESTS . . .

## HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a con-

stituent who took the time to express his appreciation for a vote I had cast on a particular bill which he, as an individual and as a member of a professional group, has viewed as being favorable to his interests. While the overwhelming amount of mail which we, as Members of Congress, receive about legislation is to ask us to vote for or against a particular measure, it is not unheard of—although it is rare—for us to receive a letter expressing appreciation for the way we voted after the vote is over.

However, that was not the interesting part about my constituent's letter.

The interesting thing was that my constituent, a physician from De Kalb County, Ga., named Wytch Stubbs, Jr., went on to say that he did not expect me to agree with him, or with the interests of his profession on all occasions, and that when the time came, he expected me to vote for what was good for the country as I understood it.

I think his words are important and instructive. Dr. Stubbs says as follows:

There will be times when I am sure you feel that legislation in the best interest of the country will not necessarily be for the best interest of organized medicine. I am counting on your voting for the interest of the country in those situations as well.

At a time when we see far too much single-interest and self-interest emphasis, I think Dr. Stubbs's words should be counted as an example of the type of intelligent and concerned attitude that good citizenship should inspire in everyone. This is a recognition that there are times when the national American interest may be perceived by a Congressman as being different from the personal or special interest of a constituent or group, and that the national interest should prevail. I hope that more and more Americans will adopt this attitude because I think it will help the Congress and the Nation deal with the difficult decisions that lie ahead.

That is patriotism in its finest sense.●

## THE AGRICULTURE PROTECTION ACT OF 1980

## HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1980, the President announced an embargo of all grain exports to the Soviet Union in excess of the 8 million metric tons the United States is obligated to supply under the U.S.-U.S.S.R. grain agreement. This embargo was imposed for national security and foreign policy reasons in response to the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan. At the time of the embargo the President announced that the Government would take whatever steps were necessary to neutralize the effect of the embargo on American ag-

riculture and that the quantities of grain that would have been shipped to the Soviet Union would be isolated from the market.

Although the administration has taken a number of actions to alleviate the impact of the embargo on farmers, I and many of my colleagues are concerned that the actions announced so far may be insufficient. For example, farm prices for the major grains are still below the levels immediately prior to the suspension, many economists forecast continued low prices without further action, and farmers are facing the largest feed-grain carryover since 1963.

In view of this, I am pleased to introduce—and to be joined by several of my colleagues in introducing—legislation which will help the administration live up to its commitment to farmers. I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks a short summary of this legislation. While I am not wedded to the exact provisions of the bill, I believe it is an important response to the crisis facing farmers.

The major provisions of the bill include authority for the Secretary to use up to \$500,000,000 to purchase wheat for donation for urgent humanitarian relief and to assist developing countries to meet their food requirements, require CCC to purchase all the embargoed grain which would have been shipped to the Soviet Union with staggered release of 10 percent per year if carryover is less than the average carryover for the preceding 3 years, and a paid diversion for wheat and feed grains. The bill would also allow corn producers who did not participate in the 1979 feed grain program to obtain price-support loans up to \$100,000.

Next week the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture begins a series of hearings to consider the 1980 wheat and feed grains programs. We will be hearing various farm groups, as well as farmers tell us what they believe should be done to alleviate the impact of the embargo on the agricultural sector of our economy. I encourage the subcommittee to act quickly on legislation and recommend the bill we are introducing for their favorable consideration.

The material follows:

#### SHORT SUMMARY OF THE AGRICULTURE PROTECTION ACT OF 1980

Section 1 provides that the Act may be cited as the Agriculture Protection Act of 1980.

Section 2 contains findings and declarations.

Title I would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire wheat on the open market or through voluntary sales of wheat held in the producer storage reserve. This wheat could be used only for donation (1) to provide urgent humanitarian relief in a foreign country suffering a major disaster where the need of the country cannot be satisfied under Public Law 480; (2) to assist developing countries to meet their food requirements when domestic supplies of

wheat in the United States are so limited that quantities cannot be made available under the criteria of section 401(a) of Public Law 480; and (3) to fulfill lawful international obligations. Up to \$500,000,000 would be authorized to be utilized by the Secretary to carry out this title.

Title II provides for isolation of embargoed grains.

Section 201 would require the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase and take title to and possession of all grain the export of which to the Soviet Union was blocked by the President's embargo. The CCC could not sell or dispose of any such grain at a price less than the parity price for such commodity except that authority would be provided for a staggered release of up to 10 percent per year (and an additional 10 percent under some circumstances) if carryover for the particular commodity at the end of a marketing year is less than the carryover average for the preceding three years and release would not unduly depress market prices.

Section 202 would write into the statute authorizing the farmer reserve the current release and call levels for feed grains (125 percent and 145 percent of the loan level, respectively). This section would also provide that when a farmer reserve is in effect for wheat and feed grains CCC may not sell any of its stocks of those commodities at less than 10 percent above the call level or 150 percent of the loan level, whichever is higher.

Title III relates to land diversion programs.

Section 301 would require the Secretary to establish a land diversion payment program for the 1980 crop of feed grains designed to divert from production 12 million metric tons of feed grains. Producers would be eligible for payments of not less than 10 percent of their acreage, computed by multiplying the farm program payment yield, by the total acreage diverted, by not less than \$1.00 per bushel in the case of corn. The Secretary would set a comparable payment rate for other feed grains.

Section 302 would require the Secretary to establish a land diversion payment program for the 1980 crop of wheat which would be designed to divert from production 4 million metric tons of wheat. Producers would be eligible for a payment of not less than 10 percent of their acreage. The payment would be computed by multiplying not less than \$1.25 per bushel, by the farm program payment yield, by the acreage diverted. This section would also amend the wheat hay and graze-out provision to provide that the minimum payment shall be not less than 50 cents per bushel.

Title IV contains miscellaneous provisions.

Section 401 would make corn producers who did not participate in the 1979 feed grain program eligible for loans, not to exceed a total of \$100,000, on their 1979 crop of corn.

Section 402 would authorize the Secretary to sell CCC stocks of corn at the prevailing market price for use in the production of alcohol for motor fuel to facilities that began operation after January 4, 1980.

Section 403 would amend Section 1002 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 to require the Secretary to establish loan rates at 90 percent of parity if there were an embargo of agricultural commodities for any purpose. However, if the embargo were based on national security or foreign policy, the loan level could be set at not less than the average market price for the particular commodity during the 30 days immediately prior to the embargo.

Section 404 would increase the minimum level of donations of U.S. commodities to

needy people throughout the world under title II of Public Law 480.●

### SAVING FOR A RAINY DAY

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, in the old days in this country, we believed strongly in saving for a rainy day.

Nowadays, the weather has not changed, but our feelings about saving certainly have. It is not the saver's fault. Federal law simply places so many disincentives on saving that people stop doing it. Because of the inflation rate, savings makes no economic sense. An inflation rate of 13 percent makes a 5- or 6-percent return on savings worthless.

Yesterday, however, the House and Senate conferees on windfall profits agreed to remove one of the major barriers to saving, and incorporated into the conference report, a tax exemption of \$200 per individual on interest earned in a savings account—\$400 for a joint return. Because the action will have no individual vote in the committee and on the floor, I wanted to make my support of this provision clear.

I am happy that the small saver will be getting some new encouragement to save. Perhaps now, we as a nation, will not continue to show the lowest savings level of any industrialized country at only 4.1 percent of our earnings. The Japanese put approximately 22 percent of their take home pay into savings accounts, and the Germans save 15 percent. I do not think it is mere coincidence that the inflation rates in these two countries are far lower than ours.

History illustrates how well we in the United States have used the principle of hard work and prudent saving to build a strong nation. Today, however, it appears as if working hard for a living is becoming a waste of time. There is no money for housing, and rising energy costs are making it impossible for families to enjoy the extras which help raise our quality of life.

This tax break for small savers is one way we can stop penalizing people for saving and investing. Hopefully, since this exclusion includes both interest and dividend income, certificates of deposit and security and bond markets will again be available to the smaller investor.

This is tax season and we all hear every day from our constituents about the seriousness of the Federal bite out of their earnings. I am happy that we will be able to take the news of this new exemption home to them.●

**THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF ACHIEVEMENT**

**HON. JOHN G. FARY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● **Mr. FARY.** Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, during this past weekend, the largest organization of Polish Americans and the largest fraternal organization in the United States, the Polish National Alliance, celebrated its 100th anniversary. Although the alliance is now based in Chicago, the centennial birthday celebrations took place in Philadelphia where the Polish National Alliance was founded on February 15, 1880.

At the time of its founding, the principal aims of the alliance and its member organizations were threefold: First, to help more recent immigrants from Poland to establish themselves in this country; second, to maintain the unique culture and traditions brought over from Poland; and, third, to work for the emergence of a free, independent Polish state. It must be remembered that, at the time, Poland did not appear on maps of Europe because Prussia, Russia, and Austria, the three superpowers on her borders, had divided Poland among themselves. However, they could not deprive the Poles of their spirit, and suppression only strengthened Polish nationalism.

In this context, the founding of the Polish National Alliance was an important event affirming unity among Poles all over America, providing a helping hand to countrymen and women, many of whom fled to the United States to escape oppression, and showing the world that Poles consider themselves a distinct nation with a right to autonomy that was being denied. We all know that this is still true today and the alliance continues to perform the very important function of reminding the world that Poland is a captive nation although no one can imprison the spirit of her people.

The anniversary celebrations in Philadelphia began last Friday, the 15th of February which is the precise date, 100 years ago, of the founding of the Polish National Alliance. The festivities included the dedication of Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski's portraits which the PNA presented to the American Nation in 1894, Polish folk dancing by young members of the alliance, a banquet, a mass of thanksgiving celebrated by John Cardinal Krol, and a mass for all members who have passed away. This weekend marked the beginning of a yearlong commemoration of the PNA's first year of existence when the various stages of actual organization took place. In September, we will observe the 100th anniversary of the First Polish National Alliance Convention in Chicago.

Now, at the beginning of this year of celebrations, I want to commend the Polish National Alliance, its leaders, the organizers of various activities, and every member of every lodge because they all contribute to the valuable achievements of the PNA. With Aloysius Mazewski at its head, the Polish National Alliance is indeed reaching the goals set for it by the founders 100 years ago. This organization has helped numerous refugees from Communist oppression over the years, it has made a significant contribution to the quality of American life by keeping the ideals of liberty and justice for all men alive, it has added to the richness of our American way of life by preserving Polish culture here in the United States. I am proud to be able to say that I have been a member of the Polish National Alliance for many years and I hope that the next 100 years are as successful and productive as the last have been. Sto Lat.●

**A TRIBUTE TO VINCENT G. BRETT**

**HON. NORMAN F. LENT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● **Mr. LENT.** Mr. Speaker, our great country has become the most admired Nation in history through the individual efforts and sacrifices of millions of American citizens who, from the founding of the Republic more than two centuries ago, have helped to develop and strengthen it. Unfortunately history seldom records the individual accomplishments and achievements of those whose collective efforts have contributed so much to the growth of our Nation.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to an event honoring one of those individual builders of our country, a most respected businessman and community leader in my Fourth Congressional District, Mr. Vincent G. Brett. His accomplishments, both in the business world and in civic leadership, typify the best in American citizenship.

On March 20, 1980, Mr. Brett's many friends will gather to pay tribute to him on the 25th anniversary of the founding of his business, Mid-Island Collision, Inc., an auto repair facility, of Rockville Centre, N.Y.

Like the great majority of small businessmen, Mr. Brett began his career in the most humble fashion. He had no vast financial resources. But he did possess in great abundance the far more important resources of intelligence, ability, and a strong desire to serve his community. In the 25 years since Mr. Brett inaugurated his auto repair business he has not only achieved the impressive business success of which he dreamed, but he has won the greatest respect and admiration throughout the Long Island area

he serves for his extensive activities in community affairs. And in so doing he has made a substantial contribution to our country.

Mr. Brett began his business with the credo "We Care," and that has been the governing credo of his life. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brett is incorporating that credo in his 25th anniversary celebration. During the first week in March, Mr. Brett is donating 5 percent of all receipts from his collision-repair business to the Cambodian Relief Fund of the Rockville Centre Roman Catholic Diocese, and to the U.S. Mission-UNICEF Cambodian Relief Fund.

As Mr. Brett himself explains:

Donating to Cambodian relief is just a humble way of saying thanks to our friends in the community for making possible the growth of Mid-Island into an institution among auto-body repair shops.

With such a humanitarian philosophy, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that hundreds of Vinny Brett's friends will gather to honor him at this milestone in his life?

I am proud to call Vinny Brett my friend, and I join with all of his friends in congratulating him or his tremendous spirit of public service, and for his unceasing efforts toward the betterment of his business and of his community. Vinny Brett's life and his business career are in the finest tradition of service to his community and to our country. We wish him continued success in the years to come.●

**THE ISSUE OF THE DRAFT**

**HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● **Mr. DANNEMEYER.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express myself regarding registration and the draft. This is a matter of great importance to the American people and it deserves the full and complete consideration of the Congress.

In the last session of Congress, I voted for an amendment to H.R. 4040, the defense authorization bill, which would have provided for mandatory registration because I believe registration during peacetime would facilitate combat readiness in case of a national emergency. Although this particular measure did not pass, it will surely come up again in this session of Congress.

The American people do not covet the territory of any nation of the world. We want to engage in international trade and favor free trade as much as possible. Historically, we are the product of a revolution in which we won our political freedom. This fact, coupled with abundant natural resources and a capitalistic economic system, has made us the envy of the world. Our foreign policy is designed to encourage other people to evolve as



we have. In a nutshell, Americans do not want any part of a war or preparation for war unless we perceive that our system is seriously threatened.

The Russian people and the Chinese people are, in reality, no different from the American people on what they want out of life. The difference is in the form of government which exists in the Soviet Union and China. Communist governments in both countries have as a stated objective the triumph of communism over capitalism. Chinese leaders still stick to the old Stalinist school of thought which is that war between the United States and the U.S.S.R. is inevitable. Russian leaders are split. Some believe as the Chinese leaders do and others believe that the triumph of communism will come as a result of wars of national liberation—North Vietnam attacking South Vietnam—or Eurocommunism, that is Italy and France—specifically, voters will vote in Communist governments. The recent invasion of Afghanistan seems to indicate that the proponents of an ultimate confrontation are winning the battle for domination in the Soviet Union.

My reading of history causes me to conclude that people who are unwilling to defend their freedom will ultimately lose it. At this point you ask, what freedom of the United States is involved in the Middle East? The answer is, the functioning of our economic system, specifically oil. If the Russians take over the oil of the Middle East it is predictable they will not continue to sell it to the United States. We currently import about 47 percent of our daily consumption of oil, some 7½ billion barrels a day, most of which comes from the Middle East. If this quantity of oil is denied to our economic system, our economy would literally collapse. Our economic freedom would be destroyed and with it, our political freedom. The two are inseparable. The world would be plunged into a depression of major proportions.

For these reasons I have concluded that we Americans must understand that our economic and political freedom is seriously threatened by the Communist governments of the world. Leaders of Communist countries respect one element: force. We must maintain an ability to defend our interest, and in my judgment, the Volunteer Army is not doing the job that needs doing. Our Reserves are seriously depleted.

At this time I favor registration of our manpower. I want no part of the draft which existed during the Vietnam war era. It was riddled with too many loopholes. Service to our country should be a part of the tradition of being an American so long as we are confronted with Communist governments which seek to destroy our economic and political freedom. This may well entail 6 months of active duty training for all able-bodied males and then service in the Reserve for a period of 4 to 5 years. Serious consid-

eration should be given to the development of incentives which will make this 6-month active duty and service in the Reserves far more financially attractive than it is now. Every consideration should be given to permit this function to be served by volunteers rather than conscripts. We should still permit men and women to enlist for longer periods of time as the present law permits.

I do not favor registering or drafting women at this time. In the event of an all-out war, this may become a necessity but I do not believe the present circumstances require it.

It is relevant to ask some additional questions at this point on the issue of why the Soviet Union has chosen this particular point in history to engage in outright military aggression in the Middle East. When Jimmy Carter assumed the Presidency in January 1977, programs were in place to procure 244 B-1 bombers by 1986. Plans were underway to develop an MX missile system with deployment scheduled for 1983. The cruise missile was in an advanced state of development and was scheduled for deployment in 1978. An air-launched cruise missile was to be deployed. One and a half Trident submarines per year were to be built beginning in 1977. Jimmy Carter canceled the B-1 bomber and delayed the other hardware systems which were then being developed. Richard Perle, a foreign policy expert on the staff of Senator Jackson, Democrat, Washington, wrote on October 7, 1979:

Having come to office with virtually no expertise in foreign affairs, President-elect Carter drew around him a small circle of close officials whose faith in the efficiency of arms control is exceeded by their abhorrence of military power and their dread of confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Is it a wonder that the leaders of the Soviet Union felt that they could get away with military aggression in the Middle East based on their perceptions of the intentions of the occupant of the White House? In my judgment, the policy decisions made by Jimmy Carter as President and the decisions made by the U.S. Congress, since he has become President, of expanding social programs to the detriment of defense programs has proximately led to the crisis in which we are now involved. We, in effect, have encouraged Soviet adventurism by our preoccupation with domestic programs which have come at the expense of defense.

Another equally significant and serious question is, Why is this Nation so dependent on imported oil for such a high percentage of its energy supplies? The foundation for this dependence was laid in 1973 when Congress passed a law which guaranteed we would have a shortage of domestically produced oil. In 1973, the Congress passed a law which placed a maximum price for domestically produced oil which was below the world market price. The inevitable happened, namely, domestic exploration declined and domestic production has declined since that time.

The most constructive step we could take at this time is to completely deregulate oil, natural gas, and gasoline and scrap the gasoline allocation system. The Heritage Foundation in a recent study estimated that if we pursued these policy alternatives we could increase domestic production by 6 to 7 million barrels a day by 1985. The Congress refuses to follow this policy alternative and in my judgment, it is one of the main reasons why the dependence on foreign oil continues.

In summary, I join with every other Member of Congress in my fervent hope that this Nation never again has need to shed American blood in defense of freedom. But, should that need again arise, we must be prepared, for in war there is no substitute for victory. Registration will permit us to maintain this needed level of preparation. ●

#### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday will mark the 62d anniversary of the Republic of Estonia. Unfortunately, its citizens will be unable to celebrate their independence freely. For many years they have suffered under the yoke of Soviet oppression, and as human beings, we must remember their suffering today as well as their joy when independence was achieved in years past.

The Estonian people won their independence as the result of a valiantly fought, drawnout struggle against the Soviet Union. A peace treaty was signed in 1920 where the Russians both recognized Estonia's independence and vowed territorial sovereignty for the Estonian people.

That sovereignty was recognized by many countries of the world in both de facto and de jure status. And for the first 20 years of independence, Estonia was able to show the world what a small country can do when allowed to come into its own. Estonia's constitution was extremely sensitive to the human rights of man, and was especially careful in protecting the legal and ethical rights of minority groups.

Devoted to the causes of democracy and liberty, Estonia joined the League of Nations, and, while championing peace, was also a spokesman for the small, democratic states. Just as significant was Estonia's willingness to aid other countries. It exported its well-educated citizens to help other less fortunate nations, as the Estonian Government was well run, and fortunate enough to have a surplus of dedicated, trained public servants.

Mr. Speaker, this tiny nation, so committed to freedom and justice, was cruelly sacrificed to Russian domination by Nazi Germany in 1939. Forced into signing a mutual assistance treaty

with the Soviet Union, Estonia found itself overrun by the Soviet military and its Government thoroughly infiltrated by spies. For all its protestations, Estonia forcibly became part and parcel of the Soviet Union, an act which we, as Americans, cannot and will not recognize.

The Estonian people have suffered dearly at the hands of many over the years. But let us commend their spirit, so strong in the determination to be free. Their steadfastness over the years is a beacon for others. Let us, here in America, realize how fortunate we really are. We all hope that the anniversaries to come can be true celebrations of joy within Estonia proper, and not only reaffirmations of national and cultural heritage from abroad. ●

#### AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD

### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to submit two more issues which American citizens abroad must deal with in an attempt to do business abroad for the United States.

The material follows:

#### ISSUE No. 15

Short Title: VHA Benefits for Veterans Abroad.

Summary of the problem: Veterans living in the United States have a significant benefit, that of a veteran home loan to assist in acquiring a residence, which is denied to those living abroad.

ACA's question: Why are VHA benefits denied to Veterans abroad?

The President's reply: The President listed a number of problems that would be encountered in trying to extend this benefit to Veterans living overseas. Cost is one problem. Complicated administrative burdens is another difficulty.

The President mentioned that using the overseas branches of U.S. banks had been suggested but this would still leave great difficulties such as finding banks willing to underwrite loans abroad because of political risks, lending restrictions, fluctuating exchange rates and incompatible maturity limits.

ACA's renewed question: No one suggested that giving the VHA benefit abroad would be as easy as giving the same benefit in the United States. The President rightly identified the major obstacles involved. But, he did not address the basic question that still remains: Should Veterans abroad be denied one of their most basic benefits?

We do not feel that the difficulties that have been enumerated are in any way insurmountable. Indeed similar difficulties confront the U.S. Government in trade and foreign investment areas. And difficulty with fluctuating exchange rates and placing valuations on foreign transactions has never impeded the zeal of the U.S. Government in extracting taxes from U.S. Veterans abroad.

The question remains, why discriminate against the veteran abroad? VHA loans surely could be given, despite the extra difficulties of the overseas environment. The President must first answer the really fundamental question: should they be given? An even better question is: what definition

of equitable treatment justifies denying overseas Veterans this benefit?

It is perhaps worth mentioning also that many veterans serve overseas, and many were wounded overseas. Why is there the reticence to give them benefits overseas?

#### ISSUE No. 16

Short title: Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits for Veterans Abroad.

Summary of the problem: Disabled veterans, many of whom have been disabled abroad, cannot receive vocational rehabilitation benefits abroad. VA regulations limit the availability of such training in a foreign country, other than the Philippines, by specifying that such training may be authorized only if adequate training for the selected objective is not available in the United States or its possessions and, if training is pursued under the direct supervision of a representative of the VA.

ACA's question: Why are these restrictions being applied to the rehabilitation training of Veterans?

The President's reply: The President indicated that there was some improvement pending on this issue. Said the President: "The Veterans Administration has recently proposed legislation which will remove the restrictions noted above and give the Administrator greater flexibility in meeting the veteran's legitimate rehabilitation needs. In those cases where vocational rehabilitation is provided outside the United States, the VA will make arrangements through contract or otherwise for necessary training assistance and supervision."

ACA's response: ACA applauds the President and the Veterans' Administration for proposing this needed change. We hope that the Administration will work forcefully to see that this legislation is enacted. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as an American of Italian heritage, I take special pride in acknowledging the 100th anniversary of the death of Constantino Brumidi—the "Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol."

The life of this great ethnic American should serve as an inspiration to us all.

He was born in Rome, Italy, on July 26, 1805, and before he was exiled to America because of political activities in 1852, he had established himself as a renowned artist. However, it was not until he had been in the United States about 3 years that he began the artistic endeavors that would reserve himself a formidable place in art history.

In 1855, Brumidi was hired by the Superintendent of the Capitol to decorate the Agriculture Committee room, and in so doing provided the first example of fresco in America. It was at that time Brumidi was quoted as saying:

I no longer have any desire for fame or fortune. My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty.

Shortly thereafter, in 1857, Brumidi achieved a long sought goal when he obtained his U.S. citizenship. The remainder of his life was spent serving his adopted home with artistic dedication.

For 25 years, he shared his extraordinary artistic talents with our Nation, and the Capitol was his canvass. His work included the Senate reception room, Senate Appropriations Committee room, the President's room in the Senate extension, the Senate floor corridors, the House of Representatives Chamber, the House of Representatives committee room, and his magnificent display in the Capitol rotunda.

On February 19, 1880, this great artist died after a tragic fall from the dome of the Capitol rotunda, where he was engaged in what he considered to be the greatest work of his life. According to Senator Daniel Voorhees of Indiana, who provided a eulogy to Brumidi at the time of his death:

He was unfolding with the magic of genius in the dome of the Capitol the scroll of American history, from the landing of Columbus to the present day. He earnestly desired to live long enough to complete this vast conception. But he has left an empty chair, and his great design unfinished, as others have done and will continue to do in other places.

Unfortunately, it would be another 70 years before Brumidi would again obtain even the simplest form of recognition—a bronze marker for his grave. Led by the persistence of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of the then Congressman John Murdock of Arizona, Congress in 1950 authorized a bronze marker for Brumidi's previously unmarked grave in Washington's Glenwood Cemetery.

Another long overdue tribute was paid this great Italo-American on April 30, 1968, when ceremonies were held in the Capitol Rotunda to dedicate a bust of Brumidi. Earlier this week, similar words of praise were bestowed upon Brumidi during ceremonies in the rotunda.

Mr. Speaker, the walls of the Capitol serve as a constant reminder of Constantino Brumidi's greatness. Truly, he was an inspired man, who deeply loved his adopted home. It was with pride that he signed his work as "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States." It is with pride that I honor him today. ●

#### TAKING POLITICS OUT OF THE OLYMPICS

### HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in Wednesday's edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I criticized the International Olympic Committee for their actions in continuing the 1980 summer games in Moscow, while prohibiting the Republic of China from participation in both the Lake Placid and

Moscow games. Despite its self-serving claims of separating politics from sports, the IOC is clearly playing politics with the world. One need only to examine the intensive and sophisticated athlete training programs of Eastern European countries to understand the political significance attached to successful Olympic performances.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the following editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune. A colleague in the Senate and former Olympic athlete, Senator BILL BRADLEY, suggests some interesting means for depoliticizing the Olympics:

#### TO SAVE THE OLYMPICS

One man who is not surprised by the turmoil surrounding the 1980 Olympics is Sen. Bill Bradley (D., N.J.), who saw it coming four years ago. Sen. Bradley, then a star player for the New York Knicks professional basketball team and a former Olympic gold medalist, predicted in a 1976 New York Times article that the U.S. would boycott the 1980 games. He also predicted that "a few aristocrats on the International Olympic Committee" would issue pious statements about fair play.

He was right on both counts. And he may prove right on another of his 1976 predictions—that the Soviet-American dispute will mean the end of the Olympic games as we have known them since the end of World War II.

But Sen. Bradley offered solutions along with his remarkably accurate predictions. He called for denationalizing the games and removing, or at least minimizing, the political pressures that have done so much harm to them. In 1976, his ideas seemed extreme. But in the chaos of 1980 they begin to look like beacons for a floundering Olympic movement. They bear reconsideration.

First, he called for abolishing the distinction between amateurs and professionals, opening the competition to any athlete able to demonstrate the necessary skill to compete effectively. Differing national interpretations of amateurism have made it impossible to make the distinction—the best answer is to stop trying.

Second, Sen. Bradley called for elimination of team sports from the games because they "too easily simulate war games." Athletes would compete as individuals rather than as national teams. If organizers of team sports wish to have world championship competitions, they could be held outside the Olympics.

Third, he would have all competitors in the games receive identical "participant" medals, with gold medals going only to those who break records. Thus, the athletes would be competing against a standard rather than against each other.

Fourth, he suggested that the games be given a permanent home in Greece, the land of their origin, with all nations that participate in the movement underwriting the cost. By eliminating the competitive grandiosity of the present system, in which host countries see the games as a chance to show off, Sen. Bradley hopes they will become a "focus on the oneness of the world."

Fifth, he urged that the games concentrate on individual participants. They should be lengthened to about two months to slow the pace and give athletes opportunities to get acquainted. The additional time might be used to broaden the Olympic experience to include artistic expression, thus recognizing "the value of the whole person."

Sen. Bradley's proposals aren't the only—or necessarily the best—possible solutions to

the Olympic dilemma. There are those who advocate spreading the games around the world rather than concentrating them in Greece—with various countries or regions hosting single events or sporting categories. In these days of instant television communications there is no need to hold all the games in the same spot at the same time.

Others would be content with more modest denationalization than Sen. Bradley proposes. Doing away with flags, anthems, and national uniforms might be enough to minimize the "war games" atmosphere. Housing teams in the Olympic village according to sport rather than nationality would improve international understanding.

Whatever the solution—Sen. Bradley's sweeping proposals or other more modest ones—the aging aristocrats and communist bureaucrats who dominate the International Olympic Committee must do something to stop the political rot. It is absurd for them sanctimoniously to denounce the move to boycott the Moscow games while at the same time they maneuver to prevent one member country, Taiwan, from participating under the same conditions as other Olympic members. If they can't save the Olympics themselves, they should step aside for others who can. ●

#### DECISION TO RETIRE

#### HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, I was surprised this morning to learn of our colleague and friend, JIM HANLEY's decision to retire from service in the U.S. Congress at the close of this term of office.

Congressman HANLEY has served the Syracuse and central New York area with distinction during these past 15 years. He has earned both the respect and the friendship of his constituents, leaders throughout the State of New York, and national leaders here in Washington, as well as those of us who serve with him in the House. JIM HANLEY has helped me during my first term in Congress to better understand, and become effective, in this legislative system. His generous assistance has aided me in effectively serving our mutual constituency.

I join today with JIM's numerous friends both here in Washington and in New York State who wish him the greatest success in his retirement. Both he and his lovely wife, Rita, have earned the best for a prosperous, relaxing, and enjoyable future with their central New York neighbors.

The quality of public service which JIM brought to Washington with his devotion and dedication to the national interest during those 15 years has enhanced this House. Our thanks for his contributions is offered today. ●

A SALUTE TO RUSSELL FOLISE, HELEN CERMELY, HOWARD REID, ESTHER PATCH, AND THOMAS DAY

#### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in the Cuyahoga County Bar Association in honoring Mr. Russell J. Folise, Ms. Helen Cermely, Mr. Howard Reid, Ms. Esther Patch, and Mr. Thomas E. Day. These individuals have served the local court system in Cleveland for over a total of 170 years.

Employees of this caliber and dedication are hard to find in any sector of the working population. It is particularly commendable that these individuals dedicated so many years to public service.

The Cuyahoga County Bar Association will honor the aforementioned employees at their 34th Annual Merit Awards Luncheon on February 27, 1980. At this time, I am entering some information about the honorees in the RECORD so that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives can join me in saluting them.

The information follows:

#### HOWARD J. REID

Starting as a Clerk in the Court of Common Pleas Arraignment Room in 1949, Howard J. Reid handled many varied and complex assignments until he was advanced to the Chief Clerk's position in the Criminal Division of the County Clerk's office in 1954. For sixteen years he served in that capacity until he was selected by Chief Judge Leo M. Spellacy, Administrative Judge of the Common Pleas Court, in 1970, to become its Deputy Administrator.

Reid attended Holy Name, Cleveland College and John Carroll University. With his wife, Mary Margaret, daughter Susan and son Charles, the Reids live at 4043 Princeton Blvd., South Euclid. They are also the parents of Nancy Reid Knupp of Elyria.

#### ESTHER WOODWORTH PATCH

Esther Woodworth Patch was born in DeGraffe, Ohio, educated in Loudonville, Seville and Perry, Ohio schools before receiving her AB degree from Denison Univ. at Granville, Ohio in 1931. For eleven years following her graduation she worked at the May Co., climaxing her department store career as its assistant buyer in the art needlework division. From 1942 to 1949, she served as a research assistant in the thermal laboratory of the Cleveland Graphite Bronze Company.

In April 1950, she started as a secretary in the Welfare Department in East Cleveland and transferred to its Municipal Court in 1951. In 1956, she was promoted to Clerk of its Police Court. When the Court was finally established in its present form in 1958 she was appointed as its Clerk.

Mrs. Patch plans to retire on April 30, 1980 but admits that she will miss the small Court where she got to know the people of East Cleveland so well. She has been listed in "Who's Who of American Women" because of her numerous accomplishments in Court administration, in Y.W.C.A. work, in

college alumni activities and in the Eastern Star.

**RUSSELL J. FOLISE**

Russell J. Folise began his career in public service in 1933 with various part-time jobs in County and State offices, such as Highway and Board of Elections while working his way through Western Reserve College and Law School. In 1940, upon admission to the Ohio Bar, he began his practice in law with Cleveland Traffic Referee John E. Garmone, a 1973 honoree of the Association. From 1942 to 1946, Folise served in the U.S. Navy. Following this military service, he acted as a government trial attorney with the Office of Price Administration and its successor agencies, from 1946 to 1954. After two years in private practice with James McNamara, he returned to public service as head of County Auditor John Carney's Inheritance Tax Unit. In 1963, Folise joined Probate Court's Psychiatric Department, in which he is now Chief Referee.

Folise has been an active Democrat since 1928, when as a youth of 13 he organized support for presidential candidate Alfred E. Smith in Cleveland's Little Italy District. Since 1936, he has been an elected Precinct Committeeman. From 1952, he has been a member of the Dems' County Executive Committee, Ward Leader, Maple Heights (1955-65) and is presently Ward Leader for Gates Mills, Hunting Valley, Pepper Pike and Woodmere. He has also acted as Ward Leader of Moreland Hills and Orange Village. He is married to Rosalie (nee Cangelosi) and is the father of Margaret Ann, a graduate of Bulter University and now in ballet, and Michael Joseph, 20, a Junior at Case Western Reserve University.

**HELEN F. CERMELY**

Working with pre-school age children since 1942 after graduating from Wooster High School, in 1939, and after enrolling in classes directly related to child care at Fenn College and Western Reserve University, Helen F. Cermely found her niche at the County Juvenile Detention Home. For 38 years, she has continuously worked with school age dependent boys and pre-school age youngsters.

Besides being a den mother for Boy Scouts, Helen has participated in many health Tax Levy Campaigns. Collecting cookbooks, gardening, needlework and travelling are among her hobbies.

**THOMAS E. DAY, SR.**

There will always be a Day in Court, proudly proclaims Thomas E. Day, Sr., the Chief Deputy Balliff of the Cleveland's Municipal Court. He was married to Jo Ann Mulhall on May 5, 1951, thus assuring the perpetuation of the Mulhall-Day dynasty in that Court.

Frank "Pick" Mulhall, Day's father-in-law, had more than 40 years of service with the Court before he retired. The honoree's oldest son, Thomas, Jr., is already employed by the Court, and when considering that the Day family has seven more prospects in Michael, Mary, Patrick, Timothy, Kathleen, Kevin and Brian, Mr. Day's boast that there will always be a Day in Court can be readily accepted.

Tom Day started working for the City of Cleveland as an accountant in 1951, but by April 1952 he knew his heart had to be in the Court system where the Mulhall clan was already established.

Day attended the University of Detroit and John Carroll University majoring in business administration and engineering. He is past president of the Holy Name High

School Dad's Club and is the district representative of the Ohio Bailiff's Association.

The committee arranging the Merit Awards luncheon consists of Franklin A. Polk, Chairman, Hon. Harry Auslander, Secretary, Harold Sieman, Co-ordinator, Hon. Perry B. Jackson, Ranelle, A. Gamble, Allan A. Kacencar, Martin Lentz, Fred H. Mandel, Irvin M. Milner, Nelson N. Moss, Janis J. Nash and Bernard J. Nosan. ●

**ON RECENT EVENTS IN LITHUANIA**

**HON. DANTE B. FASCELL**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn the attention of my colleagues to some recent events in Lithuania and to the reaction of some members of the Lithuanian community in Miami. The world has seen that the Kremlin will not hesitate to use brutal tactics to subjugate independent countries: Today, Afghanistan; in 1940 it was the three independent countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Last summer, we were reminded that the Baltic Republics still thirst for genuine national self-determination. Forty-five representatives of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian public opinion wrote a declaration on August 23, 1979, denouncing the secret provisions of the 1939 Molotoff-Ribbentrop pact in which the Baltic Republics came under the Soviet sphere of influence. Soon there were house searches and interrogations. Next, the arrests began: On November 1, 1979, Antanas Terleckas and later that month, 21-year-old Yulius Sasnauskas.

Such repressions, however, did not daunt the brave Balts. On January 28, 1980, 30 Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians wrote two more protests: One document, drawing a parallel to what the Soviets had done to their own countries in 1940, attacks the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; the second document calls on the International Olympic Committee to move the games outside the U.S.S.R. These 30 Baltic representatives declared that no nation at war should take part in the Olympics and, further, that nations which do not recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic countries should not agree to hold the Olympic regatta in Tallin, the capital of Estonia.

At this point, I would like to call attention to the significant role played by the Lithuanians in the movement for civil and religious rights which has arisen in the U.S.S.R. in the last decade. Lithuanians have long been an important force in the struggle for the rights of religious believers—as seen in the recent formation of the Catholic Committee for the Defense of the Rights of Believers. Despite all the efforts of the KGB to destroy it, the "Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church" has appeared since 1972.

Lithuanians such as Nijole Sadunaite, Petras Plumpa, and Vitautas Skuodas have been imprisoned for their involvement with samizdat.

Lithuanians have also been active in the Soviet Helsinki movement, as witnessed in the activity of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group which is concerned with such issues as russification, emigration, and the plight of Lithuanian political prisoners, for example, Algiras Zhipre and Petras Paulaitis. In revenge, the KGB has imprisoned for 15 years Viktoras Petkus and Balys Gajauskas who are associated with the Lithuanian Helsinki Group.

I would now like to insert in the RECORD the following resolution which was adopted unanimously on February 17, 1980, by the American Lithuanian Council of the Florida East Coast.

The resolution follows:

**AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF FLORIDA  
EAST COAST**

We Lithuanian-Americans of the Florida East Coast convened at the Lithuanian American Citizens Club, 3655 N.W. 34th Street, Miami, this 17th of February, 1980, to Commemorate the sixty-second Anniversary of Lithuanians' Independence and establishment of the Democratic Republic of Lithuania, which, unfortunately, has been forcefully and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, unanimously adopted this resolution.

It is great honor and pleasure to accept the compliments and the wishes from the Honorable Bob Graham Governor of Florida, expressed in his proclamation.

In the presence of distinguished guests: The Honorable Dante B. Fascell, U.S. Congressman and Delegates of Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Ukraine, and White Russia, we solemnly pledge our lives and our work to a free, democratic strong United States and we declare our determination to make every sacrifice to restore freedom and independence to all Captive Nations.

Today, we are looking back on the glorious seven hundred years of Lithuania's history and the gallant fight of the Lithuanian people to preserve freedom, independence, and national heritage. After the short-lived period of independence (1918-1940) which followed a century of oppression by Imperial Russia, suddenly in 1940 She and two other Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia, were invaded and occupied by the Soviet armed forces. We deeply sympathize with Afganistan People. Forty years ago Lithuania was victim of Soviet occupation and still is.

For a free nation, the disadvantage of being incorporated into the Soviet Union is the unconditional surrender of its natural and human resources to the mercy of a totalitarian Russian communism. Lithuania today is nothing but a colony of imperialist Russia. Contrary to the Soviet constitution and despite the Declaration of Human Rights, the Declarator of Principles in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, signed in Helsinki, the Soviet Union not only denies freedom and self-determination to the Baltic people, but also through programs of resettlement, intensive Russification, flagrant denial of human rights and political persecutions, continues to change the ethnic character of Baltic States.

We express our respect to President Jimmy Carter, the Government and the Congress for their just interpretation of the political status of the Baltic States. We

trust that the United States' policy of non-recognition of annexation by the Soviet Union is firm and activate the principle of nonrecognition of annexation by proposing at every opportunity the decolonization and restoration of independence to the Baltic nations as the only just and sensible solution to the problem.

We demand the Soviet Union to cease colonization and national genocide in Lithuania and other Baltic States; immediately release all Lithuanians presently imprisoned or deported to Siberia for political reasons; stop harassment of religious believers and dissidents; restore freedom and independence to the Lithuanian people.

The resolution has been adopted unanimously.

A. J. VARNAS,  
President. ●

#### LITHUANIA AND ESTONIA CELEBRATE INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have joined my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the declaration of independence for the Baltic States. Two of the Baltic States, Lithuania and Estonia, celebrate their 62d anniversary this month. This year's tribute to the millions of freedom-loving people in these two captive nations is especially significant.

On February 16 and 24, 1918, Lithuania and Estonia, respectively, declared their independence from foreign rule. Tragically, that freedom was to be shortlived. In 1940, the Soviet Army, in a willful breach of international law, invaded and regained control of Lithuania and Estonia, as well as the third Baltic State, Latvia.

Since that time, the proud people of the Baltic States have been forced to endure severe repression. Families have been disbanded and deported, an unknown number have been executed, and the industrial wealth of the nations has been exploited.

Yet, despite their great suffering and hardship, the spirit of the freedom fighters in those captive nations has not been subdued and their courage has not faltered. Instead, they continue to rebel against Soviet repression, demanding that their basic human rights be acknowledged, including the right of self-determination.

Today, another nation has joined in the fight against Soviet expansionism and repression—Afghanistan. Soviet tanks have invaded that country, just as they did in 1940 in the Baltic States, and 1956 in Hungary, and 1968 in Czechoslovakia.

The Soviet Union, with their recent invasion of Afghanistan, has once again revealed its true nature; namely, an unreliable partner in world peace and cooperation bent on expanding their influence whenever they feel a nation may be vulnerable. While their

aggression against Afghanistan is no more severe than that against the Baltic States 40 years ago, it has resulted in a number of strong measures of protest against the Soviets that were long overdue.

President Carter has dealt with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in very strict terms. His actions have included a suspension of agricultural trade with the U.S.S.R., and a request that the United States not participate in the Moscow summer Olympics—a decision that has gained vast support throughout the world. I fully support the President's policies, and am hopeful they will ultimately lead to a renewed independence for not only Afghanistan, but the Baltic States and all others under Communist domination.

The combination of the resistance they have encountered in Afghanistan and the condemnation they have received from the world community has clearly shaken the Russians to the point where there has been internal questioning of the wisdom of their actions. Clearly, this is a necessary first step if the Soviet Union is to improve their relations with the rest of the world.

Earlier this Congress, I was proud to join the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in passing a measure, House Concurrent Resolution 200, calling on the President to instruct the U.S. delegation to the 1980 Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to seek the right of self-determination for the people of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia through free elections and through the withdrawal of all Soviet personnel from those nations. To help realize these objectives, House Concurrent Resolution 200 also calls on the President to gain the support and cooperation of other nations.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 200 is an effective and necessary step toward obtaining self-determination for the captive nations, and preventing the spread of Soviet influence. I am hopeful that this action, combined with the other strong measures of protest against Soviet expansionism, will help us finally achieve the ultimate goal of basic human rights and self-determination for all people. ●

#### CHICAGO'S LAKESHORE RAIL COMMUTER SERVICE

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, all through the 1970's the people of the communities along the Lake Michigan shoreline in my district have been without rail passenger service.

Back in 1971, we witnessed what we thought would be the end of an era for Wisconsin: The elimination of the

Lakeshore rail commuter service from Milwaukee to Chicago.

Replaced by the oft-tardy Amtrak, commuter service in southeastern Wisconsin became the victim of cheap energy, our love for the automobile and deteriorating track conditions. Little did we anticipate back then that the price of gasoline would skyrocket to \$1.50 a gallon.

We now have a real chance to restore that commuter service, save gasoline, and forge a viable transportation network in this part of the State. The cost of the new service will be irresistably inexpensive, too. As the table shows the Racine-Chicago trip will run about one-third the cost by bus or Amtrak and one-quarter the cost by car.

The restoration of rail service has been one of my major projects since my election to Congress in 1970. I am proud to say that the attainment of that goal is now in sight.

Several years ago, I talked with then Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams about moving Amtrak service from the Milwaukee Road tracks—which run west of the city—to the Chicago & North Western tracks—which run through downtown Racine and Kenosha.

This would open up commuter service to a whole new group of travelers and turn the Chicago-Milwaukee Amtrak run into a profitable one. My efforts were supported by almost everyone—except Amtrak. The agency that is supposed to provide efficient mass transit dredged up every excuse in the books for doing nothing.

When it became clear that it would take a lot to move Amtrak, I looked in other directions.

With the help of the Urban Mass Transit Administration—the Federal agency that oversees mass transit—and the regional transit authority in Chicago, another alternative opened up. We have reached an agreement that, if approved by local and State government, will bring commuter service back to Racine this summer and, I hope, full service to Milwaukee soon afterward.

Right now, the C. & N.W. runs a commuter service from Chicago to Kenosha nine times a day. Under the agreement, several of these runs will now continue up to Racine for a demonstration period of 2 years.

During that period, we would conduct rider and market surveys and lay the groundwork for extending the service all the way up to Milwaukee.

Right now, we expect that there will be three trains going down to Chicago in the mornings: Two in the early morning and one in the midmorning.

There will also be two trains returning in the late afternoon and every evening.

The demonstration program will allow us to experiment with the schedule to see what times draw the heaviest ridership.

To bring service to Racine, we need funds for two purposes: track rehabili-

tation and operating subsidies. There are different standards for tracks carrying freight and those carrying passengers. So work has to be done to bring the track between Racine and Kenosha up to passenger standards. We also need operating funds to pay for the base cost of the demonstration program.

The funding plan—which is supported by UMTA, the railroad and the regional transit authority—calls for the following division of responsibilities:

Track rehabilitation costs: \$800,000 from UMTA; \$200,000 from the State of Wisconsin.

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

The total cost of this project is \$2.2 million. Already, the Urban Mass Transit Administration and the city of Kenosha have committed themselves to their part of the funding.

The city and county of Racine are presently completing action on their shares, and the State of Wisconsin will follow suit soon, I hope.

The basic question is whether enough people will use the new trains. If surveys mean anything, then the answer is a resounding yes.

The Racine Journal-Times has surveyed the public and four business organizations in Racine and Kenosha have surveyed their memberships. They found a big market for Chicago-to-Milwaukee commuter service.

They also found that lakeshore service between Racine and Chicago would draw far more passengers than the present Amtrak service from Sturtevant. The accompanying table shows the results of the Journal-Times survey. It indicates that ridership to Chicago could climb 2½ times above Amtrak's current ridership.

Restoring rail service to Racine is the last step before we can regain the full Milwaukee-to-Chicago commuter service.

Of course, the benefit we get from the service must at least be worth as much as the money we invest in it. I believe the benefits will exceed the cost.

We are now at a turning point in energy conservation. Either we take constructive action to reduce our consumption of gasoline, or we will forever be at the mercy of those nations who control our gas pumps.

Restoration of service can also bring more people to Racine, create more jobs and lower the cost of travel for business people and long distance commuters. And with the upgrading and improvement of the Racine train depot, that part of the city will undoubtedly improve economically and socially.

The material follows:

TABLE I.—COMPARISON OF COSTS AND FARES FOR RAIL, CAR, AND BUS TRAVEL BETWEEN RACINE AND CHICAGO

[Figures provided by the Regional Transit Authority in Chicago]

	Round trip		
	Racine to Chicago	Racine to Kenosha	Kenosha to Chicago
Miles.....	136	22	114
By car at 17 cents per mile.....	\$23.12	\$3.74	\$19.38
Bus fare*.....	15.50	2.00	13.90
Projected rail fare.....	6.20	2.00	5.60
Amtrak.....	15.00		

\*Wisconsin Coach Lines.

#### RACINE JOURNAL-TIMES SURVEY

1. Do you use the present Chicago & North Western service between Kenosha and Chicago?

Yes: 61—29 percent.

No: 147—71 percent.

2a. Do you use the present Amtrak service to Chicago?

Yes: 60—30 percent.

No: 143—70 percent.

2b. To Milwaukee?

Yes: 26—15 percent.

No: 150—85 percent.

3a. Would you use commuter service from Racine to Milwaukee?

Yes: 154—72 percent.

No: 59—28 percent.

3b. From Kenosha to Milwaukee?

Yes: 33—19 percent.

No: 141—81 percent.

4a. Would you use commuter service from Racine to Chicago?

Yes: 172—81 percent.

No: 41—19 percent.

4b. From Kenosha to Chicago?

Yes: 42—25 percent.

No: 128—75 percent.

5. Would you use commuter service from Racine to Kenosha?

Yes: 119—60 percent.

No: 79—40 percent.

6. Would you like to see train stops at locations other than the Racine and Kenosha train depots?

Yes: 70—40 percent.

No: 103—60 percent.

7. Do you feel the two-year pilot program is worth the expenditure of \$2.2 million in public funds, including \$300,000 from the Racine area?

Yes: 174—81 percent.

No: 40—19 percent.●

#### ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, Robert P. Atkinson, a consulting engineer in Indianapolis, Ind., has written the following interesting paper which I herewith bring to the attention of the House membership:

ROBERT P. ATKINSON, P.E.,

Indianapolis, Ind., February 12, 1980.

HON. ANDY JACOBS, JR.,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing my comments on a proposed action for "Energy Independence." We have allowed this problem to reach the stage of a national emergency and I am confident that with such action we can reach a solution.

Your comments would be appreciated and I would be glad to discuss this when you return to Indiana.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. ATKINSON.

#### ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

Recent efforts to replace petroleum usage with alcohol are admirable, since this will help us with some of our most important national problems, such as, energy\* and inflation. We are blessed with large quantities of coal, just as some parts of the world are blessed with oil. We therefore have no choice for a successful approach to the achievement of a short-term solution to our problem of energy independence.

For many years the manufacture and use of alcohol, as a fuel, has been well known, so it can play an important part in our solution to the problem; at least until the technologies can be perfected for such long-term programs as solar energy. (Ref: Forbes, Aug. 6, 1979, p. 27, "The Methanol Age Is Dawning," see exhibit A.)

#### TWO KINDS OF ALCOHOL TO CONSIDER

Aside from the large usage in electric power generation, the transportation industry is one of the largest users of energy, so this application must be given early consideration because of its unique problems.

#### ETHYL ALCOHOL (THE DRINKING TYPE)

This is made from grain and can replace up to 10 percent of the gasoline for passenger cars.

#### METHYL ALCOHOL

This is called "wood alcohol" and can be made from coal. It can replace nearly 100 percent of the gasoline for cars.

Since the alcohols are lower in energy than gasoline, more fuel weight must be carried; therefore the fuels for such vehicles as aircraft and trucking, should be petroleum type. If we must consider a farm problem of grain usage, it may be possible to mix a small portion of ethyl alcohol.

#### CHANGES REQUIRED FOR AUTO USAGE

If new car production were to be changed within the next few years, to use such a fuel, a significant reduction in petroleum imports would be effected.

Such a change may also lead to better solutions to our automotive air pollution problems.

This time period would be required to implement such a program since automotive development is required and alcohol production facilities must be constructed. This change is therefore an intermediate-term solution only, and must be augmented with a short-term plan.

#### SHORT-TERM PLAN USES OLD TECHNOLOGIES

Presently we are sacrificing the economy and energy supply of our country in pursuit of an all-out clean air program based on technologies that are yet to be developed. We must immediately compromise this program and put it in proper perspective with our other more serious problems. With such a change it will be feasible to change cars in production as well as in service to make a reduction in our petroleum requirements in the order of 15 percent to 25 percent. Two basic changes can be made to accomplish this.

#### FUEL CHANGE

It should be mandatory to add a small amount of lead to all gasoline. (about 1 cubic centimeter to each gallon) This fuel will have a double gain: it permits the engine to be tuned to obtain better fuel economy and also permits an oil refining process that will yield 10 percent to 15 per-

\* Energy is one of four of our major causes of inflation.

cent more gallons of fuel from each barrel of crude oil.

#### TUNE ENGINES FOR IMPROVED ECONOMY

It has been demonstrated that substantial improvements in economy can be made by simple changes in carburetion and ignition. These can be made in cars in production with no increase in cost. It is also feasible to change cars in service at a modest cost with a small increase in exhaust pollution.

Such a short-term program could reduce the petroleum requirements for passenger cars in the order of 15 percent to 25 percent at an early date.

In summary there is a solution to our energy problem. This will also improve our balance of payments and our national prestige.

#### GOVERNMENT ACTION REQUIRED

1. Rewrite the Clean Acts to properly orient the priorities consistent with other present-day problems.

2. Encourage the free enterprise system, since this has been proven to be the most effective method for making rapid progress, by changing the necessary laws to provide:

One year tax write-off on research, new facilities, etc. as done successfully in some other countries, and

Partial tax-exemptions on profits gained from efforts which increase our capabilities of increasing our energy supplies.

In conclusion—if we are to succeed we have no choice but to promptly initiate a program of this type.

ROBERT P. ATKINSON.

[Exhibit A]

#### THE METHANOL AGE IS DAWNING

(By James Flanigan)

The most specific demand in President Carter's July 15 address to the nation was that electric utilities cut their use of fuel oil by 50 percent in the next decade and switch to coal. That would mean a significant reduction in imports—850,000 barrels a day, 10 percent of total U.S. imports.

But immediately after the speech, questioners appeared on television screens asking how the utilities could burn coal. A whole army of professional environmentalists and their groupies would take to the courts to block it. And they would have the law on their side.

But the utilities could burn methanol, and alcohol made from gasifying coal. Methanol, more commonly called wood alcohol, has the advantage of providing a relatively quick fix to at least one part of the energy problem. "Technically, we could turn dirt this afternoon," says Jimmie R. Bowden, president of Conoco Coal Development Co., speaking of his company's ability to produce methanol. "It's ready to go," adds John J. Wise, vice president of research and engineering at Mobil Corp.

In its Report of the Alcohol Fuels Policy Review, the Department of Energy conceded that gasohol, not methanol, would be the quickest available synthetic, a solution of 90 percent gasoline and 10 percent ethanol made from grain.

But gasohol has its sharp limits. It is very popular in the grain belt states but it could, said DOE, displace only 40,000 barrels a day—0.4 percent—of oil imports by 1985. Before it reaches 3.5 percent it would conflict with U.S. food needs.

Which brings us back to methanol as a fuel for electricity generation, replacing imported crude oil. Methanol can be produced in significant quantities as early as the mid-1980s. "We see methanol from coal as one of the dominant fuels that would be made in a synthetic fuels program," says Edward H. Blum, director of policy in DOE's office of technical programs. Conoco's Bowden says

he could commit Conoco to a \$1 billion methanol plant right now if he could get government help with the capital costs through a special investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation. Given such help, the company can produce methanol competitively with number-2 fuel oil to power utility turbines, and will soon be competitive with low-sulfur residual oil.

Electricity generation consumes 1.7 million barrels a day of oil at present—fully 20 percent of the nation's imports. If methanol can substitute for a substantial part of this, the U.S. could stay within President Carter's strict import limits and still have plenty of oil available for home heating and for transportation.

Nobody wants to go back to the bad old days of smog and smoke-filled skies around the coal-burning power plants. Stack scrubbers to remove the sulfur from coal is one way out. Converting the coal to a cleaner-burning substance—methanol—is a possibly better solution.

There are no technological mysteries in producing methanol, only stiff capital needs. For instance: To produce sufficient methanol to replace half the fuel oil used by utilities would demand just over \$50 billion for some 17 plants. The capital costs of coal gasification comprise three-quarters of that amount. But savings in oil imports would run over \$6 billion a year at current OPEC prices.

One reason there is no mystery in methanol is that the U.S. used it as a chemical feedstock years ago when coal was our basic fuel. But coal research stopped when natural gas and oil replaced coal. Now, in our new efforts to gasify coal, we depend on the 43-year-old German Lurgi process, and a lot of research being done by U.S. companies.

The Lurgi process can work only on western coal or lignite, has poor energy efficiency and difficult operating characteristics—it requires a lot of expensive maintenance. As new coal gasification processes (notably a Texaco method that is far along) complete their development, these operating costs, although probably not the capital costs, should diminish.

Otherwise, methanol presents itself as a practical alternative fuel. The stuff can be burned even in the Los Angeles Basin. Methanol's familiarity promises no unforeseen problems in handling or use. It is, for example, used as a motor fuel every Memorial Day at Indianapolis Speedway to power the sleek racing cars.

Today's automobile engines would need modifications to run on pure methanol, says General Motors. Rubber and plastic materials subject to corrosion would have to be changed; carburetors, distributors, spark plugs and fuel systems modified. The fuel tank would have to be twice as large or trips to the "gas" station twice as frequent.

But the U.S. may never have to go to the extreme of alcoholic auto engines. Mobil has developed a way to turn methanol into high octane gasoline at \$1.20 a gallon, or roughly double today's wholesale price for the conventional product. The company is proceeding with a \$28 million pilot project in West Germany, funded by DOE, the West German government and Mobil.

As the world's oil-importing nations search for substitutes, each uses what it has in abundance. Brazil is developing alcohol fuels from sugar cane, Germany has always used its low-grade coals, New Zealand wants to convert its natural gas to a liquid—methanol. The U.S. abundant resource is coal. ●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous commitment in Illinois on February 12, I was unable to be present and voting on several issues during the latter part of the day's proceedings. If I had been present, I would have voted in the following way:

On an amendment, as amended, to H.R. 3995, Noise Control Act authorization, which would have provided a 1-year authorization for the EPA to carry out provisions of the Noise Control Act in lieu of the 2-year authorization pending before the House, "yea."

On an amendment to H.R. 3995 which would have allowed a one-House veto of EPA rules under the Noise Control Act, "yea."

On final passage of H.R. 3995 which authorized appropriations of \$15 million in each of fiscal 1980 and 1981 for the EPA to carry out the provisions of the Noise Control Act and for other purposes, "yea."

On adoption of the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4119, Federal crop insurance legislation, "yea." ●

#### ELEVEN MORE MEMBERS ANNOUNCE THEIR SUPPORT FOR H.R. 5769

#### HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 22, 1980

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, last October I introduced H.R. 5769, a bill to reinstate and validate certain oil and gas leases in the Santa Barbara Channel. Since that time, many of our colleagues, wishing to demonstrate their support for this equitable remedy to a long-standing dispute between the holders of certain offshore oil leases in the Santa Barbara Channel and the U.S. Government, have asked me to include them amongst the ever-growing list of supporters of this legislation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to inform the House that the following Congressmen have announced their support for the enactment of H.R. 5769: Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LUNGREN, and Mr. WHITTAKER. Again I want to thank these Members for their show of support.

Mr. Speaker, due to the increasing amount of interest that has been generated by this bill, I would like to share with my colleagues the chain of events that surround this 11-year-old dispute, therefore, I submit the following chronology:

## CHRONOLOGY

1967: Pauley Group is created as a joint venture by seven independent oil companies to bid on OCS tracts in the Santa Barbara Channel, California. The Group is composed of Pauley Petroleum, Los Angeles, as operator; Mesa Petroleum; Husky Oil Company; Colorado Interstate Gas Company; and three other independents.

March 1, 1968: Pauley Group, having successfully bid \$74 million on two tracts, signs leases. Leases are in water as deep as 600 feet.

March 24, 1968-January 24, 1969: Pauley Group drills eight wells (plus one redrill) on tracts and begins preparations for ninth well.

January 28, 1969: Blowout on Union Oil Company tract up Channel from Pauley Group tracts.

February 7, 1969: Secretary of Interior shuts down all Channel operations.

February 17, 1969: Secretary of Interior issues new standard of liability for Santa Barbara drilling operations which holds oil companies strictly liable for any damage whatsoever regardless of fault.

February 19, 1969: State of California announces it will sue Union Oil, the Federal Government and three other oil companies for \$1.06 billion for damage caused by oil spill.

February 21, 1969: New standard of liability published in the Federal Register.

March 12, 1969: Pauley Group meets; all members state that "they would not participate in the drilling of another well . . . as

long as the absolute liability rule was in effect . . ." (Findings of Fact, 79.(a).)

March 21, 1969: Secretary Hickel states that oil companies are absolutely liable for pollution if it occurs in the future, regardless of whether or not they are at fault.

April 9, 1969: Petition filed by Pauley Group in Court of Claims for breach of contract.

1969: Majors, with self-insuring capabilities, resume drilling. Pauley Group, being composed of non-majors, cannot resume operations because of limited financial resources.

March 30, 1973: Department of Interior unitizes all 1968 leases surrounding Pauley tracts but excludes Pauley from units. (Units formed were Pitas Point, Santa Clara, and Oak Ridge.) Unitization of leases, all of which were held by majors, prevents lease terms from expiring.

November 27, 1973: Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirms District Court judgment in *Gulf Oil v. Morton* which directed Secretary of Interior to set aside operating suspension orders, grant all pending drilling permits and extend the term of the leases for 32 months.

February 24, 1975: Ninth Circuit dismisses Union Oil Company's challenge of the Department of Interior's order prohibiting installation of drilling platform. *Union Oil Co. v. Morton*. However, Court remanded for further proceedings.

March 19, 1976: Trial Judge files report in the case.

1977: Pauley Group attempts to settle litigation by ending lawsuit in exchange for right to continue drilling.

January 30, 1978: Solicitor responds, stating that Interior has decided that it has "no legal authority to reinstate" the leases, but recognized that "a settlement may have utility in this case." Further, Solicitor raises prospect of resale-bidding credit-refund proposal.

March 31, 1978: Pauley Group submits new settlement offer in connection with Solicitor's letter.

September 18, 1978: The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-372) is signed into law, establishing a fund to pay for oil spill cleanup costs and damage liabilities to private third parties. This law also directs the President to review the availability of oil pollution insurance offered by private insurance companies.

September 28, 1978: Justice Department rejects the Pauley Group's March 31st proposal.

January 25, 1979: Court of Claims issues judgment; rejects "breach of contract claim" holding that: "As a court of law, we cannot give plaintiffs any relief because they had no legal rights, vindicable here, when they brought suit, and have not acquired any in the course of the litigation."

The Court states, however, that: "Perhaps the Legislative or Executive branches could, as a matter of grace or policy, extend their lease-terms to permit them to drill further (if they still wish to) in the effort to discover oil in commercial quantities, but of course we cannot take that step."

October 31, 1979: Representative Jerry Patterson (D-Cal.) introduces H.R. 5769, a bill to reinstate the leases. ●