

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ETHNIC POLITICS AND PROPAGANDA, SINO-SOVIET STYLE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the ironies of the last quarter of the 20th century that ethnic politics have not only survived but are flourishing. It was taken as an unquestionable fact only a few years ago that the nations of the world were gradually but inexorably becoming to look more and more similar. Instant communication by radio and television satellite, supersonic transportation, increasing world trade—these we were told, would break down ethnic and religious and language barriers and we would all become homogenized. Those who said this, of course, saw the inevitable homogenization in terms favorable to their own world view which usually was relentlessly liberal, given to sneering at what was called ethno-centric views, considered reactionary.

Well, ethnicity struck back with a vengeance. It would seem that people all over the world want to enjoy the benefits of modern technology but do not want to sacrifice ethnic or religious values. Iran is just one example of such a choice on the part of Third World populations.

It would seem that the Moslem minorities of China and the Soviet Union are currently the focus of widespread propaganda battles: The Soviet Union is using radio broadcasts and clandestine publication of newspapers to convince Moslem minorities now under Chinese rule to revolt. China, in turn is doing all it can to incite Moslem minorities under Soviet rule to turn against their current masters.

What is important about all of this is that both of these Communist regimes recognize the value of propaganda. The very term is a "scare word" in this country because of the overtones of Fascist and Communist usage. But whatever we want to call it, the effective communication of policy by one government to the people of another government is an absolute necessity in the modern world. Notice that I said "government-to-people" communication. Foreign offices and departments of state or foreign affairs take care of government-to-government communications. But when a government wants to send its message directly to the people of another land—usually called propaganda if those we disagree with do it, but termed "international communication" when we do it—the most sophisticated and knowledgeable communications apparatus is desirable.

If the word "propaganda" offends people in this country, most certainly we should drop it. But that does not mean we should drop our efforts to reach the people of other lands with true accounts of our values, our economics, our social policies, our philosophy and, equally important in the case of societies with no free press of their own, with true accounts of what is going on in their lands. And we should do this because it is in the interest of our foreign relations to do so and not just for the sake of talking. In short our international communication should have a goal, a focus, and a philosophy geared to the interest, both long and short term, of our Nation.

To see how the Soviets and Chinese are fighting their propaganda war, I insert in the RECORD "Sino-Soviet Propaganda War Heats Up" from the Chicago Tribune, March 21, 1980:

SINO-SOVIET PROPAGANDA WAR HEATS UP
(By Jim Gallagher)

ALMA ATA, U.S.S.R.—A sophisticated Soviet propaganda campaign to stir up ethnic unrest in China's Xinjiang (Sinkiang) province has some Western observers worried that the Sino-Soviet feud is taking a dangerous new turn.

At present, the campaign is aimed at Chinese Uighurs, a Moslem minority of 6 million people who were persecuted during the Cultural Revolution and still have bitter hatred for the government in Peking.

Observers are concerned, however, that it could soon be extended to include the dozen or more other minorities in Xinjiang who harbor historical resentments toward Chinese rule, and that the Kremlin could use ethnic upheaval in that neighboring province to justify a massive military move across the border.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the Kremlin's increasing concern about Sino-American ties, have made such a move more likely, these observers believe.

Last year, Viktor Louis, a Moscow journalist with KGB connections, predicted that Peking's mistreatment of these minorities would eventually result in a widespread insurrection. In his book "The Coming Decline of the Chinese Empire," which was published in the West, Louis raised the possibility of Soviet intervention on their behalf.

At the time, Kremlin watchers were convinced that the crafty Louis, who has disseminated information for Soviet officials on other occasions, was warning the Chinese that the Soviet Union was prepared to play rough if Peking established too close ties with the West.

The efforts to inflame the Uighurs, which have grown more serious in recent months, are seen as the first step in making good on this warning.

Last year, a mysterious Uighur newspaper began appearing in Uighur communities throughout the world. It urges the liberation from Chinese rules of the part of Xinjiang province known as Eastern Turkistan, which borders on the Soviet Union.

In its first issue the monthly paper accused the Chinese of "base acts of oppres-

sion" and urged Uighurs to work for the establishment of an "independent Uighur state." "We shall follow in the footsteps of our 402 national revolutions [against Chinese rule over the past 1,000 years], and we shall set out on new revolutionary struggles.

"We shall not stop until there exists a free and independent Uighur state."

Although the newspaper has never explicitly stated where it is being published, Western observers believe it is a Soviet-sponsored project, and they say it is the best indication to date of how convinced the Kremlin leaders are that their differences with China will inevitably get worse.

Even before the newspaper appeared, radio broadcasts were being beamed across the Chinese border, just 200 miles from the Kazakhstan city, which decried the conditions in which Chinese Uighurs lived and boasted about the higher standard of living for Uighurs here.

There are believed to be about 200,000 Soviet Uighurs, more than half of them living here in Kazakhstan. The others are scattered throughout four other Soviet Central Asian republics. Many of them migrated here since the Communists came to power in Peking, especially during those periods when the Chinese were taking harsh measures to wipe out their culture or their Moslem faith.

There is a Uighur theater for musical drama in Alma Ata that currently is presenting a political melodrama said to be written by a Uighur refugee from Xinjiang.

The play depicts Maoist oppression of the Uighurs there, and in the most dramatic scene, a Uighur woman kills a Chinese to keep him from raping her daughter.

The intensity and bitterness of the Uighur propaganda drive are causing increasing concern among Western observers in Moscow about how far the Soviets are prepared to push toward an ethnic insurrection.

Some are certain that, in the wake of the Afghan invasion and the breakoff of Sino-Soviet normalization talks, the Kremlin will soon start propagandizing other ethnic groups, if only to keep China from becoming closer to those Moslem countries that are furious at the Soviets for the move into Afghanistan.

Forcing the Chinese to take harsh steps against their own Moslem populations would serve Soviet ends in this regard, observers said.

"They're becoming more and more angry at China's anti-Soviet stance and its closer ties to the U.S.," one Western diplomat said. "They want to teach China a lesson, intimidate if they can, and they think minority resentment may be Peking's Achilles heel."

At first the Kremlin may be content just to make life more difficult for the leaders in Peking by stirring up trouble among the alienated minorities who live around the rugged Tianshan [Tianshan] mountain range.

However, if unrest ever reached the explosive stage, and the Soviets were sufficiently motivated for a military move, they might send in troops to aid the insurgents, observers believe.

Since these minority peoples have cultural, ties to Soviet Central Asians, either through their Moslem religion or their Turkic ethnicity and tongues, the Kremlin could respond to a call from its own people

to rescue their oppressed kinsmen from "cultural genocide" by the Chinese.

Others suspect that Soviet fears about a rebuilt China, armed with Western weapons and economically restored with Western aid, are such that they are already establishing the rationale for a pre-emptive strike, should they ever decide one is called for.

"My feeling," an Asian envoy said, "is that the Soviets believe they have only five more years in which they'll be able to beat the Chinese for certain in a war. After that, the Chinese will be too tough and may be able to call upon the United States and other Western nations to join them in a war with the Soviet Union. That's how the Soviet leaders think."

"So I believe they are looking for a chance to strike first, while they still have the upper hand, and if they get a good opportunity, they'll take advantage of it. They're scared to death of what a modernized China might do."

Adding to Russian paranoia about being overrun by invaders from the East, which dates back to the Mongol conquests of the Middle Ages, are Chinese claims to 600,000 square miles of Soviet territory once a part of the Chinese empire, a third of that here in Soviet Central Asia.

The Chinese also beam propaganda broadcasts into the Soviet Union urging minorities here to resist Russian rule.

The possibility that a billion Chinese may some day be able to make good on territorial claims or rally Soviet minorities to their banner is a cause for growing concern in this country.

Local officials here bridled when Western correspondents recently inquired how they felt about Chinese claims to Soviet land. It was clear they did not take such talk lightly.

"We will never give any land to them," one ethnic Kazakh insisted. "Our people are indignant about these territorial claims. No one has any right to our territory. It's ours and we're going to keep it." ●

SKELTON RECOGNIZES INDEPENDENCE YOUTH

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 19, a special event will take place in Independence, Mo. On that date more than 2,000 young people will be recognized by the Independence neighborhood councils and the city of Independence.

In these times when we are reminded daily of the problems faced by young people through news accounts of those who have erred, it is especially important to recognize the efforts of young people who are contributing to society. The Youth Appreciation Show is planned to give that recognition.

It is a pleasure for me to join with the officials of the city of Independence and others involved in the program in offering congratulations to the youth of Independence. We are all proud of their accomplishments to date and their preparation to accomplish even more as they grow into full adult participation in society. ●

RONALD REAGAN AND FOREIGN POLICY

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was recently thinking of a candidate for the Presidency. He was elected twice as Governor of one of the largest and most influential States in the Union. At the time of his announcement to seek the Presidency, his enemies made the claim that he was all "charm" and not very deep on substantive matters. Finally, this candidate was constantly challenged because his critics said physical impairment would stop him from serving as President. Many of his critics also said that he simply wasn't deep enough to understand the complexities of foreign affairs.

No, it is not Ronald Reagan of whom I speak. It is Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the 32d President of the United States. The same kind of criticism was made about FDR that is now being made about Reagan. You may or may not agree with everything Roosevelt did, but no one can deny he was an effective spokesman for his philosophy, whose enemies always underestimated his political abilities.

I was thinking of all this when I came across a column by Stephen S. Rosenfeld of the Washington Post. Rosenfeld, a distinguished commentator on foreign affairs and not known as a partisan of Ronald Reagan, recently took a second look at the California Governor's credentials to be President. The result was a fair minded appraisal. As Rosenfeld makes clear, Ronald Reagan cannot be dismissed out of hand and must, on the record, be taken seriously by all Americans. What Rosenfeld is saying is exactly the kind of thing that needs to be said. It is not pro- or anti-Reagan. It just looks at the facts and demonstrates that the facts justify a good hard second look on the part of those who, having read so many anti-Reagan clichés perhaps have not bothered to look at the man's record.

At this point I include in the RECORD, "Can An Ex-Governor Handle Foreign Policy?", by Stephen S. Rosenfeld, in the Washington Post, March 21, 1980.

[The Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1980]

CAN AN EX-GOVERNOR HANDLE FOREIGN POLICY?

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld)

A brief memoir: a few days after Jimmy Carter announced for president in 1974, I called him up—an aide named Jurdan, something like that, got him out of a shower in San Francisco—to ask whether a mere ex-governor could handle international affairs. He said sure and I went on to agree that the next president didn't need to be, and perhaps shouldn't be, a foreign policy expert, and suggested that he could rebuild foreign policy first at home.

In a superficial sense, this was wrong. Many of Carter's frustrations have arisen from his innocence and inexperience and

the ways he sought to compensate. But in a deeper sense, it was perhaps wronger. The expectation that Carter would solidify a domestic base has not been fulfilled. He has neither assembled a workable domestic consensus for a liberal policy nor assuaged widespread security anxieties nor gotten on top of the policy-making process in Washington.

This brings us to Ronald Reagan, who, after the Illinois primary, must be accepted as possibly the next helmsman of American foreign policy. Once again, the question is whether an ex-governor with no national security experience can do the job.

Frankly, I have never been one of Reagan's fans. I have always identified him with the hard-core right: a jingoistic anti-communist carelessly offering simplistic military-oriented solutions to complex global problems. He is not subtle. He is not cool.

None of this is comforting. Yet in view of what has happened since 1976, it would seem necessary to ask if Reagan's conservative boosterism promises to be any less effective or reliable a guide to policy than the liberal guilt that was so prominent in Carter's baggage in the last campaign. I say this not because I think one is more cynical and opportunistic than the other. But Carter's initial approach did not produce results that either the public or—ultimately—he himself found acceptable, and so he reversed field, especially on the critical Soviet issue.

What results would a hard-line Reagan approach produce? How would he react if the results were disappointing? If we have learned anything in the last four years, it should have been to demand that our leaders respect the jagged orneriness of events and not simply follow the seamless contours of their own ideologies and hopes.

For just this reason, it's fine by me that Reagan was, as reported, generally bland and unspecific in his "major" foreign policy address in Chicago this week. That beats telling us how many troops he's going to pull out of an allied country he has neither consulted nor been briefed on. The details come later. And if, as Lou Cannon reported, the speech's "new conciliatory tone . . . was designed to show that he is not a warmonger," that's fine, too. That's just what he needs to show.

But the Chicago speech was more interesting for the "broad requirements" of foreign policy that Reagan listed. His first was "a clear vision of, and belief in, America's future," by which he means faith in American capitalism as the engine of our progress and as a potential model for others. A conservative cliché? Perhaps. But it's worth more than a liberal cliché in response. Not many Democratic hearts may go pitter-patter for Reagan's eminently Republican vision. But though it's arguable, it's not outrageous. There's something to be said for cheering one's system on—and making it work better. The relationship of free enterprise to political liberty is not accidental. Let's hear more.

Reagan's second foreign-policy "requirement" is a strong economy, which he would achieve by unleashing free enterprise. I leave the heavy economic lifting to others. But surely, given the debris around us, it makes sense to ask why, say, Germany and Japan can import far more of their oil and yet not suffer nearly as much inflation. And so on. Carter in 1976 suggested that an ethical or social regeneration was the proper base for rebuilding foreign policy. Reagan suggests economic regeneration. Who disagrees?

If Reagan really wants to convince people that he's not a warmonger, then he's right to keep his third priority—a strong defense, "adequate military power"—third. He as-

serts that his positions on foreign and defense policy are generally closer to the majority view in Congress than Carter's are. Carter, to be sure, has been moving right, especially since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. But whatever Reagan would do in national security, he does not labor under Carter's burden of having to prove he's not soft.

I am not simply trying here to be "fair" to Ronald Reagan. I am trying to figure out who can best take us where we want and ought to go in the world. People who dismissed Reagan out of hand in the past cannot avoid taking a second look now. ●

OPPOSITION TO PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED IMPORT FEE

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, with my good friend and colleague JAMES M. JEFFORDS of Vermont, a proposal expressing the opposition of the House to the President's proposed import fee on crude oil.

The \$4.62-per-barrel fee on crude oil imports will cost American consumers approximately \$10.5 billion annually. This fee will be reflected in a 10-cent-per-gallon increase at the pumps, which will translate into an additional \$75 per year in gasoline costs for each American driver.

The import fee will serve only as a minimal conservation measure, while the increased financial burden on consumers will be significant. In addition, the President's own guidelines admit to an expected 0.75-percent increase in the Consumer Price Index. These factors combined will place a greater burden on the American consumer through increased energy costs.

In summary, the President's proposal is meant to serve as an anti-inflation conservation measure, when in fact it is nothing more than an innovative revenue-raising mechanism. Rather than curbing inflation, this proposal will only fuel the inflationary spiral, while doing little to promote conservation beyond the levels dictated by already prohibitive energy costs.

I urge my colleagues to join us in opposition to this ill-advised and burdensome tax on the American consumer. ●

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DIS- CRIMINATION

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the proposition that no one shall suffer the cruel injustice of discrimination rests at the very foundation of a democratic society. Yet in this city, in this Nation, and all over the world, we still have much to do to obliterate this

blight on mankind. I call the attention of my colleagues to one attempt at removing the scourge of discrimination. Last Friday the United Nations sponsored the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

Most people are quite adept at identifying discrimination. In South Africa, millions are treated as third-class citizens in their native country, because they are black. In the Soviet Union, millions more are systematically stripped of their freedom because they are Jewish. In countries all over the world, hundreds of millions of people are deprived of their basic human rights because of their race. Many of us have been vigilant in calling attention to instances of discrimination all over the globe. All too often, however, deprivations of these same rights are overlooked here at home.

Right here in America, we have a long way to go before the last vestiges of discrimination have been purged from existence. When it comes to human relations, we are not yet colorblind. Often, minorities still work for lower wages than their white counterparts. And minorities can still find themselves shut out of housing, employment, and even restaurants and clubs.

Nor are we sex blind. Discrimination against women occurs as much outside the office as inside the office. It is nothing short of appalling that over half a century after Susan B. Anthony led the battle for women's suffrage that the average woman makes only 59 cents for every dollar earned by a man. I further note that only 18 Members of this body and 1 Member of the other body are female. Although women represent 52 percent of all Americans, they represent only 4 percent of the House of Representatives.

Finally, we are not ageblind. Because we are only beginning to recognize its devastating effects, ageism is perhaps the most insidious kind of discrimination. We have not rid ourselves of negative stereotypes of older people. We continue to sever millions of productive workers from their livelihood for no better reason than exceeding an arbitrary age limit. We continue to treat 24 million Americans with condescension rather than compassion, simply because they are old.

Mr. Speaker, despite these glaring instances of discrimination, I am proud of the leadership provided by the Congress in working toward equal opportunity and equal rights. The 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 are two important steps on the road to equality. Instances in which Americans, protected by the Constitution, are discriminated against because of color, age, or sex remind us how far down that road we must travel. I hope that the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination will have served as a vehicle which will take us further down that path. ●

REDUCING THE DEFICIT START- ING WITH THE 1980 BUDGET

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a rescission bill to take back a quarter-billion dollars which we have appropriated for the purchase of office furniture by the executive branch in fiscal year 1980 and to reduce the spending limitation for rental of office space by the Federal Government.

Section 1 would reduce the appropriations for office furniture. Every year for the last 10 years GSA and the executive branch purchasing officers have bought \$100 million worth of office furniture. The agencies which get the furniture complain that it is in poor condition or in some way substandard. But the automatic procurement system does not wait for excellence; so the furniture piles up and we have wasted over a billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there are 78 warehouses around Washington that are filled with unused furniture. The Senate Subcommittee on Federal Spending Practices has identified the warehouses where the unused furniture is stored. It has asked the Justice Department, the IRS, and GSA to investigate the source of this waste. But nothing has been accomplished and the needless purchases have continued. I therefore propose to slice away \$229 million from the moneys appropriated for office furniture procurement to stop further purchases of office equipment by GSA and the executive branch.

Section 2 of the bill also proposes cuts. The administration originally requested \$20 million for the acquisition of office space for the Judiciary under the Omnibus Judgeship and Bankruptcy Reform Act. The administration has indicated, however, that it will only be able to rent space costing \$5 million for this year. Thus, we can save \$15 million through a simple rescission.

\$244,000,000 is a small cut to make in the 1980 Budget, Mr. Speaker; clearly much, much more needs to be eliminated. The section which prohibits purchases of additional furniture will apply pressure on GSA to reform its procurement practices in the way simple entreaties from Congress have failed to do in the past. The reduction of outlays for office space should provoke no opposition from any quarter. I urge my colleagues to support me in eliminating these wasteful, needless expenditures from the 1980 budget.

The bill is printed below:

H.R. 6919

A bill to rescind certain appropriations provided for the purchase of furniture by Federal departments, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled. That, out of the total moneys appropriated for the operation of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government for fiscal year 1980, \$229,000,000 of this total appropriated for the purchase of furniture is hereby rescinded. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is directed to allocate this rescission total among the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and report back to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations within 30 days following the date of the enactment of this Act as to the allocation made.

SEC. 2. Out of the moneys appropriated to the Federal Buildings Fund for fiscal year 1980 for rental of space, \$15,000,000 of such appropriation is hereby rescinded.●

RUSSELL LLOYD

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, former Mayor Russell Lloyd of Evansville was the tragic victim of senseless violence which continues to plague our country. Evansville and Indiana have lost a distinguished and hardworking public servant. He was a devoted husband, father, and great American. I was proud to call Russ Lloyd my friend.

During his terms as mayor of Evansville he brought new vigor and hope to the community through progressive leadership. He was an active and fresh force in the Republican Party. Russ Lloyd, at age 47, had only begun to live.

We are deeply saddened by this tragedy and extend our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and to his children.

I include the following editorial from the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette which eulogizes the accomplishments of Russ Lloyd and depicts the void left by his death:

RUSSELL LLOYD

Russell Lloyd was out of political office but he was not out of politics. Last fall, having served two terms as mayor of Evansville, he had declined to seek re-election in order to devote more time to his family and his law practice. Few doubted, though, that the young, personable Republican had forsaken public service for good. He had considered a run for state office or the U.S. Congress; and he had not ruled out another mayoral candidacy in 1983.

But a flurry of gunshots ended Mr. Lloyd's promising career last week. His alleged assailant was said to have had a long-time feud with the city; she reportedly was unaware that Mr. Lloyd was no longer mayor. The shooting occurred in the kitchen of Mr. Lloyd's home Wednesday, and he died two days later.

When Mr. Lloyd first ran for mayor in 1971, the Democrats had controlled Evansville's City Hall for 16 years. But he won by the largest margin in city history, and when he was re-elected in 1975, he became Evansville's first two-term Republican mayor in this century.

Mr. Lloyd ran an open, progressive administration, encouraging economic growth and industrial development and pushing for development of a \$60 million commerce center at the city's riverfront. He worked hard at recruiting minorities and women for city

posts, and he tried to encourage young people to become involved in local government. He was active in the state fight to approve the Equal Rights Amendment. A poised speaker, he had a sharp wit and obvious intelligence.

At age 47, Mr. Lloyd had already served his city long and well. He deserved the break from politics he had barely begun to take. But had he lived, his greatest contributions to his city and state might well have been ahead.

Violence against public figures is a particularly abhorrent phenomenon—it harms our political system as well as the individual it's directed against. The killing of Mr. Lloyd, it seems, was utterly pointless as well. And that only intensifies the tragedy, the sense of loss.●

STANLEY C. PACE

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it's good to know that a company such as TRW has been practicing energy management and conservation for the past 8 years.

The president and chief operating officer of TRW is Stanley C. Pace. A graduate of West Point, during World War II he was a pilot of a B-24 and was shot down over Friedrichshafen. He was a prisoner of war for several months. After the war, promotions came rather rapidly, and at age 31 he was a full colonel.

He retired from the Air Force when he was stationed at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio, and he joined Thompson, Ramo, Woolridge. In 1979 he became president and chief operating officer of TRW.

His mother, my sister, was Pearl Carter Pace, chairman of the Foreign Claims Commission under President Eisenhower. He is a native of Burkesville, Ky., and quite naturally I am proud that Stanley Carter Pace is my nephew.

I enclose for the RECORD a portion of an article from the current edition of Energy Management which contains some of Stan Pace's ideas on energy management which are being promoted by TRW:

"Sound energy management and conservation programs are essential to the well-being of industry, and in particular for a company like TRW," says Stanley C. Pace, president and chief operating officer of TRW. "We are a high-technology company that serves many markets. Some of these, such as auto and aerospace, are very much concerned about energy availability, usage, and cost.

"Conservation is important now and has been a top TRW priority for several years. That's illustrated by our record of energy consumption in recent years."

The latest figures show that TRW's U.S. operations, which include about 100 manufacturing plants, consumed 8.6 trillion Btu of energy at a cost of \$44 million in 1978. "That's a lot," says Pace, "but it's also a 26 percent decrease from 1972. And even more impressive is the fact this decrease has come during a period when we have significantly increased factory production."

Pace attributes much of that decrease in energy consumption to a very aggressive and comprehensive energy management program, headed up on the corporate level by Thomas H. George, director of environmental/applied technology.

According to George, there have been three big pushes for energy conservation at TRW from top management.

In 1972, in early 1977, and again in December of this past year, Mettler sent out directives requiring a top-down review of TRW's energy supplies, use, and conservation programs. "An internal task force in 1977 reviewed prior progress and developed new recommendations, which have since been implemented," says Mettler.

In view of the Iranian situation, government policies, and other factors affecting energy supply and costs, TRW is pursuing an even more rigorous course to reduce consumption wherever and whenever possible. But the company now faces some big decisions. All the low-cost and many large-cost energy-saving measures have already been taken. "We've made most of the building improvements," says George, "but we have many process improvements to still identify and make." Just about anything TRW undertakes now requires big bucks, with extended paybacks.

"TRW has already invested considerable amounts in programs to reduce energy consumption," explains Pace. "Our commitment in this area goes back several years. Our Equipment Group plant in Cleveland, for example, was the first industrial facility to use an on-line computer to control load demand and power consumption. That was eight years ago. Our Equipment Group, which makes components for the aircraft industry, accounts for only about 18 percent of our total energy consumption. Yet we have invested more than \$4 million in energy-saving programs in its plants. Our annual return on that investment has come to about \$1.5 million. Now, however, to realize savings in energy of \$1 per year, we must invest \$3 to \$4. So almost any investment we make in that area is substantial."

Evolving through several stages, TRW's corporate energy program has reached a level of considerable sophistication. Some features of the current program stand out as noteworthy—a well-refined reporting system, which includes measuring energy in terms of "value added"; a careful evaluation of energy-saving projects in terms of the "winners" and the "losers"; and a real commitment to taking that step beyond the low-cost, quick-payback investment.

THE FUTURE

"As we look to the future," says Engle, "it is clear that the costs of conventional energy sources will continue to increase significantly. At the same time, alternate energy and conservation technologies are changing rapidly, which suggests that we review on a continuing basis our energy management projects. In many cases yesterday's losers become today's or tomorrow's winners."

According to George, this is precisely the reason TRW has reactivated its energy task force. "We want to take another top-level look at energy efficiency and process improvements to make sure we've identified all the opportunities and are pursuing them."

TRW has already investigated the possibility of putting cogeneration in some of its plants and of converting some plants to coal. "The answer that has typically come back is we don't have heavy process steam requirements," says George. "Most of our plants are relatively small, and cogeneration burners at this point are not profitable or viable technical alternatives."

But as the energy problem grows increasingly more complex, TRW continues to evaluate all the possibilities. The company is very concerned about the natural gas situation, since gas currently accounts for 40 percent of its energy use, the uncertain availability of gas and the financial burden created by incremental pricing pose some definite problems. "The economics of the situation are tough," says George; "we're just going to have to work our way through it."

As a high-technology corporation, TRW is deeply involved in trying to do just that. From primarily an automotive and aerospace manufacturing business, the company has evolved into a major world resource for energy research and development. TRW's Energy Systems Group has practical programs in oil shale, coal desulfurization, synfuels, solar systems, ocean current, and other alternate energy sources.●

ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1980

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of sadness and loss that I heard the shocking news of Allard Lowenstein's death last Friday. As a colleague of Allard's during his congressional term between 1969 and 1971, I, like many of my colleagues, can attest to his outstanding service to his Long Island constituency and the Nation.

Allard will well be remembered for his untiring efforts on behalf of the civil rights movement. But he will also be remembered and respected for his advocacy of the underdog. Al once told an interviewer, "As a kid, I was always being beaten up * * * and ended up feeling left out. I find I can always identify with the people who are left out." I think Al expressed in that interview precisely how many of us viewed him.

Although he only served a single term in the House, Al's devotion to public service took many forms. Among his many accomplishments was his role in the 1968 McCarthy campaign, his active participation on the U.N. Commission on Human Rights (to which he was appointed in 1977 by President Carter) and his dedication to peace.

Described by our colleague, Congressman ANDY JACOBS as a "gentle tornado," Allard Lowenstein will be sorely missed.●

AGENT ORANGE CONTROVERSY
CONTINUES

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, from 1962 to 1971 this country sprayed millions of gallons of herbicides while fighting in Vietnam. The most heavily

utilized substance was what is known as agent orange, almost all of which was contaminated by a substance known as TCDD or dioxin. TCDD is a highly toxic compound, and many Vietnam veterans feel that they are now suffering from exposure to it. These veterans cite a variety of symptoms which they feel was caused by agent orange, the most serious being nervous disorders, cancer, and birth defects.

Concern over the possibility that agent orange caused these serious diseases has been with us since the late 1960's, when Vietnamese women who had been exposed to the herbicide began to experience a sharp rise in pregnancy and birth problems. Unfortunately, until recently we have not done much to investigate this relationship. The Veterans' Administration has begun to develop procedures to study the problem, as have other Federal agencies, but it will be some time before even preliminary results will be known.

I am concerned that we are still not doing enough for those exposed to agent orange. I continue to read reports of cursory and insensitive treatment by officials and medical personnel at VA hospitals, and downgrading of the problem by the Defense Department. Moreover, I am not convinced that we are moving fast enough to do the research necessary to determine what effects agent orange has on human health; given the amount of circumstantial evidence linking the herbicide to health problems, this is inexcusable.

I will continue to follow this controversy closely and expect to see reports noting an improvement in the treatment of veterans claiming agent orange related problems. As the following editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin notes, the greatest improvement that can be made for these veterans is a resolution of their medical problems in a fair, quick, and open fashion.

The editorial follows:

[From the Bulletin, Mar. 2, 1980]

WE NEED AN ANSWER ON AGENT ORANGE

The Vietnam war has been over for five years, but for many of its veterans some of its possible after-effects are just beginning to show up: Liver ailments, respiratory problems and nervous disorders, birth abnormalities in their children, cancer.

There's a disturbing possibility that such medical problems were caused by the exposure of U.S. troops in Vietnam to Agent Orange, a chemical spray that was used to defoliate jungle trees and reveal hiding places of the Vietcong.

So far, however, the Veterans Administration hasn't been accepting many disability claims based on the alleged harm done by Agent Orange. There hasn't yet been sufficient scientific proof that the chemical was responsible for the ailments. Of 1,233 Vietnam veterans who have filed for disability benefits in cases related to Agent Orange, only 21 have been awarded benefits.

There appears to be enough circumstantial evidence against Agent Orange, however, for research into its possible side-effects to be given the highest priority. The De-

fense Department maintains that there was no widespread exposure of U.S. soldiers and marines to the herbicide. But the General Accounting Office says that tens of thousands of troops were based either in, or extremely close to, areas in which they could have been exposed to Agent Orange.

There have been charges that the Federal Government is more interested in avoiding liability for any disabling effect of Agent Orange than in discovering what its medical properties might be. We would hope there is no basis for such charges. It's simple justice, in our view, for veterans who can show they were exposed to Agent Orange to be compensated for any disabilities that may have resulted from the exposure. It would be the same, really, as if they had been felled by enemy bullets.

If Agent Orange is found "guilty" as charged, it's likely to cost the taxpayers millions in disability payments. But these men were our agents in Vietnam. If they were injured, or are facing death, because of exposure to the herbicide, we owe them and their families some compensation for their suffering.

The issue comes down to being fair to all concerned, the veterans and the taxpayers. The answer is likely to be found in a laboratory. We hope an all-out effort is made to provide that answer.

Meanwhile, we applaud efforts such as those in New Jersey, where a state commission has been established to identify possible victims of Agent Orange and help them find medical, legal and social assistance.●

THE 159TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
BEGINNING OF THE WAR FOR
GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. DAN LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 159th anniversary of the beginning of the war for Greek independence. On this day in 1821, Greece embarked on a 9-year struggle to overthrow four centuries of domination and cultural repression by the Ottoman Empire. Nine years later, victorious, Greece's commitment to freedom and equality was manifest in the reinstatement of a democratic government.

It is appropriate on this day to honor Greek Americans, and to recognize the tremendous contribution Greece has made to our Western civilization. It was in Greece, over 2,500 years ago that the philosophical foundations of democratic government originated. It was this foundation upon which the U.S. philosophy of government was based. The American creed of liberty, freedom, and justice for all is an embodiment of the ideals and concepts of the ancient Greek city states and philosophers.

Today, throughout the 34th District of California, the Greek community will celebrate their independence and heritage of freedom and democracy proudly. In gratitude for the tremendous contribution Greece has made, and continues to make, to the United States, I extend my congratulations

and continuing support to all Americans of Greek ancestry.●

A FRUSTRATED AMERICA WILL TURN TO RONALD REAGAN

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this country is in serious trouble today because our leadership in the White House and in the Congress have consistently failed to make the tough choices which are necessary if inflation at home is to be controlled and the erosion of our strength abroad is to be stopped.

The American people are sick and tired of leaders who would have us believe that higher taxes and gasoline prices will lower inflation; or, that the SALT II Treaty will make us stronger militarily. Americans are too canny to take this doubletalk for anything but what it is.

Mr. Speaker, Nicholas Mahoney, publisher of Hoosick Falls Standard-Press and the Washington County Post in New York, provides as good an expression of the frustration the American people now feel as I have seen from any of our so-called "national opinion-makers." But rather than simply ring his hands over the precarious state of our Nation, Mr. Mahoney offers us a hope and an opportunity. In 1980, he tells us, we can turn to the one leader on the scene today who offers the American people a "consistent, unwaffled philosophy," a steadfast plan to put this country back on track economically and militarily. That leader is Ronald Reagan, the next President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Mr. Mahoney's fine article for the consideration of my colleagues:

CONSISTENT, UNWAFFLED PHILOSOPHY

This is a frustrating time in which to live. It is frustrating to stop at a supermarket and wince at the prices of food. It is frustrating to receive an oil bill for heating. It is painful to be told by the president that we must sacrifice more in our private lives to douse the flames of inflation, while the plan he outlines fails to make sense. It is at least disconcerting to have a 10 cents per gallon extra tax on gasoline to fight inflation, and to be told that a tax cut would fuel inflation.

We never have been able to understand why it is less inflationary for the government to tax us and spend the money it takes from us than it is to lower our taxes and allow us to spend the money. We do know, however, that a tax helps build the federal bureaucracy.

We also know that none of the medicine prescribed by our government experts to date has been effective in reducing the rate of inflation. On the contrary, it has made it worse.

An American becomes almost apoplectic over the retention of American hostages in Iran, especially when banners bearing such messages as "America Can Do Nothing About It" are shown on television. Choreographed Iranian mobs, chanting and jab-

bing their fists into the air, and screaming insults against America, are shown outside the U.S. Embassy where 50 Americans have been held hostage for months. It is true that the United States can do little or nothing about freeing its citizens from Iran without risking their lives, but there is some solace in realizing that any ragged group of wild-eyed terrorists can seize an embassy in any country at almost any time and hold hostages of other countries. We aren't the only nation being victimized.

It is frustrating to have countries throughout the world heaping scorn on Americans and desecrating the American flag after two generations of Americans have dug into their own pockets to furnish money, food, equipment, and protection to get them on their feet and able to take proper places in the world.

No one likes to see a "Yankee Go Home" sign in a country we have saved from starvation.

Even some of our own allies, countries where we maintain troops for their protection, refused to subscribe to plans to invoke economic sanctions against Iran for its unlawful imprisonment of hostages, or even to boycott the Olympic Games in Moscow as punishment for the cruel Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

It is obvious that the present administration does not have the answer to inflation or the nation's security. It has a waffling philosophy which has scared us all.

We'll wager that despite the promise by the present administration that the number of federal employees will be reduced by 20,000 will never come to pass. At the end of the year, there will be additional federal employees added to our already bloated bureaucracy.

The only philosophy in sight, which has remained constant through two presidential campaigns and through two terms as governor of California, has been that of Ronald Reagan who seeks the Republican nomination for president. He has not waffled. He has been consistent. It is time America adopted such a philosophy for the good of us all.●

INFCE II

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I made a statement to my colleagues on a matter of important international consequence, the conclusions reached by the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE) regarding the importance of nuclear technology. As I stated then, I felt it was unfortunate that the press account of the conclusions of this 2½-year, 66-nation effort was buried deep and received very little public attention. The Washington Post attempted to rationalize in a March 3 editorial position that the outcome of this effort was "a modest success." It is difficult to imagine that this Carter-promoted activity, which in effect led to a 65-1 vote against the U.S. position, can be claimed as a "modest success," yet the attitude assumed in the Post editorial resembles the mind-set that has been prevalent since the early months of this administration. I do not see how one could fashion even a mild dip-

lomatic victory out of this outright rejection. But now, before us, is the challenge of recovering some of the erosion of our international posture prior to the next economic summit in June and the Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference in August of this year. This responsibility must be assumed by Congress with urgency.

I would hope that my colleagues would join me in asking this administration whether or not they are prepared to take the steps necessary to reconstruct nuclear energy policy in a manner consonant with the needs of an energy dependent world precariously linked with Persian Gulf resources where the Carter administration now talks about military steps we may have to take to defend the oil fields for the benefit of the free world.

An important perspective of the issues can be distilled from the article I submit below, which summarizes a number of concerns raised by various participants in INFCE. The central conclusion on which a consensus was reached, namely that spent fuel has value, especially to nations with large commitments to nuclear energy, must become the focal point for the review of our current policy. Coupled with this is the recognition that reprocessing of spent fuel is important to recover the value in this fuel as well as to enhance our ability to manage the small amount of high-level waste included in this spent fuel. An argument over the relative economics of the value of this fuel has been put forward by the United States in an attempt to justify the current administration position.

The following article addresses this from a number of perspectives and puts this issue into proper context. There are a number of conditions under which decisions to reprocess and recycle material will be made, based on the macroeconomics of the overall impact on the cost of uranium supply. Yet other decisions will be made on the basis of the asset that reprocessing represents to waste disposal coupled with the importance of energy resource conservation. It is distressing to me that this administration would use the free market economics argument when it was its unilateral initiative which resulted in the shutdown of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's licensing proceedings. The propriety of a member of the White House staff contacting an independent regulatory agency, namely the NRC, to force termination of a public licensing process is highly questionable. Thus, this administration eliminated the only vehicle for the free market system to seek its own level. This maneuver suggests that some members of the administration may have believed that the outcome of the proceedings before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission could have provided substantial arguments directly contrary to policy. Members of at least one of the special interest organizations opposed to this policy and a participant in the proceedings

before the NRC now occupy key positions in the Council on Environmental Quality, the Justice Department, and the Environmental Protection Agency. This vested interest is cause for even greater concern since the need to resurrect this issue in the administration may be subverted by internal manipulation.

I subscribe to the recent statement by the National Academy of Sciences in its report, "Energy in Transition: 1985-2010," that "the exacerbation of international competition for access to fossil fuels that could occur in the absence of an adequate worldwide nuclear power program" is a greater threat to peace than a consistent and thoughtful approach to energy applications of nuclear energy technology. The standards for safeguards, public safety, and environmental impacts of the operation of vital fuel cycle facilities should be adopted as U.S. standards. Without a viable demonstration program of the acceptability of our standards as they may relate to the efficient operation of these types of facilities of this nature, it is difficult to imagine that we could ever be credible in insisting on U.S. standards.

Thus, I feel strongly that the time is now to resume the licensing consideration of these matters as well as to press for meaningful demonstration of various facets of this technology at commercial scale. To the extent that it will provide opportunities for other nations to defer commitments of their own, we should also encourage international participation in these facilities. Anything less than this willingness to accommodate the vital international energy security needs of both the industrialized nations of the free world and the developing nations, would be a national tragedy. Should we fail in this effort, there is a strong likelihood that the United States would be cited as the cause for the rejection of the Nonproliferation Treaty by those nations whose energy security interests have been jeopardized by our unilateral policies.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a disappointment to me to address the House again in late August or early September after the June and August international meetings to revisit this issue in an open discussion of what our next step is to be after announcements are made that nations have been forced from their solemn commitments to adhere to the principles and the requirements of the Nonproliferation Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert an excellent summary by Simon Rippon of the INFCE activity that was published in the March 4 Energy Daily:

INFCE'S FINAL SESSION: CONSENSUS BUT NOT ACCORD

There is no single nuclear fuel cycle that is wholly proliferation proof. But there also is no single fuel cycle that cannot be reconciled with the need to avoid proliferation. This is one conclusion of the two-year inter-

national Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE) on which all the delegates to the final conference in Vienna last week seemed to agree.

But it was equally clear from the closing statements of the national delegations that different countries still will draw different conclusions from the voluminous INFCE reports on what is and what is not acceptable in the nuclear fuel cycle.

Those countries that are likely to depend on others for uranium supplies have generally adopted the position—as voiced by West Germany's Hans Werner Lautenschlager—that "Every country will still have to make its own decisions on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, taking into account [its] respective technical, ecological, economic, political and financial circumstances." And for most of these countries, these circumstances clearly dictate keeping open the option of reprocessing and fast breeder reactors.

The INFCE participants did not contest U.S. Ambassador Gerard Smith's conclusion that "all countries were agreed that the economic advantage of plutonium recycle in light water reactors will at best be small." But several countries clearly deny the accompanying implication that there is no need for thermal recycle.

Notably, the head of the Brazilian delegation stated: "Plutonium recycle in thermal reactors can achieve savings of up to 40 percent in uranium requirements over the once-through fuel cycle, which makes reprocessing an indispensable operation in most nuclear fuel cycles." The Swiss talked of the "well-known advantages" of plutonium recycle in thermal reactors.

And the Belgians—who now own a small reprocessing plant which could be reactivated, who have a mixed-oxide fuel fabrication plant and a great deal of irradiation experience with plutonium fuels in thermal reactors—insisted that the question of whether or not a fuel cycle is economically justifiable "should be left entirely to the country concerned."

More generally, the position of the delegations from the uranium-dependent countries was that INFCE had identified reprocessing as an essential first step in most fuel cycles, and therefore provision for this option should be retained in all long-term supply contracts. This being so, their reasoning went, it is better to reprocess sooner rather than later, or at least to ship spent fuel to a large reprocessing center where it can be stored under an international management scheme.

The three countries with relatively abundant uranium reserves—Australia, Canada and the U.S.—conceded the right of others to decide on their own fuel cycle options. But they noted that INFCE has identified "sensitive areas" of the fuel cycle, and they can be expected to seek improved institutional control over these areas as a condition in bilateral supply agreements.

The efforts of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to establish an international plutonium storage scheme (IPS), which have been proceeding in parallel with INFCE, offer the prospect of one such institutional arrangement to deal with the sensitive area of separated plutonium. The fact that IPS was endorsed by the three main uranium suppliers, as well as by all the consumers, was seen as one of the most encouraging developments at the final INFCE conference.

There may be less accord on another sensitive area which was identified in the INFCE report—namely, the long-term proliferation risk associated with spent fuel storage and disposal. The INFCE working group that looked into the question of spent fuel storage noted that while wet storage of low-burnup fuel has been demonstrated for

periods up to 20 years, experience with high-burnup fuel is only 10 years and further testing will be required to evaluate longer-term storage.

Many of the conference delegates felt the U.S., Gerard Smith had gone too far with his claim that INFCE had proved spent fuel "can be safely stored on an interim or long-term basis, and terminal disposal without reprocessing appears to be a realistic option for either economic or nonproliferation reasons."

The head of the French delegation, M. de Communes, warned of large accumulations of untreated spent fuel in years to come. Along with delegates from several smaller countries, he advocated a scheme for international management of spent fuel in parallel with international plutonium storage.

Hermann Bondi, head of the British delegation, referring to the report of INFCE's uranium supply/demand group, said: "The overriding message which comes through to us from that report is the uncertainty we all place in planning of nuclear power." He called uranium "the most political of all commodities." And like most of the consumer country delegates, Bondi drew attention to recommended guidelines for long-term supply contracts contained in the final INFCE report.

The hope implicit in those guidelines is that greater predictability can be introduced into conditions of prior consent for retransfer or reprocessing of spent fuel, and that "case-by-case" constraints can be effectively eliminated from bilateral agreements.

To foster a mood that could make this possible, most delegates to the INFCE conference were inclined to play down residual differences of opinion. They concentrated instead on mutual self-congratulation over the fact that 46 nations had agreed on a consensus report without the need for minority views. Nonetheless, last week's final national statements indicate that consumer nations can—and will—draw on plenty of ammunition from INFCE in forthcoming negotiations of international nuclear supply agreements.●

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution which would extend by 60 days the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, with the expectation that the House will act on the resolution later this week. This action is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because without it the act will expire on next Friday, March 28. It must not be allowed to lapse, because it contains important authorities under which our industrial base is kept in a state of readiness to mobilize quickly in the event of a national emergency.

We have twice before in this Congress extended the Defense Production Act for short periods, in order to give the conferees time to complete work on S. 932, the "Energy Security Act." Members will recall that the House synthetic fuels legislation which we passed overwhelmingly last June represented amendments to the Defense Production Act and included an extension of the act. We are still in

conference on this energy legislation although I am pleased to report that we have made significant progress since we last extended the DPA in January. I have every expectation that when we bring this matter to the Members for action again, it will be contained in a conference report on the omnibus energy legislation. Meanwhile, it is vital that we continue the authorities of the Defense Production Act, and I hope Members will act expeditiously when this resolution comes before them for action later this week. The Senate plans to take similar action.●

INDEPENDENCE OF BYELORUSSIA

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, today marks a momentous day for all who are committed to the ideals of self-determination, independence, and freedom. Sixty-two years ago, on March 25, 1918, the executive committee of the First Byelorussian National Congress proclaimed the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, implementing a national constitution which guaranteed freedom of assembly and speech, liberty of conscience, inviolability of person and home, and equality of all citizens under the law. However, this dream of independence and nationalism was tragically short-lived.

The victims of both Communist aggression and imperialism, and later, Nazi occupation, the Byelorussian people remained steadfast in their resistance to subjugation. Gallant Byelorussian patriots sacrificed their lives for their ideals, demonstrating their total dedication to national independence. Since 1921, the Russian Communist Party has controlled the affairs of Byelorussia; but, the cultural heritage of the people has remained one of the richest in Eastern Europe. In their hearts, the Byelorussian people have a continual desire for the independence which was once theirs—and a belief that this independence will be restored.

I would like to take this opportunity to alert my colleagues to the plight of Michal Kubaka, a proud Byelorussian, unjustly imprisoned by the Soviets—yet another prisoner of conscience! And what is Michal's crime? He enlightened his fellow workers of their basic human rights as designated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—hardly an act prompting a 6-year imprisonment in a psychiatric prison! He has once again been imprisoned for his essays, "Human Rights and Détente are Indivisible," and "The Stolen Fatherland." Michal has become another victim of the oppressive Soviet regime. I urge my colleagues to join me in demanding the release of Michal Kubaka, whose cour-

age and determination is admired by all!

In conclusion, I want to support the wonderful suggestion to include Byelorussian in Voice of America broadcasts. This is certainly a method of bringing reassurance and support to the courageous Byelorussian people and the Byelorussian-American community, and an idea to be given thoughtful consideration. The proud people of Byelorussia are an inspiration to all, and we join them in the hope that one day their aspirations for independence will be realized, and they will come to know the freedom we value so highly in the United States of America.●

PRESIDENTIAL PLAN FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE REFORM

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, last week, in response to a Freedom of Information Act request, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provided me with certain documents used by the White House in the preparation of the Presidential plan for selective service reform.

The Presidential plan report was submitted to Congress February 11, 1980, in response to an amendment to the 1980 Defense Authorization Act that requested the President to study and report back to Congress on 10 Selective Service System (SSS) and military manpower issues.

On October 12, 1979, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, directed James T. McIntyre, Jr., Director, OMB to—

undertake such studies and deliberations as are necessary to develop a broad Presidential plan for Selective Service System reform as will be called for in the 1980 Defense Authorization Act.

On October 15, 1979, Mr. McIntyre tasked out to three agencies the 10 issues to be addressed in the report. Five issues were assigned to SSS, four to the Department of Defense (DOD), and one, national civilian service, to OMB.

These three agencies prepared the three studies used by the Presidential plan "steering group" in writing the February 11, 1980, report to Congress.

The SSS report, dated January 16, 1980, was obtained by Senator MARK HATFIELD and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1980, at S1917.

OMB has refused to release its report on national civilian service on the grounds that it is "sensitive and confidential" and thus exempt from the FOIA. I am appealing this decision.

The DOD report, dated January 14, 1980, is set out below, along with an

article from the March 20, 1980, Washington Post.

It should be noted that neither the SSS report nor the DOD report, which represent the best thinking on the subject from these two agencies, recommend pre mobilization (peacetime) draft registration.

Tomorrow I will discuss additional documents I obtained under my FOIA request.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1980]

DRAFT REGISTRATION PLAN RUNS COUNTER TO
PENTAGON MEMO

(By George C. Wilson)

President Carter's plan for peacetime draft registration was not what the Pentagon's manpower office had in mind, according to an internal Defense Department report obtained yesterday.

The report also warned that requiring the registration of men, but not women, probably would be challenged in the courts and could hinder mobilization.

The document, dated January 1980 and obtained by Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.) under a Freedom of Information Act request, is expected to fuel the controversy over President Carter's plan to require 19- and 20-year-olds to register this year.

Since the House has refused to pass the required legislation for registration of women, Carter is now trying to persuade Congress to provide \$13.3 million in fiscal 1980 supplemental funds to finance the registration of men only.

The manpower office report, written as Carter was mulling his registration decision, did not recommend peacetime registration. It noted that the Selective Service "is developing plans to conduct an emergency registration within the first 10 days after mobilization is announced."

Selective Service, in a separate report dated Jan. 16, said it would be most "cost-effective to register young people after a national emergency were declared. Carter has rejected that recommendation partly on the ground that peacetime registration would demonstrate national resolve to the Soviet Union.

Now that Carter has settled for men-only registration, the key questions become whether Congress will provide the money and whether the courts will uphold the registration of men but not women.

The White House is pressing Congress to get around its budget ceiling for fiscal 1980 and still come up with the \$13.3 million for men-only registration by transferring that amount from the Pentagon to the Selective Service. A resolution to do this is expected to be voted on next week by the House Appropriations Committee. The Senate is awaiting House action.

In discussing the risk of men-only registration being invalidated in the courts, the Pentagon report said that "an injunction arising from these suits could cause damaging delays during a period of national emergency or war."

"Extending the presidential authority to register, classify and, with congressional approval, to induct women as well as men would reduce the risk of adverse court action during a time of crisis," the report said.

"Women have proven that they can successfully serve in a large number of occupations in our peacetime military force, and also can serve successfully in large numbers in an expanded wartime force.

"Consequently, if registration or induction is reinstated and women are excluded, it is

likely that sex discrimination suits would be brought against the U.S. government."

The American Civil Liberties Union has vowed to file such a suit. The Justice Department, in an opinion that differs from those of the Pentagon and the Selective Service System, has predicted that men-only registration would survive a court challenge.

At a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing yesterday, Sen. John Warner (R-VA.) said that any government plan that required the registration of women would "open the floodgate" and wash away the powers of the president and the Congress to keep women out of combat.

PRESIDENTIAL PLAN FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE REFORM—A REPORT ON SELECTED ISSUES

(Prepared by: the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics, January 1980)

INTRODUCTION

The Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1980 directed the President to submit a plan by February 9, 1980 for reform of the Selective Service System. The Act specifically directed the President to report on ten issues of concern to Congress. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget directed the Department of Defense to prepare reports on four of these issues:

1. The desirability of the enactment of authority for the President to induct persons registered under such Act for training and service in the Armed Forces during any period with respect to which the President determines that such authority is required in the interest of the national defense.

2. Whether women should be subject to registration under such Act and to induction for training and service in the Armed Forces under such Act.

3. The desirability and feasibility of providing authority for the President to induct persons into the Individual Ready Reserve.

4. Other possible procedures that could be established to enable the Armed Forces to meet their personnel requirements.

The four attached reports fulfill this requirement.

The Department of Defense also will submit a separate report to the Congress regarding education incentives and the status of the All Volunteer Force.

1. ISSUE

The desirability of the enactment of authority for the President to induct persons registered under such Act for training and service in the Armed Forces during any period with respect to which the President determines that such authority is required in the interest of the national defense.

2. BACKGROUND

The draft was instituted during the Civil War and World War I by Acts of Congress, and Congress authorized use of the draft by the President beginning one year prior to U.S. involvement in World War II. This authority continued through World War II. After World War II, Congress allowed the draft law to expire for a brief period, but re-instituted conscription during the Berlin airlift of 1948. For the following 25 years, the Congress delegated to the President the authority to determine when to initiate inductions. The 1948 law provided an induction authority for a two year period. The authority was extended for one year in 1950. Beginning in 1951, the induction authority was extended by Congress to the President for successive four-year periods. However, in 1971, the Congress, at the request of the Administration, extended the President's induction authority for only two years. The purpose of the Administration's request for only a two-year extension in 1971 was to

allow time to phase into an All-Volunteer force.

The last call for inductees was issued by the Selective Service System in December 1972. On January 27, 1973, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird announced the implementation of a "zero draft." The Nixon Administration did not request an extension of the President's induction authority in 1973, in part because of a belief held by some that the existence of induction authority would reduce motivation to make the volunteer force work. Congress allowed the authority to expire on July 1, 1973. Other provisions of the Military Selective Service Act, including Presidential authority to register and classify young men, remained in effect.

3. ALTERNATIVES

The Administration considered the following alternatives:

Provide authority for the President to induct persons based on Presidential determination that such authority is required in the interest of national defense.

Provide Presidential authority to begin induction upon Presidential declaration of a national emergency or Congressional declaration of national emergency or war.

Continue with the current arrangement; i.e., the Congress retains the authority to initiate induction.

4. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

The current Military Selective Service Act authorizes the President to reinstate registration and classification but prohibits inductions without Congressional approval. The Administration does not object to the requirement for Congressional approval. In a nation where individual freedom is cherished, the decision to institute conscription is a serious matter. The Administration would not hesitate to request the authority to conscript to provide the Armed Forces with manpower in a national emergency or even to maintain the strength of the Armed Forces during peacetime. Because such a decision involves a tremendous change in the lives of millions of young Americans, and their relatives, it is a decision that should be reached on the basis of a strong national consensus. Failure to achieve such a consensus could lead to bitterness and division among the population. This would be harmful to the unity needed to support the national effort in a crisis. The best means of producing a national consensus is to insure that the resumption of conscription is supported by the representatives of the people in Congress.

The President currently has authority to resume registration and classification. The Selective Service System is developing plans to conduct an emergency registration within the first ten days after mobilization is announced. An additional few days will be needed to conduct a lottery and transfer the registration data to computer records. Induction authority will not be needed until about a week after a decision to mobilize.

5. CONCLUSION

It is the view of the Administration that sufficient time probably will exist after mobilization is announced for Congress to authorize induction by amending the current Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

6. RECOMMENDATION

The Administration does not seek additional statutory authority regarding the issue of induction. However, the Administration has no objection if Congress wishes to provide the President authority to induct persons for training and service in the Armed Forces when the President proclaims a national emergency or upon Congressional declaration of war or national emergency. ●

THE 62D ANNIVERSARY OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. This anniversary comes at a time when the entire world has once again become aware of Soviet aggression and domination. The Soviet incursion into Afghanistan is but another example of the Soviet's willingness to forcefully invade an independent country and remain there while scoffing at the outcry of world opinion.

Soviet expansionism is not new to the people of Byelorussia. They have been striving to regain their national rights, and basic human rights for many years. Unfortunately, the struggle of the Byelorussian people too often has gone unnoticed. Events such as the Soviet's action in Afghanistan are painful reminders of the plight of so many people who now suffer under the yoke of Soviet occupation.

One step that could help to remind the free world of the struggle being waged by the Byelorussian people would be for the Voice of America to include the Byelorussian language programs in their broadcasts. This could be one small way in which to demonstrate recognition and support for bringing freedom and human rights back to Byelorussia.

As we reflect on events such as the invasion of Afghanistan, I hope that all my colleagues will remember people such as the Byelorussians who not only continue to suffer the hardships of Soviet occupation, but also continue to strive for the day when they recapture their freedoms.

I am including with my remarks, a copy of a resolution that will be offered at the 1980 Byelorussian-American commemoration observances:

RESOLUTION

Resolved that the Byelorussian language be included in Voice of America programming.

The aforementioned resolution to be adopted by the Byelorussian-American community at the March 23rd, 1980 rally commemorating the 62nd anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic which took place in Minsk, capital of Byelorussia, on March 25, 1918.

The Byelorussian-American community of New York is convinced that U.S. national security interests and world peace are well served when captive nations within the Soviet Union are informed of the nature of the Soviet expansionism and the vitality of their respective cultural heritages in the United States. Indeed, these are major objectives of Voice of America broadcasts. For years, however, Byelorussians in the Soviet Union have not heard any VOA broadcasts in their own language.

The Byelorussian language, the language of one of the largest ethnic groups in the USSR and one of the oldest ethnic groups in the United States, is being discriminated

against by the Voice of America as it does not include the Byelorussian language in its programming. We, the participants of this rally wish to once again express our long standing frustration at this discrimination; we ask that the administration of the VOA and other concerned government agencies recognize the inequity and unsoundness of VOA policy in this matter and move to include the Byelorussian language in VOA programming. Inclusion of the Byelorussian language in VOA broadcasts would foster closer relations with the Byelorussian people and the Byelorussian-American community. ●

ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN—A
TRANSCENDENT LIFE

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1980

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, we will never know how many people felt the shock of personal loss when they heard the tragic news of Allard Lowenstein's untimely death. Surely they number in the thousands, for he had met thousands in his extraordinarily active life, and no one who had met him could forget him. His intellect, decency, integrity, faith, empathy, and, above all, his humanity could not fail to impress and inspire anyone who knew him.

I will always remember my first meeting with him. I came to Washington, in November 1970, 2 weeks after the election which brought me to Congress. My friend and campaign coordinator, Jim Goff, said, "Let's go up and see Al Lowenstein." I said, "Do you think he will be in? It's 10 p.m." Up we went to his office in the Longworth Building. There he was, looking quite tired, working away at his desk just as though he had not recently lost his own campaign for reelection. We sat around for 20 minutes or so talking about the state of things and what the new Congress might do and what he might do. He had the knack of accepting people instantly and making one feel like an old friend. I remember particularly his unusual combination of relaxed manner and intense mental activity.

The last time I saw him was about a year ago when I sat with him and a half dozen others around a luncheon table in the Members private dining room in the Capitol. He had just returned from Zimbabwe-Rhodesia on a special mission to evaluate the situation there. The question of the trade embargo was about to come up again in the Foreign Affairs Committee. I asked Al what he thought Congress should do. He quickly outlined the importance of giving the British Government maximum leverage to force all sides to accept a peaceful solution, and he concluded that the best thing we could do was to authorize President Carter to continue or to terminate the embargo, depending on his findings as to which course would best promote

such a solution. That, of course, was what Congress ultimately did, and the experts now say that was what made the peaceful solution possible.

No one could possibly catalog all the causes that Al Lowenstein promoted, the many lives he helped, the many he saved. He was a person whose heart cried out with compassion for his fellow human beings, and who, not satisfied to sympathize and let it go at that, did not hesitate to reach out his hand or to stick out his neck.

That this man of reason and nonviolence would die at the hand of an assassin is a tragedy, not alone for him, but for us all. Yet the manner of his dying only serves to illumine the manner of his living, and he joins, in the manner of his life and of his death, Abe Lincoln, Mahatma Gandhi, and others who similarly lived and died and whose lives now serve as a beacon for those who follow.

Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of Harvard Magazine, Harvard University's publication for its alumni, contains a brilliant article by the late Prof. Emile Benoit, entitled "Human Survival and the Fear of Death." Professor Benoit points out that, to avoid being immobilized by the realization of their mortality, people develop various mechanisms to deal with it. One way is to repress it. Another is to transcend it. Those who transcend it, Benoit says, do so by developing a high degree of altruism, enabling them to live lives of dedication to the survival of other human beings as a group.

In an age when there are multiple threats to man's continued existence as a species and when our survival demands a tremendous upsurge of transcendent altruism and farseeing wisdom, Al Lowenstein was one of those pioneer spirits whose example, we must hope, will inspire leaders in our country and throughout the world. As a fitting tribute to him, I offer Emile Benoit's article for inclusion in the RECORD following these remarks:

HUMAN SURVIVAL AND THE FEAR OF DEATH
(By Emile Benoit)

Like other animals, man has a genetic predisposition to avoid death, accompanied by perturbations inwardly experienced as fear. This instinctive fear of death has played an important role in the evolutionary process.

Because man has been able to recognize the ubiquity and inevitability of death, and is endowed with an exceptional capacity for memory and foresight, he might find this fear immobilizing if he had not developed certain mechanisms for dealing with it. The most common of such mechanisms is repression. Elaborate defense mechanisms have been developed to repress awareness of the fear of death, through religious doctrines and institutions that portray death as merely the gateway to eternal life—and men half-persuaded that death is merely an illusion find it easier not to think about it, until it is imminent.

An alternative way to deal with this fear is not to repress it, but to transcend it. The biological roots of such transcendence have only recently come to light. Edward O. Wilson and other sociobiologists at Harvard have shown that altruism and a willingness

to sacrifice one's life in the defense of one's nest, hive, lair, home, etc., is not, as it once seemed, a biological anomaly, inconsistent with natural selection. It is now understood that groups as well as individuals are involved in the natural-selection process, and that those groups may do best in which at least some of their members are endowed with a degree of altruism enabling them, in an emergency, to transcend their fears and risk death to protect the fellow members of their group—who carry much the same genetic structure as they do.

In deliberately risking death to protect its fellows, either by fighting or by exposing itself to predators and trying to lead them away from its nest, lair, etc., the individual is for the moment not dominated by fear of dying. Human subjects talk of a certain euphoria in battle or in rescue operations that makes them largely oblivious to their own danger.

It is my thesis that the choice between these two alternative modes of dealing with the fear of death, repression versus transcendence, has assumed enormous importance in view of the changed character of human evolution and the crisis now confronting us. Human evolution has continued at its same slow pace biologically; fifty thousand years ago man was genetically virtually identical with man as he is today. But the evolutionary process has accelerated tremendously in the realm of culture. It is there that major mutations have occurred, that natural selection visibly operates, and that improvements have been rapidly diffused through communication and imitation. As a result, man has emerged as the undisputed master of the earth; but, ironically, he now faces the gravest dangers to his survival.

The best understood aspect of this danger is the enormous jump in man's ability to destroy, and the rapid diffusion of such powers to many hands. Along with this goes a vast increase in vulnerability: a high degree of specialization and division of labor, coordinated by a vast network of communications and transportation, readily subject to disruption. Less obvious is the danger from the waning legitimacy of governments and other intergrative institutions, as their corruptibility, their susceptibility to use for advancing the power drives of individuals, becomes more widely perceived. There is also a strenuous reaction against manifold types of inequality in modern society, with little awareness of their relative degrees of justifiability and of the real costs and difficulties in trying to abolish them too quickly. Moreover, in the rush to abolish all inequalities within the present generation, there is a tendency to disregard the creation and aggravation of temporal inequalities; that is, inequalities between this and future generations.

This ties in with the other major aspect of our problems, the ecological or environmental aspect. It can perhaps be most readily explained in terms of the "Exponential Growth Syndrome" and the negative externalities of pollution and "excess depletion." Exponential growth—growth at a constant or rising percentage—creates explosive amounts of total growth, incompatible with any fixed limits. For example, *Homo habilis* is at least two million years old. Up until the time of the American Revolution, his average growth in numbers was less than four million a year. In the last two centuries the human population has grown by around twenty million a year. Within a decade, if present trends hold, it will be increasing by the equivalent of the present population of the United States every two years. Since per capita incomes have also been rising, the amount of energy and other resources con-

sumed and the amount of polluting wastes dispersed have been increasing even faster.

The Exponential Growth Syndrome, as I define it, is the modification of attitudes, ideologies, and standards and ways of living, on the assumption that exponential growth is the normal condition and must continue indefinitely, since everyone's welfare depends on it. Its continuance is believed to be required to maintain employment, avoid inflation, mitigate poverty, and continue the hope of progress. The obvious fact that, in a world of limited dimensions and resources, exponential growth can't go on indefinitely—or even for very long—is something that, like our awareness of death, is repressed. As with death, we rely on magical solutions to make the inevitable disappear or seem illusory.

Attempts to confront the realities, and to discover how they might be transcended, are nit-picked or ridiculed or otherwise discredited. Academic orthodoxy rushed to show that Donella and Dennis Meadows' projection of ecological disaster within 125 years (in *The Limits to Growth*, Universe, 1974) would be falsified if one changed some of the assumptions. Yet the usual conclusion drawn by these scholars, that therefore the dangers were illusory, revealed their own underlying biases; for if they had taken their own assumptions and traced out how much difference they would make, they would have found that their more favorable assumptions would simply delay the pending catastrophe for a period essentially trivial in proportion to man's prior existence and future aspirations. For example, Professor William Nordhaus of Yale University, formerly of the Council of Economic Advisors, has argued that "ultimately recoverable resources" are far larger than presently estimated, so that growth will not be limited by resource shortages. He estimates that ultimately recoverable resources of coal would suffice for five thousand years at current rates of consumption. What he does not point out is that, at past rates of increase in consumption, this amount would all be gone in 150 years, and, thus, that the difference between his projected date of exhaustion and that of the Meadowses is minor. I myself have calculated that if we increased the tonnage mined of the main minerals by only three percent a year, we would in a thousand years be mining more than the weight of the earth annually.

A thousand years is only a quarter of recorded history. Relative to the two million years that *Homo habilis* has been on earth (let alone the one hundred million years during which the dinosaurs flourished), it is a negligible quantity. Even if the human race had an assurance of surviving another thousand years, this would be the equivalent of diagnosing an illness of an infant as terminal.

Moreover, if we keep to our present course, it is most unlikely that we have a thousand years. Even the short-term problems look very bad. The so-called energy squeeze is only the tip of the iceberg. We have developed, in just a few decades, a profound dependence upon one particular energy resource that is highly concentrated and that was (though we did not recognize it) extraordinarily cheap. It so happens that those who own a large part of the supply of that resource have finally become aware that the supply is limited, and—like intelligent monopolists—have decided to try to maximize not current sales but long-term profits, by restricting output.

To substitute other energy sources will require enormous investments in new infrastructure, for locating, transforming, transporting, metering, and delivering the energy, as well as for providing backup capacity in the event of failure, accident, or

abnormal demand (as from climatic variations). These, rather than the fuel itself, account for the bulk of the cost of conventional energy sources. The relentless upward pressure of energy costs in generating both dangerous inflation and large-scale unemployment simultaneously, thus accentuating class tensions, undermining loyalty to existing systems, and greatly enhancing the risk of war. (It should not be forgotten that a succession of severe inflation and mass unemployment was an important factor in bringing about World War II.)

To build the new infrastructure required to fill even a major portion of the increase in the energy demands of rapidly rising populations with rising living standards will require the diversion of vast amounts of steel, copper, etc., and energy, from present consumer uses into the new forms of investment. Indeed, oil and gas should be looked upon primarily as a chemical feedstock and emergency energy supply, to be used primarily to buy us the time required to build the infrastructure required to utilize alternative energy sources. Yet, President Carter's effort to divert even a small part of the increase in conventional energy supply away from consumption and into the development of alternative energy sources has met impassioned resistance from vested interests, and confusion and bewilderment among the general public. There is no indication that any serious change in our existing pattern of life and institutions is even being considered in connection with the Exponential Growth Syndrome.

A recent paper of mine, setting forth these dangers and proposing "Dynamic Equilibrium" policies to meet them, drew three interesting responses that throw some light on the difficulty we will have in dealing with such problems. The editor of a leading economic journal wrote: "I was fascinated by 'Dynamic Equilibrium.' I admire its eloquence and optimism, and wish I could share your belief that the grave predicaments you describe so well will yield to the mild medicines that you prescribe. In fact, I don't even believe that the patient can be persuaded to take those mild medicines. . . . What is my prescription? . . . It is to undertake a crash program of research into these matters—in a Manhattan Project mode, if you will." A distinguished congressman, deeply involved in conservation and environmental affairs, commented: "This is really first-rate work. . . . It seems to me you have an innovative and unusual approach that ought to receive some attention and favorable action." But the editor of a distinguished and widely read intellectual journal refused to publish the piece, because he was not "persuaded by the conventional wisdom of the day concerning the shortage of natural resources. My guess is that the crisis is widely exaggerated for a variety of tendentious political reasons."

As I wrote to the editor of the economic journal, my proposals were not put forward as definitive solutions, and I could wish for nothing more than a crash program of research that would explore the full implications of my proposals and various alternatives, to see which, if any, solutions would be workable. And the congressman's comment, that the issues involved deserve widespread discussion, matches precisely my own view. But the comment of the editor of the popular intellectual journal who refused to publish it seems to me to reveal the deeper source of the difficulty.

For, as I said in a recent piece in the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*: "The heart of many so-called social problems is not cognitive at all, . . . but may be that we cannot decide which values we prefer, or are unwilling to pay the cost of what we want, or accept the necessity for certain sacrifices,

trade-offs, and compromises. We may not want to know that we cannot eat our cake and have it too, that there are no 'free lunches,' that imposed equality of income destroys incentives, that exponential growth cannot continue indefinitely, and so on, because we prefer comforting illusions to sober realities."

I strongly suspect, though of course I cannot prove, that the widespread resistance to the idea of resource shortages, and the suspicion that it is a myth propagated for a "variety of tendentious political reasons," are related to the repression mode of reaction to the fear of death. Bolstered by the religious tenet that an all-powerful and loving god has promised man eternal life and has told him to go forth, multiply, and dominate the earth, the true believer cannot entertain the thought that the ultimate heirs might receive only a wasteland. Thus, a climate of opinion is developed in which it is unthinkable that built-in shortages really exist, since this would uncover the illusions by means of which we repress our fear of death.

The path of fear transcendence is quite different. It is then acknowledged that the individual must, in any case, die; but the question is seriously asked whether he can in some degree rob death of its sting by contributing to the perpetuation of the kind of life he represents. In other animal species this may require the sacrifice of life in battle or to divert marauders, and during the larger part of man's existence this was largely true also of our own species. In the twentieth century, however, it has become clear that the genetic makeup of most surviving groups is much alike, and that the destructive power of modern weapons is so great as to imperil the survival of all groups in the event of major war. What is important, then, is the survival of human culture; and the new technology of communications and recording may even make it possible for more and more of the cultural contributions of individuals to enter into the historical record, and be handed down to future generations.

If I can help to make a better world for my children and their children to live in, and leave some enduring record of how I tried to help, this is all the immortality to which I aspire, and I shall be content, when the time comes, and so many of my experiences are painful ones, to cease having new experiences. Even unending joy would ultimately become a bit of a bore. Once I have reached life's summit, and enjoyed all I am capable of enjoying, and if I can have the satisfaction of having helped to make human life more secure, then I shall be glad to stop. I may still fear death, but I shall recognize it as an instinctive reaction—a heritage of my animal nature, which my human reason assures me I need not take too seriously. Indeed, to die with dignity and a sense of transcending one's instinctive fears is one of the supreme triumphs of human life.

Before concluding, there are two basic questions I feel I must at least try to answer: 1) Is not the survival of our species and its culture also an illusion—must it not ultimately die, as individuals do? and 2) Even if contributing to the prolongation of the life of our species helps the individual to transcend his fears of his own death, is such a prolongation of the life of our race a good in itself, or simply an illusion that makes it easier for the individual to overcome his own fear of dying?

On the first question it must be conceded that, on the basis of the present scientific world view, the outlook for the permanent survival of our race seems dim. Sooner or later our present solar system will become unsuitable to sustain human life, and, as

presently conceived, the distances of interstellar space, the human life span, and the speed of light make it hard to imagine that human society and culture could be transposed to other solar systems even if suitable locales should exist elsewhere in the universe. Nevertheless, it is far from inconceivable that, in time, spaceships equipped with self-sufficient human communities, and permanent life-support systems, and miniature records of the bulk of human history, science, and the arts, could permanently leave our solar system in substantial numbers in the hope of finding congenial abodes elsewhere in the universe—and that one or more of them might be successful. But what if our universe as a whole is fated to expand continuously and end with dispersed cosmic dust, or collapse ultimately into one or more “black holes”? In thinking about such possibilities I think we need to bear firmly in mind that a great deal of current speculation and belief about the physical universe is bound to be wrong. Science, after all, is still in its infancy. Most of the scientists who ever lived are alive today, and our present notions of the universe are largely philosophical speculations erected on a rather slim data base, ignoring many incongruities. It seems reasonable to assume that another million years of intensified scientific research and exploration, if this could be achieved, would radically change our conception of what the universe is really like.

I should add that “ultimately” may be a very long time, possibly billions and billions of years, and that a tragedy long deferred may be a tragedy minimized. A species that had fully developed and long enjoyed its highest potentialities might take its leave with less fierce regrets and sense of tragedy than one whose career had barely begun. Certainly we feel this to be true in the case of an individual. Moreover, there is considerable difference between unavoidable destruction from external forces and avoidable self-destruction from blindness, stupidity, cupidity, inflexibility, and indifference. The most poignant tragedies are those in which the protagonist precipitates his own downfall—as the tragedians of ancient Greece already perceived.

To come now to our final question: Would the destruction of mankind be genuinely tragic? A friend of mine once remarked that the death of an individual, leaving behind him grieving relatives and friends, might be tragic, but the sudden termination of mankind, as by a nuclear holocaust, would not be tragic, since there would be nobody left to mourn. I deeply disagree. Even if—as is quite unlikely—death could be mercifully sudden and total, this would not detract from the essential tragedy. For the crux of the tragedy is not the grief of the mourners, but the terrible waste of potential.

The music that Bach has composed would no longer be heard, the plays that Shakespeare has written would no longer be read or seen, the knowledge that mankind has laboriously acquired, of the composition of the stars and the atom, would no longer be transferred to eager and curious minds; nor would any new knowledge be acquired, or new art created; no thrilling chess games would be played, no mountains would be admired, climbed, or skied down; no great vignettes would be savored, no lovers would embrace, no children would be educated; no deeds of kindness, justice, or mercy would be done, no meetings for worship would be held. These are, of course, almost random examples. What I am really saying is that all the values that man has created and that give worth, above that of mere life and sentience, to human existence, would cease to be experienced. And this waste, this nonfulfillment of the best that we know to exist, would be tragic.

It is simply not true that if there were no humans left to appreciate the tragedy, it would cease to be tragic. The acorn falling in the remote virgin forest creates a sound even if no one is there to hear it—the sound being the air wave that would be identified as sound by a normal ear drum in a healthy person if one were present. Similarly, the end of our race would be tragic because the loss of all these potential experiences of good would sadden most human consciences if they could know of it and could become fully aware of what was being lost.

If we were wiped out, would not evolution create a new race like ourselves? Possibly—but possibly not, in a world despoiled of resources and filled with destructive radiation. We simply don't know what peculiar mutations and accidental conjunctions of environmental conditions are responsible for our evolving as we have. And even if a new race could evolve with our capabilities, would they not finally face the selfsame problems we face today? It seems to me that we are as capable of solving these problems as another race of hominids would be, and, after all, it is only we who can assure the survival of us. It is irresponsible to assume that the human race may be given a second chance for survival—posthumously!

One final, personal observation, relating to matters of faith rather than observation or logic: It seems significant somehow that, in the one small corner of the universe that we inhabit, the universe has developed a capacity to know itself, to symbolize itself in art, and to celebrate itself in collective worship. It is hard to believe that this has happened by sheer accident, through the random collision of atoms in space. Rather, it seems to reflect some purpose of an indwelling spiritual force, whose existence we can at times intuitively sense, but whose characteristics remain shrouded in mystery. Since evil manifestly exists, it seems unlikely that this force is all-powerful (though some traditional religions, ignoring the problem of evil, try to make us believe so). Yet this spiritual force seems to appeal to our loyalty to help defend and preserve the continued existence of knowing, feeling, and caring, which constitute the heart of the human experience, and the loss of which is what men fear in dying. To have it totally disappear, not just for myself, but for others like myself who might exist in future, and to have this happen as a result of our own blindness and inflexibility, would seem to me the very essence of tragedy. And it is by participating in a world-wide movement to prevent this tragedy from occurring that we can best transcend our fear of the small tragedies represented by our individual deaths.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a commitment in Illinois yesterday, I was unable to be present and voting on several issues during the day's proceedings. If I had been present, I would have voted in the following way:

On H.R. 5043, bankruptcy tax rules, “yea.”

On H.R. 4088, sale of obsolete vessels, “yea.”

On H.R. 6410, paperwork reduction, “yea.”

On agreeing to the conference report to H.R. 2222, to extend the time for commencing actions on behalf of an Indian tribe (Indian claims), “no.”●

DR. W. G. RHEA

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues a recent newspaper article about a dedicated constituent of the Seventh District of Tennessee. I have had the honor of being friends with Dr. W. G. Bill Rhea for many years. His service to his fellow men, women, and children of Paris, Tenn., is legend and I am happy to report has not gone unnoticed. I join my friends at the Paris Post-Intelligencer in paying respect to Dr. Rhea.

The article follows:

[From the Paris Post-Intelligencer, Mar. 11, 1980]

DR. RHEA: 50 YEARS, STILL AT IT
(By Betty Cardwell McIntyre)

He relaxed his lean 6-foot-6-inch frame in a swivel chair, ran long, slender fingers through his grey hair and smiled as he recalled the “most satisfactory days” of his medical career—days when a dining room table was used to perform surgery in the home and days when he delivered healthy babies at home to proud mothers and scared fathers.

After graduating from Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, W. G. (Bill) Rhea served his internship at U.S. Marine Hospital and Staten Island General Hospital, both in New York City, and his residency in surgery at U.S. Marine Hospital in Stapleton, N.Y. His residency in gynecology and obstetrics was obtained at Woman's Hospital in New York City.

“When I was at Staten Island I met this pretty dietician from Savannah, GA., named Marian Travis Green. In 1929 we married, and a year later we came to Paris with our infant daughter, Betty,” said the doctor, whose name has become as prominent in Paris education as it has in medicine during his 50 year practice.

The Rheas had no intention of staying in Paris more than three years. “I wanted to be in touch with the people,” he said, “before going back to Kansas City, Kan., where I graduated from high school. I had my plans made to teach at the University.”

Dr. George Boone was practicing medicine in Paris. He and Rhea had gone through medical school together. “George and I ran a boarding house for the boys in Nashville our last four years. Sometimes we didn't get paid, but we managed to make enough to get us through graduation,” Rhea said.

“It was the first of March, 1930, when we came to Paris and I went into practice with George at the Wiggins Clinic,” continued the doctor. “Marian, Betty and I lived in the basement of the clinic, as we didn't have the money to rent a place. The first four months George and I made less than \$100 each after we paid our bills.”

Wiggins Clinic was actually a hospital with room for about 10 patients. There were complete surgery facilities and a nursery. I performed my first surgery on a man from Erin who had an obstruction in the nasal passage. The date was Mar. 18, 1930. The

first baby I delivered in the hospital was a girl to Mr. and Mrs. A. N. Caldwell on April 28 of the same year.

"We use to do home deliveries. I remember one woman in Erin who gained up to 300 pounds during her pregnancy. When it came time for her to deliver she had edema and was having convulsions.

"The doctors in Erin called me to come attend her. When the nurse and I arrived I found she had to have a Caesarean section. Dr. Boone Sr. assisted me, and Dr. Atkins gave her drop ether. We delivered a fine healthy baby, but when we were ready to leave we couldn't find her husband. He was a little man that couldn't have weighed over 115 pounds. We looked everywhere and finally found him hiding in the barn. He was too scared to stay around the house.

"When I first came to Paris we were charging \$25 for pre-natal, delivery and post-natal care. A lot of times I got the \$25 in food and vegetables instead of cash.

"People were real hesitant about coming to the hospital. We were still making house calls until the second World War arrived. Camp Tyson brought 10,000 more people into the area, and although they had a hospital at the camp, many servicemen and their families came to private hospitals."

Before his first year in Paris was completed, the Rhea family moved out of the basement and into an apartment where the Paris Playhouse is presently located. "On the other side were Lanny and Ruth Culley who became dear friends. Lanny died, but Ruth is still our friend," he said. Later, the couple rented a house on the corner of Walnut and Park Streets, and in 1934 Dr. Boone and Dr. Rhea built homes side-by-side on Dunlap Street.

"Our family was growing," Rhea said. "Gardner was about 11 months old when we moved. All of our children seemed to pick a holiday to arrive. Betty was born on Armistice Day. I delivered Gardner on Christmas Eve and delivered Jim on the day before Easter in 1944. Both of the boys grew up to become doctors."

"It's funny how people think some medical techniques were discovered in the past 10 years," he continued. "Take artificial insemination as an example. We were doing artificial insemination back in 1929 at Woman's Hospital and having good success with them."

In 1930, the doctors purchased the clinic and doubled the size of the building. In 1945, the name was changed to Nobles Memorial Hospital in memory of Mrs. Dan Nobles, a patient at the hospital who made it possible for the doctors to borrow money for the addition.

The hospital doors were closed in 1970, and it became Rhea Clinic. A complete renovation of the building was made the following year.

Bill Rhea, the doctor, became widely known. He was the first chief of staff at Henry County General Hospital, the local surgeon for L&N Railroad, the Paris health officer for 40 years at the salary of \$1 per year, and in the U.S. Medical Reserve Corps for 16 years.

"It really upset me when I was relieved of my commission in 1942, because the Army said, as a doctor, I was more essential in the community than I was for active service," Rhea said.

He has had three medical articles published and has been a Diplomate of National Board of Medical Examiners since 1928, which gives him a license to practice in any state in the U.S. following a personal interview.

Bill Rhea, the man, has also become known for his donations and civic activities.

Sizable donations by Dr. Rhea and his wife made possible the W. G. Rhea School, the new library building, a trust for the Rhea School Parent Teachers Association and the Henry County High School Annual Academic Scholarship Charitable Trust in honor of the Rotary Club, of which he has been a member since 1930. He has served as president of the local club and as Governor of District 676 of Rotary International. For 19 years he served on the Paris Special School District Board and has continued his interest in education through the years.

Asked why he and his wife have been so generous with their donations, the doctor replied, "As time went on I became more successful. We made up our minds to keep our bills paid and save a portion of our income.

"In 1943 we began investing in stock in a small way. Year by year we increased our investing through our savings accounts and we were fortunate in acquiring good stock.

"The main reason Marian and I have donated our money is the people in this area have been very good to us. They gave us their confidence. Marian and I felt the donations we made were our way of showing our appreciation to the people. No person will fully realize the inward satisfaction Marian and I have received. Everything we have given we have received back double in happiness.

As a member of the First United Presbyterian Church, Rhea taught the Men's Bible Class for more than 25 years. "For 10 years we broadcasted the class over the radio," he said. "This was some of the hardest work I have done, but it is something I am really proud of. I miss it even today. I also miss George, my friend for so many years. George and his family moved to Arizona in 1945 for his child's health. After he retired from practice, he moved to Ohio where he died.

"No, I have no intention of retiring. I stopped doing major surgery about 1970, but I still do minor surgery here in the clinic. I operate the clinic and I have 20 employees. I am responsible for. My employees and my patients are part of my family, and I am happier when I have them around.

"Inez Irion went to work as bookkeeper and receptionist in 1934. She is now my business manager. Florence Winsett has been with us for 44 years, and Virgil Noss, our lab technician, has been here 42 years.

"Theresa Clement Veazey, the operating room supervisor, has 30 years with us; Mildred Teague Porter, Dr. Walter Griffey's office assistant, has 28 years; Rilla Teague Edwards has been with us 26 years; Barbara Muzzall has been my office assistant for 24 years; and Jack Bell, my maintenance man and my right hand in running the physical part of this building, has been here 15 years.

"The rest of our employees have been here from 2 to 13 years. We have a fine staff of doctors. John Neumann joined the clinic in July of 1949. Walter Griffey came in July 1964. Thomas Minor joined us in February of 1966, and Terry Harrison became a member of the staff in August of 1978. Yes, they are my family and I love each of them.

"It has been a long time since I delivered babies and performed surgery with the aid of flashlights in the home, but sometimes it seems like yesterday. The past 50 years have been full ones for Marion and me. We have never regretted our decision to stay in Paris and plant our roots in Henry County soil to become part of the community we love." ●

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, after almost 400 years of foreign occupation and domination, the proud men and women of Greece declared their independence and began the struggle to liberate ancient Hellas. Under the administration of President James Monroe, the American people supported the Greek patriots, recognizing the contribution of ancient Greece to Western civilization, as well as the many heroic achievements of Greek freedom fighters in our own War of Independence.

The contributions made to American society by citizens of Greek heritage have been legion. It is appropriate that on April 12, 1980, the Hellenic Voters of America will honor five of these citizens at their first annual Most Distinguished Greek-Americans Awards dinner. The honorees are: Dr. Labros Anagnostopoulos, for his fight against heart disease in children; Judge James Geroulis, for his achievements in more than 20 years on the bench; Mr. Peter Mantzoros as the distinguished editor and publisher of the Chicago Pnyx; my former colleagues in the Illinois House of Representatives; State Senator Samuel Maragos for his fine work in the general assembly; and Mr. Nick Skoutzos who has worked for years building a fine business from scratch while never forgetting the importance of helping those in need.

As we see the ideals of independence and self-determination threatened around the globe, it is important that we recognize and celebrate these achievements and the victories won for freedom, so that we never forget their magnitude. It is for this reason that all Americans celebrate Greek Independence Day today. ●

CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL'S ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR: "SENDING A SIGNAL TO THE PHILIPPINES"

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very fine article written by our colleague, Congressman Tony P. Hall.

The article is from the Christian Science Monitor of March 19, 1980. It demonstrates the expert information which Congressman Hall has acquired as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Congressman Hall concludes in his article that:

*** the United States must apply pressure upon Marcos to hold free elections so that the Philippine people can determine their own destiny in a Democratic climate—while that is still a possibility.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 19, 1980]

SENDING A SIGNAL TO THE PHILIPPINES
(By TONY P. HALL)

As part of the security assistance request for the coming fiscal year, the administration is seeking congressional approval of \$25 million in grant military assistance and \$50 million in foreign military sales credits for the Philippines. This budget request carries out the gentlemen's agreement between President Carter and President Marcos that the administration would use its "best effort" to obtain a total of \$500 million in security assistance funding for the Philippines over the five fiscal years following the Military Bases Agreement concluded between the two countries in early 1979.

Last year, during committee consideration of military aid for the Philippines, I offered an amendment to reduce grant military assistance to that country by \$7.9 million. This amendment was adopted by the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs but later overturned by the full Foreign Affairs Committee.

Since grant military assistance is being phased out by the administration this year, I intend to offer an amendment in committee to reduce foreign military sales credits for the Philippines. In my opinion, the need for such a cut is even more compelling this year.

A cut in military assistance would convey a twofold message. First, it would signal the Marcos regime that the United States wants to see martial law lifted and democratic processes and civil liberties fully restored. Second, it would indicate to the growing opposition forces in the Philippines that the United States does not wish to be identified with the repression of the Marcos government.

It will be argued that we cannot cut or defer military assistance because such assistance is an integral part of the bases agreement. However, security assistance was not included in the text of the official agreement. Instead, the aid commitment was made in a letter from President Carter to President Marcos in which he pledged the administration's "best effort" to secure the \$500 million package over a five-year period.

Significantly, the letter made no specific commitment for a fixed amount for any of the particular fiscal years covered. There is nothing sacred or untouchable about the security assistance request this year for the Philippines. Under the very terms of the administration's commitment to Marcos, the "best effort" it has pledged can bear fruit in any of the remaining fiscal years—at a time when martial law has been lifted and the democratic processes restored.

In 1979, we saw the failure of shortsighted policies which tied the United States to the Shah in Iran and to Somoza in Nicaragua. The media are far ahead of both Congress and the administration in pointing to the Philippines as the next "Iran" or "Nicaragua."

President Marcos is a wily and skillful manipulator of world opinion. He knows when to release political prisoners, hold bogus local elections, and otherwise ease up on oppressive policies. He also may be the beneficiary this year of the heightened security consciousness which seems to be sweeping the country in the wake of the Russian invasion of Afghanistan.

Given the turmoil in that part of the world, the bases in the Philippines are likely to assume renewed importance of those concerned about the strategic interests of the United States. If Subic Bay and Clark Air Force Base are vital to our security, we must not lose them in the long run through the application of a policy that seeks to save them in the short run.

The successors of Marcos no doubt will recall the support given Marcos by the United States and hold the United States responsible for complicity in the abuses carried out under Marcos. Reducing security assistance to Marcos would demonstrate that the United States favors the early restoration of the democratic tradition in the Philippines suspended by Marcos. Continued failure to hold free national elections only postpones the day of reckoning in the Philippines and strengthens the position in the post-Marcos era of those elements potentially hostile to the US base presence.

In Nicaragua, Somoza succeeded in systematically repressing moderate democratic alternatives to his regime. The Sandinistas became the only workable opposition force. A similar situation could occur in the Philippines.

If democracy is not restored and the moderate opposition has no other alternative, a radical liberation front could become the umbrella for the disaffected. The United States must apply pressure upon Marcos to hold free elections so that the Filipino people can determine their own destiny in a democratic climate—while that is still a possibility.

Since the administration has failed to apply such pressure in a clear, public fashion, it is up to the Congress to send a signal to the Philippines. A reduction in foreign military sales credits is an effective way for Congress to do this.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE
CARDINALS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, as the whole world knows, the University of Louisville Cardinals are the champions of college basketball. They won that honor in a hard-fought and well-played game against a fine UCLA team in the NCAA finals last evening at Market Square Arena in Indianapolis.

The Cardinals have been close to the championship before, but this year, under their outstanding coach, Denny Crum, and led by the high-flying Darrell Griffith, the Cards, with style, grace, and tremendous ability prevailed in the NCAA finals and took home the bacon.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the Cardinals' NCAA tournament record and the player and staff roster of this outstanding squad:

MIDWEST REGION

Louisville.....	71
Kansas State.....	69
Louisville.....	66
Texas A. & M.....	55

MIDWEST REGION—Continued

Louisville.....	86
LSU.....	66

NCAA FINALS

Louisville.....	80
Iowa.....	72
Louisville.....	59
LSU.....	54

Players: Darrell Griffith, Jerry Eaves, Rodney McCray, Wiley Brown, Derek Smith, Roger Burkman, Steve Clark, Poncho Wright, Tony Branch, Scooter McCray, Daryl Cleveland, Greg Deuser, and Marty Pulliam

Coaches: Denny Crum, Head Coach; Bill Olsen, Asst. Coach; Jerry Jones, Asst. Coach; Wade Houston, Asst. Coach; and Mark McDonald, Graduate Asst.

Staff: Jack Lengyel, Athletic Director; Jerry May, Trainer; Dr. Rudy Ellis, Team Physician; Randy Bufford, Manager; Steve Donohue, Asst. Trainer; Lambert Jemley, Asst. Manager; Joe Yates, Sports Information Director; John Crawley, Asst. SID; Dr. Burt Monroe, Faculty Representative; and Jack Tennant, Radio Play-by-Play.

Once again, many congratulations to the University of Louisville on a job well done. As a native Louisvillian and an alumnus of the University of Louisville's Law School, I take special pride and gratification in representing this great university and its excellent basketball team.

ADDRESSING THE INEQUITIES
OF SOCIAL SECURITY TOWARD
WOMEN

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, almost a year ago, in response to a HEW report which documented the inequitable treatment of women under the social security system, I announced the formation of a special task force on social security and women. In view of her leadership in this area, I appointed Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR to chair this task force. During the past year, the productivity of this special task force has exceeded everyone's expectations. The culmination of the task force's work was a package of legislation recently introduced by Congresswoman OAKAR.

This legislative package includes some very ambitious, very well thought out, and long overdue proposals. It is a package which reflects the drastically changing roles of men and women in society. In its relatively short period of existence, the task force has succeeded in identifying innumerable instances in which the social security system fails to address the needs of women. More importantly, the task force has offered several proposals to remedy oversights that increase in gravity with each passing year.

Every year, more working married women discover to their surprise that

their many years of payroll contributions will avail them naught in social security benefits. Every year, more divorced or widowed homemakers attempt to enter the work force, only to be squeezed in the vice of age discrimination and sex discrimination. These displaced homemakers have no social security protection of their own. Every year, more widows are left to fend for themselves with inadequate survivor's benefits. Every year, as more and more women enter the work force, the social security system becomes less and less able to meet the needs and expectations of women.

Under the diligent and forceful direction of the gentle lady from Ohio, the special task force on social security and women has demonstrated its leadership in this area by introducing a landmark package of legislation. Displaced homemakers, disabled widows, divorcees, and many other women who have fallen through the "cracks in the system" would for the first time be given adequate benefits in their own right, under the proposals.

I am pleased to have cosponsored H.R. 6648, H.R. 6649, H.R. 6650, and H.R. 6651, which propose to remedy the inequities in the social security system which weigh so heavily on millions of vulnerable women. H.R. 6648, which would allow a beneficiary to inherit her deceased spouse's earnings credits, as well as H.R. 6650, which would increase disability protection for widows aged 50 to 59, constitute two of the bare minimum recommendations of the Advisory Council on Social Security. H.R. 6649, which provides for 3-month transition benefit for displaced homemakers, and H.R. 6651, which liberalizes the requirements for spouse's benefits for persons over 50, are proposals which only begin to address the hidden but all-too-real inequities of social security directed toward midlife women.

As ambitious as these four proposals are in terms of recognizing problems heretofore swept under the rug, they constitute but four steps of the long journey toward recognizing the economic rights of women in America. The most dramatic recommendation of the task force, however, would provide for a complete restructuring of the social security benefit formula—a change that would take the system miles down the road toward a fair treatment of women. This proposal would involve the adoption of an earnings-sharing plan, under which a couple would be treated as an economic unit for the purposes of benefit computations. Earnings sharing was deemed a most promising approach for the future of the system by the Advisory Council on Social Security, and I strongly echo their recommendation.

Earnings sharing would end the current discrimination against two-earner couples, and give millions of women valuable social security protection in their own right. Married working women currently are not rewarded for their efforts unless their lifetime aver-

age earnings exceed 50 percent of their husband's. Under present law, these women receive a spouse's benefit, whether they work or not. Similarly, the homemaker, who works very hard indeed, is entitled to a benefit equal to only half of her husband's. In fact, a couple with both spouse receiving a salary of \$10,000 each are actually entitled to a smaller benefit than the one-earner couple with an income of \$19,000, under current law. The failure of the current benefit structure to adapt to the reality of millions of women in the labor force would be addressed by the earnings-sharing system.

H.R. 6647, which I have cosponsored along with Representative OAKAR, would institute a program of voluntary earnings sharing. Because this legislation would not cut back any benefits to which a couple is currently entitled, and because of the modest cost of the proposal in relation to its far-reaching benefits, I have strongly endorsed this voluntary approach to earnings sharing recommended by the task force.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Aging, I am acutely aware that no government program affects the over 24 million older Americans to the extent that social security does. After careful review of literally thousands of pages of expert testimony presented to the Committee on Aging and the Subcommittee on Retirement Income and Employment, as well as the special task force, I have enthusiastically embraced the earnings-sharing proposal and the other four proposals offered by Congresswoman OAKAR. I would urge the support of every Member of Congress for this innovative and worthy legislative package.

Mr. Speaker, in order to maintain the confidence and support of the 35 million beneficiaries and the 110 million contributors to the social security system, it is imperative that any and all bias against a particular group be removed. Recognition of the instances in which social security discriminates against women has been long overdue. It is imperative that we do not allow an equally long wait for a fair and adequate remedy. ●

SALUTE TO REINHART KNUDSEN—PIONEER IN SUBURBAN NEWSPAPERING

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I take this opportunity today to recognize one of my constituents who has contributed significantly to American journalism and to communities throughout the Sacramento area.

Mr. Reinhart Knudsen, editor of Sacramento Suburban Newspapers, Inc., will be retiring from active news-

papering at the end of this month. However, after more than half a century of historymaking in the newspaper business, Mr. Knudsen's progressive ideas and outstanding contributions will continue for years to come, both within the communities he served and within the vast network of newspapers he pioneered.

Born in 1915 in Portland, Oreg., Mr. Knudsen began his journalism career at an early age, winning his first award in fifth grade. During his early years, he sold newspapers on street corners. In 1937, he received a journalism degree from the University of Oregon.

Mr. Knudsen's wide array of experience within the newspaper field between 1936 and 1947 testifies to his contributions to the journalism profession. During this time, he served as a reporter for the Eugene News, the Laredo Times, the Austin Tribune, the Oregon Journal, Kaiser Shipyard Newspapers, and the 2d Division Spearhead.

Between 1947 and 1960, Mr. Knudsen reinforced his newspaper experience by serving with the Portland advertising firm of Botsford, Constantine & Gardner.

In 1960, he purchased the San Juan Record in Fair Oaks, Calif., beginning a career in the Sacramento area that had communitywide impact for years to come.

Mr. Knudsen brought with him to Fair Oaks new, innovative concepts in newspapering. Over the years, he brought together a network of 11 suburban newspapers into a single family of independently operated community publications. Through his experience in the newspaper field, Knudsen recognized the special needs of the many communities comprising the Sacramento area and translated these needs into reality through his newspapers.

Today, the Sacramento Suburban Newspapers family is comprised of the following publications, each with its own unique character, and each addressing the particular needs of the community it serves: Citrus Heights Bulletin, Sacramento Suburban, Rancho Cordovan, East Yolo Record, Carmichael Citizen, North Highlander, East Sacramento Sun, Orangevale News, Folsom Telegraph, Foothill Reporter, and Southside Shopper.

Mr. Knudsen has won numerous awards for his community and professional contributions, including: Essay Award, Editor & Publisher Magazine (1936); Chamber of Commerce Community Service Awards in Fair Oaks (1970) and Carmichael (1964); Quill and Scroll Merit Award (1964); San Juan Teachers Association Service to Education Award (1968); Cal Tex Media Awards for Reporting and Editorials (1973 and 1978); Optimist Award for "Editorialist of the Year" (1972); Lions Club Public Service Award (1975); and Freedoms Award from Foundation at Valley Forge (1979).

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate this week to honor Mr. Knudsen for his many accomplishments and for these well-documented contributions to the field of journalism and to the people he has served over the years. Mr. Knudsen's achievements serve as an inspiration to those in the newspaper field, as well as to the many young people throughout the Nation who are now embarking on careers in journalism. ●

NATIONAL HERITAGE POLICY
ACT, H.R. 6504

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I have recently become a cosponsor of the administration's National Heritage Policy Act, H.R. 6504, and I would like to share with my colleagues the reason for my support.

Since its creation 2 years ago, I have observed with interest the growth and development of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. My attention was particularly drawn to the Department of the Interior's heritage conservation programs a year and a half ago, when an incident in my district made me aware of shortcomings in the designation process in the national historic landmarks program. At that time, I was working with city of Lansing officials and the Economic Development Administration on a plan to raze the abandoned Diamond Reo Motor Car Co. plant that had sat vacant for 4 years in order to make way for new industrial development and neighborhood restoration. Matters were proceeding well when I read in the local newspaper that eight buildings in the 40-acre complex had been designated as national historic landmarks. Needless to say, I was shocked by the public announcement of this designation about which I had no knowledge in advance.

I had never even been notified that the site was being recommended for designation. Nor had the city officials or the owners of the property. Nor, for that matter, had the Federal officials from the Economic Development Administration with whom we were working. All of us were completely in the dark, and all of us were outraged that our first hint that a Federal project could affect the work we had been doing for so many months came from reading a newspaper report about an accomplished fact. Worse, when we tried to inquire about the possibility of reversing the designation decision, we were told that nothing could be done. The process by which that designation had been made involved no cooperation, no prior notice, no public involvement. It was almost as if the process had been designed to insure a confrontation of adversaries.

This incident made it clear to me that public notice and participation, and official consultation in the national historic landmark designation process was seriously inadequate. In discussions with Secretary Andrus and Director Delaporte, I made clear my objection to the fact that congressional notification came only after designation of the Reo Motor Car Plant and that local officials and citizens were not consulted during the process. The fact that there was no opportunity for public hearings and for reviewing the record turned out to be critically important in this case. As we later learned, the research on which the recommendation for designation was based turned out to be inadequate and inaccurate. Buildings in the Diamond Reo complex thought to be associated with Ransom E. Olds were not in fact associated with Olds after all. The manufacturing products alleged in the research to have come from the Diamond Reo complex turned out to have come from buildings in Lansing that were already being protected. Misinformation of this sort can easily be corrected if it is allowed to see the light of day. But it can live forever to do untold damage if it is allowed to lead a subterranean existence.

I'm grateful that Director Delaporte agreed with me about the need for sunshine. He took a closer look at the program and suspended all designations until more open regulations and procedures could be developed and adopted. I am pleased that the interim regulations published in the Federal Register for comment in December 1979, require broad notification and opportunity for comment on proposed national historic landmark designations.

Let me emphasize that public accountability and openness is a necessity not only for the national historic landmark program but throughout the historic preservation and natural heritage programs. We have before us now legislation that addresses the identification and protection of our heritage resources. I fully believe in the value of heritage conservation. But I would like to point out that the Federal Government will play a meaningful role in preserving our country's heritage only if its programs command the respect of public officials and are fully integrated into the mainstream of planning in this country. Consultation with local officials and citizens is absolutely imperative. I hope the legislative history and record of these hearings will conclusively direct that all heritage resource programs require consultation and give a high priority to coordination with local officials and citizen input.

The proposed National Heritage Policy Act seeks to improve coordination and facilitate the exchange of cultural and natural resource information. I believe that the provisions of H.R. 6504 provide a framework for the

consultation, openness and public accountability that are crucial to the protection of our heritage resources, and I am pleased to join in supporting this legislation. ●

FIGHTING INFLATION WITHOUT
RECESSION

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is no great secret to the people of this country that the No. 1 problem facing us today is inflation, a problem which affects us all every day of the year. In recent weeks there have been a plethora of proposals written in journals and magazines trying to give us answers to this problem. Many of the reports I have gone over have been vague and confusing. But I recently read one by Irving Zuckerman, formerly Assistant Director for Planning and Budget, Office of Coal Research, Department of the Interior. It offers an insight to inflation rarely seen and I would like to take this opportunity to share it with you in the hope it will shed some new light on an old problem.

I insert this instructive article into the RECORD:

FIGHTING INFLATION WITHOUT RECESSION

(By Irving Zuckerman)

My tax accountant phoned me again, and during our conversation he reminded me that when I mentioned fighting inflation previously, I did not look to recession but looked to fundamental underlying dislocations which have accumulated out of previous production periods. I told him that the current production periods contribute little to inflation. We have already had several recent recessions during which inflation continued with only slight changes in rate. And so our previous discussion was resumed:

HIM. What do you see as the origin of the ongoing inflation?

ME. It seems to me that there are two major factors which cause inflation, and one minor factor which may even contribute some deflation. The inflation seems to result from the accumulation of "store of value" dollars, and the two factors I have in mind are two sources of that accumulation. One source of the accumulation of "store of value" dollars, is the annual deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. After years of such imbalances between dollars going out and dollars coming back, there is now abroad a huge amount of "store of value" dollars. Those dollars represent potential claims on the U.S. Gross National Product and potential claims on U.S. assets. Until 1971 those claims could be offered for redemption in gold, but since 1971 claims can be made only for redemption in goods and services, and in capital assets. The accumulation of "store of value" dollars abroad is huge.

HIM. Is that why the dollar has had a tendency to decline in relation to other currencies?

ME. Yes, and the dollar also has had a tendency to decline in terms of U.S. foreign trade. The dollar bought less and less abroad, which is to say that the dollar bought at a relatively higher price abroad,

whether directly or through other currencies.

HIM. Why do you think of the dollars accumulated abroad as "store of value" dollars?

ME. I distinguish the accumulation of those deficits abroad from the current balance of payment accounts. The current balance of payments accounts involve "medium of exchange" dollars and some of those become "store of value" dollars when there is a deficit in the balance of payments.

HIM. Is that what Eurodollars are, "store of value" dollars that were accumulated from annual balance of payments deficits?

ME. That certainly would be the major source of the Eurodollars fundamentally, but there might be some other sources of Eurodollars as well.

HIM. What is the second source of "store of value" dollars you have in mind?

ME. In the United States there is a domestic annual or current deficit that is something like the annual or current deficit in the balance of payments. The annual or current deficit is the difference between what the entrepreneurs as a group receive in sales revenues, in contrast with what the entrepreneurs as a group pay out during production. In the national income accounts, the entrepreneur disbursements are shown as wage payments, interest payments, dividend payments, and rent payments. It is generally appreciated that if the national incomes are not fully getting back to the entrepreneur group, there is a tendency toward a "deflationary gap" in the short term. The dollars being paid out during production are "medium of exchange" dollars, and they continue to be "medium of exchange" dollars while the national income is being spent on their way to returning to the entrepreneur group which originated them. However, there is an annual or current deficit which becomes "store of value" dollars and which accumulates over the years into a domestic "store of value" potential claims in the Gross National Product and assets. Those claims are redeemed when they are offered in the U.S. markets, whether directly or indirectly. In the U.S. markets there is no distinction between "store of value" dollars accumulated from the past production periods, and the "medium of exchange" dollars which comes with the current production and services. Since there is an annual or current deflationary gap, a certain amount of "store of value" claims can be readily accommodated without it turning out to be "too many dollars chasing too few goods." But the accumulation of "store of value" dollars grows in size as the years pass, and if the producing capacity does not expand to accommodate increased annual claims there develops a persistent excess of dollars demanding goods and services.

So I would want to hasten the production of goods and services, rather than to retard the production of goods and services, because dollars are coming into the markets in larger and larger amounts, whether "medium of exchange" dollars from current production, or "store of value" dollars from past periods.

HIM. It is puzzling, then, to think of the recession approach as workable if we have to sustain and increase production. The recession approach might even cause some of my clients to go into bankruptcy.

ME. The alternative is to look at the huge accumulation of "store of value" dollars which we inherited from past production periods, the same way that we look at a huge wheat crop that is reducing the exchange value of wheat, for example. In the government programs to deal with surpluses of wheat, the aim is to reserve some of the wheat crop in granaries in sufficient quantity to support the exchange value (price) of

the wheat. A similar "dollar granary" or "dollar-trust" could be used to keep "store of value" dollars from being redeemed too fast for goods, services, or assets. Possibly that would involve substituting some kind of "dollar-trust" bonds maturing over a series of future years. As those "dollar-trust" bonds mature they would be paid for with dollars from the trust. Since this would be a service to the present holders of the "store of value" dollars in supporting the purchasing power of those dollars, it might be that a refundable tax might serve to create the "dollar-granary."

HIM. If it is a service to the present holders of the "store of value" dollars, why think of it as a "refundable tax"? Why not think of it as a "refundable service charge" or "insurance premium"?

ME. The general idea is to stop the declining exchange-value of the dollar. That is what inflation involves. The inflation rate is the rate at which the purchasing power of the dollar is declining. The sooner we deal with the accumulated "store of value" dollars, both domestic and Eurodollar accumulations, the sooner we will stop the inflation.

HIM. Did you say "stop the inflation"?

ME. We should be aiming to stop the inflation, not merely to slow it down. It might even be easier to stop inflation entirely than to slow it down.

HIM. How can we prevent the accumulation of "store of value" dollars in the first place? Is that possible?

ME. It seems to be possible, and part of that effort would be to stop using government deficits to deal with annual deflationary gaps, and instead making sure that the "medium of exchange" dollars do not "leak" into "store of value" status.

HIM. As a practical matter, is it possible to separate the flow of "store of value" dollars from the flow of "medium of exchange" dollars?

ME. It is an accounting systems problem which should not be too difficult. It seems to have much more potential for dealing with inflation than the recession approach.

HIM. What does the term "stagflation" refer to?

ME. It might well be that the annual deflationary gap which causes "stagnation" in the short-run, actually provides the "store of value" dollars brought forward from they cause "inflation" in the long-run.

HIM. So the "too many dollars" now in the markets of the economy have more than one source?

ME. Yes, at any given time the dollars chasing the current GNP and existing assets are "store of value" dollars brought forward from previous production periods, as well as the "medium of exchange" dollars paid out by the entrepreneurs during production of the current GNP.

HIM. And you said before that the "store of value" dollars brought forward from prior production periods were mostly accumulated from annual deficits.

ME. That's right, it seems that in addition to the "store of value" dollars accumulated abroad from annual balance of payments deficits, there would be an annual addition of "store of value" dollars from the annual deficit in the flow of "medium of exchange" dollars back to the entrepreneur group.

HIM. What about the annual deficit in the federal budget?

ME. The federal deficits result from annual federal outlays which exceed the federal tax receipts.

HIM. Does that mean that the federal deficits contribute annually to the accumulation of "store of value" dollars?

ME. So it would seem. But it is likely that the annual deficit in the private sector which seems to contribute to inflation in

the long-run is much greater than the annual deficit in the public sector which also contributes to inflation in the long-run. And I have in mind that the annual private-sector deficit is both a domestic deficit and balance of payments deficit.

HIM. Why can a large accumulation of "store in value" dollars take place with less attention than is given to federal deficits and the balance of payments deficits?

ME. It is possible that there ought to be a "Domestic Bank of Settlements" to do domestically what the International Bank of Settlements does internationally. Then we might more readily deal with the causes of inflation as they occur, rather than cope with the inflation itself after the accumulation has become too large for the current GNP to accommodate. The accumulated "store of value" dollars are potential claims against the GNP and existing assets. When the potential claims become active claims at too rapid an annual rate, unless the GNP has grown enough in the interim, there will be a situation of "too many dollars chasing too few goods."

HIM. Would you curb current production which generates "medium of exchange" dollars, or would you curb the rate at which "store of value" dollars become active claimants in the markets of the economy?

ME. Since we have "too few goods" relative to dollars, it would seem that the current production should be increased rather than decreased, and that means I would be inclined to curb the rate at which "store of value" dollars become active claimants in the markets of the economy. And to do that, it should be possible to treat the surplus of "store of value" dollars as though it were a surplus of wheat, or a surplus of corn, as to support the exchange-value of the "store of value" dollar. This would apply to the "store of value" dollars accumulated abroad, as well as those accumulated domestically. That could be one of the ways of fighting inflation without recession. We have already had recessions during which inflation continued with small reduction in rate.

THE LAST THING WE NEED IS MORE TAXES

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, it is intolerable that people are proposing higher taxes at a time of soaring inflation and approaching recession. The same President, the same congressional leadership, the same economists who have given us 18 percent inflation now turn around and blame their failures on the American public. They are saying, in effect:

We keep cutting you and you keep bleeding. Because you bleed you must be irresponsible. So we will cut you again and again, and teach you that only through pain, recession, and lower living standards will you again become healthy and happy.

The great failure in Washington is the wish to focus on aggregate figures, to speak of what the Nation needs, to talk in economic terms as described by economists. This leads to disaster, because politics and government exist for human beings. And I doubt if there is any audience in America that would answer "no" if asked whether

energy prices are causing them pain, and "yes" if asked whether they think a 10-cent-per-gallon gas tax will help them. Yet, because of the gas tax and other, already set, tax increases, working Americans will each pay an additional \$900 in taxes during the next fiscal year.

I want to share with my colleagues an Atlanta Journal editorial that incisively addresses itself to these very questions. Will we attempt to balance the budget by raising taxes, or by cutting spending? The editorial came out on Friday, March 14, and it follows:

HIKE TAXES NOW?

We are disturbed about talk in the administration and in Congress of an oil import tax as part of the new drive to balance the federal budget.

At some other time such a tax might have merit as part of the energy program, as a conservation measure with the revenues from it used for energy-related purposes. But it is not being offered in that context at all.

Instead, it has sprung up in the context of budget revision, as a revenue-producing measure which could bring in some \$13 billion so government spending will not have to be cut so much to balance the budget.

We favor balancing the budget. But it's not just having a deficit that's inflationary; the high rate of government spending is inflationary in itself.

At a time when the proportion of gross national product being consumed by government is approaching the record levels of the World War II years, the budget deficit should be eliminated not by tax increases but by spending cuts.

Furthermore, if they think spending cuts would contribute to a recession, what do they think a tax increase would do? They've been talking about possible tax cuts later if a recession does develop; why raise taxes now and then cut them again in just a few months?

It's miraculous that, for once, politicians seem to think the public would tolerate some tax increase in an election year. But if they really believe the public is that concerned about inflation and the role of the budget deficit in it, then they ought to realize that that public would also tolerate spending cuts in an election year. We think a lot more of us would welcome spending cuts that would welcome any kind of tax increase. The politicians must be awfully confused to think the public is that confused over the current economic mess. ●

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION ACT OF 1980

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, throughout the 96th Congress the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology has been studying the critical issues of innovation and productivity.

Our hearings have covered patent policy, university-industry relations, Federal laboratory utilization, the President's industrial innovation initiatives, high-technology small business, and several other areas. In the United States private enterprise is the

sector of society primarily responsible for providing goods and services. I believe this is appropriate and the Government should not attempt to take on this responsibility. Government, however, must provide an environment in which private enterprise can flourish in both the short- and long-term. If needs for goods and services are not being met by private enterprise the Federal Government should take steps to remove barriers to action by private enterprise. The subcommittee's study has made it clear that efforts of the Federal Government to facilitate technology development are fragmented and too small to provide for a national economy in which innovation can thrive.

Today, I am introducing the National Technology Foundation Act of 1980, a bill designed to correct many of the problems we have found. The bill would establish a National Technology Foundation to facilitate technology development for the national welfare. Joining me as cosponsors of this bill are Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. ETEL, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. ROE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. WATKINS.

Responsibility for technology-related programs is now scattered throughout the Federal Government. The various mission agencies—Department of Defense, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Energy, and so forth—each support technology development related to their missions. The National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce have components directed at technology, but these are minor portions of the budgets of those agencies and are treated as stepchildren by those agencies.

In considering how the Federal Government can most effectively organize itself to support technology for the national welfare, one extreme is to leave programs scattered but to make each the best possible. The other extreme would be to consolidate all science and technology activities of the Federal Government in a single Department of Science and Technology; an idea that received considerable attention in the midseventies during consideration of the bill that became the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976. The idea of a department was not adopted at the same time because of compelling arguments that most science and technology activities should be kept closely tied to the missions which they support—defense, energy, space, health, and so forth, and, hence should be kept as integral parts of the agencies which pursue those missions. The National Technology Foundation bill represents an intermediate position. It would consolidate technology-related activities which are not now closely tied to an agency mission and would insure that the Federal Government will assume additional responsibilities for technol-

ogy which have heretofore not been adequately discharged by any sector of society.

The programs which this bill would consolidate in a single agency might, in theory, be adequately supported in their current homes, the Department of Commerce and the National Science Foundation. This has not been the case. Support has been modest at best. I am reserving judgment on which course of action is best, consolidation in a new agency or strengthening in existing agencies. The bill to establish a National Technology Foundation is a vehicle by which we can focus the discussion of alternatives. If the Department of Commerce and the Science Foundation are unable to strengthen and broaden their current programs, the National Technology Foundation may emerge as the only feasible alternative. Every idea takes time to mature, however, and I do not expect action on this proposal to be overly hasty. I recently came across a bill that was introduced in Congress in 1934 providing for Federal grants for scientific research. That idea took 15 years to mature into the National Science Foundation. While I would expect a good idea to move faster today, that example makes my point. I do plan to hold hearings on the National Technology Foundation bill in the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology this session and to stimulate a thorough discussion of this concept.

WHY A NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION?

The population of the world is growing inexorably while its resources are inexorably being consumed. It does not take a mathematician to determine that per capita consumption in the future cannot match the per capita consumption of an average American today if technology does not improve. Only if there are continual major improvements in technology can the world provide for its inhabitants. The National Technology Foundation would help insure that such progress does occur.

While the U.S. Government has adopted a largely laissez faire attitude toward international trade in high-technology items—other than military hardware—Governments in other countries—most notably Japan—have planned and provided a national atmosphere in which both technology development and the export of high-technology products are carefully nurtured. These other countries have often been highly successful in their efforts. We are buying Sonys, Volkswagens, Datsuns, and Seikos. The international balance of trade has been unfavorable to the United States for several years. It is likely that without a coherent Federal policy of technology development and promotion the United States will not be able to compete effectively in future world trade. The National Technology Foundation would provide a focus for one of the two needs, technology development. The other need, assistance for exports,

should be provided by an expanded and reoriented Department of Commerce and Trade, as several other legislators have recommended.

The United States is faced with seemingly uncontrollable inflation. By finding improved ways to produce and deliver goods and services—and this is the meaning of technological progress—we can make a significant contribution to the efforts to control inflation. The National Technology Foundation would contribute to that process.

High-technology industries have been responsible for the creation of a higher share of new jobs than low-technology industries, and the development of new technologies promises fuller national employment.

The profession that takes knowledge and converts into the design of products and processes is engineering. Engineers take science and turn it into technology. Heretofore there has been inadequate recognition of past and potential contributions of engineers. In the Federal Government, engineering has been dominated by science. In research support, engineering is but part of one branch of the National Science Foundation. There is a National Medal of Science but no National Medal of Technology. The National Academy of Engineering is subordinate to the National Academy of Sciences. Moreover, there is a shortage of engineers in the country today at all levels of training, including a shortage of the most educated; who will be needed to train future generations. The National Technology Foundation would recognize the importance of engineering and help harness its potential.

THE SPECIFIC NEEDS ADDRESSED BY THE NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION

Links between the generation of knowledge and its use need to be strengthened. The National Technology Foundation would help tie science to useful applications. This would be accomplished by several means. First, extramural grants and contracts would be provided to researchers and technologists in areas of science and technology showing promise for useful results. Second, it would disseminate scientific and technical information, and third, it would have, as an integral part, its own science and technology laboratory.

The United States needs to insure that an adequate supply of technological manpower, training or educational institutions, facilities, and equipment is available to it. This country has never had a scientific and technological manpower policy to guide where Federal funds would be best used. As a result the Federal Government has funded the training of too many in some areas and not enough in others. This is a national planning failure that ought to be corrected. The National Technology Foundation would do that.

The bill provides for the establishment of a new type of technology institution called Centers for Industrial

Technology. These centers would join industry and universities in cooperative technology activities including generic research—research on technology of use to many industries, such as welding or microfabrication—and the training of individuals in technology innovation. The President has asked for funds in fiscal year 1981 to initiate four such centers through the National Science Foundation and the Department of Commerce. Congress has been working on other legislation—H.R. 4672 and S. 1250—to authorize these centers. Although I plan to continue consideration of H.R. 4672 separately, the material from that bill has been included in the National Technology Foundation Act because the Foundation ought to have cognizance of the centers.

In order to make sensible decisions about technology and society, there is a need in all sectors of society to understand the workings of technology development, of technology management, and of the interactions of technology with society. The National Technology Foundation would analyze the workings of technology in modern society. It would formulate policies based on these analyses, both for its own operations and for the benefit of other parts of the Federal Government and society as a whole. This function was included in H.R. 4672 as that bill's other major thrust.

Technology, in the sense I am using it, includes not only what comes immediately to mind—machinery, electronics, chemicals, and so forth—but also the structure and management of the human organizations of our society. The Foundation would study technology policy in this broader sense.

The National Technology Foundation would foster high-technology small business. The past performance and the potential of small business are tremendous in high technology. We need more Silicon Valleys and Route 128's, and we need to encourage them in all areas of the country.

State and local governments are a large sector of the national economy. They should be as efficient and productive as possible and need assistance to become so. The National Technology Foundation would encourage and assist State and local governments to be more productive and make better use of science and technology in their operations and decisionmaking.

The inadequacy of the Nation's position in engineering has already been cited. This inadequacy needs to be corrected. The National Technology Foundation would work to see that the Nation has an appropriate supply of engineers. In addition it would provide support for fundamental engineering studies. The bill would provide for national awards in recognition of the accomplishments of engineers, and the National Technology Foundation would bear primary responsibility for nominating award winners.

We are living in a time of rapid change. Degrees of change that once

took a century now come about in a decade. The Nation needs to look down the road and anticipate better what tomorrow will bring. The principal agent of change is technology. The National Technology Foundation would identify emerging national problems and support research and development of solutions to those problems.

The Nation needs to provide incentives for development of innovations, and the Nation needs standards of measurement and product performance or design to permit the efficient flow of commerce. The National Technology Foundation would provide for these needs.

Many, but not all of the needs mentioned above are already being addressed. For example, the Patent Office provides incentives for innovation, and the National Bureau of Standards provides standards. None of the needs is being met with complete adequacy. There is a tremendous need, moreover, for such existing programs as there are to be coordinated more fully. One of the primary accomplishments of establishing a National Technology Foundation with strong central control would be to meet the need for coordination.

DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

The National Technology Foundation Act of 1980 establishes the Foundation as an independent agency in the Federal Government.

STRUCTURE OF THE FOUNDATION

The Foundation would have eight main branches.

First, Office of Small Business.—This office would serve as the focus of the Foundation's small business activities. It would carry out the small business innovation program that would be transferred to it from the National Science Foundation. This program provides funding for the research and development phases of new technology small business and links small business with venture capital for the production phase. The program has been very well received in the small business community and is ripe for expansion. The National Technology Foundation would have authority to operate other types of programs for the development of high-technology small business, as well. Other functions of the Office of Small Business would be to foster communication between scientific and technological agencies of the Federal Government and the small business community, assist high-technology small businesses in dealing with the Federal Government, and recommend policies enabling the Nation to benefit more from high-technology small businesses.

Second, Office of Institutional and Manpower Development.—This office would collect and analyze information on technological manpower, providing quantitative manpower need projections, and would provide for adequate training and educational institutions

for technological manpower to meet the needs. The Foundation would provide support as necessary directly to individuals to obtain training, provide support to existing institutions, such as schools of engineering, support the development of new curricula or training programs, and support with funding—or if need be operate—new kinds of institutions—for example the centers for industrial technology authorized by the act.

Third, Office of Technology Policy and Analysis.—This Office would conduct technology assessments, develop indicators of the health of technology, study the effects of technology on the economy and vice versa—including foreign trade matters—study the impacts of policies on technology, identify emerging problems, and make recommendations for steps with the potential for advancing technological innovation. In short, this office would be the brain of the Foundation. Two existing parts of the National Science Foundation's Division of Policy Research and Analysis would be transferred to this office to form a nucleus of its activities.

Fourth, Office of Intergovernmental Technology.—This Office would facilitate the integration of scientific and technological resources into the policy formulation, management support, and program operations of State and local governments. The intergovernmental programs of the National Science Foundation would be transferred and serve as the nucleus of this Office.

Fifth, Office of Engineering.—This Office would support, by extramural grants and contracts, fundamental research in all engineering disciplines and applied research not adequately supported from other sources. The National Science Foundation's engineering divisions would be transferred to the Office of Engineering and would constitute the initial program of the Office.

Sixth, Office of National Programs.—In conjunction with the Office of Technology Policy and Analysis this Office would identify emerging national problems—for example, novel ways of producing materials—and support basic and applied research leading to their solution. It would also support applied research and development in areas of national interest not adequately supported by other agencies—for example, earthquake hazards reduction. The National Science Foundation's Applied Research and Problem Focused Research Divisions would be transferred to form the core program of the Office initially.

Seventh, National Bureau of Standards.—The Bureau would be transferred intact from the Department of Commerce to the National Technology Foundation. It would continue in its current missions—maintaining measurement standards, performing basic research related to standards, serving as a laboratory for other Federal agencies, and so forth. It would also assist other activities of the Foundation, as

determined by the Director of the Foundation. The act gives authority to the Foundation to support U.S. interests in international voluntary standardization activities, which is not adequate under existing law. The Bureau would be the proper branch of the Foundation to exercise that authority. Whether international activity would be undertaken by Federal employees or by representatives of private voluntary standards organizations with Federal funds is a matter deserving further consideration.

Eighth, Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service.—These two agencies would be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the National Technology Foundation and administered as a single branch of the Foundation. Both agencies deal with the classification and dissemination of scientific and technical information and closer coordination would provide improved service. The Patent and Trademark Office has had a particularly hard time in the Department of Commerce and hearings are underway and will continue regarding the advisability of making it an independent agency. Because the purpose of the Office is to promote technology, it would be more appropriate to incorporate it in a larger entity devoted to the same purpose and having additional functions.

MANAGEMENT OF THE FOUNDATION

The Foundation would have a Director, a Deputy Director, and eight Assistant Directors—one for each branch. It would also have a National Technology Board.

National Technology Board.—The Board would have 24 members and would have powers over the National Technology Foundation similar to those the National Science Board has over the National Science Foundation. Members would be Presidential appointees and would be selected from people eminent in a wide variety of fields. In addition to the variety of professional expertise specified in the bill it would be expected that both big business and small business would be represented on the Board and that nominations for the Board should be solicited widely, including from all member societies of the American Association of Engineering Societies.

The intent of having a Board is to insure that the community of those who will be affected by the Foundation will have a say in the operation of the Foundation. There is considerable risk in any Federal agency either that it will be captured by a narrow segment of its potential community or that it will operate solely under motivations and incentives internal to the Federal Government, thus falling in either event to serve properly. The best way to insure proper service is by control from the community. There is little risk of the Board running amok because the President has control over the Director, the membership of the Board and the budget.

The principal specific functions of the Board would be to establish the policies of the Foundation, review its budget, review its program, and approve any large grants or contracts.

Director and Assistant Directors.—The Director, the Deputy Director and the eight Assistant Directors of the Foundation would be Presidential appointees at executive levels II, III, and IV, respectively. The Director's term of appointment would be 6 years.

In order to permit the strong central operation needed to coordinate activities of the various branches of the Foundation, all authority over the Foundation other than that reserved to the Board, has been given to the Director. The Director may delegate parts of the authority and would be expected to do so, but would always have the ability to take personal control of any aspect of Foundation operations.

COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS

A separate section of the National Technology Foundation Act, section 12 requires close coordination of the Foundation's programs with other activities in technology.

The strongest tie created by the act is between the National Technology Foundation and the National Science Foundation. This is because of the need expressed earlier to strengthen links between the generation of knowledge and its use. One of the virtues of having applied activities in the National Science Foundation has been the closeness of the activities to basic research. The act preserves this virtue by requiring that the membership of the National Technology Board overlap the National Science Board by six to eight members. Terms of service of National Technology Board members are to be of the same length and to have the same starting dates as Science Board members to facilitate the overlap. The act also requires that to the maximum extent feasible extramural basic research support the National Technology Foundation wishes to provide should be channeled through the National Science Foundation. The integrated basic research program of NSF's applied science activities does this kind of channeling now and could be used as a model. This provision would not apply to basic research in engineering since it would be transferred entirely to the Technology Foundation.

Section 12 also requires that the Technology Foundation coordinate programs closely with the Small Business Administration. SBA has not in the past provided strong support for high-technology small business, but it has authority to do so and appears to be moving in this direction. The act gives the Director of SBA the authority to assure that any small business activities of the Foundation do not duplicate SBA activity.

Section 12 requires further that Foundation activities be coordinated with State and local governments. The centers for industrial technology au-

thorized by the act for example, will be of interest to State and local governments and their participation in the centers should be explored.

Other coordination is required in other sections of the act. The President's Office of Science and Technology Policy and Analysis would be assisted in two ways, by support from the Foundation's Office of Technology Policy and Analysis and by staff assistance from the Foundation's Office of Intergovernmental Programs to the Intergovernmental Science, Engineering and Technology Advisory Panel.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

Section 11 of the act establishes a National Technology Medal to be awarded by the President to individuals who are deserving of special recognition by reason of their outstanding contributions to the promotion of technology and technological manpower for the improvement of the economic, environmental, or social well-being of the United States. This would put into a law an award that the President has proposed as part of his industrial innovation initiatives, thus making the award coequal with the National Medal of Science, which is statutory.

Sections 10 and 13 of the act provide miscellaneous authorities to the Foundation that are common throughout Government: reorganize, have regional offices, transfer funds to a modest degree among authorized categories, make rules for its operation, expend funds, enter into grants and contracts, acquire and hold real property, and so forth.

AUTHORIZATIONS

The act would provide for authorization of activities in fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983. Any funds for years beyond 1983 would have to be authorized by further acts. The following table gives an analysis of the current funding of programs that would be transferred to the Foundation, and levels of funding proposed by the act for the offices of the Foundation.

A brief rationale for the funding levels also follows. In general, these are activities which have been chronically underfunded in comparison to the need, so that proposed funding increases at a moderately rapid pace. The total amount requested by the President for these programs in fiscal year 1981 is \$378.6 million. The act proposes \$500 million in fiscal year 1981 and \$690 million and \$875 million in fiscal years 1982 and 1983, respectively.

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION—BUDGET ANALYSIS

(In millions of dollars)

National Technology Foundation Office	President's request fiscal year 1981	Fiscal year—		
		1981	1982	1983
1. Small Business.....	\$13.0	10	20	40
2. Institutional and Manpower Development.....	\$7.2	45	90	150
3. Technology Policy and Analysis.....	\$2.8	15	20	20
4. Intergovernmental Technology.....	\$7	10	20	30
5. Engineering.....	\$62.6	80	110	140
6. National Programs.....	\$49.2	70	90	110
7. National Bureau of Standards.....	\$107.4	120	145	170

NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION—BUDGET

ANALYSIS—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

National Technology Foundation Office	President's request fiscal year 1981	Fiscal year—		
		1981	1982	1983
8. Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service.....	\$121.3	130	170	190
9. Other purposes.....	\$7.6	20	25	25
Total.....	\$378.6	\$500	\$690	\$875

Note: This is a prorated share (136.6/1087.2) of NSF's overhead (60.8).

* NSF.

** NSF and DOC.

*** DOC.

RATIONALE FOR FUNDING

1. Small Business.—This is an excellent existing program with plenty of demand. It should increase as quickly as possible. The amounts budgeted are small compared with Small Business Administration programs (which are budgeted at over \$1 billion). The reason the amount suggested by the Act for fiscal year 1981 (\$10 million) is less than that requested by the President is that the President agrees it is a good program and recommended a large increase after the Act was prepared.

2. Institutional and Manpower Development.—This is the area of greatest need in the Foundation. Rapid increases are proposed to a level that can have national impact.

3. Technology Policy and Analysis.—This office should quickly be put together to help formulate Foundation programs and begin longer range studies. It should not need to grow much thereafter.

4. Intergovernmental Technology.—This area should also grow rapidly from its current size. National impact can be accomplished without enormous funds.

5. Engineering.—This is a mature area which needs steady moderate increases.

6. National Programs.—These have been virtually strangled at NSF. They need immediate resuscitation and continued revitalization.

7. National Bureau of Standards.—The Bureau is a mature organization. Continued growth at a moderate rate is appropriate. Expansion of innovation programs and of linkages between NBS and industry will be encouraged.

8. Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service.—The Patent and Trademark office is mature but malnourished. More high-quality patent examiners are needed and a computer based information system for getting access to patents should be developed. A substantial increase between 1981 and 1982 is provided for this purpose.

9. Other Purposes.—This is intended to provide funds for the central administration, the National Technology Board, certain personnel costs, support staff, and other inevitable overhead costs. Once the Foundation is fully staffed increases should be slight.

SUMMARY

The concept of a National Technology Foundation grows out of continuing study of innovation and productivity by the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology. There is a clear need for the Federal Government to improve its programs in support of technology, and the consolidation and enhancement of existing fragmented programs in a National Technology Foundation is an alternative deserving careful consideration.

The principal needs the Foundation would address are the need for improved technology for the benefit of all mankind, the need to improve the U.S. balance of trade, the need to fight inflation, the need to provide full employment, and the need for more adequate support and recognition of engineering.

The National Technology Foundation would be an independent agency with eight main branches for small business, institutional and manpower development, technology policy and analysis, inter-governmental technology, engineering, national—problem focused—programs, National Bureau of Standards, and Patent and Trademark Office, and National Technical Information Service. The agency would have programs transferred from NSF—almost all of Engineering and Applied Science plus other tiny bits—and from the Department of Commerce—almost all of the programs of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology.

The National Technology Foundation Act incorporates the two main features of another bill, H.R. 4672, by putting the Office of Industrial Technology functions of H.R. 4672 into the technology policy and analysis branch of the Foundation and putting the responsibility for the support of centers for industrial technology in the institutional and manpower development branch.

The National Technology Foundation would not have any responsibility for assisting foreign trade. Independently, the Department of Commerce should be upgraded to a Department of Commerce and Trade and should be assigned a foreign trade assistance function. The Foundation would work closely with the Department.

The governance of the Foundation would be handled by a Director and a National Technology Board patterned in organization, but not composition, after the National Science Board. Key functions of the Board would be to establish the policies of the Foundation and review the Foundation's budget and programs. The Director would have all powers not assigned to the Board and would be assisted by a deputy and eight assistants, one for each branch.

The bill would establish a National Technology Medal patterned after the National Medal of Science.

The bill contains authorizations for fiscal years 1981, \$500 million; 1982, \$690 million; and 1983, \$875 million. In each year the eight branches plus an "other purposes" category each have a line item. Each branch grows over the 3 years of authorization.

The bill requires close coordination between the National Technology Foundation and other agencies, particularly the National Science Foundation. The two Foundations are to have interlocking directorates.●

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE
DAY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian people, courageously rejecting Tsarist oppression, issued a declaration of their freedom containing these words:

Today we, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their own Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states.

The Byelorussian government made significant advances in the fields of education, culture, and social welfare. Unfortunately, the Byelorussians' freedom and progress were short-lived. A few months after the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence's issuance, the Red army seized Minsk, the capital of Byelorussia. By 1921, the Soviets controlled most of the country, and eventually Soviet domination supplanted Byelorussian independence. In the years that have followed, Byelorussia has experienced a program of forced Russification, including purges of intellectuals and mandatory collectivization of agricultural production.

Mr. Speaker, Americans can relate and sympathize with a people yearning for their liberty. We in the Congress must continue our support for the freedom of captive countries and request that the Soviet Union respect the provisions of the Helsinki Agreement. Today let us, as a freedom-loving people, express our support for the Byelorussians' legitimate quest toward self-expression and self-determination.●

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY: A
SYMBOL TO THE WORLD

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, today marks a proud day for all Greeks and Americans of Greek descent. On March 25, 1821, 159 years ago today, Archbishop Germanos and his fellow Hellenes raised their banner of rebellion—the sign of the cross—and the Greek war of independence against Turkish oppression had begun.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate Greece's recapturing of her legacy and her rich Hellenic tradition, both of which have been bequeathed to the

world and encapsulated in the word "freedom." This is indeed a joyous occasion for those of us who enjoy our proud Hellenic heritage—a heritage which was darkened by the shadow of Turkish rule for four centuries, from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 to the revolt of 1821. This is also a memorable day for freedom lovers and friends of Greece around the world.

The struggle for independence in 1821 was a daring decision, an all or nothing cast of the dice. Either perish or be delivered. The revolt was the culmination of centuries of oppression—and humiliations—and uprisings begun and crushed.

And, Mr. Speaker, just as the issues of Greece and Cyprus and human rights today attract a concern far beyond her shores, the Greek revolt was considered an event of great interest, not only to Europe but to much of the 19th century world—including America.

The cause of Greece captured the interest of many Americans, even though the American Republic itself was very young, numbering only a few million citizens, and the journey to Greece by ship took 60 days.

These circumstances notwithstanding, Americans did in fact make the lengthy journey to Greece to fight against the Turkish tyrants and for the glory that was Greece in a war that stretched out over 7 years.

For these lovers of freedom and democracy and human dignity, Greece called up visions of our great classical age—of Plato and Aristotle; of great democratic city-states and the world of Alexander. And then, as we do today, I am sure that they remembered that Greece's contributions to the enlightenment of mankind extend beyond the classical period. For the language of the New Testament of the Bible was Greek, and the Christian faith was first spread by Greek-speaking missionaries, notably St. Paul.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, with the help of these freedom lovers, and others, a country with no standing army, no money to speak of, and no central government to command the land's scattered resources threw off the yoke of oppression at terrible costs.

One hundred and fifty-nine years ago today, Greece reasserted her claim as the birthplace of democracy and the spiritual forbear of the land we now live and prosper in. And, America, the adopted homeland of many Greek immigrants and their descendants, owes much to Greece. The concept of government and the principles of democracy, which were the basis of the government of the ancient Greeks, are also the principles of government that all Americans now harbor.

Mr. Speaker, we of Greek descent can take great pride in the shaping influence our homeland has had on Western civilization. Indeed, I am sure we ourselves can take pride in our own contributions to America and to our respective communities.

Again, if one word could capture the essence of Greece, it would be: freedom. Freedom: its cry was first heard many years ago when democracy was firmly planted on the land of the ancient Greeks—and its cry is heard today, as we celebrate Greece's independence from 400 years of tyranny.

But, Mr. Speaker, freedom is not a cry associated with Greece alone. Wherever there are injustices, human indignities, and the suppression of political thought and free will, the call for freedom will always be heard.

And, when it is heard, Greece's struggles will always be remembered.●

IN MEMORY OF MAHLON N.
WHITE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent of mine, one of the most respected residents of Missouri, recently passed away. Mahlon N. White, of Clinton, Mo., was publisher of the Clinton Daily Democrat, the Clinton Eye, and the Benton County Enterprise at Warsaw, Mo. Mr. White was a third-generation Missouri editor. His grandfather, Thomas Benton White, founded the Warsaw Enterprise 100 years ago.

He was a 1929 graduate of William Jewell College, an outstanding athlete while in school and a veteran of World War II. He played professional basketball for a short time in the 1930's before he returned to the newspaper business.

White bought the Clinton newspaper in 1950. His columns, "Much About Nothing" and "Spin a Yarn," were widely quoted.

He was an author of many books based on his knowledge of the Ozarks and its people. His book "Farmin' In the Woods During Prohibition Days," told of the thriving industry of making moonshine whiskey in southern Benton County. "Pretty Privvies of the Ozarks," was a photo essay with each picture captioned by a verse of Americana. "They Call It Truman Dam," is about the Osage River from its birth in a Kansas hog lot to its confluence with the Missouri River.

I became well acquainted with Mr. White and his family a number of years ago, and remained one of his greatest admirers. In addition to his many accomplishments, he was a man rich in friends throughout our State. His warm smile and friendly and witty conversation will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

I extend my sincere sympathy to his wife, son, and three daughters and nine grandchildren.●

FREEDOM TO THE ROITBURD FAMILY

HON. ALVIN BALDUS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. BALDUS. Mr. Speaker, today I am bringing the plight of a Soviet refusenik family, the Lev Roitburds of Odessa, U.S.S.R., to the attention of the House of Representatives. I first became aware of the family's valiant struggle to leave the Soviet Union in December 1978, after Joseph Roitburd, a cousin who now lives in Milwaukee, brought the situation to my attention. Joseph Roitburd has worked indefatigably for the family's release since 1975. To my dismay the family is still in the Soviet Union and prospects for a visa seem very dim.

Lev Roitburd, an aeronautical engineer by training, first applied in 1972 for a visa that would allow him and his family to emigrate to Israel. Since the first application was filed, the family has been repeatedly denied permission. Several times denial was based on the grounds that Lev had access to secret information, even though he had never been required to sign the government's secrecy document. On other occasions, the emigration visa was denied with no reasons whatsoever provided.

During the intervening years, the family has been subjected to various degrees of harassment. In 1975, Lev, while attempting to meet with a delegation of U.S. Senators in Moscow, was arrested on charges of resisting an official in authority and sentenced to 2 years at hard labor in Siberia. He was not considered a political prisoner, but placed instead in a camp with hardened criminals. He had a history of back problems, but no arrangement was made to meet his special needs. During his term of imprisonment, he suffered further injury to his knee, an injury which still causes him problems.

He returned to Odessa in 1977 with the expectation that he would be granted a visa to leave the U.S.S.R. very soon. The visa never arrived and it did not take long before harassments began again. A potentially serious situation developed when both he and his wife were interviewed separately by the KGB, which attempted to associate them with espionage activities. Since I last spoke to the House about the family, Lev was picked up again by the KGB along with three other refuseniks. A Hebrew textbook and book of poems were taken from him and his friends were warned that Roitburd was a Zionist and criminal.

Most recently, during the week of November 18, 1979, an article concerning Roitburd appeared in the *Znamia Kommunizma*, a local Odessa newspaper. The title of the article was the "Fables and Fairy Tales of Lev Roitburd." This decidedly antisemitic arti-

cle accused Lev of being a Zionist agent, a parasite, receiving visits from foreign Zionist agents, of drunkenness and hooliganism. The appearance of the article was alarming because similar attacks in the press are frequently the prelude to arrest. Further, it was a signal to his acquaintances and neighbors of the party's disapproval of the Roitburds.

The Soviets must have hoped that by printing the article in an obscure newspaper, local opinion could be turned against the Roitburd family, but at the same time, the act would remain hidden from Western eyes. Copies of the article did get out of the U.S.S.R. and Western reaction against such harassment was registered with Soviet authorities.

Another complication revolves around the Roitburd's son, Sasha, who turned 16 in February of this year. He is quickly approaching the age of military eligibility. Should he be required to serve in the Soviet Army, the family would face at least a 5-year delay before being able to apply once more for a visa.

Lev, his wife, and son are all alone in Odessa. Mrs. Roitburd's parents now live in Israel—they are elderly and desperately want to be reunited with their daughter, her husband, and grandson. The Roitburds have had their hopes for reunification raised many times. The Department of State has brought their case to the attention of Soviet authorities upon numerous occasions. In 1978, the family was included on a list of 17 other families whose visa denials the Soviets promised to reconsider. Of 18 families on the list, only the Roitburds remain in the Soviet Union.

The Soviets are a party to the Helsinki accord. In that accord, each nation pledges itself to facilitate the reunification of families. On this basis alone, it is time for the U.S.S.R. to recognize its responsibilities as a signatory to Helsinki and to allow the Roitburd family to leave Odessa immediately. There is no justifiable ground for further denial of the visa because of security reasons. The family is now being used as an example, a warning to other Jewish families who may also want to emigrate.

Jewish and Christian communities around the world will celebrate festivals of freedom in the coming weeks. I call upon the Soviet Union to recognize the very basic freedom of choosing one's homeland and to grant that freedom to the Roitburd family.●

MARCH 25, 1980—159 YEARS OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 159th year

of Greek independence. It is truly admirable that the cradle of modern democracy has been able to emerge intact, its internal problems of the last decade surmounted by the everlasting principles of freedom of thought and action.

The Greek people have made immeasurable contributions to the world, both in ancient times and modern. Among them, philosophy, science, geometry, the arts, and industry. They have inspired us all to scale the limits of man's knowledge, his creativity, imagination and love of beauty. Among those contributions are the Olympics, where the grace and beauty of the athletic form allow the nations of the world to gather in friendly competition.

The greatness that is inherent in the Greek culture has been passed on to those of Greek origin who reside in the United States, and I would like to comment on the Greek-Americans residing in my own district. Mr. Speaker, there is no group more deserving of recognition at this time than they, because it is the ideals of man's goodness, his dignity and worth that need to prevail in these troubled times. The Greek people embody all of this. Their ability to triumph over adversity and prevail, is a lesson we should all learn from.

Thus, as the Greek people all over the world reflect upon their heritage and celebrate their long and glorious history, they can also point with pride at their devotion to maintaining those ideals which all free people hold in such high regard. Man's philosophical and moral birth began with the Greeks, and for that we must be eternally grateful, and celebrate joyfully with them on this day.●

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

HON. BALTASAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Subcommittee on National Parks and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, held 2 days of hearings on the issue of historic preservation. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 5496, introduced by my distinguished colleague JOHN SEIBERLING. I am also a cosponsor of the administration's proposal, H.R. 6504, which was introduced by PHILIP BURTON, chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has an unusually rich and varied natural and historic heritage, of which we are justly proud. Puerto Rico's cultural heritage includes such properties as La Fortaleza, built in the 16th century as a fortress against invading French and English and now listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a national historic landmark. On the

natural side, Mona and Monito Islands, site of what are considered to be the largest and most unusual sea caves in the entire world, have been designated as a national natural landmark.

I was happy to learn recently from the Department of the Interior's Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service that 10 additional sites in Puerto Rico are now under review for potential nomination as natural landmarks. These sites include such areas as Puerto Mosquito, the most outstanding example of a bioluminescent bay in the United States; and Rio Camuy Caves, thought to be one of the largest cave systems in the world. One of these sites, Rio Abajo Forest, was recently selected as a national natural landmark. It is gratifying for all Puerto Ricans to have our natural heritage recognized in this fashion as an integral part of the total heritage of the United States.

Legislation to protect our national heritage is needed if we are to insure the importance of our historic and natural heritage resources is formally recognized by means of the National Register of Historic Places and the proposed National Register of Natural Areas. The former Register has been in existence since 1966 and will continue to be the basis of historic preservation planning in this country. The latter Register has existed since 1963, in the form of the National Registry of Natural Landmarks. These two parallel national listings of properties stand as visible symbols of the most significant features of the American landscape. These bills will insure that the areas which have been identified and listed on the National Registers will be afforded some protection from the potentially damaging impacts of Federal or federally sponsored activities. The bill will not stop or delay these activities, but will see that the planning decisions we make in the future are based on a full understanding of the importance of these unique areas to all of our citizens.

The national heritage program will provide for continued technical and financial assistance to the States and territories to allow them to continue to identify and nominate their natural and historic treasures to the Registers. Most importantly, it will accomplish such assistance without the need for any new funding sources. The designers of the heritage program have developed a fiscally responsible program which is very responsive to the economic concerns America faces today.

I look forward to the debate and discussion on these bills. The hearings which were held, and the numerous testimonies we received, will enable us to come up with a strong bill which

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

will work to protect and enhance our valuable National Natural Resources.●

ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today the Byelorussian-American community will celebrate the 62d anniversary of the creation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Although freedom from oppression in this nation proved to be fleeting, the memories of independence will remain forever ingrained in the hearts of the Byelorussian people.

The national revolution began during the anti-Russian uprising of 1863, led by Kastus Kalinouski, and continued with the formation of the Byelorussian National Revival Movement. Independence became a reality when the first all-Byelorussian Congress convened in December 1917. The act of March 25, 1918 proclaimed to all the world Byelorussia's new status as an autonomous nation, free from the yoke of Soviet oppression, and bestowed upon the citizens of this democratic republic their liberty.

Unfortunately, the people of Byelorussia were once again subject to foreign domination with the onset of the Bolshevik October revolution. The valiant efforts of the Byelorussian resistance could not compete with the military might of the Bolshevik army, and the Soviet hold over Byelorussia became stronger than ever.

But the people of Byelorussia would not forget their brief encounter with freedom. Although the Soviets tried to unify their captives by stifling culture and creativity, eliminating diversity of language, and obliterating national heritage and traditions, the Byelorussians refused to succumb to this intellectual enslavement. Their dreams of liberty have enabled them to remain united despite the fact that they are being denied their basic human rights.

Today, let people of all nationalities and ethnic origins join together to recall the history of this Byelorussian struggle for independence for it is truly an inspiration for all who suffer under the yoke of political oppression. Let us pay tribute to the courage of these valiant people by joining with the Byelorussian-American community in celebration. It is my hope that, one day, the Byelorussians will join us again, among the ranks of the nations of the free world.●

RULES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE SELECTION AND ASSIGNMENT OF SUITES IN THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, this is to advise Members that, effective January 29, 1980, the House Office Building Commission has approved the attached rules and procedures governing the selection and assignment of suites in the House office buildings, as recommended by the Commission. The rules follow:

RULES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE SELECTION AND ASSIGNMENT OF SUITES IN THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

The following rules and procedures for the selection and assignment of suites to Members are hereby adopted by the House Office Building Commission:

Rule 1. Office vacancies occurring during a session of Congress

1.1 If an office shall become vacant during a session of Congress, due to death or resignation of a Member or for any reason, it shall not be assigned for a period of 10 days from the day of the vacancy. Beginning at 12 o'clock noon on the sixth day (or the next day if it falls on a Sunday) from the day of vacancy and ending at 12 o'clock noon on the tenth day (or the next day if it falls on a Sunday), the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings shall accept, in writing, applications (provided for convenience by the Superintendent) from Members for the vacancy. At 12 o'clock noon on the tenth day (or the next day if it falls on a Sunday) the vacant office will be assigned to the Member with the longest continuous service.

1.2 In the case of Members of equal service the one whose application was first received in the Superintendent's office shall have priority; if applications from Members of equal service are received at the same time, priority shall be determined by lot. In order to expedite the assignment of offices, each Member (or the Member's designated representative) shall be allowed not to exceed 20 minutes in which to select a vacant suite. If the selection is not made within the 20 minutes allowed, the Superintendent shall continue on to the next Member whose priority has been determined by lot. The Member then passed-over shall be given an opportunity to select a vacant suite after the remaining Members with equal service have completed their selections of office space.

1.3 There shall be a 30-day period from the date of the vacancy before the occupants shall be required to move.

1.4 For the purposes of this Rule, the day of the vacancy shall begin at 12 o'clock noon on the day following the effective date of a Member's resignation or other termination reason, or the day following the death of a Member.

Rule 2. Assignment of offices following November general elections

2.1 Following election day, the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, shall be responsible for preparing and issuing a schedule of dates on which suite applications will be received from, and suites assigned to, reelect-

ed Members, reelected former Members, and Members-elect without prior service.

2.2 Reelected Members and reelected former Members. The application and assignment schedule shall be arranged in a manner that will provide an opportunity for reelected Members and reelected former Members to apply for vacant suites, with the order of priority for selection and assignment based on length of continuous service, with the longest continuous service having the highest priority. The Superintendent of the House Office Buildings shall deliver a copy of these rules and procedures, along with the schedule of dates for applying, to each reelected Member on Thursday following the election, and it shall then become incumbent upon each reelected Member to apply for a suite at the allotted time if he/she so desires. At the same time the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings shall mail a copy of these rules and procedures and the schedule application dates to each reelected former Member. Only written application forms (provided for convenience by the Superintendent) for vacant suites will be received by the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings; these applications will be listed in the order that they are received. If a Member desires to have someone on his staff act in his behalf in applying for vacant offices, the Superintendent must be so notified in writing by the Member.

2.2.1 No Member will be permitted to apply before the allotted day and opening time, nor after the allotted day and closing time.

2.2.2 A Member may apply for only one suite at a time; the Member may revise the application during the selection time allotted to his or her seniority group.

2.2.3 Assignments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Rule 1.2.

2.2.4 A Member who applies for a suite which is then assigned to that Member, must move.

2.3 Members-elect without prior service. Between the hours of 9 o'clock a.m. and 12 o'clock noon, on the date stated in the application and assignment schedule, Members-elect without prior service, or their authorized representatives, will draw numbers from a box to determine the order of their choice of an office from those remaining available. One individual may represent any number of Members-elect but he or she must draw a separate number for each person so represented and written authority from the Member-elect that is represented must be submitted. The numbers drawn will be recorded immediately and the card bearing the number drawn must be inscribed with the name of the Member-elect for whom it is drawn. The card is to be retained by the Member-elect or his representative and presented to the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings at 1 o'clock p.m. the same day at which time offices will be chosen and assigned in the numerical order of the numbers drawn. If more than one number is drawn out of the box at one time the higher number shall prevail and the other numbers shall be replaced in the box.

Rule 3. Members-elect without prior service or their accredited representatives who have not participated in the drawing will make their applications for offices in writing with the Superintendent of House Office Buildings. Assignments shall be made in accordance with the provisions in Rule 1.2.

Rule 4. Unless otherwise provided by the House Office Building Commission, Members of Congress who will not be Members of the succeeding Congress must vacate their suites by 12 o'clock noon on December 15 of the Second Session of a Congress in

order that offices may be made ready for Members of the next Congress.

Rule 5. The Superintendent of the House Office Buildings is directed to carry out the provisions of these rules.●

THE BEST ONE-SENTENCE DESCRIPTION OF CARTER POLICY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● **Mr. MICHEL.** Mr. Speaker, United Press International recently carried a newsstory telling of yet another criticism of Carter's defense policy. The editor of Jane's Surface Skimmers, an authoritative British publication dealing with naval hovercraft, and amphibious assault weapons, had this to say about Carter's defense policies in these areas:

Characteristically, the Carter administration took a positive and unequivocal stance on this issue without any real understanding of its many implications.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that these words constitute the best one-sentence description of what is wrong with the Carter administration. How often have we not seen positive unequivocal stances taken by the President on almost every conceivable issue only to later discover that the administration is without any real understanding of the issues implications?

At this point I insert in the RECORD "Soviet Navy's Huge Lead is Told" from the Chicago Tribune, March 21, 1980.

SOVIET NAVY'S HUGE LEAD TOLD

LONDON.—The Soviet Union has built a huge lead over the West in naval hovercraft and is at least five years ahead in amphibious assault operations, the authoritative Jane's Surface Skimmers said Thursday.

Jane's also criticized the Carter administration for abandoning plans to build a 3,000-ton hovercraft warship and described Washington's decision as rash.

The Soviets not only have more naval hovercraft in service than all 15 NATO countries combined but also "a far wider range of ACVs [air cushion vessels] in or about to enter production or under evaluation than any country in the West," Jane's said.

Twenty years ago few would have believed that by the early 1980s "the Soviet navy would have become the biggest operator of these craft," it said. "The Soviet navy has been able to perfect its amphibious assault landing techniques in a manner which no Western navy will be able to begin to emulate for at least another five to six years."

In a foreword to the 1980 edition, Jane's editor Roy McLeavy criticized Carter's decision to forego building a hovercraft warship. It would have laid "the foundation for the world's first 80-knot navy"; but instead "the program which once promised to revolutionize marine transport is today virtually in limbo," the editor said.

"Characteristically, [the Carter administration] took a positive and unequivocal stance on this issue without any real understanding of its many implications."

Jane's listed a variety of Soviet air cushion vessels, including the 27-ton Gus designed to carry up to 25 marines to beachheads at 50 knots; the 270-ton Aist that can transport tanks, missiles, and troop carrier

trucks at 60-70 knots; and the 90-ton Lebed, which can even carry battle tanks.

"Recently," Jane's said, "the Soviet Navy was reported to have started a long term surface-effect ship development program aided by a test craft of about 60 tons. It has been predicted that surface-effect ships with a loaded capacity of 2,000 tons or more will be operating by the turn of the century."

Surface-effect ship is the technical name for large vessels riding on air cushions.●

LAWMAKERS SHOULD LISTEN TO FARMERS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● **Mr. FINDLEY.** Mr. Speaker, farmers may represent only about 4 percent of America's population, but I would hope that all of my colleagues recognize the fact that 100 percent of this Congress constituency is affected by how well that 4 percent fares in our economy today.

A recent radio editorial by Gene Hemphill, Illinois Farm Bureau news service director, focuses on the importance of that 4 percent. The editorial follows:

LAWMAKERS SHOULD LISTEN TO FARMERS

Recently we were reminded of a story about five very determined farm women who had taken a trip to Washington, D.C. last fall. Not only is the story true, but the lesson that we learn from it has an even greater truth.

The ladies were among several dozen farm women who participated in a program called "Farm Bureau Women to Washington." It's an annual event that allows Farm Bureau women a chance to visit with their respective U.S. Representatives about agricultural issues.

Apparently, five of the women had time left after they visited their own lawmaker, so they decided to pay a call on one of the lawmakers representing the Chicago area. But, when they entered the office they were politely and quickly informed by an administrative aide that no farmer lived in that lawmaker's district.

Disgruntled, the ladies left the office and gathered just outside the door to discuss the situation. Finally, one of the ladies said: "Well, he eats—doesn't he?" And with that ammunition, the determined ladies marched back into the office.

Hopefully, the delegation convinced that particular lawmaker that if a person takes a bite of food, then he has to be concerned about agriculture. And lawmakers, who represent a lot of people who eat, should be listening to what the farmer has to say.

Based on nationwide averages, those five women represented farms that produce enough food to feed more than 280 persons. Imagine, food for 280 persons from just five farmers.

But there's more to it than that. Illinois farmers rank first of all states in agricultural exports. Quite often they produce more soybeans and corn than any other state. And Illinois farmers pay some \$376 million in property taxes. That money goes a long way in helping a lot more people than just the farmer.

Farmers represent less than four percent of the population in this country, but that four percent has a big job to do and they do

it better than it is done any place else in the world.

Why? It's because they have been pretty much free to do it their way in a free enterprise system. And that's why farmers and their wives go to Washington. They want to convince the lawmakers that such a freedom should be protected. If agriculture in the United States fails, then a lot more will go down the drain with it.

As the ladies said: "If a person eats—then that person should care about agriculture." That's more than just a mouthful of words.●

SOUTH AFRICAN REPRESSION CONTINUES

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the congressional Ad Hoc Monitoring Group on Southern Africa, I wish to draw attention of this House to the conditions of political prisoners and banned persons in South Africa.

Three years ago I joined with other House Members in forming the ad hoc group. Our aim was to work diligently toward a lessening of the repressive and racist policy of apartheid within South Africa.

Regrettably, the reality remains in South Africa—basic human rights are denied simply because of the color of your skin. Blacks, although comprising 18.6 million of the country's 26.1 million people, are virtually prisoners in their own country. A web of racist laws spawned by the repressive white minority denies blacks political rights, educational opportunities, and fair treatment within the South African judicial system. An archaic land law forces many blacks to reside on 13 percent of the country's land, while they number four-fifths of the country's population. Any efforts at legitimate and orderly protest is censored by strict government banning orders.

This senseless stifling of human rights cannot continue. America has always been a zealous crusader on behalf of freedom for all individuals, regardless of race, creed, or color. Yet our Government watches as U.S. capital investment contributes to the white minority's control over the black majority and the Botha government continues to randomly arrest and detain blacks under the sweeping Terrorism Act of 1967.

A young man named Saths Cooper is one example of the authoritarian rule of the South African Government. His shameful ordeal is typical of many black leaders, and we must voice our sharp disapproval of this repression.

Along with Steve Biko, Mr. Cooper was a founder of the Black People's Convention, a national nonstudent wing of the Black Consciousness Movement. After attending a 1974 rally supporting the liberation movement in Mozambique against Portuguese colonial rule, Cooper was arrested by South African security forces

and detained for 2 years under section 6 of the Terrorism Act. Section 6 is a mockery of justice, providing the security police the power of indefinite detention without bringing charges against an individual. In January 1975 he was one of nine leaders of the Black Consciousness group brought to trial on charges of intending to endanger the maintenance of law and order. The government could not document any action by Cooper showing he had endangered law and order, but government officials used this one-sided legislation to sentence Cooper to a 10-year term in prison.

The laws allowing such arrests and detentions are horrifying enough, but the South African system compounds the injustice. The accused is expected to prove his innocence, often without proper counsel, and the task is usually impossible.

This frightful example of the whimsical nature of justice in South Africa is the rule, not the exception. The Terrorism Act is an instrument used by the minority government for perpetuating control over the country's discontented and disenfranchised black, colored, and Asian majority.

Recent events indicate that attitudes of the South African Government could change. Prime Minister Botha has hinted that the 1936 land law apportioning only 13 percent of the country's land is not a "holy cow" and might be altered.

However, these attitudes continue to suffocate under the weight of racist resistance within the country. Furthermore, the one crucial step—the sharing of political power between whites and blacks—has never been publicly mentioned by the South African Government. The Pretoria regime, content to preserve the status quo, must be forced to face reality—the discriminatory policies of apartheid are unacceptable.

Unfortunately, our Government has hesitated in the past and continues to hesitate in taking stringent actions against the South African Government. Three years ago following Steve Biko's death I joined with an overwhelming majority of my colleagues in condemning apartheid and urging President Carter to take the necessary measures to strengthen U.S. policies opposing the government in Pretoria.

President Carter did not back our efforts then, and today I must admit our Government still hesitates. The administration's policy of prohibiting sales of goods or technology which can be used for military means is basically ineffectual. Violations routinely occur, ranging from the transportation of guns into the country to the sale of civilian planes to private citizens who in turn use them for military purposes, and the administration demonstrates no willingness to tighten its control.

Last November's strike by 700 black workers at the Ford Motor Co. plant was met with the usual brutal response, the detaining of black leaders for indefinite periods without pressing

charges and the imposing of banning orders on numerous black leaders. This cowardly response against people with legitimate grievances elicited no action from our Government. I must shamefully say that we stood by and watched the repressive tactics of the South African Government continue unabated. Our silence helps perpetuate this repression. It is long since time that our Government speaks out in clear condemnation coupled with the necessary measures to give our condemnation credibility.

As the urban unrest and grievances of blacks increase, the punitive measures also increase. The policy of apartheid escalates the confrontation between blacks and whites and action must be taken to resolve the confrontation peacefully.

U.S. investment in South Africa must be halted and our efforts must be directed toward insuring that all South Africans play a part in determining the future of their country. Constitutional guarantees must be established and enforced to protect the rights of all South Africans. Our silence condoning apartheid is unacceptable. We must demonstrate that our commitment to human rights is constant throughout the world.●

PLANT CLOSINGS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times carried a thoughtful and well-researched article about an increasingly important problem for working people and their communities, the threat of sudden plant closings. The story featured a Michigan family that was victimized by one such closure, but their story is repeated thousands of times each year, in every part of the country.

The article surveys the response of various State legislators, labor unions, and community groups to the many problems caused by plant closings, and describes the growing movement for legislation to regulate business relocation and disinvestment decisions. My own bill, H.R. 5040, which I introduced last summer and which now has 60 House cosponsors, is briefly described.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this article will help awaken my colleagues to the seriousness of the issue of economic dislocation and the need for a comprehensive Federal response, rather than a piecemeal, State-by-State attempt to resolve what is a national problem.

The text of the article follows:

STATES SEEKING TO CURB IMPACT OF CLOSING INDUSTRIAL PLANTS
(By Iver Peterson)

DETROIT, March 15.—The flight of manufacturers and jobs from the industrial Northeast and Middle West has prompted a drive in a growing number of States to make

businesses pay some of the costs borne by communities they leave behind.

In the past year, bills have been introduced in eight State legislatures, including New York's, and in Congress to lessen the impact of plant closings. The legislation includes requirements that companies give up to two years' notice when plants are closed for reasons other than bankruptcy, make big severance payments to discharged workers, maintain health benefits for a while and pay into community economic development funds.

Wisconsin has had a law since 1975 that requires 60 days' notice of a plant closing, a statute inspired by the loss of a potato chip factory in Madison. In Maine, losses of shoe factories and paper mills prompted the Legislature to pass a law several years ago requiring companies that close plants to pay workers a week's severance for each year of service.

The growing movement for such legislation reflects rising fears among unions and community groups in aging industrial cities that their jobs and local economies are being dismantled by the flight of industries to Sun Belt States and foreign countries.

OLD INDUSTRIAL CITIES AFFECTED

The number of manufacturing jobs is decreasing throughout the country, but the impact is uneven. Eastern and northcentral States are finding it difficult to win the new industries—in electronics and aeronautics, for example—that are concentrating in the South and West, leaving old manufacturing centers with shattered tax bases and workers who are too old to find new jobs or learn new skills.

The proposed laws are aimed primarily at protecting the unskilled and semiskilled manufacturing jobs, such as the majority of those in the automobile manufacturing industry, that are most vulnerable to sudden shifts in the economy.

None of the proposed measures, other than perhaps Ohio's, is given even a remote chance of becoming law this year, but their proponents view the growing lists of sponsors for the legislation and increased willingness of community groups to join the push as evidence that their campaign is picking up speed.

"The bill is intended to prevent the kidnapping of capital earned by employees in this state by employers who take the money to build someplace else," said State Representative Perry Bullard of Michigan, who introduced the legislation in that state.

"Much of General Motors' or Ford's profits come from the work of a large number of workers in Michigan," Mr. Bullard added, "and management's claim is that they have the right to take the profit of all that work and invest it in Alabama or Spain or Mexico and not take into consideration the impact on all those workers and communities that made those profits possible."

TWO YEARS' NOTICE REQUIRED

Mr. Bullard's bill, patterned on measures pending in other states, would require plants with more than 100 employees to give two years' notice before closing or cutting the work force by half or more. Employees would be paid a week's salary for each year they had worked at the plant, provided a year of paid medical coverage, and get up to five weeks of paid leave to look for another job.

In addition, the company would have to pay the equivalent of 15 percent of the plant's annual payroll into a fund to soften the blow of lost jobs and taxes on the community.

"In its present form I don't think the Legislature would be so lacking in wisdom that they'd ever pass the bill," said John G. Thodis, president of the 2,500-member

Michigan Manufacturers Association, who added that he had "no doubt that it is unconstitutional."

CITIZENS' GROUPS SPUR MOVEMENT

Mr. Thodis said the bill had already had "a dampening effect," on the state's economy. "I've received calls from multistate corporations considering building or expanding in Michigan, and they're nervous with this thing hanging over their heads."

The major union push behind the legislation is coming from the United Automobile Workers, but the movement's strength seems to be based in broad-based citizens' groups, especially in Ohio and Massachusetts.

The issue is particularly strong in Ohio, where plant closings in Youngstown and elsewhere have left communities stunned and angry, and where the financing of public school systems is coming unraveled, in part because a loss of plants is either shifting a growing school tax burden on homeowners or, as in Cleveland, simply leaving schools critically underfinanced.

"Pennsylvania has lost 218,900 jobs in the last 10 years, according to the state Department of Labor," said John Dodds, director of the Philadelphia Unemployment Project and one of the backers of a plant-closing bill for that state. "We're saying that those people could be working now if the manufacturing plants hadn't just evaporated."

The numbers of jobs lost in other states are either not known or are estimated by highly unreliable methods. The resulting statistical vacuum, sponsors of the legislation say, argues in favor of the measures if only because they would provide a handle on the extent of industrial shrinkage in their areas.

EFFORT TO STRENGTHEN MAINE LAW

In addition to New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Massachusetts, similar measures have been introduced in Illinois, Indiana and Rhode Island. An effort was made this year to strengthen the Maine law to require a year's notice of a plant closing, but foes fought down the attempt by threatening to attack the existing law.

Legislation in Congress was introduced last summer by Senator Donald W. Riegle Jr. and Representative William D. Ford, both Michigan Democrats, with strong backing from the auto workers' union.

The bill would require prior notice when a plant employing more than 50 workers is to be closed. It would also require a company to maintain a worker's medical benefits and other compensation for a year after his layoff, and would force a company cutting its workforce or wages to declare whether the jobs or lost pay would be restored within 26 weeks.

SHOCK OF UNEXPECTED JOB LOSS

The main reason for workers' seeking the long prior notice of a plant's closing, according to those who have lost their jobs, is to cushion the shock of learning that they have been laid off by reading a notice tacked to a closed factory gate.

"My husband came home and the afternoon shift went to work and there was a big notice on the door—'This plant closed, pick up your checks at the union hall,'" said Dorothy Fisher, whose 59-year-old husband, Robert, worked at the Seaman Manufacturing plant in Pontiac, Mich., for 23 years until last December.

After that, his wife said, he attempted to kill himself three times, and finally died three weeks later after he stopped eating.

"All he done was to live for his work," she said, "and when they took it away he felt like a nobody."●

WHY I LOVE AMERICA

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, during these troubled times, when our Nation is assailed from all sides by self-styled "reformers" who take delight in portraying the world role of the United States as the embodiment of reaction and oppression, it is important to keep a proper perspective. To me, the envy-inspired words of a Sadegh Ghotbzadeh ring hollow in comparison to recent remarks of distinguished actor Ricardo Montalban, which I would like to enter into today's RECORD.

Mr. Montalban notes that, "To me, America means generosity and compassion." I believe each of us in the House can think of hundreds of examples of American generosity and compassion* in just the last few years which have made our country the beacon of hope to millions all over the world. I believe it is important for us in the House, and our constituents, to keep Mr. Montalban's comments in mind as we read our daily newspapers and listen to the humiliating daily news broadcasts replete with the comments of professional "America-haters." Richardo Montalban loves his Nation of choice. How refreshing. He also loves his land of birth and sees no conflict of affection. Again, how utterly refreshing and inspiring. Similar to loving one's parents, right, Rick?

The remarks referred to follow:

WHY I LOVE AMERICA

(By Ricardo Montalban)

To me, America means generosity and compassion.

You will find, for instance, that there are many countries where an American actor can't work.

But America opens its doors to actors from all over the world.

When the Red Cross makes an appeal, Americans come across. It's not because of affluence—it's because of generosity and compassion.

Since I first came to America, I have felt tremendous warmth and I've felt very welcome. I've never felt anything but a welcoming hand—a friendly and generous hand.

My experience has been very, very wonderful.

When my brother drove me to Texas, I did see a sign that said, "No Mexicans or Dogs Allowed." Having just arrived, that set me back a little.

But the man who wrote that sign really didn't know any Mexicans. Because to know a Mexican—to know him well—is to love him. To know any man is to love him. So I feel sorry for the man who painted that sign.

Every civilization reached the top and failed. But I don't think America has reached its peak at all. It's such a young country—it's like a teenager.

I think the best is yet to come.

I think we're going to see very wonderful and exciting times ahead.●

**COURAGE OF THE
BYELORUSSIAN PEOPLE**

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

• Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Byelorussian people from Communist Russia and proclamation of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The Soviet Government retaliated just 10 months later, crushing that spark of freedom by creating the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and setting it within the ironfisted grasp of the U.S.S.R.

At the end of World War II, the All-Byelorussian Congress again convened to approve a second proclamation of independence, but was soon dispersed by the Soviet armies.

However, the fierce desire to be free remains in the hearts and minds of the people of Byelorussia. Despite the continuous oppression imposed upon them by the Communist regime, the Byelorussians have at every opportunity, sought to restore their national identity as a sovereign state, free from the forces of Communist domination and control.

Throughout their history, the Byelorussian people have transmitted from generation to generation their national identity through their cultural achievements, language, and rich heritage. The knowledge of what it is to be free and the determination for this renewed freedom continues to inspire these valiant people in their dream of reestablishing their homeland as an independent nation.

It is, indeed, a real tragedy that the Byelorussian people, whose heritage is so rich in the tradition of democracy, live under the oppressive rule of the Soviet Government. It is also unfortunate that these people are not well served by the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty broadcasts. The Byelorussians are not allowed to learn of the nature of Soviet expansionism throughout the world and the vitality of their respective cultural heritages in the United States because for years the Byelorussians have been denied any VOA broadcasts in their own language.

In recent years, the RFE and RL have suffered substantial cutbacks in both staff and operations. These cuts have seriously impaired the effectiveness of their broadcasts behind the Iron Curtain. As our broadcasts to the Soviet bloc are the principle communication link between the United States and more than 330 million people within that area, these broadcasts could serve as a most valuable vehicle in disseminating information to those captive peoples in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. These radios are our most important nonlethal weapons in our confrontation with the Soviet Government.

Therefore, I plan to introduce a resolution calling for extension and improvement of the quality and quantity of programs in foreign languages of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty, and to increase their impact and effectiveness. I believe that we must make full use of our technological capability to increase the power, number, and performance of transmitters of the VOA, RL, RFE, and to extend their range to overcome, as much as possible, the Soviet interference by jamming.

As we commemorate this anniversary of independence we highlight this day as a symbol of the national aspiration of the Byelorussian people for their sovereignty and self-determination. We also commend and acknowledge the courage of the Byelorussian people. This anniversary serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Byelorussian people despite Communist oppression.

Now more than ever, when flagrant violation of Soviet expansionism and oppression continue in Afghanistan, this commemoration gains additional significance. I trust that we can reassure those brave people whose human rights and cultural heritage are held captive, that they will continue to receive our encouragement for their goal of self-determination.●

A CASE FOR ASSISTANCE DOGS

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

• Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I have the pleasure of introducing a bill to allow all handicapped people with specially trained assistance dogs the opportunity to travel with their dogs on board common carriers and to take their dogs into public buildings.

Under the present law only the blind are allowed to take their specially trained seeing eye dogs on common carriers and inside public buildings. When this law was passed, people with other handicapping conditions did not have trained dogs to assist them.

Fortunately, we have discovered that dogs can be of great benefit to people with a wide variety of disabilities other than blindness. Dogs are now being trained to assist people affected by deafness, cerebral palsy, arthritis, spinal cord injuries, and other disabilities. The present law was well intended, but it is now outdated. Certainly, if a blind person with a specially trained dog is allowed to fly with his dog or to go into a public building with his dog, then any handicapped individual with a specially trained dog should be allowed the same privileges.

This bill will not cost the Federal Government anything and will simply allow all handicapped people the same

rights as those already accorded the blind.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in passing this piece of legislation as soon as possible.●

**CAMBODIA'S FUTURE:
RECOVERY AND RETREAT**

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

• Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Jim Laurie, who recently returned from a 6-week visit to Cambodia.

Mr. Laurie, the Hong Kong bureau chief for ABC News and a noted authority on current affairs in Southeast Asia, cites both positive developments in the political-economic situation in Cambodia as well as the many serious problems which must be overcome.

Starvation again looms on the horizon, despite recent improvements in the distribution of food aid. International contributions must continue to reach the country's 4½ to 5 million inhabitants, who may again be subject to famine unless the next rice crop is planted before the June monsoon. In addition, several hundred thousand Cambodians camped along the Thai border are suffering the long-term effects of severe malnutrition and disease and are still totally dependent on the international relief effort.

Recovery of this ravaged country has begun, but the tragedy continues. I urge all my colleagues to take note of this recent assessment of the Cambodian drama presented below:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Mar. 12, 1980]

**CAMBODIA IS SLOWLY PICKING UP THE
SHATTERED PIECES**
(By Jim Laurie)

Cambodia is a nation that is struggling, with some success, to bring itself out of the utter devastation caused by five years of war followed by four years of the unpopular Pol Pot regime.

Such an assessment does not necessarily square with the prevailing pessimistic view on Cambodia reflected outside the country.

But definite signs of recovery were apparent to this writer after traveling through the 11 of Cambodia's 19 provinces that are firmly under the control of the Vietnam-backed Phnom Penh government. The government has been unable to exercise complete control of the rest of the country because of pockets of resistance led by the ousted Khmer Rouge forces of former ruler Pol Pot.

Indications of a return to normality in Cambodia are at odds with the commonly held view that Vietnam seeks to subjugate the population through colonization or forced starvation and that it is obstructing international relief deliveries.

Among the telltale signs of national rehabilitation witnessed during a six week visit: Families are being reunited and permitted to own property such as household items, bicycles, and farm animals.

Schools are being reopened. Market activity has resumed (but so has smuggling and

corruption). Abandoned cities and towns are slowly being repopulated. All the moves appear calculated to win at least the qualified support of the people.

In Kandal Province, 25 miles southeast of Phnom Penh, I happened across a saffron-robed mendicant monk walking house to house. A small boy carrying a food bucket preceded him, announcing the bonze's arrival with a brief Buddhist chant. People who had not been allowed to practice religion for four years under the Khmer Rouge came out of their houses and offered small plates of mixed rice and corn. The monk delivered his blessing and moved on.

The people said that most pagodas had been desecrated by the Khmer Rouge and that all bonzes were killed or defrocked during the Pol Pot regime. In January 1979 the new government began promoting the return of religion.

At the national theater in Phnom Penh on the Bassac River, I watched as a dozen-or-so former members of the royal ballet attempted dances unpracticed since 1975. Miss V. Savoy, the lead dancer, estimated that most of the better dancers and teachers of the original 300-woman troupe had perished under the Khmer Rouge. Her own 44 months of toil in the rice fields had put her out of shape for the ballet, but she and the others were now encouraged to resume classes.

Still, it would be far too sanguine to suggest that the Cambodians I met were generally pleased with their way of life under Vietnamese domination. Most clearly were not.

Two fears were voiced repeatedly: fear of hunger and the fear of a never-ending Vietnamese military occupation. These show no signs of disappearing.

Many Cambodians I talked to expressed ambivalent feelings toward the presence of the Vietnamese. Hanoi's military presence was an onerous one.

Few Cambodians disguised their desire that Vietnam's troops go home. Yet many expressed the fear that if the Vietnamese did leave, the dreaded Khmer Rouge would return and there would be another round of reprisals.

Vietnamese advisers assigned to the Phnom Penh government were forced to admit that what had been greeted as "a liberating army" was now regarded as an army of occupation. One adviser acknowledged, "We know that the longer we stay, the more resentment against us will grow."

Historical antipathy between the Vietnamese and the Khmer seemed to play a greater role in rising resentment than specific Vietnamese actions. But some Cambodians did complain of individual acts of theft and extortion. The Vietnamese adviser admitted to "bad elements in the Vietnamese Army. . . . Even if that number is only 1 percent," he concluded, "that represents a lot of trouble for Vietnamese-Cambodian relations."

In addition to an estimated 200,000 troops in Cambodia, the Vietnamese have placed advisers at all levels of Cambodian government. The extent of their presence has given rise to accusations of Vietnamese colonialism. Since August, Cambodians reported that the advisers have turned more responsibility over to their Cambodian counterparts, though the Vietnamese appear to retain the privilege of veto over most decisions.

I could find no evidence, however, of Vietnamese in any great number settling in Cambodia, though it would be understandable if some of the more than 300,000 Vietnamese residents of Cambodia in the 1960s returned.

The Phnom Penh government has clearly not met the nation's food and medical needs, and Vietnam's suspicion and distrust of outside help has limited the number of foreign-aid teams inside Cambodia.

After seven months in Phnom Penh, the international aid agencies are still limited to fewer than 30 "observers" in the capital. Only in late January did the government permit entry of foreign medical teams, and these were from Cuba and the Soviet Union.

A random survey conducted in Phnom Penh and four outlying provinces revealed considerable disparity in food allocations.

Adult city residents received between 12 and 16 kilograms of rice and corn a month. At three of the four rural food distribution centers, people were receiving less than two kilograms.

That food distribution continues to be slow and inefficient is widely acknowledged in Phnom Penh. Foreign observers who have taken the time to look around do not believe officials are purposefully hampering the process, however.

Delays, they say, are caused by a disorganized bureaucracy, inexperienced and incompetent administrators, lack of transport and primitive communications.

In general, it appears that as government control has improved and the Cambodian government structure set up by the Vietnamese has gained in experience, food deliveries have become more efficient.

During my visit to the port of Kompong Som in December, it was evident that thousands of tons of rice, donated by other countries, had piled up in warehouses. It was expected that 16,000 tons of this would be shipped to the countryside that month, yet less than half that amount was moved out.

The situation improved somewhat in January, when 12 thousand tons was trucked to the countryside. There are reports that February deliveries topped those of January.

More worrisome to Cambodian officials than food distribution is the continued failure in agriculture.

In the east I saw newly cultivated fields, and along the Tonle Sap Lake in the northwest, people were planting an extra crop of rice. But elsewhere there was an ominous lack of farm activity.

Even the best official government estimates predicted only 60 percent of the land cultivated in 1969 would be tilled by the end of 1980. At present only 25 percent of the 1969 cultivation level has been reached.

Yet few Cambodians I spoke to expressed much confidence in the government of former Khmer Rouge battalion commander Heng Samrin. A Cambodian from Kandal Province told me the Phnom Penh government possessed some good men but "most were incapable of independent thinking."

Both Cambodians in the government and some Vietnamese advisers seemed to believe that if it were to succeed, the Heng Samrin government would have to move to distance itself from Hanoi and broaden its base to include Khmers of different backgrounds.

At present the lower ranks of government are filled with bureaucrats who have survived the Khmer Rouge purges and who once were aligned with either Norodom Sihanouk, former head of state, or the Lon Nol regime.

These people voiced uncertainty about the future, but hoped they could somehow preserve an independent Cambodia while, at the same time keeping Vietnam happy.

A government timetable for 1980 calls for the writing of a constitution; village, district, and provincial elections; and the formation of a national assembly.

Some Cambodians hope these formalities will allow a more Cambodian, and less Vietnamese, government to emerge. At the very least any Cambodian government will have

to take note of and deal with rising popular resentment to the continued Vietnamese occupation.●

A TRIBUTE TO MORRIE LEIBMAN

HON. ROBERT McCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that my longtime friend—Morris I. Leibman of Chicago—a member of the executive board of the Center for Strategic and International Studies at Georgetown University, was recognized in a recent tribute by the officers of this prestigious center.

It is heartening to know that such unselfishness and dedicated service does, indeed, induce the plaudits of his colleagues and associates.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to attach to these remarks a copy of the tribute to Morrie Leibman, as follows:

IN RECOGNITION OF MORRIS I. LEIBMAN

The strength of the American system arises out of the citizen statesman. No one exemplifies this more than Morris I. Leibman. It was his commitment and his power of persuasion that originally joined the basic elements which formed the nucleus of the Center for Strategic Studies in 1962.

Always the careful and analytical lawyer in times of trouble, always the goad and prodder in times of triumph, Morrie Leibman has served the Center and through it, the Georgetown University and the nation as a whole in a spirit of the highest public service.

Morrie Leibman's service results from a remarkable combination of outstanding professional accomplishments within the legal profession, deep concern about the national security of the United States and above all, an unshakeable dedication to the fundamental precepts of human freedom. In an all too modest manner, Morrie Leibman has defined himself as the catalyst of many of the important coalitions that sustain frank and open communication between the private sector and the nation's public institutions. The recent rejuvenation of the American Bar Association's standing committee on Law and National Security is an immediate example.

At the Center, he has repeatedly addressed the institution's organizational needs, financial requirements, and academic relations. He has provided leadership in the substantive areas of geopolitical communication, national security evaluation, and national intelligence. For all of these great contributions we hereby honor him at our Advisory Board meeting of March 6 and 7, 1980.

David M. Abshire, Chairman, CSIS; Arleigh Burke, Chairman, Honorary Board; Nathaniel Samuels, Executive Board; Anne Armstrong, Vice Chairman, Executive Board; Timothy Healy, S.J., President, Georgetown University; Frederick Seitz, Chairman, Advisory Board.●

ACID RAIN: A SERIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DANGER THAT MUST BE CONTROLLED

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frightening phenomena of our industrialized society is the increasing prevalence of acid rain. It is the unwanted transition between polluted air and polluted water—an unseen danger that adversely affects almost every ecological system.

Time magazine recently pointed out the dangers which inhere in acid rain. Because Congress must, in its environmental protection programs, address this very serious threat to the future of our planet, I want to share this article with my colleagues:

ACID FROM THE SKIES: CORROSIVE RAIN HAS BECOME AN INSIDIOUS MENACE

Just a little breeze with some smoke in its eye,

What have they done to the rain?

—MALVINA REYNOLDS.

Already it has killed off the fish in about a hundred lakes in New York's Adirondack wilderness. It has pelted the slopes of the Rockies, and has already affected Scandinavia and much of industrialized Western Europe and Japan. It is a newly recognized and increasingly harmful kind of pollution, invisible and insidious: acid rain, a corrosive precipitation that actually consists of weak solutions of sulfuric and nitric acids.

Last November 35 nations, including the U.S., gathered in Geneva and signed a pact pledging to work together against this sky-borne peril. President Carter has authorized a \$10 million annual outlay for a ten-year research program on acid rain, which he considers one of the two gravest environmental threats of the decade (the other: increasing levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere from the burning of fossil fuels).

Acid precipitation is apparently caused largely by sulfur dioxide emissions from coal-burning power plants, smelters and factories. To a lesser extent, nitrogen oxides from car exhausts and industry contribute to the problem. Rising high into the sky and borne hundreds of miles by winds, these chemicals mix and react with water vapor to form sulfuric and nitric acids. The acids then fall to earth in the form of rain or snow that can damage anything from monuments to living organisms. After a number of such rain showers or highly acidic snow melts, a lake's pH¹ can plunge low enough to impair the egg-producing ability of fish. Decomposition of organic matter slows, probably because of a loss of scavenging microorganisms. The number of plankton falls off sharply, depleting a vital link in the food chain. Finally, the water appears blue, clear—and virtually lifeless.

The ill effects spread beyond the lakes. In some areas, humans may also be affected. In the Lac la Croix lake system of Ontario, where the Ojibway Indians fish for their livelihood, catches are showing high levels of mercury. Reason: the toxic metal, ordi-

¹pH is a scale, ranging from 0 to 14, for measuring acidity or alkalinity. A chemically neutral solution is denoted by 7, increasing acidity by lower numbers (each one representing a tenfold increase), and rising alkalinity by numbers greater than 7. Rain or snow has a natural pH around 5.6, resulting mainly from atmospheric carbon dioxide, which produces a weak solution of carbonic acid.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

narily concentrated in sediment, changes into an organic form, methyl mercury, in acid water and is then easily absorbed by the fish. While the threat to plants is not as well understood, acid rain can eat away at leaves, leach nutrients from the soil, interfere with photosynthesis, and affect the nitrogen-fixing capabilities of such plants as peas and soybeans. Scandinavian scientists claim the rain has caused a 15 percent reduction in timber growth. It can also corrode stone statues, limestone buildings and metal rooftops. In the past two decades, Athens' Parthenon and Rome's Colosseum have deteriorated severely; the prime suspect is acid rain. In the U.S. it may cause as much as \$2 billion each year in structural damage.

Paradoxically, one tactic in the fight against air pollution has contributed to the increase in acid rain. To keep the air clean in the immediate neighborhoods of factories, industry has been building ever taller smokestacks. These belch gases that are out of sight—and out of mind—for local communities, but not for those downwind. The farther the gases go, the more time they have to combine with moisture and form acids. Indeed, scientists estimate that the world's tallest stack, rising 1,250 ft. above a copper-nickel smelter in Sudbury, Ont., accounts for 1 percent of all sulfur emissions in the world, including those from volcanoes. All told, Canadian industry and the winds send about half a million tons of these emissions south to the U.S. every year.

But Canada gets more than it gives. Some 2 million tons annually blow north across the border from the U.S., mostly from the industrial Ohio River Valley, which is also thought to be the main source of the Northeast's acid-rain problem. In Europe, says Svante Odén, a Swedish soil scientist, acid rain is equivalent to a "chemical war." Scandinavians claim they are being "bombed" by British and German factories, and similar charges have been exchanged by France and West Germany.

Written before any widespread alarm about acid precipitation, the U.S. Clean Air Act of 1970 gives states a liberal hand in controlling their own emissions to meet federal air quality standards. But it does not assign any responsibility for blights one state may inflict on another. The result has been a see-no-evil attitude that may well require more federal intervention. Also, the 1970 act sets standards only for "ambient," or ground-level air quality; acid rain is formed by high-floating emissions.

In some regions, nature itself buffers the effects of damaging rain; alkaline soils and rocks in the vicinity of the lake help neutralize the acidic water. But when man has tried to duplicate the process by spreading lime on and around endangered lakes, the task has proved expensive and only a temporary palliative.

Taking aim at the source of the trouble, the EPA is requiring the installation of scrubbers that remove up to 90 percent of sulfur emissions at all new coal-fired power plants. But older plants are not covered by the new law, and the problem is likely to worsen as the country turns increasingly to its vaunted ace in the energy hole, coal. "Washing" high-sulfur coal can help. This process involves crushing the coal, then separating out pyrite, and iron-sulfur compound. Because ash, dirt and rock are removed at the same time, washing also makes the coal more economical to ship and less damaging to utility boilers. Still, the expense of these measures is staggering. By one estimate, just to cut sulfur dioxide emissions by 50 percent in the Northeastern U.S. alone would cost up to \$7 billion annually.

Yet even at such prices a solution may be a bargain. For as ecologists point out, doing

nothing about acid rain now could mean nightmarish environmental costs in the future.●

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 62d anniversary of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Such a day serves as a reminder that there was a time when these noble people were free, and that now they suffer under the yoke of Soviet oppression.

The Byelorussian-American Association held a rally on Sunday in New York City to mark that anniversary. Among the issues they considered that day was the evergrowing Soviet expansion into many corners of the globe, and Soviet mistreatment of dissidents in Byelorussia. Among those now imprisoned is human rights activist Michal Kukabaka. Mr. Kukabaka spent 6 years in various Soviet psychiatric prisons for refusing to cooperate in Soviet elections, and for enlightening his coworkers of the tenets of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Because he was always outspoken in his defense of human rights, he is today again in prison, serving out a 3-year sentence for writing, among others, essays entitled "Human Rights and Détente are Indivisible," and "The Stolen Fatherland".

Michal Kukabaka has renounced his Soviet citizenship, as he considers himself a Byelorussian; furthermore, he is hoping to emigrate to any country willing to accept him for what he is—a man seeking freedom from political discrimination and one who only wants to practice his cultural and ethnic heritage in freedom. As he has no family whatever, it is up to us and the entire world community to come to his aid and speak out on behalf of him and the many other prisoners of conscience held captive in their own land.

Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are but one group among many that has suffered dearly at the hands of the Soviet Union. Yet it is heartwarming to know that these brave people are willing to fight for both their ethnic heritage and political freedom. Such a struggle is surely one that must be admired and sustained if we are to be true to the principles of democracy.●

THE ADMINISTRATION'S UNITED NATIONS VOTE FIASCO

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, while I was truly appalled at the spectacle of the administration's mistake in in-

structing our United Nations Ambassador to vote in favor the Security Council resolution on the future of Israeli settlements in the territory won in the six-day war, I have so far refrained from comment waiting for the dust to settle, so to speak. However, with the additional statement of Secretary of State Cyrus Vance at a hearing in the other body last week, I can no longer remain silent.

First of all, I must join in the incredulity that has been expressed by many of my colleagues that an error of this magnitude would be committed by the highest foreign policymaking officials of this land. Second, I must add, that even if the specific language with respect to Jerusalem had been properly deleted, there were many other flaws in the resolution that should have rendered it unacceptable in any case. The future of the territories won by Israel in the six-day war are, and should be, the subject of negotiation between Israel and the affected Arab States, as was the case with the occupied Sinai. If Israel had relinquished the Sinai to Egypt at the United Nations or the United States prodding 3 years ago, there would have been no Camp David peace treaty, no Egyptian Embassy in Tel Aviv, and no Israeli Embassy in Cairo. To give up something of strategic or even symbolic importance while getting nothing in return—not even the recognition of the most elemental fact of one's right to exist—is foolhardy at best and could be catastrophic at worst. That is what the United Nations—and apparently—the U.S. State Department are asking Israel to do. Negotiations with other Arab States—yes, Egypt was willing to try and she was amply rewarded for her efforts. The other Arab countries must be convinced that they cannot gain their ends without going through a similar process. Unilateral capitulation—no.

Mr. Speaker, an excellent analysis of this matter appeared in the March 13 issue of the *Christian Science Monitor* in an article written by George E. Gruen. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to this column with the thought that it sheds some much-needed light on this entire matter.

The article appears as follows:

UN RESOLUTION—JERUSALEM IS NOT THE ONLY PROBLEM

A thorough analysis of the full text of UN Security Council Resolution 465, adopted on March 1, makes it clear why the affirmative vote of the US delegation seriously undercut the American-backed Camp David negotiating process, sowed widespread confusion concerning our Middle East policy goals, and undermined Israel's confidence in the US as a fair-minded negotiator.

The subsequent disavowal of the American vote by President Carter does not undo all the damage, for the resolution contains several pernicious elements in addition to the clauses concerning Jerusalem and the dismantling of settlements to which the President objected in his statement of clarification. The presence of all these elements contrary to previously accepted American policy should have prompted not merely an abstention but a threat of veto.

Following are some specific examples:

1. This was the first time the US voted for a UN Security Council resolution speaking of "the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967" (emphasis added). This distinction gives support to the PLO contention that the West Bank and Gaza district should form part of an independent Palestinian state and are not to be equated with other Arab territories, such as Sinai or the Golan Heights, occupied from Egypt and Syria.

Resolution 465 thus interprets and in effect amends Resolution 242 in ways that are contrary to the stated American policy of opposition to a separate West Bank Palestinian state not linked to Jordan and contrary to the commitment made by the US to Israel on Sept. 1, 1975, to veto any changes in 242 that would adversely affect Israel. This commitment was reaffirmed by President Carter at the time of the signing of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty last March.

Furthermore, this phrasing prejudices the ultimate issue of sovereignty over the West Bank (Judea and Samaria) and Gaza, which are matters that the Camp David accords left for decision at the end of the five-year autonomy period. It is thus not surprising that the news of the US vote was initially hailed by the PLO in Beirut.

2. The call to Israel "to dismantle the existing settlements" goes far beyond stated American policy. United Nations Representative Donald McHenry's expressed reservation that it was "impractical" to dismantle the settlements was woefully inadequate. President Carter added that this call was "neither proper nor practical." He stated that "the future disposition of existing settlements must be determined during the current autonomy talks."

Even this goes beyond previous American policy. The Carter administration has strenuously attempted, without success, to get Israel to agree to a moratorium on the erection of new settlements during the time of the autonomy talks. (Israel did agree to a three-month freeze during negotiation of the Egyptian-Israeli treaty). The fate of existing settlements in the West Bank was at most considered a subject for discussion in the negotiations among Israel, Egypt, and Jordan and the proposed self-governing authority regarding a final Israeli-Jordanian peace treaty at the end of the five-year period.

3. The resolution also for the first time includes changes in the "institutional structure or status" of the Palestinian and other occupied Arab territories as among the Israeli actions it regards as lacking legal validity and constituting a "flagrant violation" of the Fourth Geneva Convention. Despite Mr. McHenry's statement that the US does not regard this language as "in any way prejudicing the outcome of the autonomy negotiations," the fact remains that the thrust of this language and of the resolution as a whole is precisely to undermine and negate the validity of the autonomy negotiations.

4. The resolution makes no distinction between other occupied territories and the part of Jerusalem recaptured by Israel from Jordan in 1967—thereby ending the illegal division of the city caused by the Jordanian invasion in 1948.

While the US does not accept the legal validity of unilateral actions taken by Israel in Jerusalem, it has always made it clear that Jerusalem was unique and therefore East Jerusalem could not simply be lumped together with other occupied territories, as this resolution explicitly does. It was precisely because of the complexity of the Jerusalem question, and the failure of the parties at Camp David to reach agreement on this subject, that it was decided to defer consid-

eration of the ultimate status of Jerusalem until a later stage in the peace process.

The US vote on Resolution 465 is only symptomatic of the larger problem, which will not go away even if the US takes the unprecedented step of having its vote formally registered as an abstention. The resolution remains on the record as an official UN document. States hostile to Israel will be able to build upon it.

Moreover, the resolution perpetuates the existence of what had been an ad hoc Security Council commission on Israeli settlement activity. The commission had been established on March 22, 1979, (Resolution 446) on the basis of a Jordanian initiative clearly designed to undercut the US-backed Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty due to be signed four days later. The US did not support last year's resolution establishing the commission. The March 1 resolution requests the commission to continue to examine the situation in the occupied territories "including Jerusalem, to investigate the reported serious depletion of natural resources, particularly the water resources, with a view to insuring the protection of those important natural resources . . . and to keep under close scrutiny the implementation of the present resolution;" and asks the commission to report back to the Council before Sept. 1.

Since the question of control over natural resources is obviously among the agenda items of the current autonomy talks, the Security Council by means of this Arab-sponsored resolution attempts to undercut these talks. Instead of encouraging Palestinian and Jordanian participation in the Camp David process of direct Egyptian-Israeli negotiation, the Security Council resolution sets forth a competitive locus for presenting Arab grievances. This may serve the interests of the rejectionist Arab states and of the Soviet Union. It certainly runs contrary to the American interest in strengthening the current peace process in which the US has been a "full partner" trusted by both sides. ●

POSTAL EMPLOYEES' RIGHT TO SAFETY BILL

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which establishes the right of a postal employee to choose not to perform an assigned task if he or she has a reasonable belief that the workplace condition is abnormally dangerous. The bill further prohibits postal officials from discharging or otherwise discriminating against an employee who exercises the rights afforded by this legislation.

In effect, the bill makes applicable to the Postal Service the provision of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 143) which provides that the quitting of work under such circumstances in the private sector shall not be considered a strike. The bill further codifies and makes applicable to the Postal Service the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court—*Whirlpool Corporation against Marshall*, decided February 26, 1980. That decision supported the right of the Secretary of Labor to issue such a regulation and determined that the regulation con-

formed to the objective of preventing occupational death and serious injuries.

On October 22, 1979, the House of Representatives approved related legislation, H.R. 826. That bill authorized the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to conduct unannounced inspections of postal facilities and to impose civil penalties for violations of Federal safety and health laws. That bill, now under consideration by the Senate, subjected the Postal Service to the same safety and health standard as the private employees. My bill further eliminates differential standards of health and safety between private employers and the Postal Service.

Since House approval of H.R. 826, the Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization has conducted extensive oversight hearings and onsite investigations of the safety and health program in the Postal Service. That program is deficient in several major respects. In addition, a recent accidental fatality in the New York Bulk and Foreign Mail Center was a direct result of numerous serious safety defects which were disregarded by postal management. Two weeks ago, in Bellmawr, N.J., postal employees were allegedly refused permission by postal management to vacate a burning postal facility. In Miami, Fla., the Postal Service has been dilatory in taking action to examine former employees who, since 1957, were exposed to excessive levels of cancer-producing asbestos fibers in the atmosphere.

The Postmaster General, who recently appeared before the subcommittee reluctantly, was unconvincing in his efforts to convince the members that he was serious about taking immediate action to correct these unsafe conditions. He supported the provisions embodied in this legislation with reservations.

I want to make it clear that enactment of this bill would not authorize employees to conduct "strike with pay" over unsafe working conditions; nor would it permit malingering. The bill simply subjects the Postal Service to the same safety standards as private employers by providing that an employee who in good faith believes that performance of a specific task may result in death or serious injury may refuse to perform that specific task and shall not be subject to discharge or discrimination by his employer.●

ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1980

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, for every man there is a season, and a time for every purpose under heaven.

And for Allard Lowenstein the time was always now.

It was impossible to be active in New York politics or to be involved with any issue that touched human rights and not come into contact with Al Lowenstein.

He believed fervently in the ability of committed people to make a difference—whether on a college campus, in a local Democratic club, in the Halls of Congress, or in the arena of international affairs.

He reached out to people all over this country to get them involved, to make them care, to stir them to action. But the action was always within the system. He was a firm believer in nonviolence and despite the tempers and storms in the various movements with which he was involved, he never renounced the principles of nonviolent change and his conviction that reason could prevail.

In 1962 Al Lowenstein's book, "Brutal Mandate" exposed the horrendous conditions in South Africa, the brutal repression of human rights, and the excesses of the colonial administration in South-West Africa. When he died last week, he was still working to bring about peaceful self-determination for the people of Namibia.

Last year Al was part of the effort that many of us in the House and Senate made to evolve a policy that would end the bitter and bloody war in Rhodesia and achieve majority rule in that country. Though we differed on some of the particulars of the solution, we all shared the conviction that it was worth the struggle to find a peaceful solution for that troubled nation. I am sad today to realize that Al Lowenstein did not live to see the formal birth of an independent Zimbabwe, which will occur on April 18, and which he in his own inimitable fashion helped to bring about.

I knew Al in the antiwar movement, in what appeared to be a hopeless attempt to turn around an entire nation that seemed determined to continue a long war in Indochina. Thousands of us got into that movement, and while we were unable to bring peace to Southeast Asia, we did stop the loss of thousands more of our young soldiers, and we brought legions of new workers into the political process.

Al was involved in dozens of other causes and movements and campaigns. He served effectively in this House for one term. But I think he will be remembered more for his lifelong efforts to make human rights issues widely understood and appreciated.

He was a brilliant debator who never ceased to amaze his audiences or his opponents with his arguments and the number of quotations from the pile of books under his arm that he could weave into any debate or discussion. He loved to wrestle—with men and ideas. He could argue into the night on any subject—and while you may not have agreed with his position, you had to respect his persistence and consider his side of the issue.

Today as I look around in Washington I realize that there are scores of people in this body and scattered in agencies across town that knew and worked with Al at some time. And, as I stand here today, scarcely believing that Al Lowenstein will not be coming back here to lobby or nudge, and that a senseless shooting took away his life, I still feel the real loss of a friend.

This is the first week of spring, and traditionally spring is the season of hope and of new life. And so, despite my sadness and the sadness of thousands of other people who knew and loved Al, and of the great loss to his family and his children, I look around and I still feel some hope. And that hope is based on the fact that the people whom Allard touched—all over this country—will somehow continue the important work that Al gave himself to so freely, the effort to loosen the bonds of prejudice, poverty, ignorance, and oppression that burden so much of humanity.●

THE ASSASSINATION OF ARCHBISHOP ROMERO

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my grief over the assassination of Archbishop Oscar A. Romero of El Salvador who was gunned down at point-blank range on March 24 while delivering a memorial mass.

To the people of El Salvador, Archbishop Romero was a guiding light, a voice for freedom and equality. He was an outspoken champion of human rights and was nominated for the 1979 Nobel Peace Prize by British members of Parliament and some members of the U.S. Congress.

Since last year violence has wracked the country of El Salvador as factions on the left and right battle for control. The Archbishop was a consistent voice for peaceful conciliation between left and right political extremes. Until his death he remained hopeful that a violent revolution could be avoided within his country. However, just before his death his public statements reflected an increasing disillusionment with the current government and his death symbolizes the complete lack of respect certain sectors of El Salvador have for human rights.

Archbishop Romero remained a Christian devoted to human rights to the very end. His brutal, tragic death is a loss not only to El Salvador, but to the entire world. On the one hand, I fear that it will initiate a spiraling escalation of violence within El Salvador. On the other hand, I hope that it will cause all of us to remember the ideals for which Archbishop Romero stood—the universal extension of human rights and the construction of a more just and equal society for everyone. Now more than ever, it is time

for all of us to recommit ourselves to these ideals.●

THE 62D ANNIVERSARY OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, the first Byelorussian Congress proclaimed independence in Minsk, the capitol of Byelorussia. This new government organized the Republic's armed services, schools, and established diplomatic relations abroad. This proclamation marked the beginning of a new life for the people of this republic.

However, Byelorussia's Declaration of Independence coincided with the period of Bolshevik expansionism and the conquest of a number of smaller nations which had recently liberated themselves from Russia.

In 1919, only 1 year after the declaration of Byelorussian independence, the Moscow government in opposition to an independent Byelorussia created a new state: The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, B.S.S.R. Two years later Byelorussia was conquered by the Russian army.

Since then, Byelorussia has been under Russian dominance and its people deprived of their national and human rights. This domination and deprivation has taken the form of mass terrorism and the annihilation of over 6 million Byelorussian people. Economically, Byelorussia's people and resources have been exploited leading to the underdevelopment of Byelorussia. Currently, the citizens of Byelorussia are involved in a number of Soviet projects in which they have been forced to work and participate.

Deprivation of the Byelorussian people has not stopped with economic and political oppression, but has taken the form of cultural and religious oppression as well: Byelorussians are forced to speak the Russian language and positions of authority and influence in Byelorussia are held by Russians. The national church and religion of Byelorussia, the Orthodox Autocephalic Church, was destroyed and the Russian Orthodox Church imposed on the Byelorussians.

Despite the repressive Soviet policies in this small republic, Byelorussians have continued to assert their human rights, often at great cost, and have tried to preserve their national heritage. In 1944, at the Second Byelorussian Congress, Byelorussians annulled all ties with Russia and ratified the proclamations of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic according to the 1918 declaration.

The story of Byelorussia is not unique. It is the same story of many independent Russian countries that have been forced to adhere to Soviet

dominance. Byelorussia shares a history similar to that of the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It is the same struggle for human rights, dignity and self-determination, freedom of religious expression, and the right to pursue the interests of their own country or Republic rather than those of the Soviet Union.

Byelorussians, like many of their neighbors, have seen another anniversary of independence pass without experiencing true independence. It is my hope that this Republic and others under Soviet dominance be given the right to true self-determination and independence soon.●

THE DEATH PENALTY IS A DETERRENT—JUST ASK A CRIMINAL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's New York Daily News a rather remarkable story appeared entitled "Teen Killer Looks Back—But Mostly Forward." It is a story about 17-year-old Willie Bosket, Jr., who at the age of 15 committed a vicious murder. He is now in the second year of a prison sentence.

The story focuses on several aspects of Bosket's life but certain observations offered by Bosket about the criminal justice system should be given the most serious consideration by my colleagues.

In Willie Bosket's own words—

I didn't care about killing those guys because I knew I was a teenager, could have killed a hundred people and gotten only a few years in jail."

When the judge sentenced me to five years, I could have jumped on the bench and kissed him. You know, the only just sentence would have been for me to get the chair because I killed just for the experience.

But that was the law and I was not about to tell them differently.

The News article continued—

Willie Jr. claimed he never would have killed if they had the chair. And they should have it for people who kill for fun.

Beyond the shock value which this type of attitude evokes, it is in fact indicative of the minds of many criminals who feel they can operate with impunity and never really feel the heaviest hands of the law.

I came to Congress after serving 23 years as a police officer in New York City. I dealt with the most hardened of criminals and the worst of neighborhoods. I have always maintained that deterrence is a key element in crime reduction. Whether that deterrence takes the form of the uniformed police officer patrolling the streets or is in the form of a statute which imposes the death penalty—the result is the same, it can reduce crime.

More than half of the States in the Nation have passed laws restoring the death penalty. I support these State laws and feel a Federal law should be passed as well. I advocate a law which is specific in its application. The death penalty is a strong tool. It should be used only against the most heinous of criminals.

As we continue to deliberate on our criminal justice system let us not lose sight of the fact that we must be prepared to use our strongest weapons if we are to win the battle against crime. The next time we as Members of Congress are presented with an opportunity to vote on restoration of the death penalty—let us remember the words of Willie Bosket, Jr. They are truly reflective of the extent to which the criminal elements in this Nation are flourishing thanks to the absence of strong laws.●

AMENDMENTS TO ACHIEVE LEGISLATIVE SAVINGS IN THE FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1981 BUDGET

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, there are many opportunities for reasonable, needed cost reductions in Federal programs throughout the budget.

In social welfare programs, which have all been significantly increased above current levels in the First Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1981, which was approved last Thursday by the House Budget Committee, hundreds of millions of dollars in legislative savings can be achieved by tightening up eligibility requirements and taking action to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse, so that only the truly needy or deserving citizens are able to obtain benefits.

Some excellent proposals have been made over the years in both Houses of Congress, to reform the overlenient eligibility requirements for food stamps, to set a ceiling on gross income and personal assets for participation, as well as to help eliminate fraud and abuse.

The food stamp program approaches \$10 billion a year in cost. It has 20.2 million recipients—1 out of every 10 Americans. There are many ways in which legislative savings can be achieved, and the following amendments which will be offered during House consideration of the First Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 1981 provide good examples of responsible cost reductions which should be considered.

The same is true for aid for families with dependent children (AFDC), another large welfare program which has very lenient eligibility requirements and a great deal of fraud, waste, and abuse. There are many ways in which

March 25, 1980

we can achieve needed legislative savings through responsible reforms, as represented by the following amendments:

AMENDMENTS TO ACHIEVE LEGISLATIVE SAVINGS IN FOOD STAMPS AND AID FOR FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN (AFDC), FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1981 BUDGET

RUDD AMENDMENT TO FUNCTION 600—INCOME SECURITY

(In millions of dollars)

	Reduce function by—	
	Budget authority	Outlays
Legislative savings by restoring the food stamp purchase requirement eliminated in 1977.....	800	800
Legislative savings from the following food stamp eligibility revisions: (1) Limit eligibility to those with gross income at the poverty line, plus a 15 percent allowance for work-related activities; (2) Establish purchase requirements at percentage of gross income expended for food by average household of same size and income range, with regional variations as established by the most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Survey, or 30 percent, whichever is less; and (3) Use the Thrifty Diet Plan, with family size, age, and sex of family members taken into account.....	700	700
Legislative savings from using a food stamp assets test initially established for supplemental security income (SSI), with a \$1,200 limit on a motor vehicle; a \$15,000 limit on property used in a trade or business essential to self-support of a household; an overall limit on liquid and nonliquid resources (with the above exceptions) of \$1,500 for the household, or \$2,250 for households of two or more persons with a member or members age 65 or over.....	522	522
Legislative savings from implementing food stamp fraud control, mandating a photoidentification card, counter-signed warrants, a national application cross-checked, and an earnings clearance system.....	138	138
Legislative savings from counting as income for food stamp eligibility determination (1) income tax rebates; (2) Federal energy assistance; and (3) any in-kind income which provides food assistance.....	503	503
Legislative savings in the food stamp program by eliminating student loans and grants (all of which "cannot reasonably and properly be computed") and housing subsidies as exclusions from income.....	38	38
Legislative savings in the food stamp program by (1) restoring to age 6 (not age 12) the age of a child which exempts an individual from work registration; and (2) strengthening the work registration requirement by permitting States to establish community work experience programs as a condition of eligibility.....	34	34
Legislative savings in the food stamp program by eliminating the overlap of food stamp benefits with the school lunch program.....	630	630
Legislative savings in the food stamp program by (1) retaining the \$90 per month child care deduction (rather than the increase proposed by the House Agriculture Committee amendment to S. 1309), and (2) retaining the \$35 per month medical expense deductible (rather than the decrease to a \$10 deductible, as proposed by the House Agriculture Committee amendment to S. 1309).....	122	122
Legislative savings in the food stamp program by reducing the standard deduction from \$75 to \$50.....	600	600
Legislative savings in the food stamp program by requiring the Department of Agriculture to correct the 12 percent error rate estimated by the General Accounting Office.....	360	360
Legislative savings in the food stamp program by eliminating from eligibility (1) strikers, and (2) college students.....	29	29
Legislative savings in the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program by enacting the following reforms regarding eligibility of recipients with income: (1) Limit gross eligibility to 150 percent of the needs standard; (2) Implement the Senate Finance Committee's recommended revision in the earnings disregard formula; (3) Deduct work-related expenses before earnings exemptions; (4) Require eligibility to be redetermined without benefit of earnings exemptions for (a) any individual who has earned income in four or more consecutive months and (b) any applicant or re-applicant; (5) Including a standard work-related expense provision; and (6) Implement the Senate Finance Committee's recommendation on unreported earnings.....	271	271
Legislative savings in the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program by instituting a 30-day retrospective accounting and monthly income reporting.....	571	571
Legislative savings in the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program by implementing the following reforms to help eliminate improper beneficiaries: (1) Exclude strikers from eligibility; (2) Require use of a standardized photoidentification card; (3) Define "child" as individual below the age of 18; (4) Provide 50 percent Federal matching for local law enforcement fraud control costs; (5) Implement the Senate Finance Committee's recommendations for improved program management (quality control) initiatives; and (6) Require three-year residency for aliens prior to eligibility, and require every alien admitted for permanent residence to have sponsor who will contract to support him for three years, or to have other means of support.....	171	171

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RUDD AMENDMENT TO FUNCTION 600—INCOME SECURITY—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Reduce function by—	
	Budget authority	Outlays
Legislative savings in the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program by (1) allowing adjustment of overpayments from the grant, and (2) defining available income to include any for which the individual has to file a claim, and shared housing and utilities.....	179	179
Legislative savings in the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program by (1) Requiring support by nonneedy person living with welfare family in the amount it would cost him to support himself, and (2) Requiring cross-check with Federal and State income tax agencies to determine if needy person living with a welfare family has claimed any members of such family as dependents.....	670	670
Legislative savings in the Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program by (1) Implementing the Senate Finance Committee's recommendations (a) concerning community work and training and (b) for modification of the Work Incentive Program (WIN), and (2) Standardizing sanctions against able-bodied employable recipients who voluntarily leave employment or who refuse to look for or accept employment.....	103	103

Mr. Speaker, in light of the President's solemn commitment to maintain real growth in defense spending, while meeting current force objectives, there is no way that Congress can justify a cut in defense spending below the President's January budget request.

In fact, the President's own request was an estimated \$7 billion below required funding in order to meet current force objectives with no new or expanded programs.

The proposed amounts under the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1981 budget approved by the House Budget Committee last Thursday, of \$160.8 billion in budget authority and \$147.9 billion in outlays for national defense, are \$2 billion below the President's budget reestimate in budget authority and a cut of \$1.4 billion in outlays below the reestimate.

I believe that Congress should add \$12.6 billion in budget authority and \$8.8 billion in outlays to the National Defense function. Such an increase is entirely reasonable and absolutely necessary in order to maintain the President's solemn commitment to increase our worldwide military capabilities by providing 5.6 percent real growth in fiscal year 1981 defense expenditures.

The following amendment to the budget resolution will accomplish this objective, and I hope that it will be seriously considered by all my colleagues in the Congress.

I am also including in the RECORD two amendments which I offered during markup of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1981, which are part of the larger amendment, but may be offered separately during House floor action on the resolution:

6609

AMENDMENTS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE, FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 1981 BUDGET

RUDD AMENDMENT TO FUNCTION 050—NATIONAL DEFENSE

(In millions of dollars)

	Increase function by—	
	Budget authority	Outlays
To maintain 5.6 percent real growth in defense spending while meeting current force objectives in a realistic manner.....	12,650	8,825
Additional funding required is as follows:		
1. Correct underfunding for current operations:		
a. Fuel price increases.....	4,500	4,500
b. Maintenance of current naval operations.....	250	250
c. Meeting higher than expected inflation in procurement.....	1,500	1,500
d. Excessive pay absorption.....	600	600
e. Personnel compensation improvements.....	200	200
Subtotal: Funds required to maintain President's commitment to 5.6 percent real growth with no new programs.....	7,050	7,050
2. Program improvements:		
a. Strategic forces.....	250	100
b. Naval forces.....	1,500	500
c. Aircraft procurement.....	2,500	500
d. Theater facilities.....	250	125
e. War reserve material.....	500	250
f. Operations and maintenance.....	600	300
Subtotal: Funds required to meet current force objectives.....	5,600	1,775
Total: Required additional funds to maintain 5.6 percent real growth while meeting force objectives in a realistic manner.....	12,650	8,825
To restore the fiscal year 1981 aircraft procurement program to 639 aircraft, as requested in the President's 1981 plan submitted in January 1979.....	2,500	500
To provide long-lead funding for a separate Naval task force for the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf.....	1,500	500

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in recognition of Greek Independence Day. As the representative of 39,000 Greek-Americans, there are few holidays more important to my constituents than this day. Similarly, there are few international relations issues more important to the people of the Ninth District of New York than Cyprus and Greece.

It is a widely recognized and often quoted fact that Greece has contributed more to the development of America than any other nation. Our American institutions, from our system of government to our educational system, are rooted in the teachings of the ancient Greeks. Our commitment to the principles of democracy, freedom, and civilized society spring from those of the Greeks. Our most precious value, the right to be free, is borrowed from the Greek tradition. Yet, the contributions of Greece and its people go far beyond the framework of this Nation. The impact of this great nation and civilization are seen not only in the foundations of American society, but in the ensuing structure that has evolved. The commitment of today's Greek Americans to their homeland

and their culture has been incorporated into American ideals.

Working with and on behalf of my Greek-American constituents has been among the most rewarding aspects of my work as a Member of the House. I have met with them and spoken with them about the needs of their families and friends who remain in Greece and in Cyprus. To gain a better understanding of these issues, I traveled to Greece and Cyprus last summer. I have seen the refugee camps. I have spoken with men and women whose homes and possessions, and even more importantly, whose values, have been taken from them. I have watched, with tears in my own eyes, as they express their fears and frustrations. And I have returned home to the streets of Astoria and Long Island City to speak with their relatives here. I returned with more than a broader understanding of the issue, because I brought back with me a deeper commitment to insuring a just resolution of this tragedy. I have seen, from both sides, the continuing commitment to freedom and the principles of liberty in the face of severe deprivations of those values.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we appreciate the meaning of the struggle of the Greeks. We share with Greece the determination to be a free and prosperous people. On the anniversary of Greek independence, we join all Greeks in saluting their heritage, and in their call for continued and new freedoms. We salute the success of Greece and pray for new victories. I join in recognizing Greek Independence Day and in thanking Greeks, both here and abroad, for establishing and maintaining a civilized and decent culture and for helping this Nation achieve those ends, as well. ●

CAN LIBERTARIANS SUPPORT ABORTION

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, libertarians are divided over the abortion issue, although more today are prolife than a few years ago, when few realized the inconsistency of their proabortion position.

Recently Dr. Edmund Opitz of the Foundation for Economic Education wrote an excellent article for Human Events which demonstrates, in scholarly fashion, the untenable position of most libertarians, who are otherwise noted for their defense of nonviolence and condemnation of all aggressive acts.

This obvious contradiction—denying the right to life to the innocent unborn—undermines libertarian influence as a political movement seeking to protect “our natural and absolute right to our lives and our property.”

Libertarians believe that neither our lives nor our property should be interfered with, by government or our neighbors. No one, they state, has the right to initiate force against another. If libertarians, with this strict view of the inviolability of lives and property, permit the taking of a life because that life is within a woman's body, then they must accept the logical extension of the argument. If we can kill the unborn, why not the unwanted, unhealthy, or simply annoying newborn who is occupying the home of the victimized parent?

I have never heard a libertarian argue for this violent act of killing an infant. As an obstetrician and gynecologist, I know that abortion is the killing of a human being, not the removal of a glob of protoplasm.

The article follows:

CAN LIBERTARIANS SUPPORT ABORTION?

(By Edmund A. Opitz)

Libertarians are divided on the question of abortion, as we might expect; some are for it, others against. We find a similar split in the ranks of doctors, lawyers, politicians, golfers and vegetarians. But some libertarians are giving the old question a new twist: they agree with the pro-lifers that the fetus is human, but they conclude with the pro-abortionists that abortion is OK.

Outside of libertarian circles, opponents of abortion argue that the fetus is human; that the fetus contains all the potentials for future personhood; and that the fetus, therefore, is entitled to the same protection against injury and aggression that the law extends to every other human being. The judicial process may require the life of a man declared guilty of a capital crime, but the fetus has not been judged guilty of anything. He should not, therefore, be put to death.

Proponents of abortion, on the other hand, regard the fetus as a mere collection of cells (which is all the adult human is—if we are to believe some intellectuals!). The destruction of these cells, they say, is not the taking of human life, and abortion, therefore, is no concern of the law or of morals.

The new-model libertarian persuasion on abortion is set forth on pages 120-121, of Murry Rothbard's *For a New Liberty*—a libertarian manifesto which expounds the party line on a variety of issues.

Rothbard does not deny that the fetus is human, with—presumably—the same rights as the rest of us. But he shifts attention away from the fetus' rights to focus on the fetus' responsibilities—and the pro-abortion argument moves onto novel ground. The fetus, is a responsible being, must be held accountable for his actions—just like any adult. Now, when the fetus invades the rights of his host—as he does when he over-stays his welcome—he acts irresponsibly and thus forfeits his rights. In which case it is OK to take his life.

But let Rothbard present his case in his own words: “If we are to treat the fetus as having the same rights as humans, then let us ask: What human has the right to remain, unbidden, as an unwanted parasite within some other human being's body? This is the nub of the issue: the absolute right of every person, and hence every woman, to ownership of her own body.¹ What the mother² is doing in an abortion is causing an unwanted entity³ within her body to be ejected⁴ from it! If the fetus

dies,⁵ this does not rebut the point that no human has a right to live, unbidden, as a parasite within or upon some other person's body.

“The common retort that the mother either wanted or at least was responsible for placing the fetus within her body⁶ is, again, beside the point. Even in the stronger case where the mother originally wanted the child, the mother, as the property owner in her own body, has the right to change her mind and eject it.”

But is it not obvious that the association between pregnant woman and fetus is unlike any other type of human association? It is a relationship between two humans, true enough, but no other case parallels it. This unique form of human association, in other words, cannot be reduced to a mere instance of the various other ways in which humans may be linked.

It is most certainly not analogous to the two-party arrangement which everyone in advanced circles is familiar with—a freely entered into association between “consenting adults.” In this arrangement, two people get together on a strictly voluntary basis on the grounds of mutual advantage, each believes that his/her purposes are better served by the partnership than if each went his own way. Tandem is deemed better than solo, or the deal would not have been made in the first place.

This voluntary association demands the consent of two parties, but it takes only one party to call the deal off. Dissociation may be initiated at the discretion of either party, whenever either one decides that the original purposes that brought the couple together are no longer being served. This unilateral decision is final, however much the other party might protest.

It is disingenuous to deal with the relationship of the fetus to the pregnant woman as if it corresponds to the association between “consenting adults.” But even if the two cases were analogous, the argument from the right to dissociate to the right to abort lacks cogency; the right to dissociate does not grant a license to kill!

Suppose that one of the adults in the familiar coupling no longer consents; he wants out. But the other wants the association to continue, and he persists in foisting his unwanted company on the now no-longer-consenting partner. His persistence has become harassment, and even a libertarian legal code must take cognizance of harassment and deal with it in terms of previously agreed upon rules.

Social cooperation is impossible without such rules. Lacking such rules, the alternative is a piece of malignant advice: “When your former associate becomes obnoxious, dispose of him—quietly, if possible.” This is a recipe for chaos, and it is absurd to offer this recipe as an excuse for abortion, i.e., to say that a pregnant woman and a doctor have a right to kill the fetus when his presence becomes unwanted.

Nearly everyone would agree that there are certain last resort situations where it might be necessary to kill in self-defense, but abortion is not one of them. The fetus has not aggressed against anyone; he has not initiated force against the mother-to-be, nor against the doctor. It would be absurd to try to excuse his slaying as an act of self-defense.

The fetus is “guilty” of not doing the impossible; he did nothing to get himself into this situation and he can do nothing to get himself out of it. And the penalty he is to pay for this? The death penalty—without due process, without a trial. His punishment does seem a bit on the cruel and unusual side, and somewhat disproportionate to the crime. His only “crime” is the natural urge to go on living.

Footnotes at end of article.

In the Rothbard argument for abortion, overly much is made of the fetus' responsibility and overly little of the woman's. The man who got her pregnant is not even mentioned! It was not any action on the fetus' part that brought him into his hazardous situation. He did not choose to enter into this unique human association which puts him completely at the mercy of someone else; he was put on this spot by others. They are responsible for his precarious situation.

Adult human beings are justly held responsible for themselves and their actions. Every person is responsible for the intended and immediate consequences of his actions; and he's also responsible for the unintended and long-range consequences. He is responsible for the ends he acted deliberately to attain, but also for the events which occurred but were not foreseen. He's responsible for the effect upon himself of his actions, and for the impact of his actions on someone else. He's responsible for the probable and predictable consequences of his actions, and sometimes for the improbable and unpredictable as well.

To be fully human means to accept full responsibility for one's self and one's conduct, whether the actual results be on the plus side or the minus. In the present context, it means that the male and female involved are responsible for the new life resulting from their actions. Who else?

Justice needs to be tempered with mercy, and the utmost compassion should be extended to those who feel trapped by an unwanted pregnancy. But sentimentality should not be allowed to disguise the fact that abortion is the taking of life.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Self-ownership is a basic libertarian dogma, according to Rothbard and others, but "it's a dubious notion at best. 'I am myself,' is a truism, the verbal form 'am' links two terms in a relationship of identity. 'I am myself' certainly does not equate with 'I own myself.' In a valid property relationship, the subject who owns is never identical with the object which is owned. Furthermore, it is a definitive mark of ownership to be able to sell one's property, or give it away, or make whatever disposition of it one chooses. Obviously, I cannot sell myself or give away that which I am; and if I dispose of myself I simply cease to be.

Rothbard appears to believe that his notion of self-ownership is sanctioned by John Locke, for does not Locke say, "... every man has a property in his own person." But this property is the man's labor, Locke tells us, not his person or his body! It was Locke's belief that we are God's property. "For men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent and infinitely wise Maker... they are his property." It is an aid to understanding to know that in ancient usage, now obsolete, the word "property" meant "a tool." (Compare Adam Smith: "The property which every man has in his own labor... the strength and dexterity of his hands...")

² A "mother" is one who has given birth to a child. The pregnant woman is just that, a pregnant woman; or she is a gravid female, or the grávida. To refer to the pregnant woman as a mother is a careless use of words. Precision in thought is impossible apart from the accurate use of words. A dictionary is useful at this point.

³ How did we get from the fetus as a human being, to the fetus as "an unwanted entity"? Not even a convicted murderer on death row is customarily referred to as "an unwanted entity!"

⁴ Abortion is a medical operation, not accurately described as the "mother" "ejecting" the fetus. In an abortion the fetus is either (a) suctioned out of the womb, (b) dismembered and pulled out piecemeal, or (c) scalded in a saline solution and later expelled. In any event, the woman does not act, she is acted upon.

⁵ If the fetus dies... If? Of course the fetus dies when it is aborted! If the abortion is performed in the third trimester and the fetus is born alive, the abortion is a failure, and is usually followed by infanticide. There is nothing "iffy" about the effect of an operation to abort if the operation is performed during the first or second trimesters. The fetus is deliberately killed.

⁶ The woman does not "place" the fetus within her body! The fetus grows in the womb, from a fertilized egg. A genetic implant is a possibility—the

"test tube baby"—but even here no one would speak of the woman "placing the fetus within her womb!" The woman is operated upon. Careless use of words again.■

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION: WORKING IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, this year's candidate for the most disliked Federal agency has to be the Federal Trade Commission. The FTC has been charged with attempting to undermine the integrity of the free enterprise system by many critics, including funeral parlor owners, the auto industry, optometrists, the insurance industry, and many others.

Although the FTC has made mistakes and has admitted many of them, a careful examination of the record reveals a rather interesting pattern. Whenever the FTC indicates an interest in probing a monopolized industry or protecting consumers' rights in a given industry, the affected special interest group loudly cries foul. Within a matter of weeks, a horror story about omnipotent bureaucrats at the FTC begins to make the rounds in Washington and throughout the country.

What is lost in this whole process is the fact that the FTC is generally fulfilling its congressional mandate to encourage competition, not monopolization, in industries and trades and to protect consumers' interests. Unfortunately, competition seldom has a spokesman; and general consumers' interests often do not appear at congressional hearings.

Another horror story has begun to make the rounds, and this one involves the popular sport of golf. However, Colman McCarthy has set the record straight concerning this horror story in an excellent article in the Washington Post. I hope that all of my colleagues will read this article and remember its lessons, as we approach the authorizations and appropriations bills for the FTC.

The article follows:

HOLDING A CLUB OVER THE FTC

As a loyal member of Arnie's Army—fans of Arnold Palmer, the golf champ—I had a thrill the other day on finding the general's thoughts in the Congressional Record. He teed off on the Federal Trade Commission. In a reprinted telegram to Sen. Jesse Helms, the North Carolina Republican who is one of the leaders in the current attacks against the FTC, Palmer said the agency had invaded even the fairways.

"The FTC's proposed rule on standards and certifications," he charged, "would affect the United States Golf Association Rules of Golf on golf balls and clubs and, ultimately, how the game itself is played." Other sports would also be affected.

On looking into these claims, I learned that Palmer was far out of bounds and on his way to a triple bogey. Officials at the agency state categorically that no sports or golf regulations have been proposed.

The agency's link with golf came in hearings last year when a small businessman testified on the virtues of an adjustable-head golf club he had invented. He argued that the USGA is "a closed-door organization" that, in setting its private standards, prevents innovative products like his low-cost, multipurpose golf club from coming to the market.

All the FTC did was hear the fellow out, he being one of some 225 witnesses. But the story spread that the wicked bureaucrats in Washington had really done it now. They were about to take over the ancient and royal game of golf—or as Helms said, "There is no limit to a federal bureaucracy's estimation of its own competence."

Unable to resist what it saw as an easy kill, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce tried to club the FTC in an article in its July 1979 newsletter: "If the rule is adopted, sports groups would have to sit back and watch technology eliminate the problems of putting golf clubs, laying up basketballs, or scoring field goals."

Since then, with the unfounded horror story spreading, the FTC has been catching it from numberless golfers, Arnold Palmer being the latest. The agency has no record of Palmer's checking with the FTC for something other than the Helms version.

This clamor from the 19th hole wouldn't be worth heeding except that it reflects the quality of many of the attacks currently being leveled against the FTC. If Michael Pertschuk, the commission's chairman, can be depicted as taking out after hapless golfers—or beleaguered funeral directors, car dealers, insurance agents et al.—then the public is less likely to know that the agency has been doing a worthwhile job against marketplace predators. And wants to keep doing so, if Congress will leave it alone.

Groups like the Chamber of Commerce might have a case against the FTC if the agency's powers really were rigged against business. But the bureaucrats are in traction at having to bend so far over backward to be fair. On the proposed standards rule, some 80,000 pages of testimony were taken over five months. If anything, the agency is open to the charge of being too cautious.

Since coming to the FTC, Pertschuk has seen to it that some 150 trade practice rules—many established in the Nixon years—were rescinded. Yet he is charged with being a reckless over-regulator.

The anti-FTC campaign is depicted as the championing of free enterprise. But if the case of the inventor with the adjustable-head golf club is representative, then it is closed enterprise on view. The man devised a club with a face that can be adjusted to the loft of a driver, putter, wedge and five different irons. It would cost less than \$50 and weigh about a pound. But the USGA, the standard-setter and rule-maker, says the technology is illegal. Since most pro shops and sporting goods stores won't carry "banned" clubs, shoppers have no choice: pay high prices for sanctioned equipment.

I wish the FTC did have the power to break the USGA's authoritarianism. An all-purpose golf club—light to carry and light on the wallet—would be a boon, even though the game would continue to be a joyful agony.

The essence of this case is options: does the consumer have the fullest choice possible? Providing those options is a major function of the FTC in all its operations—ensuring an open marketplace where competition, health and safety are expected by the buyers, and honored by the sellers.■

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today millions of Greek-Americans will observe the 159th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. This day always has great significance in America for we, as a Nation, in our third century of independence, owe a debt of gratitude to ancient Greece, where the origins of all democracy began.

Greece acquired its independence in 1821 after winning its war of independence with Turkey. There were many leaders in this era of Greek history but none more famous than the inspirational Archbishop Germanos and his fellow churchman of Agia lavra who on March 25 raised their banner of rebellion—the sign of the cross—and the war of independence was won. The victory insured the rebirth of the independent Greek nation after centuries of oppression.

The 10th Congressional District in New York, which I am proud to represent, today is celebrating Greek Independence Day as well as the religious commemoration of the Feast Day of the Annunciation. Included in my congressional district are the communities of Astoria and Long Island City, with one of the largest Greek-American communities in this entire Nation. These are hard working—God fearing—loyal Americans who live life to the fullest and have established values which do not and will not waver with the passage of time. The Greek family is an institution of stability. The Greek culture is unique and eminently rich in tradition and symbolism.

The celebration of Greek Independence Day is for the sixth consecutive year muted by the continuing tragedy of Cyprus. Here a large group of Greek Cypriots continue to be under the rule of an illegal Turkish occupation army which has ravaged both the land and the economy of Cyprus. It is a situation that must be resolved before another life is lost or home destroyed. On this occasion I renew my plea to our State Department to demand of the government of Turkey a full accounting of those 2,000 Greek Cypriots still missing since the 1974 invasion.

It was my distinct privilege to once again march in the annual Greek Independence Day parade this past Sunday in New York City. Hundreds of thousands lined the streets and were treated to a colorful and lively parade indicative of the great Greek spirit. It was a truly enjoyable day.

I salute my many friends in the Greek-American community on their independence day and pay tribute to their many and varied contributions which they make and have made to American society. Greek-Americans have impacted on all walks of life from

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the arts to politics, from education to entertainment. May the year ahead for them be filled with peace and prosperity.●

NEW DEFENSE BOOM SPELLS ECONOMIC BUST

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's 1981 defense budget calls for a trillion dollars over the next 5 years, the biggest escalation in peacetime defense spending in two decades. Moreover, in the current effort to balance the Federal budget, the defense budget alone is being spared reductions, while virtually every domestic program will be subject to cuts.

Despite the fact that the new defense boom will aggravate inflation, perpetuate unemployment, draw resources away from ailing civilian industries, and cause a shift in national priorities away from domestic, social, and economic goals, the defense budget has received very little public scrutiny as to its cost and impact. Insofar as the bulk of the increased funding will go toward new weapons development, questions should also be raised about the greater likelihood of fighting a nuclear war.

"The New York Review of Books" on April 3, 1980, published a major analysis of the new defense budget, entitled "Boom and Bust." Written by Emma Rothschild, a leading authority on the defense industry and a professor at MIT, this article should be read by all citizens.

BOOM AND BUST

(By Emma Rothschild)

The United States may buy itself two things with its \$1 trillion defense budget of 1981 to 1985. The first is an economic decline of the sort that comes about once or twice in a century. The second is a nuclear war.

This country is in the early years—not, despite the new shine of the Carter Doctrine, at the very beginning—of the most expensive military boom in history. In the process, the distinction between the military and the nonmilitary modes of the American economy is being suppressed. So is the distinction between nuclear and nonnuclear war. The continuum of money and destruction is being projected, through investment in military research and development, into the far future.

The expansion is military science and technology is the most ominous component of a defense budget that is dense with the ghosts of past and future wars. The new defense boom has been welcomed—in the US Congress, for example—as a response to recent events in Southwest Asia and elsewhere. But its main focus, instead, is on nuclear conflict.

The greatest increase in any major category within the 1981 budget is for "research, development, test and evaluation," or "RDTE." Spending on strategic and other nuclear weapons increases particularly fast, as does futuristic research at the "leading

March 25, 1980

edge" of military technology. With the money it spends to buy and keep scientists and engineers, the Defense Department is designing the weapons of ten and twenty years from now. With its research boom, it is defining a revised American doctrine of science-intensive war.

This effort is not new, and it is scheduled to persist for the balance of the five-year defense plan. The proportion of defense spending devoted to research and the procurement of new weapons has increased steadily since 1976. This constitutes, as the Report shows, the first sustained boom in US military investment—investment in Southeast Asia aside—since 1960-1963.

The RDTE budget for 1981 is \$16.5 billion. The MX missile—the race track of Ozymandias that Herbert Scoville described in the previous issue of *The New York Review*—is its most expensive item. The MX is allocated \$1.5 billion in research money: this is more than the combined RD budgets for the Department of Labor, the Department of Education, the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Drug Administration, and the Center for Disease Control; over 140 percent of the RD budget of the National Science Foundation.

This allocation for the MX is only part of a build-up in research on nuclear, anti-nuclear, and post-nuclear weapons systems. The "science and technology" program ("advanced research," "technology opportunities," and so forth) receives special commendation from Defense Secretary Brown, who presided as Director of Defense Research and Engineering in 1961-1965 over the first great boom in strategic research, and is now concerned to "overcome the effects of reduced funding during the 1965-75 period." It is as though the years of obscurity, of the bargain basement, low technology Vietnam war were over; as though military scientists can now step out into the clear light of particle beams, space optics, and blue-green lasers.

The military doctrine that Brown outlines is suited to the epoch of innovative war. He returns again and again to concepts of flexibility, precision, "selective and measured" attack and calibrated retaliation. Even the hopes and dreams of Russian leaders are measured; to the calibration of retaliation is added a calculus of values, in which the utility of certain "political control targets" exceeds that of, let us say, the entire city of Gorky, with missile sightings adjusted accordingly. Is there to be a further role for social scientists and moral philosophers in the teams of savants who are nourished by Sea Launched Ballistic Missiles?

The notion of "flexibility" is a leading plier of American strategic doctrine. Nor is there anything new about the idea of a "continuum" of nuclear weapons. But it is elevated by Brown into the writing on the wall of future destruction, from bazookas to particle weapons, "A continuum of deterrence," an "unbroken continuum" from "conventional to intercontinental forces": the word occurs five times in a brief discussion of so-called "theater" nuclear weapons, for use within one region such as Europe. At one extreme is the American first strike. "Even supposing a US first strike," Brown muses at one point in the report, the Russians would have many surviving weapons.

This exercise in the use of the conditional is not likely to reassure those, such as the authors of the most recent SIPRI *World Armaments and Disarmament Yearbook*, who see in the MX missile system and in the latest anti-submarine technologies a refinement of the US ability to strike first at its enemies. Next in the continuum come the varieties of intercontinental retaliation dictated by the doctrine of "countervailing"

force. Here again the emphasis is on precision, on choosing frequently among military and political targets, on "retaining an assured destruction capability" for the weeks of burning cities, social destruction, and ionizing radiation which would follow a limited "exchange."

From here to the long-range "theater" nuclear weapons—such as the Pershing II and cruise missiles which will be able to strike from Western Europe into the Soviet Union—is a mere nudge along Brown's continuum. Thence to the array of "battlefield" and other nuclear warheads, of which the United States maintains some 7,000 in Europe alone, and "many thousands more" elsewhere. "Conventional" weapons, too, are to be found in the rainbow of modern war, often, indeed, launched from "dual purpose" nuclear or nonnuclear artillery, missiles, planes, and ships. At the end of the continuum, chemical weapons, of which the "deterrent stockpile" is to be maintained in 1981, which feature ("lethal chemical munitions concepts") in the Army's 1981 research budget, and for which "a facility that will have the capability to build binary chemical bombs, warheads and projectiles is being designed."

What is most remarkable about the doctrine of the continuum from non-nuclear to nuclear conflict is the cool and precise rhetoric in which it is described. Brown notes that "we have no more illusions than our predecessors that a nuclear war could be closely and surgically controlled." But the Report returns obsessively to the promise of such illusions: to "increased NATO options for restrained and controlled nuclear responses," to the "effectiveness and versatility" of nuclear-armed destroyers in the Indian Ocean.

This is the banalization of the nuclear epoch. We no longer find the pious disclaimers, the epithets ("of course, terrible") which earlier defense secretaries once appended to the words describing nuclear war. Nor are there frequent references to "the limited utility of nuclear weapons" (Donald Rumsfeld in the last Republican Defense Budget). The phrase "total war" is used casually in a discussion of defense spending. The unthinkable is being thought, ignored, presumed upon.

The Report puts forward three sorts of arguments in favor of increased defense spending. The first, and most familiar, suggests that because the Soviet Union is spending much more than the United States on its military effort, the United States must now rearm. The Report is full of speculation on Russian intentions: the fact that their forces in Eastern Europe are "much too offensively oriented," and that their positions in the Far East are "apparently designed for offensive operations"; their curious propensity to "take more seriously than we have done, at least in our public discourse, the possibility that a nuclear war might actually be fought." But the argument relies in general upon the simple reiteration of relative expenditures.

The shortcomings of such comparisons are well-known, as the Report itself comes close to acknowledging. They are selective, in that they sometimes measure the Soviet Union against the United States and sometimes NATO against the Warsaw Treaty Organization. They pass lightly over the proportion of Russian military efforts which is directed not against NATO but against China. They move even more expeditiously past the sharp qualitative advantages enjoyed by the US, such as the "rather startling asymmetries" which SIPRI detects in US and Russian strategic submarines.

The comparisons of dollar costs are even more misleading. They are measured, the Report explains, "by what it would cost to

buy Soviet programs (including personnel) in the U.S. economy." Estimates are thus arrived for such quantities as "Soviet resources devoted to RDT & E." One has only to imagine the reverse exercise to see the tenuousness of such calculations. A Russian "estimate" of American military research would start, to be sure, with the published budget figure of \$16.5 billion. To this it would add the \$1.3 billion which the Department of Energy will spend on nuclear weapons and other defense research, and a sizable part of NASA's \$5.6 billion RD budget. The Russian economists next need to calculate what portion of RD spending by American business supports the military effort, notably in two industries, aircraft and communications equipment, which are called by the government "defense product industries."

At this point, they might decide what it would cost "to buy" this science and technology in the Soviet Union—to reproduce the utility of Hewlett-Packard's basic research, or of such military contractors as Penn State University. Do they multiply by two? Or three? Or is Penn State unreproducible? All that remains for our diligent academicians is to head, charts in hand, for the Armed Services Committees of Mr. Smirnov and Mr. Ustinov and the other titans of the Soviet Union's military-industrial complex.

This exercise is not frivolous. Some such sequence may indeed have helped to determine the present arms race. We can assume that the Soviet Union reacted to the American military buildup of the late 1960s—an effort directed in large part at Southeast Asia—by investing in military research. The weapons that the Russians are building now are the products of that research. The Americans in turn react by increasing their own research, which will produce the arms race of the early 1990s; such are the dynamics of comparative weaponry.

The second argument in favor of the military boom suggests that the "growth in international turbulence" in Afghanistan, Africa, the Caribbean, Thailand, and elsewhere makes such an effort essential. One may question whether the times are, indeed, notably turbulent. There are relatively few wars underway, and revolution is distinctly on the retreat. It is even more questionable whether acquiring the capacity to construct particle beam weapons in the 1990s is likely to reduce turbulence in the Third World in 1980. One of the major new projects, the CX airlift plane, is recommended for "contingencies outside of Europe," yet it is some years from being deployed. The strategy of knowledge-intensive war suggests that the United States will look for precision and measured responses in its worldwide military efforts: in other words, the use of tactical nuclear weapons. Is this what the Carter Doctrine requires? Is this what Congress is buying with its bucks?

Brown's report, meanwhile, demonstrates a far more muscular attitude to US military intervention outside Europe than has been seen for some years. "Our defense establishment could be faced with an almost unprecedented number of demands," Brown writes. We are not far from Henry Kissinger's recent thoughts, when after considering whether US troops would be welcome in Oman he said:

"The immediate crisis shouldn't deflect us from other areas of potential danger. The situation in Turkey requires our urgent attention. Thailand could be a dangerous situation. Morocco remains under attack from adversaries armed with Soviet weapons. Central America is in turmoil. We may yet be needed in Southern Africa."

The third argument is the murkiest. It suggests that "perceptual problems" are critical, that the United States must in-

crease its military spending lest it "lose, not from war, but from changes in perceptions about the balance of nuclear power." Even those who accept this argument—I do not—should ask themselves whether the United States is buying the right power and the right perceptions with its new defense dollars. Must it sell the far future with blue-green lasers? Is the Brown Doctrine of science-intensive war the best standard under which to fight the battle of perceptions? It should be added that the Report's calculus of "perceptual" costs and benefits is bizarre. Thus we learn that "the aura of great US military power" is "a legacy of World War II, Korea, the Cuban missile crisis, and even (up to a point) Southeast Asia . . ." that "the mining of Haiphong Harbor demonstrated the deterrent effect of mines . . ."

The Brown position is based on a view of the American economy and American society as organized around knowledge and science. The Report contrasts the "manpower-intensive Soviet economy" with the "more capital-intensive and technologically advanced American economy." The obvious strategy, thus, is to lead from strength or from comparative advantage; to prepare to fight an automated and innovative war. This choice has the further advantage of appealing to the apparent preferences of the Congress for hardware and for clean wars.

Yet even on these terms, the strategy is perilous. The Report is full of allusions to "problems with materiel readiness, in part because of the advanced equipment coming into the forces." We learn, in passing, of production problems in constructing nuclear attack submarines, of "shore processing software, computer loading and array reliability problems" with Navy sensor systems; that the Air Force finds it difficult to maintain "their increasingly complex equipment," given "maintenance backlogs" and "increases in our accident rates"; that the Army's "telephone switches in Europe are obsolete, require continuous costly maintenance, and often break down," and will be replaced by German digital switches.

We are not far from the more familiar problems of the civilian economy: from subway systems whose sensors break down, and hospitals in which electronic hardware surpasses medical software, from the maintenance problems of DC 10s (the Federal Aviation Administration's budget for civilian RD is less than that allocated to one Navy aircraft). The military has conventionally assumed that because it can afford the most elaborately redundant controls, and because its operations are isolated from the messiness of real life clinics and sewage tunnels, it is thereby free from such tribulations. Even this may no longer be the case.

There is a related and deeper contradiction in the notion of knowledge-intensive war. The United States is practicing a variety of "la guerre savante," the stylized struggle which has dominated European wars since the sixteenth century. But as Fernand Braudel shows in his new *Les Temps du Monde*, such struggle is only possible when it is practiced by both sides at once; the veterans of Flanders campaigns who brought their learned battle formations to Oran in the 1590s and to Brazil in the 1630s found opponents who were playing in a different game.

The United States cannot expect that the Soviet Union will continue to join in its high science game, as this game becomes ever more idiosyncratic and ever more indulgent. The American military is choosing those weapons systems which are, in Robert Oppenheimer's phrase, "technically sweet." But this sweetness seems increasingly determined by the most introspective of scientific

cultures. Are the random dashes and dummy missiles of the MX "sweet" to Russian probability theorists and computer scientists? The arms race implicit in the new military boom requires the most precise coordination of national scientific emotions, as the United States and the Soviet Union move together toward the MX, to "invulnerable" missiles for the Russians, pressure on SALT, new missile defenses, pressure on the ABM Treaty, laser weapons, more pressure to abrogate the ABM Treaty, warfare in space.

The epigraph to Brown's Report is a remark made by Abraham Lincoln, in 1861: "I think the necessity of being ready increases—look to it." That America's leaders should choose, now, to evoke the last war fought in this country is itself awesome. The insignia to the Defense Budget should be not what Lincoln said on the eve of the Civil War, but rather what he said at its end: "It is sure that I have not controlled events, events have controlled me."

The last, striking contradiction of the doctrine had to do with its economic costs. These, too, are determined by the technology-intensive character of the projected boom. Yet they have been to an extraordinary extent forgotten in discussions of the Defense Budget. Just as it is assumed that investment in lasers will somehow encourage the loyal Pathans, that the incantation of numbers (4 percent real growth in defense spending) is itself useful, so too are the economic consequences of the boom ignored.

Even the most rosy expectation does not deny that military spending will stimulate inflation. Previous arms booms began in years of moderate price increases (consumer prices increased 1 percent in 1950 and 2.9 percent in 1966); inflation in recent months has reached an annual rate of 16 percent. This tendency is likely to be exacerbated because many engineers, skilled workers, and high technology components are in short supply; the chairman of General Dynamics (the contractor for the Navy's troublesome attack submarines) looks forward to "some type of priority system" favoring defense contractors.

It is much less likely that the boom will provide extensive new employment for American workers. In the first place, the character of defense spending is, following Brown's dictum and the exigencies of the times, increasingly capital-intensive. If a billion dollars in the 1960s could procure a sizable arsenal of General Motors rifles for Vietnam, it will not now pay General Dynamics for a single Trident submarine. Secondly, by cutting into other government programs, military spending may jeopardize the most precarious of existing jobs.

The defense boom and the business confidence it inspires are from this perspective deeply disturbing. They suggest an instinctive return to the industrial and scientific culture of an obsolete expansion, the power of what Veblen, writing of the British railroad industry in the 1890s, called "the inertia of use and wont." Such a reversion can only make the long cyclical decline of military industries more painful and more dangerous.

The United States in 1970—after the first decline in military spending for Vietnam—consecrated a fifth of its engineers, a fourth of its physicists, a fifth of its mathematicians, almost half of its aeronautical engineers to defense-related employment. Estimates in the Rumsfeld defense budget suggest that the proportion did not fall during the Republican defense recession, and may have increased since. At the trough of the recession in military research, the United States devoted 28 percent of its national research and development effort to defense,

as compared to 7 percent in West Germany, 19 percent in France, and 4 percent in Japan. An economy in the throes of decline cannot afford to lose this portion of its knowledge, of its educational system, of its future to old industries, and to destruction.

There is now, as not often in the world since Nagasaki, the intuitive possibility of nuclear war. There is also the possibility of a remilitarized world economy which will make this prospect more imminent, year after year, as the research boom becomes a boom in procurement, in strategic doctrine and in military culture. Very little is more important, in the spring of 1980, than to act against the one and against the other. ●

VIEWS OF KATHERINE V. HURLOCK

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a very fine woman, a constituent and an American, has strong views which she has earned the right to express.

Those views are as follows:

I am 83 years old, a woman, and I was in World War I. My husband was also in World War I. We have five sons and two daughters. Our five sons were all in the service at the same time. Some were drafted, some were volunteers. Two served for 25 years, one served for 20 years, the other two served in the Korean War. One of them is still in the Reserves after 20 years.

I was so proud of my family and wouldn't have wanted them serving any other way. Today they are real happy and loyal citizens of our great U.S.A. So, "crybabies," take off that long face and be proud you can do something worthwhile for your country. ●

RAIL INDUSTRY SUPPORTS CAPITAL COST RECOVERY ACT

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that another vitally important industry has endorsed the Capital Cost Recovery Act. The Association of American Railroads recently announced their support for the proposal. Mr. William H. Dempsey, the president and chief executive officer of the AAR, details in his letter of endorsement the reasons his organization supports this proposal. He recognizes the need for increased capital formation and productivity, and recognizes the part H.R. 4646 can play in achieving this goal:

The letter follows:

ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICAN RAILROADS,

Washington, D.C., March 24, 1980.

HON. JAMES R. JONES,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JONES: It is our pleasure to join the various groups which are expressing their support for the Capital Cost Recovery Act. As you know, the Board of

Directors of the Association of American Railroads voted unanimously to support this bill on September 28, 1979 and we have been working with the Committee for Effective Capital Recovery and other groups to urge its enactment.

The "10-5-3" system responds to the capital needs of all industries in our economy and we are pleased to be a part of this broad base of support. H.R. 4646, introduced by you, Rep. Conable and 290 others, addresses the overriding challenge to our domestic economy today—the need to encourage capital formation and establish a long term pattern of sustained growth in the face of spiraling inflation. Accelerating the rate by which our industries can recover their costs of necessary investments will improve declining productivity, permit the business community to modernize and expand plant and equipment, and improve competition in foreign markets.

The sponsors of this legislation have acted upon the growing awareness among economists and academicians that increasing supply rather than restricting demand is the more appropriate way to fight our raging inflation. Inflation has caused business profits to be overstated because existing accounting and tax systems do not reflect the cost of replacing capital investments. Depreciation which is based upon historical cost was designed in a non-inflationary environment, does not cover replacement costs, and acts as a deterrent to capital investment.

The Senate Commerce Committee, in its recent report on the economic regulation of the railroad industry (Senate Report No. 96-470, December 7, 1979), spoke of the huge unmet capital needs of the railroads which has caused deferred maintenance, delayed capital expenditures, and bankruptcies:

An efficiently operating transportation system is essential to the well-being of the Nation. About 20 percent of our total annual expenditures for goods and services goes for transportation of people or freight. More than 12 percent of our total civilian employment is in transportation or related industries, amounting to more than 10 million jobs in 1977. The tremendous demands on the national transportation network to move goods are evident when total freight ton-miles number over 2 trillion annually. Of this total tonnage, railroads carry over 70 percent of coal ton-miles and 60 percent of grain ton-miles. They are also the principal mode for pulp and paper products, automotive products, foodstuffs, chemical and primary metals. Unfortunately, at a time when the need for increased transport capacity is developing at a rapid pace, the railroads are the weakest sector in our transportation system, and the ability of the railroad industry to meet its future responsibilities to society is considered by many to be in doubt.

Basically, the railroads cannot function without constant large infusions of capital. The ability to get capital depends on profitability. The railroads' profitability, however, has been declining since the boom World War II period when all-time peak earnings of \$993 million were reported. The decline in earnings has occurred while the cost of capital has risen from 4 percent to double-digit percentages. For a disproportionate share of class I railroads, investment money is not available at any rate because of decreases in cash earnings versus increasing capital expenditure requirements on the one hand and, on the other, the increased cost of money which reduces the purchasing power of what earnings will buy.

After adjusting for inflation, railroad ordinary income today is one-quarter its 1947 level. Over the past decade the rate of

return on the investment of Class I railroads in transportation property has averaged less than 2.8 percent. In a study by the Department of Transportation entitled, "A Prospectus for Change in the Freight Railroad Industry" cash flow from internal operations and funds that could be raised from private capital markets were concluded to be insufficient to renew the existing plant and equipment and provide the capacity for anticipated levels of traffic. Specifically, cash flow from all Class I railroads in 1977 was reported to be \$1.7 billion less than capital expenditures with projection that, excluding the capital requirements of Conrail, the rail industry will suffer a financial shortfall of \$13 to \$16 billion over the decade 1976 to 1985.

The rail industry's historical response to inadequate financial performance has been to defer maintenance and delay capital expenditures for roadway and equipment. This practice has led to reduced speeds under slow orders on 47,200 miles of track. This, in turn, has resulted in a deterioration of the quality of rail service and loss of business. In short, many of the railroads are caught in a vicious cycle. Depressed earnings have robbed them of the ability to make improvements inplant which are needed to reduce cost and improve service. The inability to reduce costs and improve service eventually erodes the railroads' competitive position and adversely affects their net income—as the cycle is repeated.

In reciting such facts, the temptation is to run up the danger flag over the entire railroad industry. It should be pointed out that the railroads, though financially troubled, are not in uniformly desperate financial straits. The severe distress of some carriers, such as the Milwaukee, the Rock Island, and other bankrupt or near bankrupt roads in the Midwest and Northeast, obscures the far stronger positions of roads in the South and West. Nonetheless, it does not take an accountant to determine that an industry operating in a financial environment illustrated by a declining rate of return over a 20-year period is, as a whole, in financial trouble.

The combination of outdated depreciation measures and inequitable regulation has had a ruinous effect on the railroads' financial condition and their ability to improve their plant and equipment.

As the Senate Report indicates, the ability to get capital depends on profitability. The Interstate Commerce Commission says that over the long run railroads must earn up to 11 percent on net investment in order to attract the outside capital needed to modernize and maintain adequate service levels. In the face of this:

The industry's rate of return has been under 2 percent consistently in the past four years and has not exceeded 4 percent in the past twenty years.

The most profitable regional group of railroads now earns less than half the return deemed adequate by the ICC.

Not one of the 15 largest railroads earned as much as 11 percent in 1978 and only five earned as much as 7 percent.

Recently the railroad industry's return on equity has been but one-tenth what the average public utility achieves and an even smaller fraction of the average returns for unregulated industries. At the same time, the earnings of other transportation modes far outstrip those of the railroads as shown below. (Figures are for 1977, the most recent year for which comparable figures are available.)

	(In percent)	
	Return on net investment	Return on equity
Class I railroads.....	1.25	2.67
Motor carriers of property.....	15.52	15.33
Water carriers, inland and coastal.....	6.97	5.58

Unlike their competitors, railroads have to build, maintain and pay property taxes on their rights-of-way. Grossly inadequate rail earnings have led to an inability to modernize and revamp large portions of the nation's rail system. The Senate Report correctly notes that as service deteriorated, old traffic was lost and new traffic opportunities were missed, resulting in further earnings decline and more service deterioration. Nor has this trend been reversed. Rail earnings during 1978 totaled but \$260 million in net income. It should be noted that the industry accrued a total of \$286 million in Federal tax liability on this \$260 million profit.

Recent in-depth studies demonstrate that the industry's future needs far outstrip the industry's ability to finance those projects in the present tax and regulatory environment. The Department of Transportation estimates the industry, excluding Conrail, will have a \$13 to \$16 billion shortfall in needed funds over the next ten years. Other studies—private and governmental—have placed higher price tags on the shortfalls facing the industry.

At the same time, there is little argument about the future public need for modern rail freight service. With its proven fuel efficiency, environmental pluses, safety advantages, substantial segments of unused track capacity and its pre-eminent role in facilitating the growing reliance on coal, the need for a strong, expanding rail system is patently clear. In fact, these advantages were the reasons the DOT projected that railroads should show the greatest traffic increase of any surface mode by 1990, if outdated federal regulations were revised.

Absent major reforms in federal tax and regulatory policies, the alternative solution to adequate rail service is annual, multi-billion dollar subsidies, which can only add an inordinate burden to the nation's taxpayers.

The adoption of the 10-5-3 system, which would significantly shorten the recovery period for railroad rolling stock and equipment, would contribute to alleviating a major problem of our industry.

We are grateful for the long and hard effort in designing this bill, and most importantly, for the recognition of the need for its enactment by well over half of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

W. H. DEMPSEY,
President and
Chief Executive Officer.●

MARYLAND DAY

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today commemorates the first landing of English colonists in Maryland.

On June 20, 1632, King Charles I gave Cecil Calvert, possessor of the Irish Barony of Baltimore, a charter to found a colony in North America.

In November 1633 an expedition set forth from England under the leadership of Lord Baltimore's brother, Leonard Calvert, to erect the colony that the Calvert family had envisioned and Charles the First had named in honor of his consort, Queen Henrietta Maria.

Approximately 100 colonists in two ships, the Ark and the Dove, landed on Saint Clement's Island, Saint Mary's County, Md., on March 25, 1634. Later that year the first permanent settlement in the colony was erected on the mainland at a place called Saint Mary's City. Unlike earlier English colonies in North America, Maryland prospered from its beginning. It was ruled by a Governor appointed by the Lord Proprietor except for two periods: during the Cromwellian era and the 25 years following the Glorious Revolution.

An early Maryland booster wrote in 1635:

Now Maryland by the testimony of all that have been there is a soile earthy and fatt * * * and consequently menacing no such barrenesse as the foresaid mountainous places, whereof also the heate, by the reverberation from the rocks, is more intense: and so that of Maryland least to be feared of our English bodies. Besides the East being to the Sea and Southward of it, the mountaines to the North and Westward render it free from many stormes and unseasonable gusts which in other countries of America prove noisome and almost insupportable to the inhabitants.

Two early milestones in Maryland history came not upon the initiative of the Lords Baltimore or their Governors, but upon the initiative of the general assembly. The Act of Toleration, which guaranteed religious freedom for all Christians—not perfect, but quite a radical idea for the day—and the admission of Margaret Brent, the widow of a wealthy landowner, to the bar of the Colony, were accomplished during the legislative session of 1649.

Mr. Speaker, Maryland Day is not only a day when Marylanders take pride in their State, but commemorate those who have contributed to its greatness. This past weekend, one of our predecessors in this House, George Fallon, passed away. Mr. Fallon represented the people of Maryland in the House of Representatives for 26 years and served as chairman of the Committee on Public Works. He was a fine legislator who served the people of Maryland and this country well. During Mr. Fallon's tenure on the Public Works Committee the face of this Nation was transformed because of his efforts in promoting the concept of an Interstate Highway System.

I am inserting a recent editorial from the Baltimore Sun; it is a fitting tribute to a distinguished public servant:

GEORGE H. FALLON

On his way to a 26-year career in the House of Representatives, George H. Fallon became one of the most powerful men in Congress. First as acting chairman, then later permanent chairman of the Public

Works Committee he oversaw that most priceless of political provisions—the pork barrel. During the 1950s and early 1960s the Fallon committee drafted and delivered some of the nation's most expensive projects. Whether highway, airport or harbor—whatever the need—the committee's decisions meant billions of dollars and accounted for countless jobs back home.

These mammoth outlays weren't inspired by thoughtless spendthrifts. Most committee members had experienced the Great Depression and sought to encourage an expanded, yet sound, economy. In addition, millions of ex-servicemen were returning from World War II eager to start a family, drive a car and build a dream house in the suburbs. What better way to achieve it than through Mr. Fallon's interstate highway system?

In George Fallon, who died Friday at 77, the House chose an almost perfect colleague to dispense such important projects. He was quiet, almost shy, never a brash or boastful politician. Someone else might have used this chairmanship to twist arms. Mr. Fallon was benign. He made certain no congressman or district was slighted. If challenged about his committee's considerable spending programs, the congressman would point to new state and federal revenues that had been generated and to new communities that had prospered and grown, thanks to this congressional largesse.

His unshakable support of the Vietnam War—when other congressmen began having doubts—helped Paul S. Sarbanes win the Fallon seat in the old Third district in 1970. But the slight that most disillusioned Mr. Fallon was how voters in North and Northeast Baltimore could reject the father of the Interstate Highway System. "I thought I was helping people," he told a reporter shortly after his defeat.

Building and extending roads might seem questionable by today's standards, what with limited energy supplies. But in 1954 oil was plentiful and the economy needed a substantial boost. For a quiet, unpretentious man like George Fallon, who would rather have thrown out the first ball at a sandlot game in Clifton Park than at Memorial Stadium, concrete and steel was an ideal response.

Each State has made special contributions to the greatness of this Nation. Today, I salute the contributions that the men and women of my State of Maryland have made, and are making, to this country.●

NORTHFORK HIGH SCHOOL SETS NATIONAL RECORD

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride, for the Northfork (McDowell County, W. Va.) High School basketball team tied a national record this past weekend for consecutive high school basketball championships.

With the Blue Demons 60 to 54 victory over Winfield High School, they captured the class AA trophy for the seventh straight year.

Led by Coach Jennings Boyd, who himself has never suffered a losing

season in 24 years of junior varsity and varsity coaching, the Northfork team achieved their success with solid teamwork.

In the final game, balanced scoring spelled victory. Dwayne Spencer had 19 points, Jesse Fields had 11, Kenny White and Robert Foster had 9 points, and Quentin Crenshaw had 7 points. These young men, along with their teammates have been a source of pride for their family, friends, area, and State. I join today to express my heartfelt congratulations to everyone involved in the Northfork program, and join with them in looking to No. 8 and a new national record next season.●

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—INVESTIGATING MONOPOLISTIC PRACTICES IN AGRICULTURE

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important tasks of the FTC, as mandated by the Congress, is the investigation of monopolistic practices in the economy, which inhibit competitive conditions. This is a particularly important task, because our free enterprise system can be strangled by monopolies and monopolistic practices.

Leading antitrust experts have become very concerned about the possibly wide extent of monopolistic practices within agricultural cooperatives. Some of these cooperatives contain huge multinational agribusiness corporations which have the ability to control production or marketing or both of given agricultural products. Reflecting that concern, the FTC wisely decided that it should initiate three probes of giant agricultural cooperatives, in order to determine whether monopolistic practices are occurring. If those practices are in fact happening, they would be contributing to the high rate of inflation in food prices.

The FTC did receive a reward for trying to promote competition and lessen inflationary pressures. According to the House version of the FTC authorization bill, it would specifically forbid a FTC investigation of agricultural cooperatives. Although that amendment has received little attention, Merrill Brown in an article in today's Washington Post has directed attention to this ill-advised amendment which would terminate vitally necessary FTC probes. I commend this article to all of my colleagues.

The article follows:

FTC AUTHORITY OVER AGRICULTURAL CO-OPS
AT STAKE

(By Merrill Brown)

While public attention has focused on the congressional efforts to gut the Federal

Trade Commission's controversial "kidvid" investigation, another amendment to the Federal Trade Commission authorization bill passed by the House could wipe out three commission probes of giant agricultural cooperatives.

The measure was adopted without public hearings and ultimately could raise consumer prices of such basic commodities as milk, critics of the large cooperatives argue.

But few outside the industry fully understand the workings of these giant cooperatives. Thus, Reps. Mark Andrews (R-N.D.) and Charles Pashayan (R-Calif.), the leading proponents of the amendment, had little trouble convincing their House colleagues to gut, in effect, the pending cases when their amendment easily passed last November. The Senate never considered the amendment.

Although the cooperatives were granted partial antitrust immunity under the Capper-Volstead Act of 1922, the FTC, backed by many leading antitrust experts, believes that its limited authority over these co-ops extends to the enforcement of monopolistic practices.

"A few of these cooperatives have grown far beyond anything ever contemplated by Congress when it granted them limited antitrust immunity," 14 House members, including Rep. Peter Rodino (D-N.J.), chairman of the Judiciary Committee, wrote last year.

"Their memberships include large multinational agribusiness corporations, not just the small family farmers for whom this legislation was intended. A few of these large corporate co-ops have come to dominate the production and marketing of certain agricultural products," their letter continued.

Among those giant cooperatives are Sunkist Growers Inc., which according to an FTC suit controls as much as 75 percent of the production and marketing of western citrus fruit. A second is Ocean Spray Cranberries Inc., which is under investigation by the FTC and is believed to have controlled as much as 90 percent of all cranberry production since 1962.

And the final target of potential FTC action is Dairymen Inc., a mammoth Louisville, Ky., dairy co-op which purchased Farmbest Foods Inc. in 1978 for \$19.4 million. The two dairy concerns would have combined sales approaching \$1 billion.

The staff of the FTC's Bureau of Competition has recommended that the commission sue Dairymen, the nation's third largest dairy cooperative, in an effort to gain divestiture of Farmbest, sources said last week. Although the case has not yet gone to the commission itself for approval, investigators say the Dairymen acquisition could raise consumer milk prices and is particularly significant because Dairymen provides nearly half of the Southeast's raw milk.

The issue before the conference committee when it meets this week is whether the FTC should be stripped of the authority to challenge these cooperatives. Some co-ops such as Sunkist have led the fight, arguing that Congress never specifically delegated responsibility to the FTC to regulate either the co-ops' practices or their marketing orders, but instead left the responsibility to the Agriculture Department.

"The attempted FTC usurpation of authority in these two areas not only results in the harassment of farmers and cooperatives, but also is a waste of public funds," Sunkist Vice President William K. Quarles wrote in a letter to selected members of Congress last fall.

But on the other hand, the National Commission for the Review of Antitrust Laws and Procedures last year concluded that government trust-busters should monitor the growth of co-ops carefully.

"The antitrust treatment of cooperatives once formed, however, should be similar to that of ordinary business corporations," the commission said in its final report. "Specifically, mergers, marketing agencies in common and similar agreements among competitors should be allowed only if no substantial lessening of competition results."●

FOURTH ANNUAL SWEET POTATO AFFAIR

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to prepare all of my colleagues and their staffs for a taste of the extraordinary tomorrow, March 27. I am very proud to join the Louisiana Sweet Potato Commission on that day in sponsoring the "Fourth Annual Sweet Potato Affair." As part of the celebration, a complimentary serving of candied Louisiana yams will be offered to each lunchtime diner in the House Restaurant.

In case you might think you will be receiving some ordinary vegetable, consider these facts about the savory, versatile—and extraordinary—golden Louisiana yam.

A Louisiana yam is technically a sweet potato, but it is different from any other sweet potato in the world. It was scientifically developed to have golden, moist flesh, a copper-toned skin, and rich sugary taste. It is grown to perfection by Cajun farmers—French-speaking descendants of the Acadians who settled in southwest Louisiana in the mid-18th century.

The deep orange color of the Louisiana yam is more than just attractive—it indicates large quantities of vitamin A to help maintain healthy skin and eyes and good general health. In fact, one medium yam supplies more than the recommended daily dietary allowance of vitamin A and from 40 to 60 percent of the amount suggested for vitamin C.

The Louisiana yam, aristocrat of sweet potatoes, is a versatile vegetable with many uses. Mix yams with meat, fish, poultry, fruits, or with other vegetables. Try them boiled, baked, or fried; served up as a main dish, side dish, bread, or dessert. The possibilities for appetizing yam variety are endless.

Louisianians have enjoyed the tasty yam for many years, and it is a staple item of our famous Southern cooking. The purpose of our sweet potato affair is to let the world in on our delicious secret. Once you try the Louisiana yam, we know it will become a staple in your life too.

Be sure to enjoy this Louisi-YAM-a treat tomorrow. Bon appetit.●

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN TAIWAN

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in December 1978, President Carter acted unilaterally to normalize diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and end our historic official ties to the Republic of China on the island of Taiwan. At that time, I rose in protest over the irresponsible manner in which this act was carried out and expressed my fears about the effect that such action would have on the free and democratic people of Taiwan. Unfortunately, the President's action came just prior to scheduled nationwide elections and resulted in their immediate cancellation as the ROC Government moved to secure domestic stability in the wake of normalization.

The shock and disappointment that President Carter's normalization decision represent to the Government and people of Taiwan is readily understood. Now, more than ever, the continued progress of that nation depends upon its ability to meet the pressing economic and social needs of its people. As a member of a delegation from our House Foreign Affairs Committee that visited Taiwan in January, I became aware of how vital the support and goodwill of the American people is to their continued political, economic and defensive needs.

After more than a year of readjustment following President Carter's action, serious cracks in the island's peaceful stability began to show. As pointed out in a recent article in the New York Times by James P. Sterba, the ruling Kuomintang regime:

Apparently suffered an attack of anxiety, and its subsequent harsh actions have raised doubts about its confidence and questions about the sincerity of its "liberalization" program. Following a small but violent clash between dissidents and riot police in the southwestern city of Kaohsiung, Taiwan's rulers launched a crackdown on their political opponents. The crackdown was severe enough not only to draw outcries from human rights advocates but even to turn the heads of some devoutly pro-Taiwan United States Congressmen.

For these reasons, I am greatly concerned about recent symptoms of a growing social frustration and unrest on Taiwan that stems from President Carter's action and the ROC's response in canceling the elections and tightening its control over the people of that nation.

As pointed out in the New York Times article, serious trials have begun against dissidents stemming from the election related Kaohsiung riots of last year. In addition, just prior to the trials, the mother and two of the children of one of the defendants were ruthlessly murdered by unknown assailants.

Such murders are virtually unheard of on Taiwan as well as the Kaohsiung

riot of last year. Irregardless of who or what faction may have been responsible for these recent violent events, such acts can only lead to greater risks to the peace and security of the people of Taiwan if they are not adequately addressed by the government.

Therefore, I welcomed the steps taken by the ROC Government to open the trials to international observers and for the families of the eight defendants as was urged by the members of our committee delegation during our recent visit. As a result, the Presbyterian Church, the American Institute on Taiwan—official U.S. Representative—and other individuals and organizations are attending the trials as international observers.

Unfortunately, the trials in Taiwan are still being held before a military court, and the charges are still sedition. This action results from the tense anti-Communist atmosphere that has been reinforced by a continual state of siege. Which, according to the New York Times article, allows the Taiwan regime:

to justify the need for a continuation of martial law now in its 31st year—a prime target for a dispersed opposition that has argued that martial law is merely an excuse the minority uses to perpetuate its power.

I draw my colleagues' attention to these trials and related issues to underscore the dangers represented for all of the people on Taiwan by the emotions generated by them. I urge a return to the spirit of 1978 and a reconciliation and cooperation for all people of Taiwan at this critical point in their history. Care must be taken to insure that our efforts to help the people of the Republic of China to protect and defend their independence and integrity from outside attack are not undermined by internal unrest. As the New York Times article concludes:

The Kuomintang may be increasingly restricting itself to an eroding middle rather than embracing and influencing the debate over Taiwan's future that the eight defendants now on trial for sedition were trying to conduct.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting the entire text of Mr. Sterba's article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 23, 1980]

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION REMAINS A TRANSITORY THING IN TAIWAN (By James P. Sterba)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN—Any Taipei taxi driver can tune in mainland Chinese broadcasts on his car radio. Few do, not because it is still against the law to listen, but because Communist programs are rather provincial and boring.

Although, the local press remains subject to post-publication censorship, a remarkable diet of government criticism and mainland news does appear. Foreign publications arrive most of the time without pages missing. Even an issue of Time magazine with arch enemy Deng Xiaoping on its cover found its way to mail subscribers intact, although authorities would not allow the Communist leader's face to adorn newsstands.

For more than a year, in fact, the Kuomintang regime has exhibited uncharacter-

istic confidence in the ability of Taiwan's 17.5 million people to absorb, calmly and rationally, increasing doses of free speech, news from the outside world, and even domestic debate that has often included sharp criticism of its rule.

Last December, however, the Kuomintang apparently suffered an attack of anxiety, and its subsequent harsh actions have raised doubts about its confidence and questions about the sincerity of its "liberalization" program. Following a small but violent clash between dissidents and riot police in the southwestern city of Kaohsiung, Taiwan's rulers launched a crackdown on their political opponents. The crackdown was severe enough not only to draw outcries from human rights advocates but even to turn the heads of some devoutly pro-Taiwan United States Congressmen.

Several hundred persons around the island were picked up for questioning, sometimes in the middle of the night. Three opposition magazines were closed. At least 67 persons were detained, 26 of them for the capital crime of sedition. Eight of those—all highly educated staff members of a popular monthly called *Formosa* magazine, which sponsored the Kaohsiung rally—went on trial in a military court here last week.

Sedition on Taiwan is one of those catch-all charges that can apply to everything from fraternizing with mainlanders or advocating an independent Taiwan to political disturbance of the peace, which is how most foreign observers here describe the Kaohsiung clash. Both sides grossly exaggerated the incident. Riot police didn't fight back, but they also didn't give the demonstrators a way out of their rally site—the first rule of peaceable crowd control. The police claimed 183 injuries. The dissidents claimed their ranks were battered too. Other than scratches, however, no more than five or six people on both sides were hurt, according to independent reports.

By all but government accounts, *Formosa* magazine's purpose was simply to create a viable opposition. Some moderate Taiwanese think the Kuomintang crackdown serves as evidence that it was succeeding, and doing so far too swiftly for Kuomintang comfort. The Kaohsiung affair, with its intricate and dubious threads of conspiracy tied, ironically, to both forces for independence and for reunification, has had its chilling effect:

Far more chilling, however, were the mysterious murders last month of the twin daughters and mother of one of the defendants, Lin Yi-Hsiung. All of a sudden, someone or some group had intensified the affair, but for reasons that escape moderate elements on both sides.

Since its escape from the mainland in 1949, the Kuomintang has consistently attempted to play on popular fears. Both the Korean and Vietnam wars fueled campaigns for vigilance and solidarity in the face of alleged threats from the more numerous mainland Communists.

United States abandonment of Taiwan for recognition of Peking in December, 1978, sent waves of concern, both genuine and orchestrated, through the Taiwan populace. For all but the aging Kuomintang leadership, however, the distress was brief. Nevertheless, the Government used the occasion to postpone national and local assembly elections. The expiration of the United States-Taiwan mutual defense treaty last December generated even less popular concern.

While Taiwan's population remains far more anti-Communist and far less rebellious than Peking would like to believe, its rapid-

ly rising affluence has contributed to a spirit of moderation, openness, and security that the Kuomintang finds increasingly difficult to manipulate. Officially, Taiwan is still at war with the mainland. A state of siege was proclaimed on May 19, 1949. But for a population in which nine out of ten households have refrigerators, virtually all have televisions, two-thirds have motorcycles, and almost all are educated or in the process of becoming so, the war seems rather dated.

Still, the Taiwan regime uses it to justify the need for a continuation of martial law now in its 31st year—a prime target for a dispersed opposition that has argued that martial law is merely an excuse the minority regime uses to perpetuate its power. Those who fled the mainland in 1949, along with their descendants, represent only about 14 percent of Taiwan's population. Many of Taiwan's most prominent business leaders are Taiwanese who pledge obligatory allegiance only.

Meanwhile, the Communist mainlanders have done nothing lately to disturb anyone on Taiwan except the Kuomintang and its constituents in the military, the security forces, and the bureaucracy. Peking has lately been promising that Taiwan could retain autonomy, its higher standard of living and even its Prime Minister, Chiang Ching-Kuo, if it would rejoin the mainland.

Taiwan's rulers may have made a mistake in publicizing and admitting the foreign press to its sedition trial of the *Formosa* magazine defendants. Indeed, later in the week Government officials were sharply critical of how the foreign press was covering the proceedings. The vague links in the Government's indictment to the mainland and to independence groups in the United States are precisely the kinds of ties the Government overlooks when commerce is at stake. The point won't be lost on large numbers of sophisticated Taiwanese.

As a result, the Kuomintang may be increasingly restricting itself to an eroding middle rather than embracing and influencing the debate over Taiwan's future that the eight defendants now on trial for sedition were trying to conduct.●

DRUM BARRACKS: HISTORY RESTORED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues of an important historical event that is going to take place in my district this weekend. This Saturday, March 29, 1980, in Wilmington, Drum Barracks will be officially reopened. Named after Adj. Gen. Richard Coulter Drum, the barracks' one remaining original building has been painstakingly restored to its original Civil War state by the untiring efforts of the many volunteers who comprise the Society for the Preservation of Drum Barracks.

The members of the society felt that this building, formerly officers' quarters, was far too valuable to go the way of the barracks' previously demolished soldiers' quarters, hospital, and commissary. So, in 1963 they began

the long and arduous process of raising funds, in order to meet the purchase price of \$32,500. Among their efforts was a month-long door-to-door campaign, known as bucks for the barracks; due to the work of Marga Jean Lorenzen Lucas, over \$5,000 was raised toward the first down payment on the building. In recognition of her contribution, Marga Jean was given the lifetime title of "Miss Drum Barracks." Since then, over \$200,000 has been spent in restoration, a mixture of contributions, and State funds.

During the Civil War, Drum Barracks was housing for troops of the Union Army. The barracks at that time consisted of about 60 buildings, and its presence was largely responsible for California's remaining in the Union. An interesting aspect of this Far West post was that it was a terminus for the short-lived experiment in using camels to carry supplies across the great southwestern desert. Now it will be a Civil War museum, for all to benefit and learn from.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I want to emphasize is this; that a small group of people, determined to the last, can overcome seemingly insurmountable odds in achieving their goal. It is obvious through their years of effort, time and money, that Drum Barracks means a great deal to them. In its new capacity as a museum, we owe them a great deal. At least a part of Drum Barracks, with some of its artifacts, has been saved. It has left us a great legacy, one which the society's members have restored to us. With its handmade nails and split cypress shingles, this structure is a monument to California's participation in the Civil War. Between January 1862 and November 1871, the entire complex of Drum Barracks housed between 2,000 and 7,000 troops. In the latter days of its existence, it was a base for troops protecting the famous Santa Fe Trail from Indian forays.

I am sure that the descendants of those men appreciate as well as we all do, what the Society for the Preservation of Drum Barracks has done for us in restoring this fine building. Led by Oliver Vickery, acting commandant; and Jean Lorenzen, president of the society, we can thank all these fine men and women for their contribution to our national heritage.

So, Mr. Speaker, when a Civil War vintage Union flag flies over Drum Barracks on Saturday, we will all be able to point with pride at the achievement and dedication of the human spirit. Let Drum Barracks serve as a reminder of both the struggles of the past and the present. Let me just conclude by saying that I am very proud of these constituents of mine; their contribution will help all of us understand American history that much better.●

BYELORUSSIAN-AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, today Michal Kukabaka will wake up to a familiar sight: The walls of his prison. Since 1969 he has been in psychiatric prisons in the Soviet Union. His crime? Refusing to participate in Soviet elections, and acquainting his coworkers with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Today, however, will not be just another day for Michal Kukabaka, for today marks the 62d commemoration of Byelorussian Independence Day. Today Michal will reflect upon the value of freedom of expression, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech, rights assured to all citizens in the Byelorussian Constitution written 62 years ago. I am sure, too, that Michal will be angered by the ironic and appalling fact that today, decades later, that constitution exists only in the dreams of the Byelorussian people who still fight for their freedom from Russia.

The Byelorussian-American Association national headquarters is located in Queens. This past weekend these dedicated people observed Byelorussian Independence Day in New York, and passed a resolution expressing their concern that the Byelorussian language be included in the Voice of American programming.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the members of the Byelorussian-American Association for their continuing commitment and efforts on behalf of freedom. Their struggle for justice reminds me of the words of one of the great proponents of freedom in our Nation, Thomas Paine: "There is nothing on this Earth more glorious than a man's freedom, and no aim re-elevated than liberty." I know that my colleagues join me today in supporting the goals of the association and dreams of freedom of Michal Kukabaka and all prisoners of conscience.●

A TIME TO PIERCE THE CHARADE
AND PROVIDE A REAL ATTACK
ON INFLATION

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest incentives for the industrial revolution and, indeed, one of the cornerstones which brought our republic to its level of greatness, is the free market economy. The time to return to it is now. Renowned economist Milton Friedman made it abundantly clear that Mr. Carter's cosmetic approach to these paramount problems must give way to a more realistic present-day approach. It is essential to

remove useless governmental regulations and controls which hinder productivity, and to cut governmental spending so as to truly balance the budget. Only by taking these measures can we seriously stimulate the economy and return to the path of prosperity.

Following is an article by Nobel Prize winner Dr. Friedman, which appeared in the March 24, 1980, issue of Newsweek, and which should serve to enlighten some of my colleagues on the issue of inflation.

CARTER'S ANTI-INFLATION PLAN

President Carter's anti-inflation program is another in a long series of cosmetic measures designed more to quiet public outcry than to resolve our serious economic problem.

That problem has two faces: inflation and declining productivity. Inflation has discouraged productive investment and fostered economic inefficiency. Declining productivity has contributed to inflation. We badly need a coordinated attack on both inflation and declining productivity.

The obstacle to launching such an attack is not a lack of knowledge of what to do. The obstacle is a lack of political will and leadership to do what has to be done. Any effective attack must have three key ingredients:

1. Monetary Restraint. A gradual reduction over a period of three to five years in the rate of growth of the quantity of money to a level consistent with stable prices. Such a policy was announced by the Federal Reserve System on Oct. 6, 1979. However, performance has been uneven. In view of the wide difference in the past between what the Fed has said and what it has done, announced targets must be persistently met before any policy can attain credibility and thereby have maximum impact.

2. Fiscal Restraint. A drastic cut in taxes—not just visible taxes but also invisible taxes—and thoroughgoing reform of the tax structure.

The true tax burden on the American people is what government spends, not what the accountants label "tax receipts." If the government spends more than it receives in visible taxes, who do you suppose pays for the difference? You and I do, through the hidden tax of inflation or the even more subtle hidden tax involved in government borrowing from the public. And the true tax burden has been exploding.

President Carter proposes to cut projected spending for fiscal 1980 (ending Sept. 30, 1980) by an unspecified amount and for fiscal 1981 by \$13 billion to \$14 billion. That is sending an infant to do an adult's job. Consider the figures in the accompanying table.

Projected spending for fiscal 1980 was revised upward by \$32 billion between January 1979 and January 1980—and fiscal 1980 is not yet over. Actual spending will almost surely be still higher. Compare the proposed \$14 billion "cut" for fiscal 1981 with the \$38 billion upward revision in projected spending for that year, or with the \$52 billion increase in projected spending from fiscal 1980 to fiscal 1981. President Carter may talk about ending inflation but his own budget numbers assume continued high inflation. Which is the surer guide?

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OUTLAYS AS PROJECTED IN BUDGET
PRESENTATION

(In billions of dollars)

	January 1979	January 1980
Fiscal year (ending Sept. 30):		
1980.....	532	564
1981.....	578	616
1982.....	615	686
1983.....	646	774
1984.....	674	839
1985.....		903

President Carter has not proposed a meaningful cut in spending. He has simply proposed a slightly smaller increase. We should be considering cuts of \$60 billion to \$100 billion in fiscal 1981 projected spending, not \$14 billion.

President Carter stressed the need for a balanced budget. He has been able to promise a balanced budget, despite the small cuts in spending, only because there is already in train a \$50 billion to \$75 billion increase in recorded taxes as a result of measures already passed and of inflation. As further assurance, he pointed to receipts from a "conservation fee" he is levying on imported oil. (We are now subsidizing imports through the entitlements program. What sense does it make to subsidize with the left hand and tax with the right?)

Balancing the bookkeeping budget is not the real problem. The easiest way to do that would be to accelerate the inflation. That would raise recorded tax receipts faster than recorded spending. The real problem is the explosive growth in government spending. Government outlays of \$400 billion with a \$100 billion book deficit would be far healthier for the economy than government spending of \$600 billion with a balanced budget—and would be easier to accommodate without inflation.

3. Curbing Regulations and Controls. The tidal wave of regulation during the past decade has been counterproductive. It is a major source of declining productivity. We should eliminate price controls on natural gas, crude oil and other petroleum products and, along with that, the incredibly complicated entitlements system. These are the major sources of the energy crisis. We should end the mislabeled "voluntary" price and wage controls and abolish the Council on Wage and Price Stability. Return Alfred Kahn to deregulation instead of obfuscation—at both of which he has demonstrated great competence.

Instead, President Carter proposes more regulation and more controls: controls on credit; more reliance on "voluntary" price and wage controls and a tripling of the staff of the Council on Wage and Price Stability; more regulations of energy—all harmful evasions of the basic problem.

In my opinion, the American public is far ahead of Washington. It will recognize cosmetics and political opportunism for what they are. It is ready to be told the truth. We are reaping the accumulated harvest of mismanagement of the economy over the past several decades, by Republican and Democratic administrations alike. There is no quick fix for the resulting economic ills. Even the best policies will take time and involve a difficult transition. But we simply have no good options. So let us get to it and put our house in order.

Inflation rates on a month-to-month basis will be coming down almost regardless of government policy, simply because recent very high rates reflect transitory shocks. The basic inflation rate is far too high, but it is not as high as the nearly 20 per cent rate of recent months. President Carter will both take credit for and be given credit for

any improvement. That is perhaps the greatest danger from his cosmetic proposals. We may be lulled into postponing still longer an effective attack on our fundamental problem. ●

HONORING BERT BOECKMAN

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, March 28, the Los Angeles County Chapter of the March of Dimes will be honoring H. R. "Bert" Boeckman II with its coveted Humanitarian Award at a dinner dance at the Sportman's Lodge in Studio City, Calif. I will be unable to join my distinguished colleagues Mr. CORMAN and Mr. GOLDWATER at the dinner, so I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Boeckman before this distinguished body.

Bert Boeckman is the owner and president of Galpin Ford in Sepulveda, Calif. Bert built the dealership from a 1-acre lot into an innovative 13 acre complex employing more than 250 people. Galpin Ford Square represents a modern advance in industrial development, offering employees their own restaurant, shuttle bus service, and other innovations developed by Bert himself. Many of his concepts on plant management have been adopted by car dealerships all over the Nation.

The popular surfer van, seen today on every road in the country, made its initial debut as a Galpinized special in the late 1960's. Bert has always demanded products of the highest quality for his customers, a factor which led to his founding the Establishment Motor Home Co. in 1971. Today, Establishment is one of the top companies in the field of recreational vehicles.

Being so intimately involved in the sales and servicing of automotive products, Bert is keenly aware of the problems we face on the energy front. In response to the threats we face as a result of an increasing dependence on foreign oil, Bert formed a partnership with Chuck Stone, former director of the California State Legislature's synthetic fuels program, to develop Future Fuels of America, a company which converts vehicles to run on 100% synthetic fuel. Future Fuels of America also manufactures their own synfuel, Methanox X.

Last month, the first truckload of synthetic powered fleet vehicles were delivered to the Bank of America regional offices in San Francisco, offering a brilliant ray of hope on the energy horizon.

In addition to his outstanding achievements in the business world, Bert has been a pillar of numerous charitable and philanthropic organizations throughout southern California. His deep commitment to helping others is powerfully illustrated in his deeds. He personally contributes most

generously in time and treasure every month to programs and projects which directly affect the quality of life for the people in his community. He has been a backbone of fundraising efforts to projects benefiting churches, schools, young people, senior citizens, the ill, the handicapped, and the arts.

While Bert and his lovely wife Jane has been honored and feted by hundreds of groups because of their outstanding and meritorious service to the community, I wanted to express my own personal admiration for the example they have set. I offer my colleagues this brief commendation as a reminder of the tremendous impact one man can have, especially when backed by a talented and supportive wife.

Well done, Bert and Jane. Los Angeles County is lucky indeed to have you. ●

INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES CALLS FOR ENERGY NATIONALIZATION TO SAVE DÉTENTE WITH THE SOVIET UNION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Institute for Policy Studies is a consortium of Marxists pressing for a revolutionary, socialist America through a variety of tactics.

One of these tactics involves a form of lobbying or "subversion from the top" in which the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) tries to gain influence in Congress and the executive branch agencies through seminars, forums, and devices such as the Washington School, for staff aides and direct contact with legislators.

IPS uses its influence to manipulate U.S. foreign policy along lines favorable to the Soviet Union, Cuba, Vietnam, and various terrorist "national liberation movements," such as the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) which have been developed and backed by the Kremlin and its KGB in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

In its domestic policies IPS has long sought to destroy our Democratic Party by splitting away its left-wing into a third party movement that IPS hopes would hold the balance of legislative power. In the late 1960's IPS founded the New Party, and began its manipulation of the New Democratic Coalition, now it is backing the Citizen's Party effort of Barry Commoner.

At the State and local level, IPS runs a project called the National Conference of Alternative State and Local Public Policies (NCASLPP), headed by former SDS chieftain Lee Webb.

This IPS project tries to coordinate the efforts of New Left officials in order to promote the fragmentation of American society into local collectives that would own and operate all property, capital and resources in their

area, starting with local government takeovers of the utilities.

It is significant that the Institute for Policy Studies has never discounted the role of violence and terrorism in what it terms "social change." Since the 1960's IPS staff members have included domestic and foreign terrorists ranging from members of the Weather Underground to the Rhodesian Patriotic Front, and Communists of many factions from the Moscow-line Communist Party U.S.A. (CPUSA) through the Castroite Puerto Rican Socialist Party (PSP).

As a British specialist on KGB propaganda operations noted recently, the most impressive work of the IPS has been in the area of influencing liberal and left-wing academics and junior foreign policy staffers. He pointed out that as a "think tank" IPS is able to lend a "sort of credibility" in these circles to ideas, lines and themes which would be immediately discredited if they were seen as obviously coming from the KGB or other overt Soviet propaganda organizations.

In this light it has been instructive to analyze the fevered efforts of senior members of the IPS and its affiliated project, the Transnational Institute (TNI) in covering up or attempting to rationalize the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Reduced to simplicity, TNI's Fred Halliday and IPS-founder Richard Barnet argue that the Soviets were forced to invade because the United States was destroying détente by building modern weapons, and by Soviet fears of an Islamic uprising—as if the Afghans were about to launch a jihad armed with Korans and scimitars against the Soviet Union.

It is curious that IPS has picked up on the old discredited isolationist theme of "Fortress America." Obviously there is nothing that would better facilitate Lenin's long range plan to encircle and isolate the United States than such a shortsighted program. And in examining the various themes put forth by IPS at last week's forum "Energy and the New Cold War" we should keep in mind the innate bias of IPS and its leaders, so clearly expressed by Richard Barnet in his book "The Roots of War," in which he wrote:

There is much to hate about America, and nothing so much as American militarism from which so many other evils flow.

The most recent edition of the Information Digest, the authoritative newsletter on the U.S. political scene published by John Rees has reported in detail on that IPS forum and the efforts to split the Democratic Party which I am certain will be of intense interest to many of my colleagues. The article follows:

ENERGY AND THE NEW COLD WAR

Two weeks of intensive publicity coordinated by Trin Yarborough of the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS) gathered some 500 people, mostly students, to hear speakers launch a new phase of the general attack on U.S. businessmen and the oil industry in particular.

Entitled "Energy and the New Cold War: A Public Forum on the Roots of the International Crisis," the event was held in All Souls Church on March 18, 1980, and was funded and organized by IPS, 1901 Q Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009 [202/234-9382]; the Environmental Action Foundation (EAF), 720 Dupont Circle Bldg., 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036 [202/659-9682]; and the Youth Project, 1555 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036 [202/483-0030].

Members of the planning committee for the forum included Daniel Adkins, Candace Howes, Andrew Feeney, Lili Francklyn, Mark Hertsgaard, Jayne Loader, James Leas, Carol MacLennan, Ken Sala and David Talbot.

The sponsoring groups for the forum included:

Institute for Policy Studies (IPS)—founded in 1963 by former Kennedy administration junior officials of the National Security Council and State Department, Richard J. Barnet and Marcus Raskin, IPS is an internationally active Marxist thinktank pressing for a revolutionary world and U.S. IPS's programs include lobbying and gaining influence in Congress through seminars and contacts with staff aides and legislators in order to influence U.S. foreign and defense policies along lines favorable to the Soviet camp and the multitude of Soviet-backed terrorist "national liberation" movements in Africa, the Middle East, Asia and Latin America. IPS's domestic policies have focused on coordinating the efforts of state and local New Left officials in developing Marxist "alternative" programs and institutions; and in breaking down the two-party system.

Environmental Action Foundation—was formed by the activists who organized Earth Day in 1970. The EAF has long worked with IPS in domestic policy and anti-nuclear power projects; and EAF collaborated with IPS and IPS's southern spin-off, the Institute of Southern Studies (ISS) in organizing the anti-utility and anti-nuclear power Citizens Energy Conference in 1973. This conference and the Georgia Power Project served as the pilot project for the subsequent national campaign for the nationalization of all U.S. energy industries—oil companies, coal mines and the utilities.

Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy (CNFMP)—120 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC 20002 [202/546-8400], is the principal left activist apparatus lobbying against U.S. defense spending and particularly against development of new weapons systems. CNFMP opposes any U.S. intervention against Soviet-backed aggression and supports a foreign policy of accommodation with the new Marxist revolutionary regimes in the Third World.

IPS provides substantial input into the CNFMP strategy, resources publications and lobbying efforts. Among the organizations most active in the CNFMP are several which collaborate with the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council (WPC) including Women Strike for Peace (WSP), the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), and American Friends Service Committee (AFSC).

Clergy and Laity concerned (CALC)—with national offices at 198 Broadway, New York, NY 11038 [212/964-6730] and a local office at 1322 18th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 [202/223-0527]. CALC was founded in 1965 by the National Council of Churches (NCC) as Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (CALCAV). The organization quickly became the main coordinator of the efforts of activists in the religious community in support of the North Vietnamese cause.

Generally CALC has carefully couched its rhetoric in humanitarian terms, but in January 1970, stated its radical "anti-imperialist" premise as follows:

"[W]hat we are about today is not simply an end to the war in Vietnam, but a struggle against American imperialism and economic exploitation in just about every corner of the world. * * * Our task is to join those who are angry and who hate the corporate power which the United States presently represents, and to attempt, in our struggle, to liberate not only the black, brown and yellow men in every corner of the world, but more importantly, to help liberate our own nation from its reactionary and exploitative policies."

In joining with those who hate the U.S., CALC's more recent activities have included organizing support for the Iranian revolutionary militants and initiating a campaign against the Nestle Corp. which charges its executives are responsible for the deaths of many Third World infants whose mothers feed them formula in unsanitary bottles.

Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS)—with offices at 1538 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 [202/483-0045 and 800/424-2477], was organized in the summer of 1978. NIRS states it "is building detailed, up-to-date files on skilled people helpful to the anti-nuclear and safe energy movement." NIRS says its lists include "attorneys, consultants, engineers, organizers, physicians, public speakers, public relations and media people, graphic artists, performers, and other persons with useful skills."

Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee (DSOC)—with national offices at 853 Broadway, Room 617, New York, NY 10003 [212/260-3270] and local offices at 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Room 713, Washington, DC 20036 [202/296-7963] operates as an active and influential caucus within the left wing of the Democratic Party. Under the leadership of its founder and chairman, Michael Harrington, DSOC has called for nationalization of the oil companies as the first step in total federal takeover of all the U.S. energy industries.

According to an IPS news release dated 3/10/80, the forum was organized, in the words of IPS founder and Senior Fellow Richard J. Barnet, because "The 1980's may be the most dangerous decade since World War II unless the United States bases its security on a sensible energy policy." That theme was reiterated in the forum program which said the meeting was organized "in response to the grave dangers posed by current, corporate-dominated U.S. energy policy, at both the foreign and domestic levels."

Warning that the pursuit of economic growth through what was termed "extravagant energy consumption and the exploitation of foreign resources" had "raised the specter of nuclear war in the Middle East," the program declared, "It is essential that we develop a citizens' energy agenda—one stressing conservation and renewable energy, a recognition of our limited access to the world's resources, and social control over energy production."

The forum opened with a brief introduction by Candace Howes from the Planning Committee who explained that the meeting had arisen from its organizers' perception of the "need" for a "coherent Leftist response" to the Carter Administration's post-Afghanistan policies. After explaining that the event was being taped by Pacifica Radio, she introduced the moderator, Victoria Leonard, of Environmental Action.

The lead speaker was Richard Barnet, modestly identified on the program as a "researcher at the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS)." Barnet, with IPS co-founder Marcus Raskin, has had a strong influence on the

direction of thinking of a broad sector of the academic U.S. left. Generally avoiding the heated rhetoric of orators like Barry Commoner, Barnet is a prolific writer of essays, articles and books such as "Global Reach" and "The Giants: Russia and America" in which he suggests that the confrontation between the United States and U.S.S.R. is the machinations of U.S. businesses engaged in international trade—as is, in Barnet's opinion, unequal distribution of the world's natural resources, food, water, etc.

There have, however, been occasions on which Barnet's academic demeanor has been dropped in favor of more obvious political partisan rhetoric. In the mid-1960s with his co-author, Princeton international law professor Richard Falk, Barnet was active with the American Lawyers Committee on U.S. Policy toward Vietnam. This organization was set up by an elite group of lawyers from the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (NECLC), a legal front of the Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA) who years earlier had organized legal support efforts for the International Brigades in the Spanish Civil War. In November 1969, during a visit to North Vietnam, Radio Hanoi quoted Barnet saying that the message he would take back to the U.S. "is the message that the Vietnamese will continue to fight against the aggressors, the same aggressors that we will continue to fight in our own country."

In a 1971 essay published in "Washington Plans an Aggressive War," Barnet suggested that the Americans involved with the war in Vietnam were guilty of "war crimes" against the "civilized conscience" and that their civil liberties should be revoked so that they could be excluded from holding public office and be forbidden to "preach or advocate" policies of using military force to help allies resist Soviet-backed "national liberation movements."

In January 1977, Barnet was one of the nineteen signers of an advertisement in the New York Times defending the Hanoi regime against charges that it had incarcerated 300,000 people in forced labor and concentration camps. Barnet these reports with the statement in the ad above his signature, "True, some Saigon collaborationists have been detained, perhaps 40,000 * * * [but] such a number is surprisingly small considering the several million Vietnamese involved in Saigon's war effort." In other words, for Barnet all the several million South Vietnamese who fought the Communists could be justly imprisoned as "Saigon collaborationists."

Note: Richard J. Barnet graduated from Harvard Law School in 1954. He practiced law briefly, then did post-graduate work at Harvard's Russian Research Center (1960-61) and joined the Kennedy Administration State Department arms control and disarmament section. When the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was made an independent entity, Barnet was appointed Deputy Director of ACDA's Office of Political Research. He resigned in 1963. Late that year he joined with former National Security Council aide Mark Raskin to co-found IPS, which the two co-directed through 1977, when administrative duties were turned over to their protege, Robert Borsage.

Barnet told his audience that his talk would be on a problem too serious to be introduced with much levity, "the problem of the renewed Cold War." The 1980's, proclaimed Barnet, "have begun at a time fraught with more dangers to world peace than any time since the 1960s." Barnet warned that the "New Cold War," which is the "correct" terminology, had started "well before the events of December and Janu-

ary" when Soviet forces "intervened" in Afghanistan. Barnett then enumerated the causes of the "New Cold War."

"The United States Congress had already decided that we were to have at a minimum a 5 percent annual real increase in military expenditures. The basic decision to go forward with a variety of exceedingly dangerous and destabilizing weapons systems had been made—not only the Trident, but the MX."

Barnett described the MX as "highly threatening to the Soviet Union" because it was really an anti-weapons force which would tempt U.S. military planners "to think about so-called pre-emptive strikes." Attempting irony with his audience of young students and anti-nuclear activists, Barnett asserted that the U.S. is drawing to a point "where the weapons systems are becoming so ornate that literally the question of war and peace is to be made by a computer. . . . and we can be assured they have the same high level of reliability that computers and all other systems have had in our nuclear power plants—Three Mile Island."

Another U.S. action Barnett charged had brought about the "new Cold War" against the USSR was the decision to proceed with new missiles to be based in the NATO countries of Western Europe. The Pershing II and cruise missiles, said Barnett, are "a new weapons system which held out the possibility of destroying the cities west of the Urals in the Soviet Union in some five or six minutes. They were a new dimension in the arms race which I believe, has very seriously complicated the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union; and in the process has decreased the security of Europe . . . because . . . what they do is increase the nervousness of the other side."

These events were factors in the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, according to Barnett. Barnett said the Soviet invasion was "a brutal intervention which all people ought to deplore," but went on to argue that it was those actions of the U.S. which caused United States-Soviet relations to deteriorate to such an extent the intervention took place. Later, in response to a question, Barnett said the invasion was the result of a local political situation created by "Islamic fundamentalists and anti-communists." Apparently the principles of self-determination do not apply to these categories of people.

Barnett emphasized that Afghanistan had changed little since the U.S. was just as "over-dependent" on Persian Gulf oil as before, and the Soviet Union had had the military power to send its forces into the Gulf and faced the "same deterrent" as it did now. He charged that the Administration has used public concern over the threat to oil supplies "to mislead the public about the nature of the new Cold War." Barnett never did precisely define it, but the implication was always that the international crisis was the result of U.S. aggression, U.S. action to undermine détente that has caused Soviet defensive reaction. What was so misleading, said Barnett, was that the U.S. government was creating the "illusions in the minds of the public that there are military solutions to a problem for which there is only a political solution."

Barnett added that he had seen the troops of the new Rapid Deployment Force in training operations at Fort Bragg and that he did not believe paratroopers could defend the oil fields. ●

NICARAGUAN LOAN DELAY OPENS ANTI-U.S. PROPAGANDA FLOODGATES

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues have had an opportunity to read the Nicaraguan and Cuban press reports I have inserted in the Record regarding the House's handling of the \$75 million loan to Nicaragua. If they did, they would have seen a shower of vitriolic attacks on the United States and the CIA, both being blamed for the failures of the Sandinista revolution.

If that was a shower, however, what came from Nicaragua when the foreign aid appropriations bill was delayed because of our budget ceilings must be considered a veritable flood. The Sandinista-controlled press has been filled with incredible half-truths, distortions, and hysterical outbursts by Sandinista leaders and others about the matter, with little time given to explanation about how our budget process works or why the loan has been delayed.

These reports make very interesting reading, and I commend them to my colleague's attention.

The reports follow:

REPORTAGE ON REACTION TO U.S. LOAN FREEZE

MANAGUA RADIO SANDINO, MARCH 6, 1980

The U.S. Senate decision to freeze the \$75-million loan to Nicaragua has been spread like wildfire by the international news agencies in view of the great importance and scope of the Sandinist people's revolution. It is obvious that this imperialist attitude is another maneuver by the most reactionary U.S. sectors which are trying to destabilize our revolutionary process. They will not be able to do this, however, because, while it is true that we need these millions and many more for our reconstruction, it is also true that those millions are not essential to the economic reactivation of Sandino's homeland.

The Nicaraguan Government and people have clearly stated that we do not want conditions set on our loans. The action taken by the U.S. Senate Budget Committee is, of course, due to strictly political considerations and to the reactionary and destabilizing policy U.S. imperialism has adopted in view of the irreversible course taken by the people of the world who are trying to establish a fair system and a better society.

CHINANDEGA DEMONSTRATION—MANAGUA RADIO SANDINO, MARCH 5, 1980

[Excerpt.] From Chinandega the Sandinist Front's Secretariat of Propaganda and Political Training reports that right now the people of the department—not only the people of Chinandega but of the municipalities too—are mobilizing for a mass demonstration in repudiation of the freezing of the \$75-million loan by Yankee imperialism today.

We see that this is a further act of aggression by imperialism, a way of interfering in our revolution and a way of boycotting the economic reactivation plan, a needed instrument for our country's economic liberation. Our people are indignant and are re-

sponding in an active and effective way against this new Yankee aggression.

The mobilization occurring on the streets of Chinandega now denotes the clear awareness of our people, their awareness of the need to defend the revolution, the Sandinist awareness that our revolution is marching on and no one, not even Yankee imperialism, will stop it.

JULIO LOPEZ DENOUNCES FREEZING OF \$75 MILLION U.S. LOAN

MANAGUA SISTEMA SANDINISTA TELEVISION NETWORK, MARCH 6, 1980

[Text.] The reactivation of the private sector and the development of specific plans in the construction of homes and roads were included in the \$75 million financing which was frozen by the United States yesterday.

This is nothing more than the concrete expression of the will of imperialism's reactionary sources which seek ways of maneuvering, blackmailing and speculating in connection with this loan. Companero Julio Lopez, director of the National Secretariat of Propaganda and Political Education of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN], told this newscast today.

[Begin Lopez recording.] International agencies report that the Appropriations Committee of the U.S. Senate has frozen the \$75 million loan. The earlier maneuvers of the most reactionary forces of imperialism have already been pointed out. These insist on seeking ways of blocking and sabotaging the process of national reconstruction being conducted by our people.

Yesterday, it was the Central Intelligence Agency which the Senate questioned in depth. Today, this same counterrevolutionary force appears in the form of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

In my opinion, this is nothing other than the concrete expression of the expressed will of this reactionary sector of imperialism, which seeks ways of maneuvering, blackmailing and speculating with this loan.

I definitely think these maneuvers of the most reactionary sectors of imperialism will be unable to blackmail us because the posture of the FSLN and the revolutionary government is intransigent in the defense of this historical heritage of ours, which is that of not yielding a single bit in our political and economic independence.

I think it is advisable to point out that these same forces granted \$1.6 billion to the genocidal, dictatorial and dynastic regime of the Somozas; that they are about to approve \$400 million for that beachhead of international reaction in Pakistan; that an imperialist (?pool) is organizing a loan or aid to Pakistan itself amounting to about \$2 billion. However, the Nicaraguan revolution, in the process of national reconstruction, is being confronted with a whole series of barriers, with a series of (?falsehoods) which clearly express the intent of those forces to create all the obstacles possible for the process of national reconstruction and reactivation of our economy.

GOVERNMENT RADIO COMMENTARY—MANAGUA DOMESTIC SERVICE, MARCH 7, 1980

[Unattributed commentary.]

[Text.] The freezing of the \$75 million loan by the United States has given us the chance to confirm the erratic and incoherent nature of U.S. foreign policy as well as its lack of honesty in explaining its mistakes. This loan has been frozen after long debates on it in the U.S. Congress, which included the discussion of a confidential report issued by the CIA—known to the world and even to the U.S. people as the sewer of filth and crimes. At the same time that the pretext of lack of funds is being used however, money by the handfuls is being offered to governments that are con-

fronting attacks by their people, as are the cases of El Salvador and Pakistan—a springboard of counter-revolutionary gangs, armed and trained by the CIA against Afghanistan.

The U.S. leadership has been scorned by the Pakistani Government, which has rejected its aid package of more than \$400 million.

Furthermore, while the Somoza family was murdering, torturing and openly stealing the state funds and loan money, neither U.S. congressmen nor any other aid organization showed the slightest curiosity in investigating anything before signing the loans, as well as the abundant U.S. military aid and advice which Somoza never lacked in order to massacre our people.

It is not difficult then for Nicaraguans to unmask the true essence and interests that the United States has in granting aid aimed at listing this country out of chaos and destruction—a chaos and destruction that the United States itself helped to create. No money or funds exist to carry out a truly praiseworthy task such as helping us climb out of the ruins in which Somoza left us. However, there is a great deal of money to arm governments that repress their people and shelter counterrevolutionary gangs.

The United States is only repeating its behavior: When the Somoza government was killing and stealing, it was happy. Now that there is an honest government in Nicaragua, which is only trying to save the country economically, it is revealing its dishonesty and false moral standards. ●

TRIBUTE TO ARCHBISHOP ROMERO

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep sadness and abhorrence over the cold-blooded murder yesterday of Archbishop Oscar A. Romero, who had long been the leading advocate of human rights in El Salvador.

It was just 1 year ago that I had joined a number of colleagues, and members of the British Parliament in nominating Archbishop Romero for the 1979 Nobel Peace Prize. In my nominating letter to the Nobel Peace Prize Committee in Oslo, Norway, I stated: "Archbishop Romero has become the most courageous and dedicated spokesman in El Salvador for peace and justice, at a time when the Government there has been cited for numerous human rights violations, including arbitrary arrests, murder, and torture. Despite continued persecution by the Government of El Salvador, and at the risk of his own life, Archbishop Romero has remained the leading advocate in his nation for human rights, nonviolence, and social progress * * *

Ironically, his untiring efforts to achieve peace and basic human rights in El Salvador led to his violent death. Yesterday, the 63-year-old archbishop was assassinated by four gunmen who shot him several times at point-blank range while he was saying mass in northwestern San Salvador.

The senselessness of this single act is overwhelming. However, the situation is made even more tragic by the fact that this was not an isolated incident. The archbishop's life had been threatened several times before. Just last week, 72 sticks of dynamite were discovered in the church where he normally gives his Sunday sermon. Furthermore, the archbishop has not been the only religious target of leftist and rightist extremists in El Salvador. Six priests have been murdered and many others expelled from the country since early 1977. In June 1977, a rightist paramilitary group threatened to kill all Jesuit priests who did not leave the country by a set deadline. In each instance, Archbishop Romero was extremely critical of the military government and blamed them as being either directly or indirectly responsible.

Nor is this terrorist action confined to only El Salvador. We have heard similar reports of 52 Jesuit priests in Guatemala being threatened with death because of their efforts to promote and protect basic human rights.

It is still unclear as to whether leftist or rightist extremists are responsible for the archbishop's murder. Both factions are violently battling for control of El Salvador—a battle that has resulted in about 1,500 deaths since January 1, 1979. Both sides have their reasons for wanting the archbishop killed. The ultra-right hated him for his outspoken defense of the poor and his advocacy for basic human rights, while the ultra-leftists can point to his death as another sign of increasing oppression and thus, attract more followers to their cause.

The archbishop was often at conflict with his more conservative colleagues, who would criticize him for his involvement in what were thought to be political rather than clerical causes. However, to most, he was a man blessed with a special balance of courage and compassion. Sadly, though he was both loved and respected by the poor and oppressed of El Salvador, and received several European peace prizes for his efforts, Archbishop Romero never received the reward he had so willingly sacrificed his life—basic human rights for all people of El Salvador.

While we must express our outrage and condemn such acts of terrorism, we can and must do much more. Recently, Archbishop Romero wrote a letter to President Carter opposing U.S. plans to send military assistance to El Salvador's military-civilian government. In the letter, he stated:

The U.S.-supported junta does not govern this country (El Salvador), rather political power is in the hands of the unscrupulous military, who know only how to repress the people and favor the interests of the Salvadoran oligarchy. If you really want to defend human rights, stop this military aid to the Salvadoran Government, guarantee that your government will not intervene directly or indirectly with military, economic or diplomatic pressure to determine the destiny of the Salvadoran people.

I am not so sure that the archbishop's recommendations are necessarily the proper solution to this very difficult problem. However, his concerns are understood and appreciated. Certainly, our plans to provide military assistance to El Salvador must be closely scrutinized and carefully reevaluated in light of these recent developments.

Today, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations is conducting hearings on the issue of aid to El Salvador. I would certainly urge that any deliberations on this issue include an investigation into the archbishop's allegations, and the possible repercussions that may result from the archbishop's assassination. Any final decision in this very important issue must be based on two overriding considerations—our efforts to promote and protect basic human rights, and our efforts to prevent the threat of a Communist takeover in our own backyard.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed by the loss of such a peace-loving and courageous man as Archbishop Romero at the hands of terrorists. However, I am comforted by the fact that his life and death has been an inspiration to freedom-fighters throughout the world. ●

MRS. BEVERLY MIDDEN—"OUTSTANDING YOUNG WOMAN"

HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best lessons I have learned during my years of public service is that you can get more done for others if you do not care who gets the credit.

Therefore, I am particularly pleased that the Bluegrass Junior Woman's Club has named Mrs. Beverly Midden Lexington's "Outstanding Young Woman of 1979." Although she is officially honored as outstanding, I am told that she is best known as unusually modest.

All too often, it seems, when awards of this type are announced, the selection surprises almost no one. Therefore, it is especially gratifying to see such a prestigious award given to a woman who says she "never believed it would happen to poor little old school-teacher me."

Mr. Speaker, because I believe this award is so richly deserved, I would like to share with my colleagues an article from the Lexington Herald which more fully describes the reasons why Beverly Midden has been recognized as Lexington's outstanding young woman:

BEV MIDDEN MODESTLY ACCEPTS HER PLAUDITS

The janitor offered to carry her tray at lunch. A student brought her a thermos of fresh coffee, and local disc jockey Dave

Murray proclaimed Wednesday "Beverly Midden Day."

But when the school secretary brought her flowers from the Metropolitan Women's Club, the 35-year-old math teacher threw up her hands in dismay.

"Oh, this is too much! This just isn't me," she protested.

An attack of false modesty?

"No," she said earnestly, her merry brown eyes growing serious. "I really am modest."

Tuesday night, the Bluegrass Junior Woman's Club named Mrs. Midden the Outstanding Young Woman of 1979. Chosen over seven other nominees who were evaluated by the Richmond Younger Woman's Club, she said she "never believed it would happen to plain-little-old-school-teacher me."

But she earned the award through her professional and community service to young people, according to Beth Hill, chairman of the awards committee.

"I think it's outstanding that in this day and age, when people are downgrading youth, she's pulling for them," said Mrs. Hill.

Currently math department chairman at Bryan Station Junior High, where she has taught for the past nine years, Mrs. Midden has immersed herself in faculty committees and PTA work. She has sponsored a variety of student activities and is constantly taking on more. Her latest effort was to adopt the floundering school newspaper with another teacher.

"We didn't want to see it die," she explained.

Mrs. Midden has also found time to chair the Metropolitan Woman Club's Miss Lexington Pageant and a special community program to help youngsters understand the workings of private enterprise.

"I do these things because I enjoy them," she said, settling down on a couch in the lounge between classes.

That's a word Bev Midden uses a lot: "enjoy." She also "enjoys" teaching, even after 14 years.

But what about that much touted bugbear, teacher burnout?

She shook her head, blowing a cloud of smoke from a cigarette. "There are so many new things in math. We've gone from modern methods back to the basics and to the calculator stage. I enjoy it."

Nor is she bothered by students' math phobia. "They come to me all the time and say, 'I hate math.' But I tell them, 'Oh, by the time you get through with Mrs. Midden, you'll like it.'"

Her method, she explained, is to "try to do it (math) a different way from all the drills we had—to spice it up and still keep it practical."

And she thrives in the junior high setting. "This is where students pick a path to the future. If I could just help them get on that..."

The Cynthiana native tempers her jolliness with old-fashioned ideals about students' behavior.

"I've seen discipline change over the years. . . . There's just not that respect for older people that I grew up with." I can remember my mother telling me, "Speak to everyone and smile. Remember, your Daddy owns a warehouse and they may bring him some tobacco."

EITHER UP OR DOWN

But there are times when even Mrs. Midden doesn't smile. "My husband says I'm either up here," she said, lifting her hand over her head, "or down there. He can read me like a book."

In between her school and community duties, Mrs. Midden chauffeurs her 9-year-old son Richard to and from ballgames,

takes him swimming and drops by her husband's business to help out with bookkeeping.

But her favorite pastime is working on the restoration of her childhood home in Harrison County. "If I weren't in teaching, I'd probably go into antiques—if I had lots of money," she joked. ●

RONALD REAGAN ON ISRAEL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the current administration has conducted its foreign policy in the Middle East in a manner which has served to severely strain relations with our staunchest ally in the region—Israel. Not only is Israel the only democratic state in the Middle East, but it is the only nation to support American foreign and military objectives in the area. That any administration would undermine the diplomatic and military posture of so valuable an ally is an indication of the serious state in which our foreign policy is today.

Ronald Reagan has correctly in my view, identified Israel as the centerpiece of American diplomacy in the Middle East, and has articulated a policy to support it. William Safire, columnist for the New York Times has taken a special interest in the views of leading public figures on Middle East policy, and his columns have become authoritative summaries of their policy perspectives. In his column on March 24, 1980, Safire reviewed Ronald Reagan's views on American policy toward Israel in an essay entitled, "Reagan on Israel." He summarized Reagan's views on Israel this way:

Mr. Reagan does not see Israel as an obligation and a burden for the United States, and thus is not tortured by doubt about whether a pro-Israel position is in the U.S. interest. On the contrary, Reagan sees Israel as a much-needed ally to be defended and upheld because the alliance is in the U.S. strategic interest—not so much for old times' sake, but for U.S. security in the future.

I hope that the damage the current administration has done to America's credibility in the Middle East can soon be undone. The current administration would be well-advised to reverse its anti-Israel posture, and reconstruct it along the lines Ronald Reagan has recommended.

REAGAN ON ISRAEL

(By William Safire)

Ronald Reagan, campaigning in New York City last week, met for a half hour with a group of Jewish leaders brought together by Albert A. Spiegel of Los Angeles, a Reagan campaign vice chairman.

"If there's one statement I'd like you to remember, it's this," said the likely republican nominee. "In my Administration, there will be no more betrayals of friends and allies by the United States."

The questioning went to that point. How would he, as President, have instructed his

U.N. Ambassador to vote on the resolution condemning Israel and ordering it to dismantle settlements on the West Bank and in Jerusalem?

"I would have directed the Ambassador to vote no," Reagan replied. "This Administration should rescind its vote, and there should be an investigation into who makes our Mideast policy and what it is. The West Bank should be a decision worked out by Jordan and Israel; I would never have supported dismantling."

One questioner—a Democratic officeholder—evidently wanted to see if Governor Reagan had been reciting some tough-sounding words, or if he understood the diplomatic consequences of them. "An undivided Jerusalem" is an ambiguous phrase—to the U.N., it means "international control"; in terms of sovereignty, which is what the dispute is really about, where did Reagan stand?

"I mean that the sovereignty is Israel's," Reagan said, and repeated it in a way that could not be mistaken: "An undivided city of Jerusalem means sovereignty for Israel over that city."

No hedging; that was refreshing. One worry expressed to Reagan was that the State Department had a way of capturing Presidents after elections. "I lack a great deal of confidence in the present State Department," Reagan allowed. "I think the State Department should represent the policies of the President—they're not in business for themselves."

He said all the right-wing things: "I believe in the right of settlements in the West Bank." On the P.L.O.—which will surely be recognized if Mr. Carter is re-elected—he told an interviewer later that afternoon: "I don't see any reason to negotiate with a terrorist group." If the P.L.O. were to embrace U.N. Resolution 242, "I'd still want to know whether they represent the Palestinian people they claim to represent." His mindset is wholly different from that of Mr. Carter's coterie of Arabists.

Some of the Jewish leaders, having been burned by assurances made when Carter was a candidate, wondered if Mr. Reagan would stand by Israel in December as he was doing in March. After proving to themselves that they could ask questions about U.S. domestic subjects, the Jewish leaders came back to the point of erosion of White House support for Israel.

Reagan did not give them the customary pap that candidates generally ladle out to Jews about Israel—the special relationship, the moral obligation, the guilty hang-ups of the world after the Holocaust. Instead, as a long-time realist about Soviet intentions, this conservative leader spoke in terms of the U.S. strategic interest in the world:

"Israel is the only stable democracy we can rely on in a spot where Armageddon could come. The greatest responsibility the United States has is to preserve peace—and we need an ally in that area. We must prevent the Soviet Union from penetrating the Mideast. The Nixon Administration successfully moved them out; if Israel were not there, the U.S. would have to be there."

Mr. Reagan does not see Israel as an obligation and a burden for the U.S., and thus is not tortured by doubt about whether a pro-Israel position is in the U.S. interest. On the contrary, Reagan sees Israel as a much-needed ally, to be defended and upheld because the alliance is in the U.S. strategic interest—not so much for old times' sake, but for U.S. security in the future.

That consistent, hard-line approach to alliances, it seems to me, offers Israel's supporters the main assurance that Reagan would not emulate Carter's post-election performance. (Reagan sticks up for Taiwan and there are not that many votes in China—

town.) Israel will be willing to take more "risks for peace" when trusting America ceases to be a risk.

For too long, American supporters of Israel—and that's not just a codeword for Jews—have been enchanted by liberal pols who say all the right things about defending Israel and then (a) get a post-election attack of the even-handed twitch and (b) cut military spending so that the U.S. could not defend any ally.

Israel's only security is in being a valued part of—and not a sentimental exception to—American strategic response to Soviet expansion and subversion. In gaining the respect of the nervous, great powers should not betray the steadfast.

After the session, I asked a member of the group who was an educator how he rated Reagan's presentation. "A-minus." Why the minus? "I'm a professor—I never give an A." ●

ON RUNNING FOR CONGRESS

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 1980

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, in his memorial service, it was said that the one honor Al Lowenstein was most proud of was to have been a Member of the Congress of the United States. His belief in the possibility of true human dignity for the disadvantaged was based on the development of societies through democracy. Again and again, Al was willing to trust that the democratic process would give the best result in human affairs.

For him, the Congress was the end result of that process and the place where his basic faiths must meet the test. And he wanted very much to have a hand in giving life to that faith.

So a major part of Al's life was spent on congressional campaigns, successful and unsuccessful. He was often criticized for running too many times—even criticized as a "carpetbagger" when running in Long Island when he had, in fact, represented one-third of that district in Congress before his seat was "rearranged" by the politicians through redistricting.

The following article from the New Yorker of March 12, 1966, gives a background for Lowenstein's election to the House of Representatives in 1968:

CANDIDATE

One morning this week, we may pick up our breakfast newspaper and read that the New York Reform Democratic Movement has chosen Allard K. Lowenstein as its candidate for Congress from the Nineteenth District, a saxophone-shaped territory that hooks around lower Manhattan and runs up the West Side to Eighty-sixth Street. Then, again, we may not.

Mr. Lowenstein is a thirty-seven-year-old attorney—a rugged-looking man, easy, humorous, and earnest, who can be found in a state of repose only after sensible people have been in bed for hours. By day, he races through appointed rounds of conferences, kaffeeklatsches, and rallies. At night, he takes off his shoes, squats Indian-style on

the floor of a friend's apartment, and explains, in an uncannily lucid manner, what must be done about Rhodesia or Vietnam or Mississippi or Harlem. His friends tell us that he has been pursuing this regime for years, but that they have become less tolerant of his informality now that he may be running for Congress. (A candidate, it seems must not discuss "the issues" in his stocking feet.) Any way you look at it, Lowenstein is not at all like the usual office seeker, even though for the last three months he has been, in a sense, seeking office, as one of four candidates being considered by the Reform Democrats. The truth of the matter is that he has spent the past twenty years dashing about the globe toiling in the service of Causes: In Spain, helping the organized opposition to Franco; in southwest Africa, investigating conditions, smuggling out anti-apartheid tape recordings, gathering evidence of oppression to present to the United Nations, and writing "Brutal Mandate," a widely admired book about the South African situation; in Mississippi, working for "the movement" before that became modish; in Manhattan, campaigning for William Fitts Ryan in the early days of Reform Democratic insurgency; in Washington, serving as legislative assistant to Senator Frank Graham and, later, as foreign-policy adviser to Senator Hubert Humphrey; at Stanford, teaching international law; at North Carolina State, teaching political science; in Los Angeles, serving as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention; in Atlantic City, counselling the Freedom Democratic Party; and, from Oregon to Massachusetts, helping to found a national group called Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy.

By the time we had finished splicing this roster of credentials together, we were beginning to suspect that Lowenstein must have doubles planted in trouble spots around the world, poised for action whenever the need arose. We expressed some wonderment over his activities late the other night, when we happened to catch him alone in his makeshift headquarters on West Eighty-first Street. He laughed. "Very often, young people in our society don't take advantage of the fluidity and freedom they have," he began, untying his shoelaces. "So many people act as if they were in seventeenth-century England, had got themselves apprenticed as carpenters at fourteen, and couldn't change it. Then they go on through some ladder-climbing course. I suppose that's all right if you're psychologically so set up that not leading that kind of life leaves you feeling insecure and unhappy. But I'd say that the wisest accident of my post-college life is that I've never really tried to plan ahead. I've tried to do what seemed useful and interesting as the time came. I know that occasionally people who love me have wished they knew what I was going to do, and thought it would be better for me if I settled into being a lawyer, but when I was supposedly practicing on a full-time basis I got so deeply involved in other things that I wasn't much of a breadwinner at it. You see, the priority of your goals gets complicated if you're trying to build up a law practice and are always being tangentially pulled into struggles you believe in."

We said we imagined that many a young man would choose the footloose, heroic manner of existence if it were not for the dreary prospect of starvation.

Lowenstein dismissed any such concern. "Now, I have a very uneducated palate—I eat hamburgers and hot dogs a great deal," he said. "I don't smoke or drink, and my clothes are hardly stylish. So although I've always wished there were greater sums available for the things I care about, and al-

though I've been improvident about saving, I've been able to earn enough by teaching and occasional writing and legal work to get by."

We inquired whether Lowenstein recommended a career of global gallivanting.

He appeared nonplussed at the very thought. "If you simply wish to enrich and deepen what you understand and what you've done, without real involvement, you risk becoming a dilettante and a tamperer," he said. "What life is all about is how you spend the day, and each day becomes part of this totality of involvement. So you build, as you go along, a life in which you may do many different kinds of things, in different situations, with different kinds of people. But it all has a common denominator that gives it some sense, some direction—the sense that your total activity is going to make a better situation for people to live in."

We knew that for years friends of Lowenstein's had been asking him "Why don't you run for Congress?" in precisely the tone of exasperated benevolence in which they had been asking him "Why don't you get married?" or "Why don't you stick to one job?" Now we asked him why he had waited so long to seek public office.

"Isn't the notion that you have to achieve some titular power to have influence and help bring about social change pretty dubious?" he replied. "You know, I don't suppose there are many people who have had as great an impact on as many other people as Norman Thomas has in this country. Because here's a man who clearly never had the remotest possibility of holding office once he'd chosen the path he chose—the path of saying what he felt was right and sticking by it. One can disagree with his position on specific issues—in fact, anyone who doesn't disagree with Norman Thomas on something must not be thinking. But his whole life has been dedicated to the idea that there is value in humanity."

He's been willing to sacrifice his own power to worthwhile principles, to lost individuals. That kind of life lights up the sky, and there are dozens and dozens of state senators and United States Senators who have never achieved anything like it. One of the great calamities in American politics is that politicians so often don't say what they think, because they believe that people wouldn't sustain them if they did. There's always a kind of blindman's buff going on, with political leaders not providing leadership for fear of the consequences, and the electorate not being able to express itself because the leaders aren't giving it a voice. Something terribly important to democracy is lost here. You have to realize you're going to run on the things that matter most, you're going to try to make as honest a stand as you can and as effective a campaign as you can, but if you don't win the office, that is not the only thing that matters."

We asked Lowenstein if he could define exactly where he stands politically.

"I think of myself as a liberal," he replied. "That's a vague word. It doesn't define how you stand on a specific issue, because one aspect of being a liberal is that you're not told by any one line how to stand on issues. You find your own truths, if you can. But I think liberalism in the United States must face some of the failings and shortcomings of its shibboleths."

We asked Lowenstein if he was thinking of his early involvement with civil rights.

He smiled, and admitted he was. "We had a very basic notion back in those days that the processes of democracy this country had already evolved would solve external injus-

tices," he said. Those processes were the ballot and the courts, and that was it. You educated public opinion, you voted, you went to court when you were being denied basic rights, and so forth. Well, those things weren't removing injustice, and probably would never have done so. And so what happened was that there began a breaking down of proper procedures by people determined to get what the Constitution said was theirs. The restaurant sit-ins began it. But they didn't do the job, so we ended up marching. If someone had told me five years or eight years beforehand that I would ever march in a column of a thousand people—as I did in a march against segregation in Raleigh—I would have thought he was quite mad, because it would not have occurred to me that this would be either proper or necessary. But it was necessary and it was proper. Then, when even demonstrations didn't produce the needed results, we had to go further. In Mississippi, for instance, we discovered that you couldn't march, you couldn't picket, you couldn't vote—you couldn't do any of these things. Proper procedures were so thoroughly blocked off that if you waited for them to work, you'd wait a millennium. We had to conceive of a whole new series of tactics.

We came up, in Mississippi, with the idea of the first Freedom Vote. And, again, if someone had said a few years before that there would come a time when we would organize a supplementary election outside the established local voting system, I would have thought he was mad. Yet it was necessary in Mississippi. And even our Freedom Vote wasn't enough, because the reign of terror was so great that our workers couldn't walk on the streets. We had to let people know what was happening to us. There was no press coverage, no way we could get out of the morass. It was almost like being absorbed by quicksand, with nobody even knowing about it. You could be beaten and arrested, they could do what they wanted with you, and there was nowhere to turn. Every American who hasn't experienced that might be wiser if he had. It gives you some idea of what freedom is all about, to go through a situation where you're completely at the mercy of brutality—where there's no appeal. That was Mississippi in 1963. The real radicals always said that the country didn't care, that the country was basically indifferent to the oppression of Negroes, but I always felt that if we could let people know what was going on, they wouldn't stand for it. 'Well,' we said, 'all right, bring people into Mississippi.' And so there began this sort of series of new procedures that are finally starting to make the old procedures work, even in Mississippi—where more Negroes have been registered to vote in one year than were registered in the previous century. Rednecks who'd worn buttons reading 'Never!' are now saying that we've got to accept the change. Very soon you'll have congressmen from the South who will be more liberal than congressmen from New York. Because they'll be an accurate reflection of the needs of that area."

"Then the old liberalism still works after all?" we asked.

Lowenstein sat silent for a moment, running one hand back and forth over his hair, which he wears close-cropped. "I'm not sure it's that simple," he said, at last. "When I was in college, I think we all felt that if we could produce a society in which we'd removed the scourges of war and dictatorship and racism and poverty, we'd have a happy society. That was the liberal creed. Yet it's a fact that now, for the vast majority of our people, we've removed many of the external forms of misery, we've attained our goals, and there's still the hollowness. Our personal lives, in many cases, have been successful

without being fulfilled or happy, the way we thought they would be. We live in a society today that may be even more fundamentally unhappy than the old one. We have to figure out what's missing at the center of the person now."

"You mean you're becoming a Hobbesian?" we asked.

"Earlier generations had to overcome the Depression or win a war," Lowenstein replied. "My generation had none of that. We came out of college with everything green before us, and we used to think that by this time our problems would really have evaporated. There's a sense of internal loss now, and it cannot be blamed on democracy, because democracy has given us opportunities and freedom and great material wealth. People in my generation have developed a fatigue, a sort of premature old age, that's exceedingly difficult to combat. Many of them perhaps feel now that they can live only for their children, because maybe their children will find some other way to solve problems. We've discovered that time goes awfully fast and that what was once going to be forever is now half gone, and a little bit empty. So we go on living in some fraternity memory or some football-weekend memory when things seemed very much more roseate."

Why haven't things turned out the way we'd hoped they would, now that we've got the house and we've got the car and we've got air-conditioning when it's hot and heating when it's cold? We've got all the opportunities that freedom can give, but, still, what good is it all accomplishing? It's in this kind of poignant struggle for meaning that I think disappointment has come, because nobody ever before in history, as far as I know, has had a generation in which all the external things were there and in which the internal lack had to be so clearly an internal lack. That's why I feel so relatively lucky in not having expected to find that material or political or titular goals represented the end of a quest. You don't just set goals and, when you reach them, find that they equal happiness. I understand that these struggles will go on as long as I live, that within the quest itself much of the fullness of life exists."

Mr. Speaker, as you might expect, State-level politics that controlled the redistricting of New York Congressmen in 1970 were not very kind to this sort of public figure. As a result, Lowenstein was put at a great disadvantage in the election of 1970, fought hard, but lost. Robert Mayer's article in *Newsday* before that election describes Al's service as a Congressman and his prospects for reelection. And the article from the *New Yorker* describes his defeat.

LOWENSTEIN WITHOUT GLAMOR

A couple of weeks ago a severe storm blew the roof off a number of garden apartments in Levittown. The families had to vacate the building until it could be repaired, and they had no place to live. One of the families called Rep. Allard Lowenstein for help. Lowenstein sent an aide to the scene, and the aide quickly discovered that the area was not in Lowenstein's congressional district.

"My first thought was, 'What the hell, there are no votes here,'" the aide admits. But he quickly overcame that thought, aware of Lowenstein's concern for the well-being of people from Baldwin to Blauvelt. The aide called the landlord, who agreed to relocate the families in other apartments he owned.

In Freeport, a new post office was going to be built alongside a school. Residents were opposed to the building, concerned that the increase in traffic would be a danger to their children. Charges began to fly back and forth. Then Lowenstein's office got involved. It brought together the P-TA, the school board, the post office and the postal union, in a search for a new site that would give the community good service without creating a traffic hazard.

In Wantagh, a new sewage plant was proposed that threatened to pollute much of the South Shore. Lowenstein worked with conservation groups to delay construction groups until the proper modifications could be made.

In Hewlett, a new railroad station was built with only one staircase that became jammed during the rush hours. Lowenstein helped convince the Long Island Railroad to build another staircase. In Baldwin, Lowenstein spurred local officials to seek court action against an asphalt plant that was polluting the air. In Island Park, Lowenstein helped form CLEAN, a community drug council.

In the past two years, Lowenstein has sponsored more than 40 forums in his district to discuss issues of concern to the people. One guest was William F. Buckley Jr., who discussed civil disorders. Another guest was Bess Myerson Grant, who talked about consumer problems. One all-day forum was devoted to school financing, and the problem of relieving the burden of property taxes that are choking middle-income people. He has sent inspection teams to expose the dreadful conditions in veterans hospitals, an interest that earned him the endorsement last week of the New York State chapter of the Disabled American Veterans.

There is not much glamor in any of these matters. They cost much sweat and earn few headlines. They are not flamboyant affairs, they do not make good selling points in an election campaign. But they ought to. They have to do with the way people live, which is what politics should be about.

Much has been written about Lowenstein's reelection struggle. Most of it deals with the kind of scurrilous campaign waged against him. I have just spent two hours reading through a collection of Lowenstein's opponent's campaign literature, and it is enough to make you sick. It distorts, it misrepresents, it attempts to link Lowenstein directly or indirectly with communism, crime in the streets, pornography and every other evil that hatchet men could dream up.

But Tuesday's election should be a reflection of Allard Lowenstein's record. The Fifth District rose beyond many people's expectations when it sent Lowenstein to Congress two years ago. Then the state legislature tried to purge him by gerrymandering the district. Now the people have a chance to show that they, and not the political hacks in Albany, will choose their congressman.

Lowenstein came to the district with an imposing national reputation, as a fighter for justice, for human dignity, for channeling the ideals of the young into the existing political system. The question two years ago was whether he would neglect his home district while perusing his broader interests. Now that question has been answered. He has done his job, earning respect both at home and in Congress. If people really do get the leaders they deserve, then Nassau's Fifth CD is a special district indeed.

LAME DUCK

One of the noteworthy results of this month's elections was the defeat of Allard K. Lowenstein, the freshman representative

from this state's Fifth Congressional district, in Nassau County. Mr. Lowenstein, a Democrat, is best known for his activities in 1967 and 1968, when he set in motion the events leading to the "Dump Johnson" movement, the Presidential candidacies of Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy, and the Children's Crusade. He was in politics in the broad sense—mostly as a kind of one-man civil-liberties committee, with branches in South Africa, Spain, and Mississippi—before he ever thought of public office, and he is certain to remain in politics in the same way.

We've been over the returns for the Fifth District in more detail than the Election Night television bulletins permitted, and the figures show that while Mr. Lowenstein lost the election, he ran a considerably stronger race than he did in 1968, when he won. What happened between 1968 and 1970 was that the Republican-controlled state legislature redrew the boundaries of the district, eliminating the heavily Democratic Five Towns area and adding heavily Republican and Conservative areas, including the village of Massapequa. Had the voting followed the pattern of two years ago, Mr. Lowenstein would have lost by twenty-five thousand votes; as it was, he lost by about eight thousand, and he ran some twenty thousand votes ahead of the Democratic ticket. His vote on the Democratic line exceeded by about five thousand that of his opponent Norman Lent, a state senator on the Republican line. Mr. Lent's margin of victory came from his votes on the Conservative line, where he was helped by the extremely strong showing of that party's successful candidate for the United States Senate, James Buckley.

We had a talk with Mr. Lowenstein a week after Election Day and asked him what he thought the consequences of his defeat would be. "The fact that I lost worries me less than the possibility that the results in my district will be misread," he said. "One of the most satisfying aspects of the campaign for me was that I had the opportunity to go down to Washington in the middle of it and vote against the crime bill and the military-appropriations bill. A lot of people came up to me on the floor and said, 'For God's sake, don't vote against these bills, Al! You'll never survive.' I think the figures show something quite different, which is that you can stand against the war and against the Administration's way of dealing with the so-called social issue and you can survive in the face of that. My physical presence in the House, continuing to vote as I voted before, would have been the best reminder of that, but if the message can be got across that I was not in fact defeated because of the stands I took, the danger that what happened will weaken people's backbones will be less."

We asked about the character of the campaign, and Mr. Lowenstein said, "There was an ominous warning in this campaign, and that is that the ugliness can get so intense that it confuses great numbers of voters."

Having followed Mr. Lowenstein's fortunes off and on through the fall, we remembered that his opponent had taken his cue from the Nixon-Agnew campaign against "permissiveness" and the like, and had carried the theme to limits not exceeded anywhere in the country. Among other things, Mr. Lowenstein found himself accused of being "an echo of Hanoi," "an inflamer of youth," and "the chief apologist for the Black Panthers" odd accusations all, since Mr. Lowenstein is a convinced anti-Communist, the leading advocate of student participation in electoral politics, and a critic of the Panthers' infatuation with violence, and since these stands have resulted

in much ill feeling toward him on the extreme left.

"The possibility exists that the same thing might happen that happened in the nineteen-fifties, when people were swept away by distortions," Mr. Lowenstein continued. In the case of the Fifth District, I think it's important to stress that while it hurt us in areas where we weren't able to get the facts to people, it wouldn't have worked without the gerrymander. It didn't work in the country at large, and I don't think it will work in 1972. You just can't gerrymander the whole country."

"What about your own plans?" we asked. "In personal terms, I don't really have any, beyond attending the lame-duck session of Congress. The lame ducks like me will quack, and the lame quacks will duck. In political terms, I'm going to work, beginning right away, to see to it that the ugliness that was unleashed all over the country is turned out of office in 1972. We have taken the measure of these people, and they can be defeated."

Mr. Speaker, time after time, Al tried to return to Congress, running not because the prospects were good, but because the issues were compelling. He did much better than anyone expected everytime, and drew support from every sector. A large part of his success was because he was a true idealist. Even William Buckley, the most prominent conservative political writer, repeatedly endorsed and supported Al in his campaign for Congress, writing the following endorsement in the 1978 campaign. That campaign too was unsuccessful. But Lowenstein may have known, much more than the rest of us, that winning in politics is truly not everything.

A LIBERAL INDULGENCE

NEW YORK.—In the Silk Stocking District of New York City, the ganglion of so many of the miseries of the republic, and not a few of its glories, the congressional race for the seat once occupied by Mayor Ed Koch and former Mayor John Lindsay goes largely unnoticed. This is odd because the two Democrats contending for nomination are interesting to write about. It is fitting that the district should be represented in Congress by one of the outstanding young men in the country, Allard Lowenstein.

Twice in seasons gone by I have written about Lowenstein, infuriating many of my friends because, you see, Lowenstein is a liberal Democrat. Why should a conservative Republican advocate the election to Congress of a liberal Democrat? In the past, pressed on the matter, I have permitted myself, out of polemical fatigue, to reply simply: "It is a personal indulgence." One should try to do better.

Lowenstein is independent, thoughtful, in respect of not a few matters, and optimist whose belated recognition of, for instance, the inherent rights of parents to select the schools their children may attend, could lose him the editorial support of *The New York Times*.

But most appealing is Lowenstein's ability to talk to people who disagree with him without inducing a shouting contest. As U.S. representative in Geneva to the UN Human Rights Commission two years ago he actually caused that commission to consider—however briefly—the question of human rights in the Soviet Union.

There is in Lowenstein a quality of innocent good will that makes the conventional defenses appear fustian and contrived. Re-

cently, having been banned from traveling there for 20 years in punishment for writing an unfavorable book about the race laws, Lowenstein was invited to visit South Africa. There, over the airwaves, he spoke simply and eloquently about the fraternal imperative, and lo, high officials in the South African government, instead of looking the other way and shooting him out, invited him to return, on the understanding that he would be free to continue to speak out against apartheid, but confident that his palpable integrity distinguished him from the fanatics who desire in South Africa less the restoration of black rights than the shedding of white blood.

There is, in Lowenstein, a hectic idealism which it is impossible to fall to be moved by. There will be quite a few liberal Democrats in the next Congress. So why not one whose integrity and warmth will at least reprimand a movement grown cynical, bureaucratic and ineffective?

The liberalism of the Eastern Establishment is grown hoary and bureaucratic. Its idealistic vision, filtered through conservative forms, would be an improvement on the existing situation. "Christianity without the crucifixion," Whittaker Chambers once meditated, "is liberalism." Allard Lowenstein belongs in Congress as demonstrably as Rudolph Nureyev belongs on the stage. ●

FURTHER INSIGHT FROM THE FIELD

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if we are to develop a consensus on how to deal with the problems facing the military today, we need to hear from our sailors at sea and our soldiers in the field. They are the ones who have to live with the decisions made in Washington.

Adm. Harry D. Train II, Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, provides us with some observations rarely heard in Washington.

The article, from the March 1980, *Navy Times*, follows:

RETENTION MUST BE SOLVED BEFORE FLEET CAN GROW, TRAIN DECLARES

(By Paul Smith)

NORFOLK.—The U.S. Navy badly needs more ships, but it cannot expand the fleet until it solves its shortages of skilled petty officers.

That's what Adm. Harry D. Train II, the Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic Fleet and the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, told *Navy Times* in an interview.

"For example," Train said, "the windfall that befell the nation when we were permitted to buy the Iranian destroyers (that were cancelled by the Ayatollah Khomeini) . . . is going to be a hard windfall to cash in on because we didn't have the people to put on those ships. To put people on those ships requires short-changing other ships. Nonetheless it was a magnificent step."

The Navy needs more ships if it is to meet its defense commitments, the admiral said, but the problem is much more difficult than simply putting more ships in commission. "We have to solve (the problem of too few qualified petty officers) before we can in-

dulge in the luxury of thinking that we can expand the size of the Navy," Train said.

The Navy has made some strides recently, he revealed. He said that second-term reenlistments in the Atlantic Fleet have risen from below 40 percent last summer to about 60 percent for the last four months.

Train said the retention turnaround stems directly from hope that Congress will raise military pay. The Armstrong and Nunn-Warner amendments have raised those hopes. But if Congress does not hike pay, retention could plummet, Train said.

Even though second-term reenlistment rates are up, the Navy is still in critical need of seasoned petty officers. Train said there is no way to replace the people who left when rates were low. He said shortages are worst in the fields most critical to combat ships—engineering and electronic maintenance.

"I've been out to visit ships and stations, and the thing that makes up their minds whether they will stay or leave . . . is pay," Train said. "It's a heightened awareness that the lower pay grades make less than the federally imposed minimum wage scale and that a fairly high percentage of people in every military unit are eligible for food stamps.

Train said senior people feel the strain. They spend hours each day trying to help with subordinates' money problems. Some senior enlisted get out because they are upset that the Navy can't take care of its own, Train said.

Low pay means people can't live the way they would like, Train said. "There isn't an empty bunk in any BEQ anywhere and that stems from the fact that they can't afford to be out in town.

"Not only that, but they can't afford to go out on the town. As a result, there isn't a parking place in the lot here at the enlisted men's club in Norfolk every evening because that's the only place they can afford to go.

"On board ship, the berthing spaces are full and the parking lots are full because people can't afford to live out in town. That, to me, is very significant evidence and very tangible evidence that something has changed," Train said. "And the thing that has changed is obviously that the rate of inflation has exceeded the ability of the enlisted people in the Navy to fulfill their normal recreational expectations."

Train said the Nunn-Warner allowance amendment would help sailors a great deal, but they don't see it that way. He said sailors think the amendment's emphasis on housing allowances and bonuses is just a way to give military people some money while avoiding raising retirement pay.

Train said he supports Nunn-Warner and that the Navy has to work to show sailors that it will work to most of their advantages. He added that pay is not the only thing that sours people on a Navy career.

"The second thing that jumps out of the grass at you is their dissatisfaction with medical care, particularly for their dependents. Not with the medical care itself, but with the administration of the medical care. Not the quality of the care, but the persistent back of the hand they feel they're getting. Their perception is that the dispensaries and hospitals are run more for the doctors and the corpsmen than they are for the men and the dependents who expect to have medical care provided for them," Train said.

"If a sailor finds that, for the convenience of the administrators of the medical service in an area (that there is) a central appointment facility for all medical appointments anywhere in the region and the line is busy 24 hours a day, and when you do get through, you can't make an appointment for the (foreseeable future), then he throws

the phone back on the hook and says, 'That does it; I quit,'" Train says.

The admiral said the fleet has tried hard to make people more satisfied with their work. The staffs have cut inspections in half. Train said he favors even fewer inspections—that commanding officers should be allowed to do their jobs without interference. The move to shorten deployments has been well-received by most, he added.

Train said he is a "satisfied customer" of the recruiting and training commands. He said new recruits he sees are high-quality, well trained sailors.

But that doesn't mean they can replace experienced, seasoned career petty officers. By the end of fiscal year 1980, the Atlantic Fleet will be missing more than one fifth of the petty officers it needs in critical specialties, the CinC said.

Because of that shortage, ships will not be able to carry out their missions properly. Even if a ship's complement were filled out with recruits, Train said, "it still means the ship is going to have trouble fulfilling the mission it is designed to fulfill. The critical NEC could be in a missile field, for example, meaning that ship's missile battery is suspect as a fighting battery."

Train said it is a specious argument to say that because a ship has 95 percent of her allowance, she is ready to fight; the people have to have the proper skills. "Sometimes it's worse to have your full bag of people if you're short of leaders than it is to have a short crew. (Then) the leaders remaining are hard-pressed to do their technical jobs. When they have to manage a large number of untrained people at the same time, this places a greater demand on them than they would have with a (smaller crew)."

If Train had enough people to expand the fleet, he said he would first go after more ships, missiles and planes for fleet air defense. He said he needs more Aegis guided missile cruisers with the new SM-2 missile, and added that the Navy badly needs more F-14 Tomcat fighters with their Phoenix missiles.

"Today, the one thing that's holding the fort for us in the anti-air warfare field is the F-14," Train said. "We have to take this further and develop . . . our fleet air defense capability, definitely.

"Furthermore," the CinC added, "we need to insure that we buy enough ships to maintain the size of the Navy that the political leadership feels will give it the span of options that are required to protect the vital interests of the United States.

"The president has declared publicly in his State of the Union message that that size Navy is 550 ships. That translates to 17 or 18 (new) ships per year, no matter how you slice it. Mathematically, that's what it equates to." Train noted that the five-year shipbuilding plan calls for more ships than the FY '81 budget but, "history has not been very kind to us in our out-year shipbuilding program."

Train added that the Navy must buy more aircraft. The current budget does not buy enough planes to replace a typical year's losses, Train said, and that reduces the U.S. Navy's lead in tactical aviation—the only area that raises it above the Soviet Navy.

Train said he is quite pleased with the progress of women at sea. He had high praise for the women in the crew of the tender Vulcan and for her skipper, Capt. Harry Spencer. He said that crew has had no major problems internally.

"If there were problems, it was in the form of cultural shock on the part of foreign nations who did not expect to see female sailors wandering through the streets and the sailors' haunts of traditionally male-oriented Navy liberty ports. And if

I understand the developments in that area correctly, even that problem has been worked out to the point where, as the result of (Spencer's) crew being in and out of these liberty ports, the local populace has come to regard the sight of the female sailor as a familiar scene.

The Atlantic Fleet commander said it's up to Congress and the American people to decide whether women should fight. The Navy assigns women to fill military roles. The Navy should not act as a proving ground for social experiments, however, Train said.●

CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE TO ALLARD LOWENSTEIN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 1980

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in remembering Allard Lowenstein, who was recently taken away from us.

If Allard Lowenstein had one legacy to leave, it would be that we should not be afraid to get involved in the political process of this Nation. Because of his activism, thousands of young people who never cared to participate in the political system before did indeed become involved.

Even if you did not agree with Al on an issue, you had to respect the full devotion and forcefulness that he gave to any cause he was associated with. He was a man who was not afraid to put himself on the line for the ideals he believed in. Al Lowenstein fought his battles out of sheer conviction with no thought of personal gain for himself.

His interest was to represent those, especially the young and poor, who had few to speak for them.

All of us who were fortunate enough to personally know Al, found him to be a warm, compassionate man. But he was also capable of hate. He hated war, he hated poverty, and he hated any violation of basic human rights.

Though Allard Lowenstein only served in the House for one term, his dedication to what he believed was right, will serve as a standard for all those who follow him.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO HON. ROY MARTIN, ESTEEMED CHIEF OF POLICE OF HALEDON, N.J., COMMUNITY LEADER, DIS- TINGUISHED CITIZEN, AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1980

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 29, the residents of the Borough of Haledon, my congressional district, and State of New Jersey will

gather in testimony to the outstanding public service of one of our most distinguished public safety officers and good friend, the Honorable Roy Martin, whose standards of excellence as chief of police of Haledon, N.J., have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate Roy Martin's retirement from his law enforcement career, I know you and our colleagues will want to join with me in deep appreciation of all of his good works and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife, Belle; daughter, Donna (Mrs. Robert) Vander Vliet; and grandchildren, Robert and Rebecca.

Chief Martin has indeed earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us for the quality of his leadership in seeking to achieve optimum public safety for all of our people. Throughout his lifetime he has forged ahead with devotion and sincerity of purpose in combating crime and protecting the life of our people. We applaud his knowledge, training, hard work, and personal commitment that has enabled him to achieve the fullest confidence and strongest support of the people of our community. He has always applied the most sophisticated and advanced techniques of his profession. His exemplary record of performance and distinguished achievements are now lastingly etched in the annals of the public records of the borough of Haledon.

Mr. Speaker, Roy's grandfather was one of the founders of the borough of Haledon and he has continued in the tradition of the Martin family with his deep affection and dedication to the needs of the residents of the community. He officially retired from the Hale-

don Police Department on January 1, 1980, after 28 years as a police officer and 12 of these years as chief of police.

He has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs and will long be remembered for not only his official duties and accomplishments where he has risked life and limb and been cited for bravery but for the warmth of his friendship and richness of his wisdom to all—young and adults alike.

When asked to serve on a committee, to chair some event, to speak, to participate, his answer was always yes—especially where our young people were concerned. He looked forward to passing out the PAL little league awards and checking their bikes on bike safety day, or speaking to their parents for the PTA. Many parents from broken marriages would go to him for help when their children were becoming uncontrollable.

At Christmas he would always volunteer to work for any patrolman who had small children and you could be sure on other holidays as well he would deliver to those on duty a plate of warm food—from his own kitchen. On Halloween he delighted in handing out bags of candy at the station, that he had purchased. The "kids" were always very important.

After a heavy snowstorm, en route to or from police headquarters you might find Roy stopping to shovel a sidewalk where he knew the occupant was ill or unable to do so. He truly is a beloved and esteemed police chief and good friend to all and particularly to those in need.

Mr. Speaker, I cite these good works above and beyond the call of duty to provide you with an insight of the benevolence and good will that Roy Martin was blessed with and shared with so many, many others. He is a senator of the Jaycees International and as a member of the Passaic County Police Chiefs Association, he served as financial officer and president, as well as several committees including education and training. On the State level he is a member of the New Jersey Police Chiefs Association and has served as its financial officer as well as chairman of ways and means committee, committees on legal aid and arbitration. He also served on the crime prevention commission.

Mr. Speaker, It is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of our way of life here in America and I am honored and privileged to call your attention to Roy Martin's lifetime of outstanding public service. As Chief Martin retires his official leadership badge of courage and valor as the esteemed chief of police of Haledon, N.J., I respectfully seek this national recognition of his contribution to our country placing others above self in providing safety in the streets, security in the home, and optimum public safety for all of our people.

For his contribution to the quality of life for the people of our community, State, and Nation we do indeed salute an outstanding citizen and great American—the Honorable Roy Martin of Haledon, N.J.●