EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REFUGEES FROM EAST TIMOR REPORT FAMINE SITUATION

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, during recent months, there has been a growing controversy over the war and famine in East Timor. According to many reliable reports, more than 100,000 people have died since Indonesia invaded that Portuguese territory in 1975. There is a serious need for expanded international relief programs in East Timor, particularly in the area of medical care. There have been many disturbing reports about human rights violations in the territory, including many summary executions carried out by the Indonesian military. I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a recent article by the noted New York Times correspondent James Markham, based upon interviews in Lisbon with recent refugees from the island:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1980]

REFUGEES FROM EAST TIMOR REPORT FAMINE SITUATION

(By James M. Markham)

LISBON.—Newly arrived ethnic Chinese refugees from the former Portuguese colony of East Timor say that famine conditions and some fighting have been continuing there, that Indonesian soldiers behave as a harsh occupying army and that high-ranking officers systematically divert and sell international relief supplies.

The accounts furnished by the refugees are current from September to Oct. 31, when the last of them left East Timor. More recent reports from East Timor have said that international relief efforts have had some effect in moving the area from war and famine toward survival.

A woman who got out of the East Timorese capital of Dili in October and, like others, said she paid bribes totaling roughly $2,000, reported: "Everyone wants to leave. It is the land of the devil."

All the fresh arrivals, who have joined a Timorese colony of 2,000 refugees here, are from the dwindling Chinese community in East Timor, which is 350 miles north of Australia in the eastern end of the Indonesian archipelago. They freely acknowledged that Indonesian officers permitted them to leave because, as one man put it, "they think that Chinese will not cause problems for them." It is impossible, they say, for Timorese or the few Portuguese stranded there to leave.

A GROUP APART IN EAST TIMOR

Like overseas Chinese scattered around Southeast Asia, those in Timor were a group apart, more interested in commerce than in politics. Four days of intensive interviews here, involving 11 people whose remarks were translated from the Chinese, suggested that their community had suffered as severely from the Indonesian occupation as have the non-Chinese Timorese.

Some were extremely reluctant to speak, and all pleaded that their identities and even their dates of leaving be kept confidential for fear of Indonesian reprisals against family members whose freedom they hoped to purchase.

A lanky teen-age boy just arrived in Lisbon with two siblings virtually refused to answer questions until an interpreter suggested jokingly that perhaps he liked the Indonesians. The boy smiled slyly and, barely audibly, said, "The Indonesian soldiers beat us, but we ran away."

Asked what happened after the invasion of Dili in December 1975 he said: "The Indonesians lined us up on the wharf, making us face the sea, and they shot many people. Maybe a hundred." He said that he and others, expecting execution, were spared, perhaps because of their age. An impassive man in his 50's said that Indonesian parachutists on landing in Dili, fired wildly at anyone in sight. Other refugees recounted that if an Indonesian soldier was found dead in front of a house, its occupants, with the exception of women, were summarily shot.

The refugees interviewed all came from Dili, and only one said he had recently visited villages outside, to the east, where, he said, "it is normal that 30 people die in a day."

DIVERSION OF AID ALLEGED

Among the refugees' assertions were these:

Ranking Indonesian officers have organized a system, using soldiers as middlemen, to divert Indonesian, Red Cross and other humanitarian relief, chiefly rice, to shops in Dili. "We talked to the small soldiers and they complained they were not getting enough from the big ones for selling it," a man replied when asked to furnish evidence of the corruption. Added another: "If they receive from the Red Cross of Australia, they give it as if it came from the Indonesian Red Cross. But they give only a little bit to the people and sell most."

Last April the International Committee of the Red Cross invited people in Dili to fill out forms permitting them to declare whether they wanted to become Indonesian or Portuguese citizens; many opted for Portuguese nationality, and many of those who did were discharged from whatever jobs they might have held and were otherwise discriminated against. "It was a trick to make people take Indonesian nationality," a young man asserted. "If you changed and said you wanted to be Indonesian, you could get your job back."

The refugees said that there was little genuine commerce in Dili and that economic activity centered on selling food to Indonesian troops garrisoned in the seaside town. The soldiers were depicted as eager to serve out their six-month tours, take advantage of the time to extort money and other favors from the local population, and go home.

Questioned intensely, one man insisted that when he left Dili in mid-October planes, which from his description and drawings appeared to be small American-made Bronco observation planes, were conducting bombing runs in the nearby mountains. "I saw with my own eyes the bombs brought to the planes on little carts," he said emphatically. He also said that twice a week transport planes from Surabaya, Java, flew out Indonesian casualties that had been ferried to the military hospital in Dili by helicopter. Others, including the young man who said he visited villages in the eastern section of the island between January and May, related that anti-Indonesian guerrillas from Fretilin, the revolutionary group, were still conducting resistance around the town of Baucau. He and others said that the fragmented leftist movement maintained a good information network "and anything that happens in Dili they know about."

Dili, in the words of one refugee, is "a world of terror" full of informers and spies. Police units forcibly break up small groups on the streets, residents are afraid of being arrested for listening to foreign radio broadcasts, mail is censored, the use of Portuguese is forbidden and the Timorese live in fear of being denounced as sympathizers of the guerrillas by members of an Indonesian-sponsored group called the Timorese Popular Democratic Association.

SUFFERING, TORTURE, JAIL

One of the men, saying that his brother had been falsely denounced as a Fretilin member, added: "He suffered a lot. He was tortured with electricity. He was in jail for 16 months. If it is a lady, they go with cigarettes on the face and on the body."

Several refugees said that guerrillas who had surrendered under an amnesty program were initially allowed to return to their homes but later "disappeared" and were believed to have been slain. Low-level former members were obliged to serve as scouts in the Indonesian Army, the refugees added.

Last year, according to the refugees, prisoners held in Dili were freed and then fled into the mountains. "They always fight," said a woman who related that her husband, a Portuguese, was seized and taken into the mountains by Fretilin—the name is an acronym from the Portuguese for Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor—after the 1975 invasion. "They are weak, but they do not care," she went on. "Now I do not know where my husband is. Some say he is fighting with Fretilin. Others say he is dead. I do not know."

When important outsiders, particularly foreign journalists, visited Dili, the refugees said, the Indonesians removed tanks and other military vehicles from the town, naval vessels were withdrawn from sight and soldiers and policemen went into the streets in plainclothes, pretending to be Timorese and warning people against talking to the visitors. "When journalists go there they are never free," a man recounted adding, in reference to the Indonesian President: "And people are forced to shout 'Viva Suharto!' There are many police in mufti watching, and if people say anything else they are dealt with later."

FEW FIXED POLITICAL VIEWS

Few of the newly arrived Chinese appeared to have any fixed political views. A tall, tough-looking man said that after the invasion he was taken into the mountains by the guerrillas because they suspected him of being a member of the Timor Democratic Union, a group that initially supported association with Portugal leading gradually to independence. During his time in the mountains, he said, the Indonesian Air Force constantly bombed the guerrillas. He said he managed to surrender to the Indonesians and served briefly as a scout.

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

His sentiments seemed to lie more with his one-time Fretilin captors than with the Indonesians. "When they hit you," he said of the Indonesians, rising angrily to his feet, "you have to say 'thank you'!"

The Chinese maintained that a tight Indonesian naval blockade and the absence of a seagoing tradition among the Timorese prevented people from fleeing by boat. To depart legally from Timor, they said, they paid large bribes, which varied according to their suspected wealth, to two Indonesian colonels, whose names on documents they showed were recorded, with official stamps, as J. F. Sinaga and Bam Bang. Using Indonesian identity cards, they were then permitted to fly to Jakarta.

NO BRIBES—SOMETIMES

In the capital, they said, the Portuguese-interests section of the Dutch Embassy issued them Portuguese passports. "And there you do not have to pay anything," a refugee said. "They are very nice." The Netherlands, which was the colonial ruler of Indonesia, including the western part of Timor, has represented Portuguese interests in Jakarta since Portugal broke diplomatic relations after the invasion of East Timor.

Further bribes to immigration officials in Jakarta are required to secure departure from Indonesia, the refugees said, with the result that dozens of Timorese Chinese have been stranded. Most who manage to get out fly to Singapore, whence they follow a low-cost Aeroflot air route that takes them through New Delhi and Moscow to Lisbon.●

ARCHBISHOP OSCAR ROMERO

HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 26, 1980

● Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, we have assembled to commemorate the work of Archbishop Oscar Romero, who was assassinated while at the altar in a small chapel at a hospital he had established for patients with terminal cancer.

Constantly advocating peace, the Salvadoran prelate was martyred in the cause of human rights. He had been feared by a series of military governments for his outspoken defense of the poor and the unrelenting condemnation of human rights violations. A powerful symbol of courage, Romero was awarded three European Peace Prizes in recent years. Last year, the British Parliament and the U.S. Congress nominated him for the Nobel Peace Prize.

The assassination occurred just 1 day after the archbishop, in his Sunday sermons, had warned that El Salvador faced full-scale civil war unless profound economic, political, and social changes were made, particularly an equal distribution of wealth. He had denounced the continuing violence by both left and right.

Also, Romero's last address on Sunday had specifically called for soldiers to refuse to obey orders that ran contrary to God's will, his words being: "I ask you, I pray you, I order you in the name of God, stop the repression." He also denounced U.S. offers of military aid to the junta, calling instead for the United States to channel the aid to feed the Salvadoran people.

Such demands turned the right wing against him, and his faith and insistence on nonviolence made enemies among leftists as well. The Salvadoran prelate recognized this too. But it could not shatter his strong belief in the significance of his fight. It was only last Sunday that he said: "They can kill me but it should be very clear that they cannot kill the voice of justice."

Archbishop Oscar Romero died in his fight for peace, for truth, for justice, for love.

His assassination was an attack on the dignity of man.●

VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following testimony of Mr. John Terzano, of the Vietnam Veterans of America, presented before the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Education, Training, and Employment, on March 6, 1980.

I feel that Mr. Terzano's testimony accurately reflects the desire of the teams operating the new psychological readjustment outreach centers as well as veterans themselves that there be a followup service available to help the thousands of Vietnam veterans presently inundating the centers. And that service is an opportunity for meaningful, full-time employment.

Without concrete services to offer, the vet centers will be unable to effectively assist Vietnam veterans beyond rap group counseling and token, ineffective, social welfare jobs presently available under CETA and HIRE II. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues in the House and especially on the Veterans' Affairs Committee will read this testimony, and support legislation I have introduced which will assist our Vietnam veterans in obtaining meaningful employment opportunities.

VIETNAM VETERANS OF AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to be here today to address the continuing employment needs of Vietnam veterans. I am particularly happy to endorse H.R. 5581. It offers us a unique opportunity to finally address the continuing employment problems that are affecting too many Vietnam veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this committee faces a difficult decision in a time of budget crisis. This committee has to decide where to allocate increasingly scarce resources. Today, especially, the budget crises comes home, for the Committee is looking at two expensive proposals: Fifteen percent increase in GI Bill payments; and H.R. 5581, the Career Development and Training Program.

There very well may not be money for both proposals. Where should the Committee allocate its funds?

Mr. Chairman, I think a proper sense of priorities answers the questions clearly. The first priority is to help those who bore the greatest service. The first need is to ensure that those most in need secure help.

Unfortunately, the mechanics of delimitation date are such that few veterans who actually served in Vietnam will ever see any cost-of-living increase in the GI Bill. They simply aren't eligible.

Of the nearly three (3) million veterans who served in Southeast Asia, only 877,000 were discharged in 1972 or later. The rest, over two (2) million simply will not see a cost-of-living increase.

But equally important, for Vietnam combat veterans approaching average age 35 with a wife and two children, school is no longer, for most, a viable option.

The recently released study by the Center For Policy Research found that 53 percent of the veterans who served in Vietnam never returned to school.

Mr. Chairman, a cost-of-living increase to the GI Bill responds to clear needs. But equally clear, a cost-of-living increase cannot be allowed to entirely crowd out other high priority needs. I urge the Chairman to look carefully at available funds, and the budget requirements of an employment program and educational cost of living, and seek a viable middle road.

Mr. Chairman, the urgent need for an employment program can be seen from another perspective. Earlier today, Mr. Chairman, you expressed a real concern. How do we reach the unreachable veteran?

Last year, the House Veterans Affairs Committee secured passage of the Readjustment Counseling Program that is now opening the first of more than eighty centers across the country. Mr. Chairman, on the basis of our field experience, we can tell you that the program has met its first test. Vietnam veterans are coming to the centers.

The message from across the country is that where the centers are properly run, Vietnam veterans are coming in. That is an important success.

But, Mr. Chairman, success breeds responsibilities. If Vietnam veterans have come through the door—if they are using the readjustment counseling centers—the question then becomes, what services do the centers have to offer them?

The problem, Mr. Chairman, is simple. Many of the veterans who are coming to the centers are underemployed or unemployed. But, few will be eligible for the GI Bill, and the existing employment programs outside of Title 38 simply are not working.

What are the VA centers to do? How can they make the invitation to come into the new readjustment counseling centers anything but a hollow promise? Is the VA just saying, "Come see us, but we can't do anything for you."

Mr. Chairman, the success of the VA readjustment counseling centers is an opportunity. It is an opportunity to bring many Vietnam veterans back into the system. It is an opportunity to reach many veterans that have never been reached before. But, it is also a danger. For, if the readjustment counseling centers are just another empty promise—just more rhetoric with no programs—then you will lose the veterans you have such an opportunity to win.

The Career Development and Training Program gives the VA centers what they need—a serious employment program.

Mr. Chairman, without providing the centers with meaningful services—without tying the veteran into a meaningful job program—you will incur dire consequences.

Mr. Chairman, out of 200 veterans who were "serviced" in a Chicago center within the last two weeks, two (2) have overdosed and a third was stopped from jumping in front of a train. Those are the realities—those are the consequences.●

IDAHO WILDERNESS BILL

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, S. 2009, the River of No Return wilderness bill, is scheduled for floor action tomorrow or Wednesday, subject to a rule being granted. This bill, offered by Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho, passed the Senate by an overwhelming margin and was reported out of the Interior Committee by a voice vote.

The bill would grant legislative wilderness designation to the existing primitive areas in central Idaho and would designate 178 miles of the Salmon River as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is a carefully drawn bill, which protects the base of the local timber industry, assures development of strategic cobalt deposits, protects crucial fish and game habitat, and accomplishes many long-range goals of conservationists in this portion of Idaho.

On Sunday, the Washington Post contained an editorial strongly supporting the bill. The full text of the Washington Post editorial follows these remarks.

"GOD'S COUNTRY"

Out in Idaho, Sen. Frank Church reports, the Salmon River basin and the land adjoining are known as "God's Country." Quite so. The area, rich in mountains, streams and wildlife, is among the nation's most beautiful and unspoiled places. The House of Representatives has a chance to keep it that way this week when it takes up the River of No Return Wilderness bill.

The Senate voted last November to set aside 2.2 million acres of federally owned land—almost 5 percent of the state of Idaho—in this new wilderness area. The tract would be the largest in the continental United States to be placed in this category of federal property where controls on development and exploitation are most stringent.

Unfortunately, the bill has emerged from the House Interior Committee with 50,000 acres carved out. This land, winter home of a large herd of bighorn sheep, may contain cobalt, and a majority of the committee apparently believed access to that important resource would be too severely impaired if it were included in a wilderness area. But this is not a justified anxiety: the Senate bill made provision for mining of the cobalt—if it exists—in ways that would permit some of the wild values of the area to be maintained. The Senate provision strikes a careful balance between exploitation and preservation. The House should overrule its committee's exclusion of the West Panther Creek/Clear Creek areas from the bill.

It seems likely that an attempt will be made on the House floor to use this bill as a vehicle for opening up all the other roadless areas in Idaho. The idea sounds plausible: with this much wilderness, why not ease the restrictions on how the rest of the federal land in the state is used? The answer is that the proper disposition of each large tract of federal land, in Idaho or elsewhere, should be decided independently after careful consideration of whether it should be used as wilderness or national forest or something else.

The version of the River of No Return Wilderness bill that Sen. Church skillfully guided through the Senate produced an unusual accord among loggers and backpackers and even some miners. They recognized that the real value of this large area of Idaho is its unspoiled condition and that it is unspoiled because it has been inaccessible until recent times. By voting to designate it as a wilderness, the House can help keep it that way.●

DISASTER AT A VIRGINIA PAPERMILL

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, March 22, a 100-foot storage tower at a papermill in southwestern Virginia exploded into flames killing seven workers and injuring seven others. It was one of the worst industrial accidents in the State of Virginia in 7 years. The fire at the Westvaco plant in Covington, Va., demolished all but 10 feet of the 100-foot tower. The workers who were killed—four men and three women—were employed by a subcontracting firm—International Reinforced Plastics of Denmark, S.C. They were attempting to reline a wood pulp storage tower with fiberglass and were working with potentially explosive chemicals when the disaster occurred. Federal OSHA, with assistance from Virginia OSHA, has launched an investigation of the disaster.

This disaster brings to mind other workplace disasters in Virginia. One of these was the 1973 collapse of a high-rise under construction at Bailey's Crossroads, in northern Virginia, which killed 14 workers. The other involved the Life Science Products Co. in Hopewell, Va., where several workers suffered a serious disabling disease from excessive exposure to kepone.

The true tragedy in all these cases lies in the immeasurable suffering of the workers and their families. Workers place a great deal of faith in their employers' knowledge of the nature of the work to be performed. They expect their work environment to be a safe and healthful one with the prime responsibility resting with the employer. They are also guided by assurances that the Government will monitor the workplace in order to spot those employers who are not living up to their responsibility.

There are approximately 5 million workplaces in the United States and OSHA, with approximately 1,500 inspection officers, is severely hampered in carrying out its mandate. Many workplaces must go uninspected. For this reason, I have continually stressed the need for additional OSHA compliance officers and industrial hygienists. Unless we substantially increase OHSA's current staffing, how many more workers will be killed or incapacitated?

The problems we face in the health and safety area are real and deadly. For workplace deaths and diseases to be prevented, employers must live up to their responsibilities and comply with health and safety regulations. Furthermore, it is important that OSHA, employers, and employees work together, through education and training, to build awareness of occupational hazards.●

SURPRISES YET TO COME

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most penetrating newsletters reporting on international events is the American Bulletin, published by the Czechoslovak National Council of America. The American Bulletin reports, for the most part, on the situation that exists in Czechoslovakia but also in the broader sense, wherever communism exists.

I insert for the Members' attention excerpts from the March issue of this publication, which address some of the major foreign policy issues of the day:

SURPRISES YET TO COME

The situation in the Middle East has changed very little since February: Afghanistan has not been pacified and American hostages have not been freed by the newly elected Iran president and ministers.

In Moscow, official newspaper Pravda dwells on the declining power of the United States in the world and predicts the failure of the U.S. boycott of the Olympics. "The country's ruling forces, having encountered the realities of the present day world and the objective growth of the forces of peace, progress and socialism, obviously are unwilling to make their policy in keeping with their (United States') real weight in the present day world." The United States is accused of impeding the march of history and preventing "changes that are ripe in some or other countries or whole regions to conserve antipopular regimes." Pravda lashes out the threat that U.S. attempts at world leadership are doomed (Soviet World Outlook, Advanced International Studies Institute, Febr. 16, 1980) and scoffs at Washington's attempt to advance its sphere of influence in Iran and the Persian Gulf.

Moscow may ridicule Washington's failure but its own situation is not without pitfalls. Moscow has failed to convince world Communists that the Soviet Army was in Afghanistan to "defend its national independence and territorial integrity." Soviet New Times defends in vain "the moral and political rightness" of the invasion, which was an "international duty, a new extension of Brezhnev's interventionist doctrine" . . . "To refuse to use the potential . . . would be to return the world to the times when imperialism would stifle any revolutionary movement with impunity." Throughout the turmoil, Moscow has made it very clear that it intends to promote revolutions anywhere and everywhere.

WHO WAS SURPRISED?

The Afghanistan invasion should not have come as a surprise because it was just one step further in the direction of Moscow's obvious ultimate goal. What was surprising, however, was the fact that the West was taken by surprise; that it was "dismayed" by Soviet behavior. According to experts, the invasion "broke what had been assumed to be an unwritten rule of current behavior. The world had accepted the idea that Moscow would use its own armed forces to protect its military and ideological forefield in Eastern Europe (the satellites). And the world had grown accustomed to the use of Cuban proxy forces in Africa. But it had been assumed that Moscow would not use its own forces elsewhere"—("Politics vs. Foreign Policy," Joseph C. Harsch, the Christian Science Monitor, Febr. 20). The invasion was "a major departure from anything they (the Soviets) have done since the second World War; the Soviets have now exhibited a willingness to use their military forces beyond their own borders" (White House broadcast, Febr. 13).

CZECHOSLOVAKIA—AN IDEOLOGICAL FOREFIELD

On television and radio one heard it repeated that this was the first time that the Soviet Union invaded an independent country beyond its own border. But was it? In 1948-1968—was not Czechoslovakia a sovereign state? Though Czechoslovakia had found herself in the Soviet sphere of influence at the close of the war, she was nevertheless a sovereign state; so were Poland and Hungary.

Why was it assumed in the West that Moscow would not use its forces elsewhere inasmuch as it has openly and repeatedly declared its intention of engaging in "wars of liberation" and of enforcing the Brezhnev doctrine?

When the first grab was perpetrated, Moscow insisted that the Soviet Union, twice ravaged by Germany, had the right to secure its borders; Moscow only wanted "friendly neighbors." But Czechoslovakia was friendly and so anxious to assure Moscow of her allegiance that she even turned down America's Marshall plan after World War II. In 1968, Czechoslovakia's Communist government was friendly, but not completely subservient in spirit. As soon as Czechoslovak Communists showed an inclination to think for themselves and as a consequence to take steps toward making communism less oppressive, the Red army was ordered to march in. It is always ready.

THE LESSON OF AFGHANISTAN

It is not easy for Soviet propagandists to downplay the Islamabad conference of the Muslim leaders. At first, Izvestia threatened to "overthrow" any Muslim leader who lined up with the United States on the Afghan issue. The Soviet media took great care to misinform their listeners and readers about the outcome of the conference. Instead, they are doing their utmost in depicting the Soviet Union as "a true friend of all Islamic peoples" (Gromyko in Damascus, Jan. 27).

The Afghanistan intervention has placed Fidel Castro in an awkward position as a representative of the non-aligned nations and the third world. His chairmanship of the non-aligned states, confirmed in Havana last year, has become somewhat problematic. After battling through 154 indecisive ballots for a seat on the United Nations Security Council, Cuba finally gave up as a result of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Western sources were delighted to report an alleged remark Castro was to have made in an unpublished report. He was to have said that only 140,000 tons of Soviet lumber had arrived in Cuba last year of the ordered 500,000 tons. "A country that has had as many as 36,000 soldiers in Angola and 12,000 in Ethiopia could organize a brigade of 10,000 volunteers to go to Siberia to cut timber."

Be that as it may, Castro's Cuba is dependent on Soviet aid. (For years, some American businessmen, supported by their senators, have been trying to join in and supply some of that aid for Cuba). Cuba compensates the USSR by being the avant-guard for Soviet takeovers.

IDEOLOGICAL FOREFIELD

On television and radio one heard it repeated that this was the first time that the Soviet Union invaded an independent country beyond its own border. But was it? In 1948—1968—was not Czechoslovakia a sovereign state? Though Czecholovakia had found herself in the Soviet sphere of influence at the close of the war, she was nevertheless a sovereign state; so were Poland and Hungary.

Why was it assumed in the West that Moscow would not use its forces elsewhere inasmuch as it has openly and repeatedly declared its intention of engaging in "wars of liberation" and of enforcing the Brezhnev doctrine?

When the first grab was perpetrated, Moscow insisted that the Soviet Union, twice ravaged by Germany, had the right to secure its borders; Moscow only wanted "friendly neighbors." But Czechoslovakia was friendly and so anxious to assure Moscow of her allegiance that she even turned down America's Marshall plan after World War II. In 1968, Czechoslovakia's Communist government was friendly, but not completely subservient in spirit. As soon as Czechoslovak Communists showed an inclination to think for themselves and as a consequence to take steps toward making communism less oppressive, the Red army was ordered to march in. It is always ready.

THE LESSON OF AFGHANISTAN

It is not easy for Soviet propagandists to downplay the Islamabad conference of the Muslim leaders. At first, Izvestia threatened to "overthrow" any Muslim leader who lined up with the United States on the Afghan issue. The Soviet media took great care to misinform their listeners and readers about the outcome of the conference. Instead, they are doing their utmost in depicting the Soviet Union as "a true friend of all Islamic peoples" (Gromyko in Damascus, Jan. 27).

The Afghanistan intervention has placed Fidel Castro in an awkward position as a representative of the non-aligned nations and the third world. His chairmanship of the non-aligned states, confirmed in Havana last year, has become somewhat problematic. After battling through 154 indecisive ballots for a seat on the United Nations Security Council, Cuba finally gave up as a result of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

In an editorial, the New York Times adds this information: "The original decision to hold the games in Moscow was treated by Soviet propaganda as a victory for communism. An official handbook for Communist Party activists says the Olympics will be a test of strength between 'socialism and decadent capitalism.' All aspects of the games, the handbook says, will be affected by the acute ideological struggle between the two opposed social systems."

Consequently, the selection of Moscow has been a triumph. "That such a great international event was to be held for the first time in the Soviet Union had been taken as a symbol of legitimacy: a sign that the world accepted the Soviet system. That meant a good deal to people who, despite their military power, display a continuing sense of inferiority, of defensiveness about the legitimacy of their system.

"If the Games are moved or postponed, or if American and many other athletes stay away, ordinary Soviet citizens will know exactly what happened. Propaganda will not be able to mask the reality of opposition to Soviet aggression. The humiliation will cut deep . . .

"The conclusive argument, for me, is that going to Moscow next summer while Soviet forces remain in Afghanistan would be to show that our attention span is short. The West would be signalling the Soviets that we are ready to resume business as usual—as we did, to our shame, six months after the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

"That is why I found especially compelling a statement on the Olympics by Czech dissidents, published by the Palach Press in London. Speaking of 1936, they said: "The moral boost which Hitler's Germany received by the organization of the games drowned the warning voices for a long time to come.""

OPEN LETTER TO LORD KILLANIN

Vladimír Škutina, the most popular humorist, editor and television commentator in Czechoslovakia before, during and after his five-year imprisonment, who is now in exile in Switzerland, expressed the shock and disgust of many escapees from the Soviet satellites with the attitude of the President and the International Olympics Committee. Mr. Škutina continued in part: "Just 30 years ago, the Czechoslovak hockey team, about to board a plane for London, was arrested and sentenced to long prison terms. Do you know why? Czechoslovakia was at that time the reigning World and European champion. Obviously, the Soviets could not allow Stalin's heroes to lose to a satellite, to a Soviet colony. So Czechoslovak Security was ordered to lock up the team in a Gulag. The Soviets then magnaminously left it to Czechoslovak authorities to justify this action; in such small matters, the Soviets do not interfere in internal affairs. When the Czechoslovak players were finally released, in poor health after years in prison, they were rehabilitated—for sport is not politics and no athlete can be locked up just because he happens to play better hockey than a Soviet athlete.

"Has anyone told you, Mr. President, that Věra Cáslavská, the gold medal gymnast of the Olympics held in Mexico, was silenced and not permitted to take part in any competition only because she was not a member of the Communist Party? Do you know that thousands, hundreds of thousands of talented athletes in Communist states are not allowed to compete only because the totalitarian regime doesn't want them to? Does it not bother you that part of this summer's Olympics will take place in the capital of Estonia, which—together with Latvia and Lithuania—has been occupied since 1939 by the Soviet Union and that over five million people were either murdered or deported to Siberia? You really don't know, or you only pretend not to know, as the naked Emperor in Hans Anderson's tale? Perhaps it does not bother you? After all, sport is non-political, as you keep telling the world.

"Don't get angry, Mr. President, but you remind me of the vegetarian who invited a cannibal to lunch and served him a vegetable dish to persuade him that vegetables are more wholesome than human flesh. Do you know what the cannibal did? First, he ate at ease the vegetable dish, thanked for it, and then finished his meal by eating his host. Only then did he declare that vegetables are, indeed, more healthful than human flesh."

Vladimír Škutina awarded the gold Olympic medal for literature, Mexico, 1968.●

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when farm families are faced with the highest cost of production figures ever, and receive for their products, in many cases, a return that cannot even cover these astronomical expenses, it is with regret that I rise today to express my regrets that one of the Nation's foremost advocates of the family farmer is stepping down from his position of leadership.

This week Mr. Tony Dechant, president of the National Farmers Union for the last 13 years, will be relinquishing his position. The aggressive leadership that he has shown during his tenure as president of the National Farmers Union in championing the cause of the family farmer and rancher will sorely be missed by many of us representing the national agricultural sector.

The Farmers Union and the farm community generally will miss the tremendous leadership which Tony's departure as National Farmers Union president will mean to all of us. With the example he has set, and the organization he has sustained will most certainly guarantee that the commitment to the survival of the Nation's family farmer and rancher that has been shown by the Farmers Union will continue on into the future.●

COST OF GOVERNMENT GETTING FEDERAL NOTICE

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious financial problems facing States and localities is the unexpected and unanticipated impact that Federal legislation often has on the costs of State and local government.

The State and Local Cost Estimate Act (H.R. 3697), which was introduced by our colleague, Representative ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, would address that problem by requiring the Congressional Budget Office to provide estimates of those costs when bills are recommended by congressional committees. Missouri and 45 other States have already established procedures and methods for estimating the impact of State legislation on their counties, school districts, and other units of local government. It would be a logical extension of that extremely useful practice to apply it to Federal legislation.

A recent article in the Missouri Times describes how passage of H.R. 3697 would improve the legislative process by providing the Congress with information on the costs to all levels of government of proposed Federal actions. I would like to share the article with my colleagues and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

COST OF GOVERNMENT GETTING FEDERAL NOTICE

(By James Morris)

A bill, duplicating on a national scale the legislative fiscal note system pioneered in Missouri and two other states, has gained widespread support in Congress including that of two Missouri Congressmen.

But the fate of the measure will depend greatly on the wishes of yet another Missourian—Congressman Richard Bolling of Kansas City, who chairs the influential House Committee on Rules.

The bill, sponsored by Congresswoman Elizabeth Holtzman of New York, would force Congress to consider the financial impact on state and local governments of any pending legislation.

"The bill is designed," says Holtzman, "to protect hard-pressed state and local governments from the unanticipated and unexpected fiscal hardships resulting from Federal legislation." This would be done, she says, by requiring the Congressional Budget Office to provide estimates of these costs when the bills are recommended by Congressional committees.

The idea for the state and local government cost estimate act came from the fiscal note systems presently in use in 46 states. Most of the fiscal note procedures are spelled out by statute, though some are adopted by legislative rule.

Missouri added fiscal notes to its statutes in 1963 and became the third state to have such a system.

Wisconsin and New Jersey, which adopted their systems in 1956, were the first.

Since Missouri adopted fiscal notes as part of the legislative process, they have undergone two significant changes. First, the responsibility for the notes was moved from the executive to the legislative branch of government. Secondly, the notes now include local government fiscal impact statements.

Ralph Bryant, Missouri director of fiscal affairs, worked on Wisconsin Gov. Walter Kohler's budget staff in 1956. According to Bryant, the original thinking was that the executive budget office would prepare the fiscal notes on bills affecting state revenue. The change in Missouri and in other states, explains Bryant, came as the logical outgrowth of the legislature's increased participation in the making of the annual budget.

In July of last year the state also began to include local fiscal impact with all notes. Since the state controls the means by which localities can raise taxes, the change was also a logical one.

This year there is a measure before the General Assembly to set aside funds to pay for any local fiscal impact. At least one state, California, requires that the state pay for all costs incurred by local governments because of state mandates.

State Senate Majority Leader John Schneider of Florissant, who isn't convinced the state should have to fund local costs, says the fiscal note system does insure the legislature at least consider whether the locality affected has the means to pay for it.

Additionally, says Schneider, a lawmaker can know the impact of a proposed bill "specifically not speculatively."

The bill before Congress, according to supporters, would help states by preventing the federal government from unknowingly dropping expensive programs onto sales governments.

For example, in 1976 Congress passed the Unemployment Compensation Amendments mandating numerous changes to state unemployment compensation laws. Among the changes made to the law was one providing for mandatory coverage for states and local government employees.

In Missouri alone, the increased benefit costs were estimated to be $7.3 million, according to testimony given before the Congressional task force on the budget process. Most of that burden fell on local governments.

Failure by the state to comply would have cost Missouri business approximately $250 million due to the loss of the compensation tax credit, and another $34 million in unemployment administration funds.

Another example is the passage of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 mandating equal access to citizens.

Bill Dye, the state budget director, says the 1981 budget includes more than $2 million to pay for the requirements of the act and Dye anticipates a considerably higher amount will be needed for fiscal year 1982.

Dye believes at the time the amendment was being added to the act there was no assessement made of what it would cost state governments.

Dye says he supports the legislation "but that sort of legislation should be passed with the knowledge of what it is going to cost the taxpayers. Regardless of whether the taxpayers are paying in the federal income tax form or the state income tax form they have a right to know what the actions are costing."

With the future holding less money for and greater demands from state governments, Earl Mackey of the National Conference of State Legislatures believes strict compliance with federal mandates may not be feasible or even possible.

"In short," explains Mackey "strict Federal mandates for state and local participation in programs has and will place state and local governments in contempt of law when they do not have the resources to comply."

Rep. Wayne Goode of Normandy and Sen. Harriett Woods of University City have been pushing for the passage of the Holtzman bill as part of their service on the Government Operations Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures. Woods says "Missouri is in a good position to ask for it (Holtzman bill) because we follow the same principal in regards to our local governments."

Woods, who calls it "a vital bill for the states," claims even the best intentioned Washington lawmaker might not be fully aware of the bill's impact without such a system.

Goode says from the vantage point of appropriations committee chairman that fiscal notes have had a significant effect on the way legislators approach bills. Such a process duplicated in Congress, says Goode, is bound to have an influence, have an influence.

Almost every significant state and local government association has endorsed the bill. Many of these organizations are concerned that as Congress strives to balance the budget that federal lawmakers may simply pass costs of programs on to the states. Woods is "not sure Holtzman bill will mean they will appropriate more for us, but they might mandate less."

Goode, on the other hand, says such costs may well be passed on as Congress strives to balance the budget, but if the Holtzman bill were enacted it will be done with the knowledge of the costs so that states will not be caught off guard.

The measure has been before Bolling's committee since its introduction last year. Holtzman has been pushing for a hearing.

Bolling insists he hasn't made up his mind on the legislation. However, he does say "it is, in effect, another burden on the federal government to do things that are advantageous to states."

While it is perfectly natural, admits Bolling, for representatives to introduce these kinds of measures "you can raise questions as whether we need to pass them all."

Some observers theorize that Bolling may be hesitant to pass the bill out of committee until he has completed putting together a reform package for the budget act. The same observers say it is possible that a measure like Holtzman's would help such a package gain approval.

The Congressional Budget Office has given the whole idea a lukewarm reception. It estimates that 10 percent of all reported bills or resolutions have some impact on state and local governments; of these probably half are likely to have a significant impact.

Robert Reischauer, deputy director of the Congressional Budget Office, insists the computations necessary to prepare the notes will be difficult. The budget office also estimates it will need eight additional staff members and an annual appropriation of $800,000 to do local impact statements on approximately 150 bills annually.

Supporters question the expensive price tag and the need for the additional staff. According to Ralph Bryant in Missouri "we are implementing the new local impact requirement with no increase in staff and no budget increase."

This is accomplished, says Bryant, by using the resources of existing state agencies, local governments and organizations of counties, cities, public schools and local officials. Bryant and others suggest that the Congressional Budget Office should use the same techniques and resources developed by the states which now do fiscal notes.

States, points out Bryant, have "preceded the federal government by about 20 years in this function."●

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in commemorating the independence of the modern Greek nation, celebrating 159 years of freedom, rising from beneath nearly four centuries of Turkish domination.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek nation undertook the arduous struggle for freedom and independence. Rallying behind Archbishop Germanos, and instilling their trust in God, the people of Greece set out to restore their longstanding Hellenic tradition, the philosophical cornerstone of our own great Nation. Their battle did not meet with immediate success, but the persistence and determination of their cause carried them forward in their march toward freedom.

The Greek nation continues to exhibit a degree of strength and determination akin to that of its independence movement of 1821, as she struggles to find a just and timely solution to the Cypriot question. We as a nation should be thankful for the participation of the Greek nation in maintaining the stability of Europe as a standing member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The emigrants from Greece who have chosen the United States as their home have been a positive force in my district, and can take great pride in their ancestry and the role which it continues to play in the growth of this great Nation.

The principles of democracy were first conceived by the Greeks in ancient times, yet the strength of these principles remains very much alive today in the hearts and minds of all who cherish freedom.

We celebrate Greek Independence Day therefore, not only as the anniversary of their successful rise to freedom, but also in gratitude for their rich culture and tradition which forms the foundation of the democratic society we enjoy today.●

AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of Members two more issues which affect Americans living abroad. These issues bring to the front the problems which this Congress needs to correct. I hope my colleagues will find these issues useful:

ISSUE NO. 33

Short title: Tax Treatment of Income Blocked by Exchange Controls Abroad.

Summary of the problem: Many foreign countries have currencies that are not freely convertible into dollars, or even if convertible have exchange controls that prohibit exporting currency of any kind. The U.S. tax code calls for income earned by an American in a country that has blocked currency provisions to be considered as all earned in the year that such income eventually becomes unblocked. This can lead to several years' income being taxable by the United States as if it had occurred in a one-year period. Given the high marginal U.S. tax rates, this means that the tax liability of such an individual could be much higher than it should be if U.S. law reflected economic reality.

ACA's question: Asked the President to address the question of what definition of equity necessitated such tax practice by the United States?

The President's reply: "The rules which American residents abroad must observe with respect to blocked foreign income are the same rules which apply to Americans living in the U.S. Blocked income can be taken into income when earned. If taxpayers elect to treat it as income in the year it becomes unblocked, it becomes analogous to receiving a lump-sum payment for services performed in a prior year. The income averaging provisions of U.S. tax law may be used to reduce the tax."

ACA's renewed question: Why does the U.S. have a practice that causes such added complications for Americans living overseas? The question is not an idle one, particularly since the 1978 tax law changes brought many more overseas Americans into the tax liability picture through abolition of income exclusion provisions.

Also, why is there not a recognition that living in a blocked currency country is quite different from living in the United States with some income coming from such a country? Why cannot the taxation from such sources be deferred until the income becomes unblocked and then simply have the individual file back returns to pick up the missing years?

Many low income Americans abroad, teachers, and workers at charitable institutions in blocked currency countries face much more complicated tax problems from U.S. taxes than ever before. The U.S. should address this added complexity and find a better solution.

ISSUE NO. 34

Short title: Discriminatory Taxation of Americans With an Alien Spouse.

Summary of the problem: If an American is unmarried and lives abroad, he files U.S. income tax as a single person and has the maximum tax protection benefit. If he marries an alien, his U.S. tax status changes. Unless he accepts to file a joint return with his alien spouse, who may never have been to the United States and have no intention to ever go there, and accepts to have his spouse also pay U.S. income taxes on all of her worldwide earned and unearned income, he must file as a married-filing-separately individual and he also forfeits his maximum tax protection.

ACA's question: Why does the United States want to tax non-resident aliens abroad, and why are Americans living abroad with a non-resident alien spouse faced with either paying tax on the spouse's income or losing significant U.S. tax benefits?

The President's reply: "The rules concerning joint filing status, where one spouse is a non-resident alien are the same for Americans living in the U.S. as they are for Americans abroad. Both spouses must be subject to U.S. tax in order to qualify for the benefits of the maximum tax on earned income. Married taxpayers who choose not to file a joint return must file as "married filing separately" rather than as single persons. This is the so-called "marriage-penalty" for which there seems to be no solution satisfactory to all. If these rules, including the prohibition against an annual option on filing a joint or separate return, were changed only for U.S. citizens abroad married to non-resident aliens, such citizens could escape tax on their share of the spouse's community income. This is not possible for U.S. citizens living in the U.S. who are married to non-resident aliens."

Once again we don't know how to take the reply given by the President. First of all, it seems to us to say that Americans abroad with an alien spouse must be taxed the same as Americans living at home is one thing, but to say that Americans abroad with a non-resident alien spouse must be taxed the same as an American at home with a non-resident alien spouse is quite another. We wonder just what kind of household it is that has a non-resident alien spouse in the United States. Surely this must be a rare exception rather than the general rule. Abroad, on the contrary this is the rule in almost every case.

Second, why does the United States feel that it has any right to tax a non-resident alien at all? The overseas American has precious little to show for his tax dollar. Surely the non-resident alien abroad has nothing at all. Indeed it is just such non-resident aliens who suffer from our discriminatory citizenship laws and other unfortunate practices. We would ask the President what principle of American or even international law makes such taxation justifiable?

Third, we would ask the President to tell us why an American marrying a non-resident alien abroad must either pay the U.S. Government a full tax on his or her worldwide income or else lose some very important U.S. tax benefits himself? The President has mentioned this as a "marriage penalty" situation. Indeed it is, but not at all the same type as occurring in the United States where both individuals would have a tax liability in any case. The non-resident alien spouse abroad before the marriage did not have such a liability.

ACA's renewed question: We would ask the President to please address the basic question of why the United States wants to tax overseas non-resident aliens? What is the basis for this tax? Surely it must be the most ambitious reach of any national tax authority in the world.●

ADVANCES IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of biomedical research cannot be emphasized enough. The increases in our understanding of various disease processes brought by advances in biomedical research have led to a measurable reduction in human suffering. I am convinced that this area of endeavor is vitally important to the future health and well-being of the citizens of this country and of the people of the world. There is no doubt in my mind that the directions and priorities set by the Congress for ongoing and future research can significantly alter the nature of disease as we know it.

We are all well aware of the shift in morbidity caused by our ability to control the communicable diseases—smallpox, for example, has been wiped out. Undoubtedly, advances in biomedical research during this century, including the development of a wide range of vaccines and the discovery of penicillin and other antibiotics, have contributed to longer and healthier lives for people all around the world. Nevertheless, we now find that we are faced with the much greater challenges imposed by the chronic diseases, particularly when we consider the aging of our population. Diseases such as cancer, coronary heart disease, arthritis, and diabetes afflict millions of our citizens.

There have been bright spots in this picture—for example, the death rate from coronary heart disease has fallen one-fourth in this decade. In the case of children with acute lymphocytic leukemia, not a single child studied in 1956 survived more than 15 months after being diagnosed—as biomedical research has revealed more and more about this disease, later studies demonstrate that about 50 percent of afflicted children now survive at least 5 years without evidence of disease.

Another bright spot, in which I am particularly interested, is the development of interferon. It certainly appears that this substance, naturally produced by the body, may be helpful in the treatment of a wide variety of cancers as well as a wide variety of viruses. Certainly any research breakthrough must be cautiously evaluated before claims are made on its behalf, but I believe that interferon may be the most promising development in the last several years. This belief has led me to urge higher levels of support for interferon research, a position I have expressed on many occasions to representatives of the National Institutes of Health and to my good friends on the Appropriations Committee. Because of my strong support for interferon research, I share with my colleagues an article from a recent issue of Time magazine which does an excellent job of describing why interferon must be assigned a very high priority in our biomedical research efforts.

The article follows:

[From Time magazine, Mar. 31, 1980]

THE BIG IF IN CANCER

Now, after years of agonizingly slow progress in cancer research, there is a growing and barely suppressed sense of excitement among medical specialists. Just as a fortuitous confluence of developments in rocket, electronic and computer technology resulted in the space feats of the 1960s and 1970s, recent achievements in chemistry, molecular biology and genetic engineering are contributing to what could be, in several years, a major advance in cancer therapy. If all goes well, they will make possible ample supplies of what is now a rare, extremely expensive, but promising new cancer drug: interferon, or, as scientists abbreviate it, IF.

The designation is appropriate, because doctors still precede their cautiously hopeful statements with serial "ifs." If longer-range tests show good results. If interferon can be manufactured in the massive quantities needed for effective treatment. If it proves not to have unexpected side effects. Should these and other ifs become fact, IF will be an ideal cancer drug, for it is a natural substance, produced in infinitesimal amounts by the body. Unlike existing treatments, interferon seems not to damage healthy cells or produce horrendous side effects. Its only apparent shortcomings seem temporary and confined to slight fever, fatigue, and a small decrease in the bone marrow's production of blood cells.

Even now, at ten medical centers across the U.S., the largest test ever of interferon is under way. Bought with an initial $2 million provided by the American Cancer Society (the most generous research grant in the organization's history), tiny quantities of the drug are being administered to some 70 patients with four different types of cancer—most of them advanced—that were no longer responding to conventional treatment. As more interferon becomes available, at least an additional 75 victims will be treated.

Last week the first data from the test were revealed. The details were fragmentary, but the results looked promising. Of 16 patients with breast cancer that had metastasized (spread to other parts of the body) seven cases showed noticeable improvement, five of them enough to be classified as partial remissions. Tumors shrank substantially in three of eleven patients with multiple myeloma, a cancer of the bone marrow. Though it is too early in the treatment of patients with lymphoma (a cancer of the lymph system) or melanoma (skin cancer) to assess the effect of the drug, the attending doctors see encouraging signs. Discussing the early results, Frank Rauscher, head of research at the A.C.S., was emphatic. Said he: "The answer is yes. There is definitely activity against cancer. Abundantly, clearly, yes."

The substance that has caused all this excitement was discovered in 1957 by Virologists Alick Isaacs and Jean Lindenmann. Isaacs, who died of a nonmalignant brain tumor at age 45 in 1967, was investigating influenza viruses at London's National Institute for Medical Research. There he met Lindenmann, who had arrived from Switzerland in July 1956. Lindenmann, now head of experimental microbiology at the University of Zurich, stayed in London only a year. But it was time well spent. Over a cup of tea that August, the two scientists discovered a mutual fascination with a biological phenomenon known as viral interference. It was so called because doctors had observed that a victim of one kind of virus-caused illness practically never came down with another viral disease at the same time; the presence of one kind of virus seemed to inhibit infection by any other.

But why? Isaacs and Lindenmann had the answer by early the next year, a remarkably quick solution to a major scientific puzzle. In a series of experiments, they took pieces of the thin membranes that line the inside of chicken eggshells, grew them in a nutrient solution, and exposed them to influenza viruses. When they added other viruses to the culture, they found that the cells resisted further infection. True to form, the first set of viruses seemed to be thwarting the attack of the second. The researchers next removed all traces of viruses and chicken cells, leaving only the culture brew. They added this solution to a batch of healthy cells and "challenged" them with a new virus. The cells remained uninfected. It was apparent that the initial virus infection had stimulated the cells to produce something that interfered with further viral assaults; this substance remained behind in the solution when the original cells and viruses were removed.

Lindenmann decided to call the mysterious stuff interferon, a hybrid of "interference" and the suffix "on," which was in vogue among biologists, who were using such names as cistron, recon and muton to describe new genetic concepts. The initial discovery was made in November and duly recorded in Isaacs' lab notebook under the entry: "In search of an interferon." Lindenmann took it all in stride. Said he: "I thought it quite natural that when you did research you discovered things."

But the implications were staggering. Here at last, it seemed, was an agent that would mow down a broad spectrum of viruses, just as penicillin does with bacteria.

But many scientists had their doubts, one of them disdainfully calling the finding "misinterpreton." Recalls Microbiologist Samuel Baron, who worked with Isaacs in 1960: "It was too good to believe. Other inhibitors of viruses had been debunked, so they thought interferon was another false claim." Baron, from the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston, had his own doubts when he arrived in England to join Isaacs: "I remember saying to the technician, 'Let's see how this thing works.' It was so impressive that at the end of the week I was fully convinced of its potential. I rolled up my sleeves and went to work."

Baron was one of the few to persevere. He and other interferon researchers had little to go on, for there was practically no interferon available to be studied. The chemical is produced only in minute quantities in living cells, and extracting it proved difficult and costly, liabilities that are only now beginning to be overcome.

Throughout most of the 1960s, a handful of interferon enthusiasts continued working with only the tiniest amounts of material, gradually unlocking interferon's secrets. They found that it is a protein produced by cells in response to some stimulation, usually by a virus. To date, at least three varieties of IF have been identified. One kind is produced by leukocytes, or white blood cells. A second type is generated by fibroblasts, cells that form connective tissue in skin and other organs. (A prime source of fibroblast IF is the foreskin of circumcised infants.) The third, called immune interferon, is apparently made by T lymphocytes, soldier cells that attack invaders and are part of the body's immune system. Each seems to work best in protecting cells similar to those that produced it.

The mechanism of IF's defense against viruses has also emerged. Explains Mathilde Krim, a researcher at Manhattan's Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center: "Interferon is a kind of chemical Paul Revere." When a virus invades a cell, instead of turning out the proteins needed to sustain the cell and other parts of the body, the manufacturing plant begins to produce carbon copies of the virus. Eventually bloated with the alien bodies, the cell almost literally comes apart at the seams and dies, spilling out its cargo of new viruses, which promptly moves toward healthy cells to repeat the process and spread the infection.

Enter interferon. The initial infection somehow triggers the first cell into producing IF. In turn, the interferon assumes the role of an intercellular messenger; it passes through the cell membrane and moves on to warn surrounding cells of the viral invasion. The healthy cells respond by producing antiviral proteins, which meet any invader head on. The entering virus will not be able to replicate within the new cell; if it does manage to reproduce, its progeny find that they are unable to leave the cell. The cycle of infection is broken.

The small band of interferon researchers were able to produce or get their hands on enough interferon to analyze its nature, but the stuff was far too scarce for any significant tests on humans. Most of the credit for relieving that acute shortage goes to a stubborn Finnish virologist, Kari Cantell, who proudly admits that "interferon has been my hobby and main scientific interest for over 20 years." Cantell began his career by studying the role of leukocytes, or white blood cells, in fighting infection. He became intrigued when he learned from other reseachers in 1961 that these cells could produce IF. By 1963 he had concluded that they might yield enough of the elusive substance to get research efforts off the ground. For the next ten years, he devoted all his time to developing the method that today supplies most of the world's leukocyte IF.

Cantell's manufacturing facility is unimposing, at best. It consists of a suite of labs in Helsinki's Central Public Health Laboratory. There, Cantell works with white cells derived from the 500 to 800 pints of blood donated daily to the Finnish Red Cross by citizens in and near the nation's capital. The Red Cross spins the whole blood in a centrifuge to separate its elements; the heavy red blood cells sink to the bottom, white cells settle just above, and the liquid plasma rises to the top. The Red Cross keeps the plasma and red cells for transfusions and turns the white cells over to Cantell. He infects the leukocytes with Sendai virus, an influenza-like virus harmless to humans, and incubates them at 37.5°C (99.5°F) for 24 hours. The resultant IF solution is centrifuged to separate out the white cells and partly purified to destroy the virus. What remains is a highly impure IF preparation; even after it is partly purified it consists of only one part IF for every 999 parts of other substances. To purify it totally is both impractical (99% of the interferon is destroyed) and prohibitively expensive. By last year Cantell and a small staff were turning out 400 billion units annually (one unit is the amount of IF that protects half of a cell culture in a laboratory plate from being destroyed by a test virus). That may sound like a lot, but daily doses of millions of units are needed for each patient being tested, and in the early 1970s Cantell's impure product did not go very far.

Still, researchers now had enough interferon to move studies out of the laboratory and into the clinic. In 1972 Virologist Thomas Merigan, of Stanford University, and a group of British researchers began studying IF's effect on the common cold. Soviet doctors were claiming success in warding off respiratory infections with weak sprays of IF made in a Moscow laboratory. Merigan and his colleagues gave 16 volunteers a nasal spray of interferon one day before and three days after they were exposed to common cold viruses. Another 16 volunteers were subjected to the same viruses without any protection. The results seemed miraculous. None of the 16 sprayed subjects developed cold symptoms, but 13 of the unsprayed did. There was one catch: at the IF strengths that Merigan used, each spray cost $700.

In the years since, Merigan and his Stanford team have successfully used IF to treat shingles and chicken pox in cancer patients. In other studies, IF has prevented the recurrence of CMV, a chronic viral disease that sometimes endangers newborn babies and kidney-transplant patients. Israeli doctors have also used IF eyedrops to combat a contagious and incapacitating viral eye infection commonly known as "pink eye." Researchers are now trying a combination of IF and the antiviral drug ara-A in patients with chronic hepatitis B infections. Interferon investigators have high hopes that the drug will be equally active against other viral diseases.

The concept that IF might also be effective against cancer may have occurred spontaneously to several researchers after the work of Isaacs and Lindenmann was confirmed. After all, it has already been shown that some animal cancers were caused by the polyoma virus. Though no human cancer virus has yet been definitely identified, some tumors seem to be linked to viral infections. In recent years, for example, it has been shown that women with the genital disease caused by the herpes type II virus are more likely to develop cervical cancer than those who are free of that virus.

One scientist was an American, Harvard-trained Ion Gresser, at the Institut de Recherches Scientifiques sur le Cancer in Villejuif, France. He made his own interferon by injecting viruses into the brains of laboratory mice; that stimulated the production of IF. After mashing the brains and processing them, he was left with a crude but potent solution of interferon. He gave the IF to a group of mice injected with a virus that causes leukemia, a blood cancer. After a month, the interferon-treated mice were in good health; those in an untreated control group had leukemia. Gresser then went on to demonstrate that IF actually prevented leukemia in mice that had been specially bred to develop it. Says he. "The interferon inhibited the multiplication of tumor cells."

News of Gresser's work inspired Hans Strander, a cancer doctor at Stockholm's Karolinska Institute, who had gone to Helsinki to work with Cantell in the 1960s and had done his doctoral dissertation on IF production. In 1972, using IF from Cantell's lab, Strander began injecting it into children with osteogenic sarcoma, a rare and deadly form of bone cancer. Conventional treatment of this disease is to amputate the affected limb, in the hope that the cancer has not yet metastasized. In most cases, that hope is futile. Without additional treatment, the cancer spreads rapidly to body organs, killing almost 80 percent of its victims within two years. Strander has now treated 44 of these patients with IF after surgery. More than half are alive after five years (in a group that did not get IF, less than 25 percent are alive).

Strander has also used IF with seven children who have an appalling condition called juvenile laryngeal papillomatosis. In this disease, noncancerous, wartlike growths cover the vocal cords of the victim, sometimes filling up the entire larynx so that the child can barely breathe. The only treatment has been to cut them out, but they tend to recur quickly, requiring new surgery; one of Strander's patients had had 400 operations. Here too IF worked, though it was unclear whether its antiviral or antigrowth action was responsible. It diminished the growths in four cases and completely eliminated them in three. When the injections stop, though, the growths recur. Says Strander: "We're now trying to work out a maintenance schedule."

Strander's results sounded exciting to Dr. Jordan Gutterman, of the M.D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute in Houston. He flew to Sweden to observe Strander's work and soon became a convert. Says he: "The was no question. He was having good results." Back home, Gutterman obtained money from a private foundation to buy enough Finnish IF to try it on 38 patients with advanced breast cancer, multiple myeloma or lymphoma. Again the results were encouraging. Seven of 17 breast cancer patients had positive results, as did six of ten with myeloma and six of eleven with lymphoma.

Midway during this study, with some favorable response already obvious, Gutterman applied to the A.C.S. for money to expand the research. To support his appeal, he noted among other evidence the response of his first breast cancer patient: "She had a mass under her left arm, and couldn't raise her arm. Within 48 hours of her first injection, she could lift it." Another breast cancer victim is in remission after 15 months of interferon therapy. Gutterman also reports a wide range of sensitivity among patients, some showing improvement within 48 to 72 hours and a 50% reduction in the size of their tumors within three to four weeks after IF therapy. One patient with myeloma received interferon for three months with no apparent effect. But one month after the treatment ended, his tumor began to shrink. Presumably IF had had a delayed effect.

Gutterman's application to the A.C.S. reached the desk of Frank Rauscher, who before becoming the society's research chief in 1976 had been director of the National Cancer Institute for five years. At the institute he had been urged repeatedly to "do something about interferon." But Rauscher, himself a virologist, had moved cautiously. He did send an NCI team to Sweden to look at Strander's IF tests with bone cancer, and the institute co-sponsored a 1975 interferon conference in Manhattan. But during his tenure, Rauscher increased the NCI commitment to interferon by a scant $1 million yearly. Says he: "Quite frankly, I dragged by feet—in part because I didn't believe the results. They could be explained by other factors. Strander's study was not rigidly controlled; it didn't have the built-in scientific safeguards." He was also worried about possibly "killing something good" only because there was not enough of it for a really fair test. "I was about the most negative person in the country about interferon."

But by July 1978, as Rauscher surveyed the evidence assembled on his desk, his outlook had changed. New data from Strander, with better controls, were impressive. There were reports by other researchers of positive IF effects on tumors. Cantell had upped his production of interferon, and the evidence accompanying Gutterman's request for $1.5 million to buy IF was persuasive. Rauscher was convinced. He left his office, went upstairs to the A.C.S. executive offices and declared: "It's time to bite the bullet on interferon." The big drive of IF had begun.

In effect, it was like starting an armaments program without fully understanding how the weaponry works. If interferon is the body's Paul Revere, designed to warn against viral invasion and stimulate the defense forces, why does it also appear to work against cancer? Though viruses are suspect in some human cancers, interferon also seems to work against tumors generally thought to be caused by nonviral agents such as radiation and chemicals.

What scientists do know is that IF inhibits the growth of both healthy and abnormal cells by slowing cell division. Unlike most cancer drugs it does not kill malignant cells outright, but it somehow alters them so they stop proliferating. Another important difference: rather than killing cancer cells when they are rapidly dividing, IF works best when they are dormant and in the so-called resting stage. Interferon also seems to issue a call to arms to the general immune system. It marshals macrophages, scavenger cells that gobble up foreign material, and increases both the numbers and activity of another specialized group of lymphocytes, known as natural killer cells. All types of interferon boost the defense system, but the IF produced by T cells may do it best, perhaps because, as Pathologist Robert Friedman of the National Institutes of Health says, it is more of an "insider," a substance tailor-made by the immune system cells themselves. According to Samuel Baron, the Texas virologist, immune IF is 20 times more potent an antitumor agent than the interferon produced by fibroblast or leukocyte cells.

Whatever questions remain about both the role and effectiveness of interferon as a cancer drug, most could be answered if larger amounts of IF were available. Admits Gutterman: "We don't really know what we're doing yet. It happens with every new drug. In its early days penicillin was good at treating minor infections but not the big ones, like endocarditis [a bacterial infection of the heart valves]. It took years to figure out that it would work there too—but only at very high doses. But everyone said at first it would be crazy to try that level. There was just not enough material to work with to find out. The same is true of interferon. It's frustrating."

Some of that frustration may be eased over the next few years, as the pharmaceutical companies develop techniques for mass-producing interferon. Most of that IF will be produced initially by scaling up existing techniques: the stimulation of either white blood cells or fibroblasts cultivated in the laboratory. But less conventional routes are also being explored. One is to provoke the body into boosting its own manufacture of IF by injecting inducers, usually double strands of synthetic RNA that resemble viruses. The method was tried in the 1960s by Maurice Hilleman and others at the Merck Institute. But inducers were virtually abandoned when they proved largely ineffective and, on occasion, highly toxic. A new inducer, though, has been showing some promising early results.

Other researchers are concentrating on unraveling IF's molecular structure. Caltech scientists are working with a "sequencing" machine that needs as little as ten picomoles (less than a millionth of a gram) of pure IF to determine the composition and sequence of the IF molecule's amino acid chain, which consists of about 150 links. Explains Molecular Geneticist Leroy Hood: "It's like having pearls of different colors on a string and clipping them off one by one and identifying the color of each."

So far, the Caltech researchers have sequenced 40 of fibroblast interferon's amino acid "pearls." When the structure of the chain is fully determined, which it probably will be before the end of 1980, chemists will try to re-create IF in the laboratory. That promises to be a difficult task: so long a chain tends to break apart in synthesis. But if they succeed, pharmaceutical companies may some day be able to mass-produce this and other types of interferon using only off-the-shelf chemicals.

Perhaps the most promising avenue to ample IF supplies is the recombinant DNA technique being tried by Biogen and other companies. Scientists chemically snip a gene from the DNA of one organism. The gene, which contains the code for producing a certain protein, is then chemically spliced into the DNA of another life form, usually a harmless laboratory strain of the common intestinal bacterium *Escherichia coli*. Now the genetically reprogrammed bug has the ability to produce something new. It begins cranking out the protein and, given the proper nourishment, making millions of carbon copies of itself, each capable of producing the same protein. Though each creates only a tiny amount, the cumulative output can be substantial. Biogen's accomplishment, brought off by Swiss Molecular Biologist Charles Weissmann and his international team of colleagues, was to reengineer *E. coli* so that it would produce largely complete molecules of human leukocyte IF. At Harvard, Biochemist Tadatsugu Taniguchi, who first isolated an interferon gene while at the Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research, and Molecular Biologist Mark Ptashne seem on the verge of getting their restructured *E. coli* to spew out human fibroblast IF.

Despite all the recent achievements, the growing excitement and the favorable early test results, the verdict is not yet in on interferon. Even IF's most fervent advocates warn against prematurely raising the hopes of cancer victims and their families. They appraise IF's prospects in the subjunctive, peppering their comments with "if" and "would" and "could." Were interferon finally to prove an effective cancer drug, there would still be a long way to go. At least a few—and possibly quite a few—years will pass before it becomes widely available. "In terms of research," says Dr. Ernest Borden, a cancer specialist at the University of Wisconsin, "we're only about 2% of the way along toward widespread clinical application." And should interferon become plentiful, it would probably be used as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for existing treatment. Warns Dr. James Holland, of Manhattan's Mount Sinai School of Medicine: "There are no breakthroughs in cancer treatment." Then he adds: "Come back in a year and ask me about interferon then. I bet I'll have some really exciting things to tell you."●

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in commemorating the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, according to the declaration of March 25, 1918, celebrating 62 years of the continuous and unconquered spirit of the Byelorussian people in striving for liberty and national independence.

The history of Byelorussia has had short-lived periods of freedom and independent statehood which have unfortunately been interrupted by periods of subjugation by others, particularly the Soviet Union. In 1918 the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia and began a conquest to regain all recently liberated countries. They mislead internal and international public opinion, while invading and ultimately conquering Byelorussia in 1921.

Since that time, Byelorussia had been subordinated by the central Moscow Government and has been completely ruled as a colony, losing half its ethnographic territory in annexation to the Russian SFSR. The Byelorussian people are denied many natural and human rights. During the 62 years of Soviet rule, they have exhibited mass terrorism and official repression. In addition, the involuntary imposition of the Communist economic system is exacting boundless exploitation of both working people and natural resources. Thus, what appears evident is a systematic "Russianization" of the Byelorussian people and their country indicating further permanent Soviet expansion.

We celebrate Byelorussian Independence Day, then, not because the Republic is an independent state. Rather, we commemorate this day to remind us all of the bondage of this nation by the Soviet Union and its obvious message of eminent danger to the United States and other free countries if U.S.S.R. expansionism in a quest for world domination is left unnoticed.●

TWENTY-SEVEN STATES AND D.C. MAY LOSE SOME FUNDS IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1980 ALLOCATION OF TITLE I—ESEA

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the National Education Association (NEA) released documentation based on estimated fund allocations for fiscal year 1980 which showed a significant change in funds for some States under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act (ESEA) in the basic grant program—Part A.

NEA suggested that the shifts resulted from significant data changes in two States and the new formula for Puerto Rico. Texas reported an increase in State average per pupil expenditure of 17 percent. Most States increased theirs by about 11 percent. Puerto Rico is receiving additional funds now due to formula changes mandated in Public Law 95-561, the Education Amendments of 1978.

Most puzzling was the increase California reported for the count of children from families receiving aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) payments which are above the national poverty level—using the Orshansky index. The title I formula allows States to count 100 percent of the children ages 5 to 17, inclusive, from families that receive AFDC payments that are above the Orshansky index.

California reported that those children increased from October 1978 to October 1979 from 74,551 to 122,535. This represents a 64.3-percent increase in the number of children living in families receiving AFDC payments above the national poverty level. Especially perturbing was the fact that most States were reporting a decrease of as much as 25 percent for the same year. New York reported a decrease of 35 percent. Why the unusual increase in California when the trend has been toward much smaller AFDC counts under title I?

Of further interest is the fact that when comparing the months of October for 1978 and 1979, data shows that California actually served fewer children in AFDC as a whole in 1979—actual figures were 901,185—than in 1978—where total children served was 941,271. How can the number of AFDC eligibles above the poverty line rise when the total number served fell?

BACKGROUND

California is one of three States—Hawaii and Massachusetts are the others—which has an automatic escalator clause in State law which requires the maximum benefit payment under AFDC to increase annually with the Consumer Price Index (CPI). In July 1978—sometime after the effects of proposition 13 began to take hold—the California Legislature rescinded the escalator clause provision due to insufficient funds. The following year, around July 1979, the State reenacted the automatic escalator clause and made it retroactively effective. The net effect was an increase of 15 percent in the AFDC maximum benefit payment in the State of California.

CALIFORNIA—AFDC MAXIMUM BENEFIT PAYMENTS

	Per month
July 1978:	
Orshansky	[1] $515
4 family members	423
5 family members	483
6 family members	543
July 1979:	
Orshansky	[1] 555
4 family members	487
5 family members	556
6 family members	625

[1] For purposes of ESEA-I, the national poverty index is a standard family of four (nonfarm) measurement.

The above data shows that for 1978 only families with six or more received maximum benefit payments in California above the national poverty index, which was $515 per month. The effect of reenacting the escalator clause retroactively, boosted the maximum benefit payments for families of five or more above the national poverty level, which was $555 per month in 1979.

Because California increased the maximum benefit payments under AFDC for a family of five over the national poverty index—even though the boost was only $1 per family—the State picked up an extra $17 million in title I allocations for fiscal year 1980.

Was California's action legal? Yes. The title I statute does not require the national poverty level to be indexed. To put it another way, the $555 per month in 1979 is what the Orshansky index says a nonfarm family of four must have in countable income to be at the poverty level. That per month dollar figure would go up for each increase in the number of family members in the Orshansky index, but the title I statute does not require it to move. Hence, State social services administrations—which do the collecting for the AFDC count—only require the number of children in families above the nonfarm family of four poverty level.

For those who were not around for either the Education Amendments of 1974 and 1978—both of which dealt with reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the AFDC count was always a hot issue. In fiscal year 1966, only 10 percent of the title I children were AFDC children. Contrast that figure to fiscal year 1974 where over 60 percent of the title I children were AFDC children. In 1974 the statute was changed to allow only two-thirds of the AFDC children to be counted. Most of them were in the urban areas.

Since 1974 the AFDC count has begun to go down. Much of this is accounted for in the fact that the average size of the AFDC family is either two or three persons. Rarely is the maximum benefit payment for two or three persons in any State going to exceed the national poverty level, and so the bulk of AFDC/title I eligibles will be in the larger families. It is the middle size family—four or five—that is receiving AFDC maximum benefits payments that are close to the national poverty level. This is what made the California count possible. By the way, the Education Amendments of 1978 boosted the AFDC count back to 100 percent.

Due to the data change—and the other two I mentioned, 27 States and the District of Columbia are targeted to lose funds under the title I 1980 allocations. Below is a list of those States which will most likely be among the losers.

STATES SCHEDULED TO LOSE UNDER FISCAL YEAR 1980 TITLE I ALLOCATIONS

Percentage of loss from last year's award: Alaska (−0.6 percent) Arizona (−7.2 percent) Connecticut (−0.2 percent) Delaware (−3.1 percent) Florida (−2.1 percent) Hawaii (−11.0 percent) Idaho (−0.5 percent) Illinois (−2.2 percent) Indiana (−2.6 percent) Iowa (−1.8 percent) Kansas (−2.6 percent) Maryland (−1.2 percent) Massachusetts (−4.2 percent) Michigan (−1.7 percent) Minnesota (−2.1 percent) Nebraska (−2.7 percent) New Hampshire (−4.2 percent) New Jersey (−1.4 percent) New York (−5.5 percent) Ohio (−0.5 percent) Oregon (−1.3 percent) Pennsylvania (−3.3 percent) Utah (−1.3 percent) Vermont (−4.5 percent) Virginia (−6.6 percent) Wisconsin (−1.9 percent) Wyoming (−0.7 percent) District of Columbia (−0.5 percent).●

THE RULE FOR S. 2012, THE SPECIAL CENTRAL AMERICAN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1979

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the technical changes in the House amendment to Senate bill S. 2012, the Special Central American Assistance Act of 1979, as provided for in a rule requested today in the Rules Committee, are as follows:

In the engrossment of the House amendment to the text of the Senate bill (S. 2012), make the following corrections (all page and line citations are to the House engrossed bill H.R. 6081):

On page 1, line 4, strike out "1979" and insert in lieu thereof "1980".

On page 3, line 22, strike out "The President shall transmit" and insert in lieu thereof "Prior to releasing any assistance to the Government of Nicaragua under this chapter, the President shall transmit a certification"; beginning in line 24, strike out ", certification prior to releasing any assistance to the Government of Nicaragua under this chapter,"; and on page 4, line 2, strike out "harbors" and insert in lieu thereof "harbored" and strike out "or is" and insert in lieu thereof "and is not".

On page 5, line 9, strike out the quotation marks; at the end of line 15, strike out the quotation marks; line 16, strike out the quotation marks and run in the text on line 16 so that it follows immediately after the text on line 15; line 18, strike out "the Foreign Assistance" and insert in lieu thereof "this"; line 19, strike out "provision" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection"; line 19, strike out "report" and insert in lieu thereof "reports"; line 20, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)"; and at the end of line 20, strike out the quotation marks and the second period.

On page 6, line 4, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(l)"; and at the end of line 8, strike out the quotation marks and the second period.

On page 6, line 9, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(m)"; and at the end of line 13, strike out the quotation marks and the second period.

On page 6, line 14, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(n)"; line 14, strike out "authorized" and insert in lieu thereof "made available for Nicaragua"; and at the end of line 17, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 6, lines 18 through 22, beginning after the quotation marks in line 18, strike out "(K) THE PRESIDENT SHALL TERMINATE ASSISTANCE UNDER THIS CHAPTER IF HE DETERMINES THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF NICARAGUA ENGAGES IN SYSTEMATIC VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND PRESS." and strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(o) The President shall terminate assistance to Nicaragua under this chapter if he determines that the Government of Nicaragua engages in systematic violations of free speech and press.".

On page 6, line 23, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(p)"; on page 7, line 3, strike out "U.S." and insert in lieu thereof "United States"; and at the end of line 3, strike out the quotation marks and the second period.

On page 7, line 4, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(q)"; line 7, strike out "U.S." and insert in lieu thereof "United States"; and at the end of line 9, insert a period after the quotation marks.●

H.R. 6859—THE COMMUTER TAXPAYER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1980

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, as we seek the means to reduce our Nation's energy consumption to effectively deal with expected supply problems in the coming decade, public transit becomes a more likely candidate to accompany additional energy savings. Yet, according to the Department of Transportation, only 6 percent of the work force in metropolitan areas rely upon mass transportation to get to work. Of the daily commuters in the United States, 65 percent drive their own cars. If we could get just 5 percent of our commuters to use public transit instead of their cars, we would save 6 million gallons of gasoline per day or 44 million barrels of oil in fiscal year 1981.

An added incentive for using public transit is needed. For this purpose, I have introduced H.R. 6859, the Commuter Taxpayer Assistance Act of 1980, to encourage employers to provide their employees with free transit passes. Under present tax law, an employer is permitted to deduct the cost of such passes as a business expense. H.R. 6859 would provide an additional 5 percent refundable tax credit to the employer for the cost of the pass incurred. To encourage the employees to use the passes, this legislation would also treat the transit pass as a tax-free fringe benefit.

In addition to the benefits gained by reducing oil consumption, the Commuter Taxpayer Assistance Act would help: Reduce auto emissions in major metropolitan areas and, thus, better enable the cities to meet EPA regulations under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977; remove commuting costs from the family budgets of both lower and middle income individuals; and postpone the immediate need for further tax subsidies to local transit authorities via personal property taxes or other methods.

I believe this legislation could accomplish much in the way of lessening our daily energy usage by reinforcing our commitment to maximum use of our present transit systems as funded by the windfall profit tax. Neglected during the highway boom of the past decades, public transit is now under a major recovery period. The legislation I have introduced would encourage energy conservation while expediting the growth of our transit systems to accomplish this.●

FRESHMEN DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS MEETS WITH AAM REPRESENTATIVES

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of hosting an informal meeting between the Freshmen Democratic Caucus and the representatives of the American Agricultural Movement.

One of the AAM representatives, Polly Woodham of South Carolina, delivered to the caucus one of the best statements describing the plight of the agricultural sector that I have ever heard.

So that all of my colleagues might have the benefit of Polly's description of the effect the cost-price squeeze has had on family farming and ranching operations, I insert the text of her statement in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE FRESHMEN DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

My name is Polly Woodham from South Carolina and I am a wife. First and foremost I am Willis' wife . . . but also I am a woman involved in farm economics.

WIFE is a national association of women dedicated to the promotion of agriculture and to the preservation of the family farm as a quality of life in America. Our purpose is to educate and inform those who may be less knowledgeable that the health of our national economy is a direct result of the health of agriculture. Our ultimate goal is economic prosperity for agriculture and the Nation.

In spite of the talk from Government about improving prices for farm commodities, the principal object is simply to keep prices high enough to keep enough people and capital involved to keep the production mechanism producing. In other words—a cheap food policy.

If you will notice the copy of the Congressional Record, you will see a 5-year plan to liquidate America's farmers. It was issued by the USDA in June 1972. Officially known as the young executive's report, the plan was written by 15 carefully selected men, 40 years of age or under, chosen from each of the 15 USDA Departments in April 1971 when Clifford W. Hardin was Secretary of Agriculture. All of the men were rated G-12 or above and held positions of great responsibility. No farmers but they were devising farm policy!

The planners wanted only a few thousand farms in the United States and they said, "National policy should not be directed at assuring any particular level of income from farming. (In other words, profit isn't necessary.) Income from farms should be of concern only to the extent that it affects the industry's ability to produce adequate supplies of food and fiber."

The report goes on at length to recite that farm prices are the key to making "farming an industry rather than a way of life" in just 5 years. "Over the 5-year period", the report says, "non-resource loan rates would be reduced to a 'disaster price' for feed grain crops and wheat, and to zero for all other crops." The report continues, "the industry should not be evaluated on its ability to provide an adequate level of living for participants regardless of the size of their operation or managerial ability. If adequate supplies of food and fiber are being made available at reasonable prices, we should conclude that the Nation has a healthy, viable agricultural industry."

There it is gentlemen—in black and white—the USDA is saying that if we are not hungry, then agriculture is healthy. Our farm policy has been based on this premise for the past 7 years—and I don't think there is any question that agriculture today is anything but healthy. Our debt load continues to rise and the projection for next year is an increase in costs of 12 percent to 50 percent for fertilizer, seed, and fuel and a decrease of 20 percent in income. More and more farmers are forced off the land because of agricultural policy based on advice—not from farmers—but from a librarian, a plant health inspector, a commodity exchange authority and the like. They have just as much business writing farm policy as a farmer has assisting a doctor with open heart surgery.

Unfortunately, all the rhetoric about economic and social issues affecting agriculture obscures the real danger that confronts us today—the gradual disintegration of our economic system and our free society. Prices that will allow for a balanced exchange between agriculture, business, and labor represents the only solution to our farm and economic problems—lack of earned income, now being substituted with borrowed dollars. Agriculture is our basic industry—and records prove that gross farm income determines the amount of national income each year. Each $1 of gross farm income generates $7 of national income—and each $1 that agriculture is denied, removes a like amount. Disregarding this ratio of economics is crushing America's private enterprise system with a public and private debt beyond comprehension. The individual's right to own and operate his own business, ranch or farm or even to own his own home—the very foundations of freedom—are being threatened because of this debt and resulting inflation.

We as private citizens cannot enforce laws—we cannot write laws—we can only witness to our elected representatives and our Government agencies. We in agriculture know we cannot exist without earned income. What can you do? You must help us convince those in policymaking positions that agriculture must make a profit if Americans want agriculture to remain a viable part of our economy, we must work together. You may have to use every political trick you ever heard about—but this message must be clear—or we will all be losers.●

HUD'S AREAWIDE HOUSING OPPORTUNITY PLAN DISCRIMINATES AGAINST SMALL TOWNS AND CITIES

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed a letter to many of my colleagues describing a regulatory peculiarity that has definitely removed many small communities from eligibility for small cities grants. It is a complicated issue, I must admit, yet it is one of vital importance to the Nation's small communities, who are slowly being maneuvered out of the funds Congress originally intended for their relief.

In 1977, Congress reauthorized the small cities grant program, initially created by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. The community development block grant program (CDBG) provided a competitive program of grants to meet the many community development and service needs of small municipalities. A national selection system was established to insure that grants would be awarded to those communities with proposals that best met the objectives of the act.

Also in 1977, the Department of Housing and Urban Development created another program, the areawide housing opportunity plan (AHOP). This program was created, according to HUD, pursuant to the authority granted to them in the legislation originally establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The AHOP program's goal is to provide funds for the construction of housing units that will help to deconcentrate low income and/or minority populations throughout surrounding suburban areas.

As one can see from the description of the two programs, they are clearly very different from each other. However, HUD's Office of Housing and Community Development has effectively conditioned the awarding of small cities grants on the applicant community's participation in an approved AHOP by granting a bonus of 50 points to community development block grant applicants who also belong to an approved AHOP.

The agency is placing an unfair burden on the large number of nonmetropolitan communities applying for small cities grants. Many towns are, by HUD definition, inappropriate for an AHOP. HUD has said:

> The AHOP program was created to provide a broader choice of housing opportunities for lower-income persons outside areas of undue low income or minority concentrations. Many regions of the country contain little or no concentrations of lower-income or minority persons, particularly in rural non-metropolitan areas. This raises questions of the appropriateness of an AHOP if the problem does not exist.

Indeed, though these towns may be largely composed of low- to moderate-income families, they may be deemed unsuitable for an AHOP and, therefore, because of HUD's 50-point regulation, may be placed at a distinct disadvantage in competing for small cities grants for which they ought to be eligible.

HUD has agreed consistently that this 50-point bonus serves as an incentive plan to local communities to accept the responsibilities involved in an areawide housing opportunity plan. They are willing to admit that it hurts small communities that are not appropriate for the AHOP plan. However, as of yet, the only action on the part of HUD regarding this matter has been the recent announcement on their part to reissue the regulation with an even stronger emphasis on its importance. All this will succeed in doing is further tightening the rope which is currently strangling small cities in the small cities grant program.

I firmly believe that HUD's use of the 50 points is in conflict with the intent of Congress in the Housing and Community Development Act. The block grant program was clearly intended to provide our small communities with funds for the many necessary projects they could not afford to fund alone. HUD's attachment of the small cities grant program to the AHOP program through the 50 bonus points changes the entire purpose of the CDBG program, to the material injury of many of our smaller communities. I believe if a community is inappropriate for an AHOP it should not be penalized in its application for other grant programs. It is important that we understand the dangerous implications of the 50-point incentive plan and realize that rural communities which suffer unjustifiably due to their low concentrations of low-income families should not be condemned for this by removal from successful participation in other CDBG grant programs.●

NOISE POLLUTION THREATENS CITY DWELLERS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been concerned about the serious problem of noise pollution caused by mass transit vehicles, particularly that caused by New York City's subways and elevated trains. My district includes three elevated train lines and my constituents suffer from the noise of aging tracks and equipment and poor maintenance.

The preliminary results of an acoustical study recently compiled indicate that the average level of noise produced by one train is 89 LDN. To give you an idea of the seriousness of the situation, speech becomes significantly distorted at 75 LDN. Obviously this noise situation poses a serious threat to the health of those working or residing in the area.

This noise problem is far from an isolated situation. Transit systems throughout the Nation are plagued with similar noise pollution problems.

Fortunately, in my district the community has been effectively organized by Carmine Santa Maria, a local resident who has dedicated himself to improving New York City's mass transit system. Mr. Santa Maria has formed an organization known as the Big Screechers. In addition to engaging in noise studies, the Big Screechers, under Mr. Santa Maria's tireless direction, have brought media attention to this serious local issue, as well as to the problems of poor maintenance and faulty equipment on the elevated lines.

I would like to reprint in the RECORD a recent New York Times article that provides further information on the seriousness of the noise problem for city residents:

ELEVATED TRAINS' NOISE AFFECTS QUALITY OF LIFE IN SECTION OF BROOKLYN

(By Barbara Basler)

Dominic Mirgalia owns a funeral chapel in the Bensonhurst section of Brooklyn and at least once a day the front windows of the chapel begin to rattle, the big crystal chandelier in the reception room begins to shake and a wave of noise rolls over the building, sometimes drowning out the prayers and the grief of the mourners.

Mr. Miraglia said, in his neighborhood, sometimes you just can't bury your dead in peace.

"Nobody" he said, "should have to say goodbye to friends and loved ones like that. You can't even hear yourself cry."

And yet, all that sound and fury is nothing more than a passing elevated train.

The New York City Transit Authority says that the city has 182 miles of elevated track and Brooklyn has more than any other borough.

NOISE SAID TO GROW WORSE

For years, thousands of residents have lived and worked in the shadow of the elevated transit tracks that cut through 66 miles of Brooklyn. And over the years, countless trains have roared and rumbled and screeched along those tracks and through their lives.

Many people near the West End elevated tracks say the noise from the trains has grown worse in the last few years. And the experts know that whether the noise has increased, decreased or remained the same, it is still much more than people can live with comfortably.

Indeed, experts say that all of the 250,000 New Yorkers who live and work in buildings near the city's elevated trains are assaulted by noise at a level that aggravates and disturbs the normal flow of life.

The West End tracks run through four and a half miles of Borough Park and Bensonhurst over New Utrecht Avenue and into Coney Island. For the most part, they cut through thriving working-class neighborhoods where many of the same Italian and Jewish families have lived for 50 years.

Along the route, there are some warehouses and factories but for the most part, the streets beside the tracks are lined with two-story frame houses, prosperous little stores and businesses, and some high-rise buildings. Some of the small houses are now apartments occupied by families who can only pay the low rents common to rental properties near the elevated tracks. But many of the two-story frame buildings are owned by families who have their shops on the first floor and their homes on the second. And many of these residents believe the train noise is growing and that it may begin to drive their customers to stores farther out.

Some residents say the elevated line is stealing more and more of their time and dignity, as day after day, month after month the noise from the passing trains blocks out what they can say and hear and do for moments on end.

"We wind up reading lips or screaming when the train goes by," said Catherine Ferraro, who lives at 8418 18th Street in a second-floor walk-up just yards from the 18th Street station in Bensonhurst—the same station that sits above and behind the Miraglia Funeral Chapel.

Charles Rinaldi, a retired pharmacist who recently sold his drugstore on New Utrecht Avenue, said that when the trains thundered by, "I couldn't hear the doctors give their prescriptions over the phone."

Residents say the noisy trains also shake their houses, rattle their windows, and crack their plaster.

Acoustical experts recently completed one part of a huge Federal study of elevated railway noise throughout the country. And a city Transit Authority official conceded that "our people here are very frightened of this whole study." "It may have uncovered a very serious health hazard," he said, "and we're afraid that eventually the feds are going to say, 'this noise is intolerable, and you're going to have to shut down these lines or move all the people near them.'"

In this part of the three-part study, experts measured the noise levels of every elevated train in the country, and at the West End line (B line), measurements were taken at the 18th Street station.

David A. Towers, the acoustical expert who wrote the report, said the noise was measured in decibels that reflect the sensitivity of the human ear, and the measurements were recorded as average day/night sound levels, or LDN's.

According to Mr. Tower, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency has set 55 LDN as the ideal noise level, and to qualify for Federal funds, the Department of Housing and Urban Development says a housing project must meet a noise standard of no more than 65 LDN. At the 55 LDN level, normal conversation can be heard; at 75 LDN, Mr. Towers said, there is "a very significant distortion of speech."

"Generally, along the West End line, 83 LDN was the lowest average noise level and 89 LDN was the highest," Mr. Tower said.

At the 18th Street station, where shops and houses are crowded within 15 feet of the steel tracks, Mr. Tower said the average LDN was 89, and that when a train passed through the station, "the lowest noise level we measured was 98 decibels, the highest 106." The noise of a jackhammer is rated at 95 decibels.

Spokesmen for the New York City Transit Authority, when asked about the noise complaints, pointed to the city's multimillion dollar noise abatement program, and then conceded that most of that money was spent on underground routes.

SILENCE IS FOR SUBWAYS

"That's just great, isn't it? They're making the subways quiet for the people who ride in the cars for 20 minutes and the rats who live in between the tracks," said Dominic Santa Maria, a Bensonhurst mailman. Mr. Santa Maria organized the "Big Screechers," a community group that demanded and won more lubrication on the West End tracks to cut the screeching of the train brakes.

According to Mr. Tower, the third and final part of the study will assess the health hazards of the train noise, "and then the Government will know where and how to spend its money on this problem."

A bill that would mandate noise levels on all city subways, including the elevated lines, has passed the State Assembly and has been reported out of committee in the Senate. And, while the bill gives the city three years to cut peak noise levels to 90 decibels, a Transit Authority spokesman said the organization opposed the bill because "we don't have the money to meet those standards."

Anthony Paolillo, a staff engineer in the authority's environmental division, acknowledged that the city's decision to cut and defer its subway maintenance program might have left the old steel track "more rickety and even noisier." But, he said, the city is strapped for funds.

As for a noise abatement program that would significantly improve life by the tracks, Mr. Paolillo said, "I know how little I'd like to live under the noise of the el, and I feel very frustrated."●

WILL LIBERAL BIG SPENDERS SHOW CONCERN FOR OPPRESSED TAXPAYERS?

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, those whose political gospel is that the Federal Government should provide womb-to-tomb welfare have some explaining to do: Namely, to tell us why it is that virtually every time we create a Federal agency to "help" people, the only people it ends up helping are the bureaucrats.

Frankly, a lot of the people are sick and tired of bureaucrats, accountable to no one, helping themselves to our tax dollars.

The Sullivan (Illinois) Progress has raised this important issue once again, and once again we must face reality, as painful as it is for some of our liberal colleagues. I suggest that a few moments spent with this editorial will go a long way toward convincing our liberal big spending friends that the most oppressed group in this country—the taxpayers—need the kind of compassion and concern they have so generously given to other deserving groups in the past.

The editorial follows:

"WAR ON POVERTY" PROGRAMS POUR MONEY INTO SAME BOTTOMLESS PITS

One of the major topics of just about every political campaign in recent years has been the so-called "War on Poverty". Our lawmakers have tried their best to convince us that their best interests are being directed to making every family in our country free from the problems of want and poverty. In reality, however, this war on poverty has been assuming all the aspects of a war on the taxpayers instead considering all the graft and corruption that accompanies it.

The Office of Economic Opportunity was the main government agency set up to head this "war". Investigation after investigation has revealed that the OEO has been very busy wasting the taxpayers money in the usual manner. Money has even been stolen directly; there has been widespread overloading of offices, and personnel; funds have been drained away through graft; and payroll padding has been the usual practice, not the exception.

As Congressional investigations have continued to reveal the unpleasant facts, the office in charge has promised to correct them, but apparently has continued instead to pour the tax money into the same old bottomless pits.

What started out as a most noteworthy cause, has instead turned into one of the greatest examples of government ineptness coupled with waste that our country has ever seen. Some divisions have undoubtedly done much good work, but this is overshadowed by the accompanying scandal. The abuses include paychecks made out to non-existant persons, and bearing phoney signatures; overpayment for services; diversion of funds for illegal purposes; the financing of groups and projects that turn out to be illegal—sometimes even of Communist origin. The list goes on and on without end, and still Congress continues to continue its funding.

There is little doubt that this will be a major issue in next year's elections once more. However, we can possibly look forward to some enterprising candidates making a major issue out of the major waste of the whole affair, instead of campaigning for enlargement of the program as has been the practice previously. Taxes and waste of tax money coupled with soaring inflation have made every taxpayer more conscious of the need for a change, and they are still of far greater numbers than those who benefit most from the government programs.

Congressional investigations have revealed time after time that anti-poverty organizations have been misusing federal funds and in spite of protests, those federal funds have continued to be dished out generously in the same old way. The time for a review of the entire program, plus some constructive action, is long overdue, and next year's campaign is the very thing that may bring it to pass.●

ANOTHER CARTER BLUNDER IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Carter administration's vote in the United Nations and its repudiation was not a unique blunder in the President's conduct of Middle East policies. Although I shall not take the pages in the RECORD necessary to elaborate the mistakes made up to that point, I would like to criticize sharply a more recent blunder—namely, President Carter's shabby treatment of King Hussein of Jordan. The sorry details are provided in the following March 27 New York Times article by Bernard Gwertzman.

King Hussein has played and will continue to play a crucial role in the Middle East peace process. Hussein is a thoughtful, moderate leader who has been a good friend of the United States and who has viewed a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict as the best option for all Arabs. Despite a current difference in views with the United States over the best approach to achieving peace in the Middle East, it is evident that King Hussein still wants that peace very much.

And King Hussein deserves much greater consideration by the Carter administration than he has received. President Carter's policies toward Jordan are extremely shortsighted and are not designed to win the eventual support of the King which will be so important in the long run.

I hope that other Members of Congress who have had, as I have, the opportunity to meet the King will continue to recognize that this wise and gentle man is a friend of the United States and is important to peace in the Middle East. And I hope they will join me in urging President Carter to rectify his shortsighted and unjust approach toward this important Middle East leader.

The article follows:

HUSSEIN RULES OUT TRIP TO WASHINGTON

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—The Jordanian Embassy issued a brief statement today that said King Hussein would not be coming to the United States next month and that no date had yet been set for him to accept President Carter's invitation to visit Washington.

That seemingly bland press release was the source, however, of considerable anguish among Middle East specialists in the Government and it culminated a week of urgent messages between Washington and Amman to avoid a major rift in relations.

The future is unclear, but the latest events were seen by officials and diplomats as typical of the mistakes and mishaps, some of which seem almost comical, that have marred Jordanian-American relations for more than a year.

King Hussein, one of the most pro-Western Arab leaders, used to visit the United States at least once a year, sometimes more often than that. Inevitably, he would stop in Washington to meet the President, entertain his old American friends and see his older children at American schools.

He was a state guest of President Carter in April 1977, but that was the last time he visited the White House. The King stayed away in the spring of 1978, rather than be drawn into American efforts to gain his cooperation in the dialogue that had begun between Egypt and Israel.

Following the Camp David agreements among President Carter, President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt and Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel in September 1978, King Hussein spurned an invitation to visit Washington that October. But plans went ahead for him to come the following May.

President Carter, for reasons still not clear, canceled that invitation at the last minute, upsetting plans for the King to bring his American-born bride, the former Lisa Halaby, to the United States for the first time as Queen Noor al-Hussein.

State Department experts felt King Hussein's participation was vital for carrying out the Camp David accord dealing with Palestinian self-government. Many of them were upset by the White House cancellation, which caused an additional chill in relations. A sharp deterioration was avoided, officials said later, only because news of what happened had been kept secret.

Meanwhile, at the urging of many of his friends, King Hussein decided to visit the United States in September after attending the third-world meeting in Havana.

He was to speak for the Arab nations at the United Nations General Assembly in New York, and it was expected by State Department and Jordanian officials that he would be received by President Carter in Washington.

Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance conferred with the King in New York, but the President declined to receive the monarch. The White House was concerned that King Hussein would try to use a visit to push an anti-Camp David line.

LINOWITZ RELAYS INVITATION

When Sol M. Linowitz became special Middle East negotiator, a new effort was launched to bring King Hussein to Washington. In London on Jan. 26, Mr. Linowitz conveyed to the King an invitation from the President that said, in effect: "I'd like to see you the next time you are in the United States."

The King said he would like to visit the President and officials on both sides prepared for a thaw in relations.

A few weeks ago, officials said, the State Department began considering an appropriate time for King Hussein to come. Officials believed that late May, when the target date for the Egyptian-Israeli talks on autonomy for Palestinians was approaching, would be a bad time, because they thought Mr. Sadat and Mr. Begin would be coming to Washington in May. As a result, the State Department asked, and received permission from the White House, to suggest April 17 as a date for King Hussein.

A COINCIDENCE OF EVENTS

Nicholas Veliotes, Ambassador to Amman, was told to seek an audience with the King and raise the April 17 date. He was received last Wednesday, about the same time that the White House was announcing that Mr. Sadat and Mr. Begin would be coming to Washington for separate visits in April.

A senior White House official also told reporters that day that King Hussein would probably be coming to Washington after Mr. Sadat and Mr. Begin, inadvertantly suggesting that Jordan was being involved in their talks.

The King, in his discussion with Mr. Veliotes, noted that Queen Noor was in the last stage of pregnancy and that April 17 seemed too soon for them. Neither he nor Ambassador Veliotes knew then about the White House announcement. To protect the secret, no one but a few senior officials knew about the announcement and none of them thought to head off Mr. Veliotes.

Jordanian officials quickly let it be known to the Ambassador that the King was angry at being invited to Washington at about the same time as Mr. Sadat and Mr. Begin and that he resented the whole affair.

American officials hurried to explain that it was all a mistake.

Because the Israeli and Arab press was focusing on the possibility of King Hussein's visiting Washington in late April, the Jordanian Embassy was ordered today to announce that, despite reports in the foreign press, King Hussein "will not have the opportunity to visit the United States during the coming month."

No date has been set, it said. Officials here hoped one would be agreed upon soon but there were no predictions.●

PASSENGER RAILROAD REBUILDING ACT OF 1980

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the Northeast-Midwest Congressional Coalition strongly supports the Passenger Railroad Rebuilding Act of 1980 (H.R. 6837). We have worked hard to educate the entire House to the value of revitalization of passenger rail service on the whole Nation. I share with my colleagues the legislative alert on this important issue:

PASSENGER RAILROAD REBUILDING ACT OF 1980 (H.R. 6837)

BACKGROUND

The Passenger Railroad Rebuilding Act of 1980 (H.R. 6837) was reported out of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on March 19. The bill authorizes funding for the completion of the Northeast Corridor, design and engineering for 13 potential corridors, and emergency protection for workers of the Rock Island Railroad. The $750 million authorized for the Northeast Corridor will be used for major station improvements, construction of service facilities, and the installation of new signaling and electrification systems, enabling it to meet congressionally mandated trip-time goals by 1985.

ANALYSIS

The first part of Title I (Passenger Railroad Rebuilding Act) authorizes $750 million for completion of the Northeast Corridor Improvement Project. Within five years of the project's completion, Amtrak's annual revenues should equal or exceed the Northeast Corridor's annual operating costs. Amtrak is immediately given primary responsibility for allocating and monitoring the progress of construction contracts solely related to track improvements, and five years after enactment of this legislation, all authority for the Northeast Corridor will be transferred from the Transportation Department to Amtrak.

The second part of Title I authorizes funds from windfall profits tax revenues for improvements to designated corridors: $55 million for design and engineering, and $50 million for Amtrak to begin purchasing equipment for new corridor services. In addition, the bill reserves $850 million from windfall profits tax revenues not to be available before fiscal 1982, for construction of corridor improvements. Construction funds will be available only upon specific authorizing legislation by Congress—after Amtrak has completed design and engineering plans.

Six rail corridors in the Northeast-Midwest region are included in the bill: Cincinnati to Chicago; Cleveland to Chicago; Detroit to Chicago; New York City to Buffalo; St. Louis to Chicago; and Minneapolis/St. Paul to Chicago.

The Rock Island Railroad is bankrupt and under court order to liquidate. Title II (Rock Island Railroad Employee Assistance Act) provides $75 million in loans for benefits and allowances provided under employee protection agreements; $1.5 million for new career training assistance; $1 million to the Railroad Retirement Board for administrative expenses; and $4 million in emergency funds to continue essential operations of the Rock Island not provided by other railroads.

SUMMARY

The Northeast-Midwest region has an important stake in the passage of H.R. 6837. The Northeast Corridor Improvement Project will serve as a model for rehabilitation of other rail corridors throughout the nation and, coupled with other corridors designated in the bill, is an essential part of the region's recovery to full economic vitality.

These rail corridors in the Northeast and Midwest will provide the region with high-speed, energy-efficient transportation service and help reduce congestion and pollution at the same time. Better passenger and freight service will help generate needed jobs, commerce, and capital investment. A comprehensive rail system must be part of the nation's commitment toward reducing its dependence on imported oil.

The Passenger Railroad Rebuilding Act of 1980 is a balanced and fiscally responsible approach to the pressing need for continued and improved rail freight and passenger service. In this period of tough decisions about the allocation of scarce federal resources, we believe H.R. 6837 merits your strong support.●

MORE PAPERWORK

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, inflation is the No. 1 domestic problem facing the Nation. If every segment of society assumes the responsibility for fighting inflation, together we will be able to put our economy on a sounder foundation.

When Congress enacted the medicare-medicaid antifraud and abuse amendments, Public Law 95-142, it was seeking an effective means of managing the $25 billion that the Federal Government pays to hospitals each year. But, Congress did not intend to place highly costly and overly burdensome regulations upon the hospital industry in order to meet this goal.

Unfortunately, two sets of proposed regulations released by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will add to the mountains of paperwork already required by the Federal Government, and will also add to our skyrocketing inflation rate.

Proponents of these regulations say they are simplified in comparison to earlier proposed regulations. Their proof: The book of instructions for answering the questionnaire, which is part of the regulations, has been reduced from 600 to 305 pages. Some simplification.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to my colleagues' attention the following Washington Post article about the recently released second proposal for hospital cost reporting:

U.S. SEEKS TO CUT HEALTH COSTS WITH NEW REPORTING RULES

(By Spencer Rich)

The government proposed a new means yesterday of cutting costs in the Medicare and Medicaid programs: a uniform cost-reporting system for the nation's hospitals.

Hospital industry groups, which killed a similar plan last year, showed no enthusiasm for the new one.

The revised reporting system was proposed by Leonard D. Schaeffer, administrator of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Health Care Financing Agency (HCFA).

He said reporting methods by hospitals for Medicare/Medicaid reimbursement differ so sharply that HEW has difficulty comparing costs and evaluating charges.

As a result, he said, there is no way for HEW to determine why one hospital has far higher costs for the same item than another—for example, 38 cents for a bottle of 500 aspirins at one hospital and $2.66 at another.

Schaeffer said a hospital with a delivery room might not be completely segregating its obstetrical costs when applying for Medicare reimbursement, and therefore might be collecting Medicare reimbursement for its delivery room even though no elderly Medicare patients had babies.

The new system would exclude delivery room costs from Medicare reimbursement, he said.

Under current reporting methods, an aide said, a hospital also may report some services in a category that receives high reimbursement under the Medicare program (50 percent or 60 percent) when those services should be reported in a lower-reimbursement category. As a result, the hospital gets more government money than it should.

The new uniform reporting rules proposed yesterday—a year after the earlier, longer set of rules was shot down by the hospital industry and Congress as excessively cumbersome—would enable HEW to make clear cost comparisons and locate inefficient practices, Schaeffer said. With time allowed for public comment, congressional reaction and final revisions, the rules probably couldn't be published in binding form until the end of the year, he said.

The regulations, billed by Schaeffer as simpler and less costly than last year's proposals, drew little enthusiasm from the American Hospital Association, the nation's main hospital organization, or from the Federation of American Hospitals, representing 1,000 for-profit hospitals.

An AHA spokesman said the proposed requirements may be somewhat less burdensome than last year's—the instruction book for answering the questionnaire is 305 pages instead of 600—but still appear cumbersome. "We are not ready to embrace and endorse this in any way," said the AHA spokesman.

Mike Bromberg, executive director of the FAH, said he felt many of the changes from the earlier proposal are "relatively cosmetic." He said the aim is still the same—to impose on hospitals, by a new system of reporting, a basic reduction in Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement, the result of which he said would be to force hospitals to charge private patients and insurance companies more to maintain quality services.

"The hospital profit margin is only 3 percent. Costs are high," Bromberg said, "but that doesn't mean someone's ripping us off: Quality care is costly."

Schaeffer said Congress, recognizing that the federal government is paying about 40 percent of the nation's basic hospital costs by pumping out $25 billion a year to hospitals under Medicare and Medicaid, mandated a uniform reporting system in 1977 legislation.

Schaeffer said HEW simplified last year's proposal by reducing the size of the manual forms to be filled out. As a result, he said, instead of costing $10,000 a year per hospital, the reporting would add $5,330 to operating costs, and HEW would pay for one-third of this.

Schaeffer said hospitals today generally report their expenses by organizational units, but because each hospital is organized a bit differently from others, the accounts aren't comparable. Under the new proposal, accounts would be reported according to activities, using uniform definitions.●

IRELAND'S NEW PRIME MINISTER CALLS FOR SOLUTION TO ULSTER CONFLICT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2½ years I have served as chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs. The committee, which now has 132 members, was created to help advance a more positive U.S. role in the development of peace and justice for war-ravaged Northern Ireland.

As we assess the progress we have made, it is clear that the committee has raised the issue from a position of relative obscurity to one which now enjoys national and international visibility. However, the most significant prospects for change may in fact rest with the new leadership of the Republic of Ireland's Government. I refer to Prime Minister Charles Haughey who succeeded Jack Lynch as Taoiseach.

Charles Haughey's first major speech as Prime Minister came in mid-February when he addressed the party conference of his Fianna Fail Party in Dublin. His speech concentrated on the continued strife in the north of Ireland. However unlike the previous Governments' policy of noninvolvement, the new Prime Minister made his point very clear: "This Government sees Northern Ireland as the major national issue and its peaceful solution as our first political priority".

I consider these to be most encouraging words. They can be the catalyst for real movement. Mr. Haughey in this same speech proposed the convening of an international commission on Northern Ireland which would include participation by the United States. I have communicated directly with top officials of the State Department to urge serious consideration be given to the idea.

As we evaluate the present situation in Ulster, we find that the so-called Thatcher peace conference initiative, as welcome as it was, has failed. Its demise can be traced to two major factors. The first was the limited nature of the participants, or more specifically, that only the four major political parties in the north were invited. Wide segments of political thought were overlooked and most conspicuous was the absence of any involvement by the Irish Government. The other problem was the limited nature of the agenda for the conference. There was in fact no Irish dimension built into these discussions, and despite the many proposals which have surfaced regarding the future of Ireland, the conference limited itself to a rehashing of old formulas for limited self-rule in the north.

I have urged repeatedly that Mrs. Thatcher simply apply the same techniques that she used in achieving her remarkable accomplishments in Rhodesia to the Irish question. This means involving all parties to the dispute in the discussions. Most certainly this includes the Haughey government.

Our committee continues to feel that the United States is in an excellent position to assist in the peace process in Ireland. We speak of our involvement in terms of being a neutral broker—as compared to seeking to impose any conditions or solutions. Above all we believe that dialog is essential to the process—a free and open dialog between all sides.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert excerpts from the excellent speech made by Prime Minister Haughey as published in the March edition of Europe magazine:

NEED FOR SOLUTION INCREASINGLY URGENT

(By Charles Haughey)

We must all be conscious of the fact that even as we gather here, the tragedy of the North continues. Violence, suffering, and death are a normal part of everyday life. There are whole neighborhoods that can hardly remember normal conditions and where thousands of young people have grown up knowing only tension and strife.

The need for a solution becomes increasingly urgent. Unless one can be brought forward soon, the situation could well become irretrievable. We know from history that under such stresses it is possible for society to deteriorate beyond recovery. In the view of some observers, Northern Ireland may well be on the verge of such a phase.

The picture is a depressing one. Agriculture and industry in Northern Ireland now produce less than in the early 1970's. The population has been static or has fallen. Unemployment in some places is more than 20 percent.

In these conditions, feelings of hopelessness, isolation, and despair among individuals and families can become so deep and so widespread that the will to restore the values and relationships of a normal society may well disappear over large areas and leave behind communities that are utterly deprived in human and social terms. Surely the fine people of Northern Ireland deserve better than this.

All but a tiny minority understand that violence can never bring a solution and that it serves only to perpetuate division and hatred.

Let us make it absolutely clear that no Irish Government will tolerate any attempt by any group to put themselves above the law or to arrogate to themselves any of the functions of government.

There is one army in this state, one police force, and one judiciary, appointed under the Constitution, to uphold our laws. The Government, acting for the people, will ensure that these laws are effective and are enforced. Democracy will be defended and the rule of law upheld. That is an essential element of national policy.

For over 60 years now, the situation in Northern Ireland has been a source of instability, real or potential, in these islands. It has been so because the very entity itself is artificial and has been artificially sustained. In these conditions, violence and repression were inevitable.

Should the present constitutional conference help to ensure civil rights and equality for all the people of Northern Ireland and to ensure also that security operates impartially, then so much the better. But the conference itself cannot provide a conclusive settlement. We must face the reality that Northern Ireland, as a political entity, has failed and that a new beginning is needed. The time has surely come for the two sovereign governments to work together to find a formula and lift the situation on to a new plane that will bring permanent peace and stability to the people of these islands. No settlement can be contemplated now that merely sows the seeds of future discord.

There are massive financial, security, and constitutional questions to be solved, guarantees to be worked out. But a start must be made. In my view, a declaration by the British Government of their interest in encouraging the unity of Ireland, by agreement and in peace, would open the way towards an entirely new situation in which peace, real and lasting, would become an attainable reality.

For our part, we gladly declare that we have no wish to dominate or coerce. The evils of domination and coercion at the hands of others are too deeply embedded in our folk memory for us ever to start down along that reprehensible road.

Let me also say that in any discussion or negotiation that may be embarked upon, or any settlement that may be proposed, the safety and welfare of our fellow countrymen of the protestant faith in Northern Ireland would be for me, personally, a special priority. I have lived among them as a boy. I know their qualities, I admire their virtues, I understand their deeply held convictions. It would be my concern to ensure that their place in the Ireland of the future was secure, that their talents and industry were given every opportunity to flourish, that their traditions were honored and respected.

Northern Ireland casts a long, dark shadow into every corner of these islands. The effects of the violent and unstable situation there are felt in a hundred different ways.

Because of it, political life in this part of the country is a great deal less fruitful and constructive than it would otherwise be. We are forced to accept unpalatable measures, restrictions, and curtailments of freedom that are alien to our outlook and our character.

In the economic situation that confronts us, the cost of the security measures directly attributable to the Northern situation—about 70 million pounds—is becoming increasingly onerous for us to bear. It represents an allocation of scarce resources that could well be used for many urgent, desirable social purposes. Northern Ireland distorts official relations between Britain and Ireland. It hinders too the development of friendship and cooperation at every level between ordinary people in these islands who have such a great deal in common and who have such close personal ties going back over many generations.

Perhaps more than anything else however, the situation in the North prevents the coming together of all our cultural traditions in a full flowering and the harnessing of the energies of all the people of this island in a combined effort for their betterment, their welfare, and their happiness.

We look forward to some new free and open arrangement in which Irishmen and women, on their own, without a British presence but with active British good will, will manage the affairs of the whole of Ireland in a constructive partnership within the European Community.

This Government sees Northern Ireland as the major national issue and its peaceful solution as our first political priority.●

RECLAMATION LAW AMENDMENTS

HON. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, at some time during the next several weeks we will have before us a bill to modernize the Reclamation Act of 1902. I would like to take this opportunity to comment on one aspect of the controversy that surrounds this legislation and that is the issue of farm productivity.

The consumers of the United States should be made aware that one of the reasons they eat better for less cost than any people in the world is because of the productivity of American agriculture. We are now being treated to the spectacle of the U.S. Department of Agriculture trying to choke off Federal funds into research into cheaper ways to grow food in this country. This is being urged upon us on the ground that it is not good for the Federal Government to do anything that would reduce the number of jobs available for farmworkers.

What is not said is that these labor-saving devices have made it possible to provide cheaper food to put on American tables.

The same issues are at stake in the reclamation law amendments which are now being considered by the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee. The question is whether the Federal Government is going to decide by decree how big a farm should be, or whether we are going to let the farmer decide how big his farm should be. It is not a question of whether a 160-acre farm or a 1,280-acre farm is more efficient than a 2,000- or 4,000-acre farm. The question is whether enough food can be produced on small farms to produce the food this country needs, at prices people can afford.

American farmers, left to their own initiative, can grow the food we need in this country. Social planners cannot. American consumers should not be asked to subsidize social experiments with the most successful farming system in the world.●

"I DON'T WANT TO BE THE LAST FARMER IN THIS FAMILY"

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article in the March issue of Nashville magazine. It is a statement of our times and one which I fear is becoming all too common across our country. The article deals with the plight of the small farmer. This particular article deals with a longtime, close, personal friend of mine, Mr. Herschel Ligon. I hope the Members of this body will take the time to heed Herschel's plea, because once the small farmer is gone, he will never be replaced. I feel the title of the article says it all—"I Don't Want To Be the Last Farmer in This Family."

The article follows:

"I DON'T WANT TO BE THE LAST FARMER IN THIS FAMILY"

(By Michael J. Kosser)

The drive east from Nashville to Lebanon is a classic lesson in the paving of America. Lebanon Road beyond Donelson is patchwork of shopping centers, franchise food monstrosities and subdivisions, occasionally interrupted by a stretch of green waiting only for the right price to be turned into more shopping centers, franchise food monstrosities and subdivisions.

Yet a mile and a quarter east of the Metro line you'll find Herschel Ligon, who calls himself "the last of Middle Tennessee's poverty farmers." Unlike most everyone else in the area with a bit of open space and a few cows, Herschel doesn't farm for a hobby. Year after year he scratches a living out of 250 acres of clay just as his Cloyd forebears have done since John Cloyd settled the land in 1789. Herschel uses a tractor instead of mules, of course, but only grudgingly. "If I were able," he insists, "I'd go back to mules right now. It's more economical."

Realtors and developers would scoff at Ligon's claims of poverty. What he sees as a fine place to raise kids and food for America, they see as a million dollars worth of prime business and residential property, Nashville's gateway to the east in the modern-day scheme of suburban sprawl.

"I've got enough high-priced land," says Herschel, "that my wife and I could live like royalty in Florida . . . but then what would the children have?" He pauses. "And my forefathers must have felt the same way or we wouldn't have this land today." He shakes his head. "What my father went through in the Depression. How he had to struggle to hold this thing together.

His father is dead now. He died last year at the age of 90, the last of 13 children. He's buried in the family graveyard on a hill not far from the Cloyd farm, the same hill where Herschel buried his two mules who died two and four years back.

But the sixth generation of Cloyds has stayed with the land. Both of Herschel's sons, Bill and Jim, earned agricultural degrees from the University of Tennessee. Bill, the oldest, teaches vocational agriculture in Westmoreland and Jim manages the farm at Tennessee Tech.

To city folks, 250 acres sounds like a lot of land. But that's not much to support a modern American farmer—prices aren't high enough—unless there's something very special being raised on the farm. Herschel raises something special: prize-winning Poland China hogs, which last year swept their division at the Arkansas State Fair and won Grand Champion Boar at the Kentucky State Fair and the Mid-South Fair in Memphis. Herschel sells first-class Poland breeding stock, as well as cattle, lambs and even an occasional turkey. Yet in spite of the great prestige of the Cloyd farm's southern swine breeding stock, Herschel did not make enough money to pay income tax last year.

"I'd love to pay taxes," he says. And then he launches into his favorite subject, on behalf of which he has traveled thousands of miles to speak before farmer groups, consumer groups and government committees: parity for the American farmer. (Parity is a price for certain farm products designed to keep the purchasing power of the farmer at the level of a designated base period.)

In his book "The Americanization of Dixie," John Egerton describes Herschel Ligon as a "Jeremiah in brogans and khaki pants, a warning voice in the emptying rural countryside."

"You've seen what's happened to the price of oil," says Ligon, his square jaw sternly set. "When they liquidate the private enterprise farmers like me and the big corporations take over, food'll be next to skyrocket in price.

"Until a few months ago, hog prices were better," he continues, "and with my working 12 hours a day seven days a week, wife working away from home, me using worn-out equipment and my sons lending a hand when they could, the overdrafts at the bank weren't as frequent. Now hog prices are at half price, and you don't move much breeding stock at that price."

"But if I knew I could get parity of price, I could borrow $100,000 to spend on essentials. We could get our sawmill going, work a couple of families on the farm in addition to us. We could build the boys a house and they could be here full time. I'm positive that if they could make the kind of living that society expects, they'd both be here now—and my wife wouldn't have to work. There's three more jobs to unemployment. Look what we'd do for the economy."

The more you listen to Herschel Ligon, the more you realize that he never, ever entertains the slightest thought of giving into the signs of the times and selling out. Each year the noose of subdivisions around the farm gets tighter and tighter, and the menace of municipal government with its high taxes and restrictive ordinances gets closer and closer. Yet he'd no more give up the land of his fathers than he'd give up his life or the lives of his sons. Early every fall and again in the spring he drives his polled shorthorn cattle from one pasture to another right down the street of an intervening subdivision without undue fear for the future of his threatened way of life.

He chuckles. "Some of the cows, they've gone that way before and the rest follow. Once in a while a bush or something gets damaged, but we set it right. We've never had a complaint. Most of the neighbors are nice folks and they love living near a farm."

Yet farming in the middle of suburbia is practically a daily struggle.

"For one thing," says Herschel, "there are the dogs. Dogs have killed at least 100 sheep and lambs and 100 pigs over the years. They got 13 of my ewes at one time. Those dogs come with the civilization. But I've got some of the finest neighbors in the world.

"Another pressure is the kids," he adds. "They cut your fences, tear your haystacks down—and that turns the livestock into your crops. And they set fires. They burned down the building with my grain fan in it and I could sure use it now. I don't intend to build another barn up yonder until somebody lives up there."

Then there's a local independent fire department, which Herschel says burned down the barn "trying to scare us into protection."

While Ligon's farm does not fall within the clutches of Metro and the potentially spiraling tax structure that is the lot of most of today's cities, Mount Juliet, to the east, has over the past three years been casting hungry eyes around for land to annex to broaden its tax base. An attempt to gobble up almost 20 square miles several years back brought the countryside to the brink of revolution. This year Mount Juliet very quietly went after a couple of subdivisions along Lebanon Road. Saddened by what he judged as a lack of fighting fervor among the city's potential new citizens, Herschel decided to seek a separate peace.

"I called the mayor," he remembers, "and told her I'd be more trouble than I was worth and she agreed. They've annexed all around me, except for a couple of neighboring farms."

A political scientist would have a difficult time classifying Hershel Ligon's position on the political spectrum. A World War II veteran who went in a private and came out a captain, Herschel believes in universal military training. His feelings about the late Vietnam war are classically conservative ("They should have let us win it and get out") and his attitude toward private property is what one would expect from an independent farmer working a 200-year-old birthright.

But his farm would be a positive joy to today's young liberals who are so concerned about ecology.

"Crops are earning a diminishing return from chemical fertilizers," he says earnestly. "I don't use chemicals' I use natural fertilizer and crop rotation. We produce all our own hay on that 70 acres up the road and most of the grain—wheat, oats, barley, grain-sorghum—that we need for our stock. We don't bail our hay; we stack it like they did in the old days. And we winter the cattle up there, then all the hay that falls to the ground goes back into soil.

"We used to bail hay when we had the barn, but the fire department burned it down. Three years later the guy who did it admitted it. Now we use a stacker.

"We can succeed," he insists, looking the odds against him squarely in the eye, "because we produce prize-winning hogs and we do it by hard work and careful attention to detail—food, buildings. . . . We also provide lambs to Vanderbilt for baby research and they give parity of price. They say lambs have systems a lot like human babies."

The turkeys and the gaming chickens that flap around the barn are there because "I never denied the boys any animal they ever wanted, except I wouldn't have goats."

Then there are the horses. "I hope the mares get bred this time," he says, "because this'd be the first time the family's been out of horses [the horse business] in 190 years."

When Herschel is not out in the field, he is highly visible as the unpaid president of the Registered Farmers of America (RFA), an organization he formed more than a decade and a half ago. More accurately, he IS Registered Farmers of America. "As I go, so RFA goes," he admits.

The creed of the RFA is summed up neatly in the quotes and paraphrases included by Egerton in The Americanization of Dixie:

"Reduced to its barest essentials, the idea is this: anybody who earns at least two-thirds of his annual income from the sale of agriculture products produced by him on the farm should be designated as a 'registered farmer'; the federal government should guarantee 100 percent parity of price for all such agriculture products sold by registered farmers. . . ."

"If you make farming profitable for real farmers," Egerton quotes Herschel as saying, "people who love the land will return to it. They could pay their debts and pay their taxes. People who have migrated to the cities because they couldn't make a decent living on the farm would come back. We could make the price of food reasonable and give a lot of people a new sense of purpose."

By now you might well get the feeling that even in the seventh decade of his life, this tough warrior who once led troops onto Utah Beach must tilt at windmills when instead he could be enjoying the pleasures of the good life America has to offer those with the cash it takes to buy it. He fights politicians and bureaucrats and speaks his mind with a minimum of tact.

He comes from tough stock. At the age of 87, his mother still runs an antique shop in Donelson, as she has since 1941. As for his father: "When the war came, I could have stayed home and farmed if I'd wanted to. Father said, 'Now son, you do your part and I'll get by somehow.' He took care of his bed-ridden uncle and three farms—alone. He'd feed his team then he'd walk down the road and feed his uncle, then he'd walk back."

His brow darkens as conversation returns to thoughts of the Registered Farmers of America. In recent years he's seen the need to unite farmers and consumers and to that end his organization has been admitting consumers as associate members of the organization.

"Agriculture," he claims, "produces 71 percent of our raw material. See those big raises Congress has been voting themselves in recent years? That's their version of parity. Congress thinks they're entitled to parity but farmers aren't!"

Sooner or later, the battle will take Herschel back to Washington, D.C., where he has testified and visited with powers-that-be. "I don't mind telling you," he says, "I'm gonna make an effort to get a hold of Jimmy Carter."

Look into Herschel Ligon's face and you'll see strength of purpose. You'll also see a little humor. But you'll see sadness, too—too much sadness for a man who loves life as he does. A man who does his job as well as he does shouldn't have to fight so long and hard just to exist. He should be able to draw an occasional breath of clear air and be able to put his head on a pillow at night without worrying that in the morning someone is going to find a legal way to steal his life from him.

"I've been fighting this farmer thing since 1960," he says, "and I have a selfish motive.

"I don't want to be the last farmer in this family."●

ITC AID EXTENSION URGED

HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the plight of the color television industry and its workers. The jobs of more than 65,000 Americans depend upon this, the only remaining large segment of the domestic consumer electronics industry.

Ten labor organizations and five companies have joined in a coalition called Compact, the Committee to Preserve American Color Television. Their purpose is to save the color TV industry from going the way of the black-and-white television industry—into oblivion.

This coalition has petitioned the U.S. International Trade Commission and the President for an extension of the import limitations on color TV sets from Japan, Taiwan, and Korea. In 1977 the President granted 3 years of relief after the ITC had recommended 5. But because Taiwan and Korea and other countries sprang end runs around the limitations, the import relief has been effective for only 1 year.

I commend to my colleagues a news article which appeared recently in the Corning, N.Y. Leader. It touches on some of the highlights of the testimony given before the ITC by the cochairmen of the Compact coalition, Jacob Clayman, representing the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, and Allen W. Dawson, executive vice president of Corning Glass Works.

ITC AID EXTENSION URGED

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. International Trade Commission was told today the American consumer electronics industry is on the verge of a "new and explosive era of telecommunications growth."

But it was quickly added that this is incumbent on President Carter extending the import relief program for color television receivers, the industry's financial mainstay.

Allen W. Dawson, executive vice president of Corning Glass Works, emphasizing that color TV prices have proved anti-inflationary for a decade, said the alternative to an extension of import relief would be to see the consumer electronics industry "wither up and disappear from our shores."

Jacob Clayton, representing the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, testified at the ITC hearing that employment in color television plants has continued to decline in spite of the Orderly Marketing Agreements the U.S. signed with Japan, Taiwan and Korea. All three OMAs expire June 30 unless the President extends relief.

Clayman and Dawson are cochairman of COMPACT, the Committee to Preserve American Color Television, a labor-industry coalition comprised of four companies and 11 labor organizations.

Other witnesses supporting an extension of import relief at the hearings today include: Charles Pillard, president, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW); George M. Parker, president, American Flint Glass Workers; George Konkol, president, Consumer Electronics, GTE Product Corp.; Thomas M. Hafner, senior counsel, Magnavox Consumer Electronics Co., and Stanley Nehmer, president, Economic Consulting Services, Inc.

Richard Sturgeon, IBEW local business representative, testified to the hardships suffered by Sioux City, Iowa, workers when imports forced Zenith Corp. to eliminate 5,000 jobs and close several plants in late 1977 after the OMA with Japan took effect.

The OMA with Japan, which came too late to save the jobs of many thousands of workers, did cut Japanese color TV imports. However, Taiwan and Korea made up for the Japanese cutback and 1978 was a near record year for TV imports. OMAs with Taiwan and Korea were signed in 1979 but the first two years of the relief program had already been undermined and the domestic industry has had less than a year of effective relief against the five years recommended by the ITC and the three granted by President Carter.

Dawson, an engineer who has spent 32 years with Corning Glass, testified that although the OMAs have enabled the industry to survive the results "have been far from what he hoped." Profitability has not improved significantly, employment is down, and import levels remain high.

Clayman pointed out that "a sharp increase in imports of incomplete (TV) receivers or subassemblies—had particularly devasting effects on employment because this is the most labor-intensive part of the television production process."

He pointed out that direct employment in color TV manufacturing declined from almost 42,000 in 1973 to 29,000 in 1976 to 26,000 today. "Additional thousands of workers in supplier industries have lost their jobs as well." Clayman said. COMPACT estimates that a total of 65,000 jobs are at stake in the present effort to extend import relief.●

HENRY HYDE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune magazine recently carried an article about our distinguished colleague, HENRY HYDE. As a fellow Representative from Illinois and a long-time admirer of HENRY'S legislative and oratorical skills, I am delighted to place this article in the RECORD.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Ever the Thunder From the Right" from the Chicago Tribune, March 23, 1980.

EVER THE THUNDER FROM THE RIGHT

HENRY HYDE, ANCHORED FIRMLY IN AN OLD-FASHIONED CONSERVATISM, HASN'T YET SHAKEN THE "ONE ISSUE" IMAGE BROUGHT ON BY HIS MILITANT OPPOSITION TO ABORTION

(By Raymond Coffey)

It was "almost an accident * * * dumb luck * * * we fell into it," Henry J. Hyde recalls now of the day that put him into the history books and his name into the American political vocabulary.

This was also an occasion that sent battling Bella Abzug and some of her militantly feminist congressional colleagues "right through the roof," Hyde recalls with lingering and unfaded relish. The date was June 24, 1976, and Hyde was an obscure freshman congressman from Chicago's western suburbs, sitting on the floor of the House of Representatives with Rep. Robert Bauman (R., Md.) when along came a bill that included a $50-million appropriation for abortions for poor women under the Medicaid program.

Both Hyde and Bauman favor a constitutional amendment to ban abortions and thus negate the 1973 U.S. Supreme Court decision that largely undid state laws against abortion. But the chances, if any, for getting that kind of amendment into the Constitution are years down the road.

The $50-million appropriation, though, struck both representatives as at least an opportunity to make a point. So they sat down and "scribbled out in longhand, right on the spot," an amendment to the bill to bar federal funding of Medicaid abortions unless the mother's life was endangered.

Bauman was for some reason reluctant to introduce the amendment, so Hyde marched up to the clerk's table and put it in himself. No one was more surprised than Hyde when the amendment was adopted. Hyde says he and Bauman had just wanted a recorded vote to test the strength of anti-abortion sentiment and force members of Congress to stand up and be counted. "We didn't know it (the strength) was there." Hyde said.

That amendment or a compromise version has been passed in both the House and Senate every year since. And even though, in some years, the language was not always Hyde's, the amendment has always borne his name in the emotionally charged political and legal controversy that it provoked.

That controversy, once again before the U.S. Supreme Court, has permanently ended Henry Hyde's political obscurity. And winning one's way into the history books as a first-termer is a fate most members of Congress would suffer with some enthusiasm. But Hyde is uneasy about the fact that the "Hyde Amendment" has given him something of an image as a "one issue" politician. The amendment has become a totem that threatens to smother the identity of Henry Hyde.

His fiercer critics among the proabortion lobby tend to paint Hyde as a political dinosaur; an unfeeling, uncaring conservative who might regard Genghis Khan as an Eastern liberal; an unread yokel; a stern, forbidding, unsmiling fanatic; an uptight ogre.

They send him hate mail and rusty coat hangers, symbols of the illegal back-alley abortion butchery they feel his amendment will revive. They distribute leaflets depicting him as a wild-eyed, wild-haired ogre draining a drink from a goblet while wretched urchins look on. The caption reads "The Infamous Mr. Hyde," an effort to equate him with the evil half of the Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde phenomenon in Robert Louis Stevenson's famous story.

"The problem" says a veteran Capitol Hill staffer, "is that people have this idea that liberals are a lot of fun and have a lot of fun and that conservatives are a bunch of pokes." The problem with that idea, and with much of the picture painted by his critics, is that it does not fit Henry Hyde.

Actually, finding anything that fits Henry Hyde is a bit of a problem. He is a huge man—6-feet-3-inches and (to be fittingly conservative about it) about 265 pounds, topped with a distinguished-looking, silver-white mane.

He hardly fits the stereotype of the austere fanatic or crusader. He is an indelibly Chicago-style politician—complete with blue-stone pinkie ring, white-on-white shirt, and big cigar—who would look comfortable in a smoke-filled room.

And he is anything but uptight. Colleagues in both parties count him one of the most jovial, genial, relaxed men of Capitol Hill. He has a bottomless bag of gags, jokes, one-liners, and stories; there is nothing he enjoys more than sitting around telling them; and no one laughs harder or oftener than Hyde.

There's his story (true) about the little guy named Vito who wanted desperately to be a Chicago cop but was a half-inch too short. After weeks of being put through stretching exercises by a doctor, Vito was still an eighth of an inch too short.

"No problem," said the doctor, "bend over." Vito bent over the and the doctor thumped him on the head with a hammer—raising a bump that was just big enough and lasted just long enough for Vito to pass the physical and get on the force. Then there's the one about the "lesson in humility" Hyde got in a men's washroom at O'Hare Airport. Some wise guy had printed on the air blower for drying hands, "Press button and listen to your congressman."

Hyde, in fact, seems generally less uptight than his critics. He loves to tell the story of the time the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had a "private eye" tail him to Sunday mass at St. Thomas More Cathedral in Arlington, Va., where he was taking part in a ceremony supporting the anti-abortion movement. The ACLU idea, apparently, was to try to demonstrate that Hyde, in his anti-abortion drive, was trying to impose on the country the doctrine of the Catholic Church, of which he is a devout member.

The ACLU, Hyde says, tried to file an affidavit, in a court case attacking the Hyde Amendment, that reported he had attended the mass and received communion and noted that in the basement of the cathedral there was a statue of St. Thomas More.

The statue was emblazoned with the saint's statement, when King Henry VIII of England had him beheaded, that "I die the king's good servant but God's first."

Hyde finds "outrageous" the idea that anyone, especially the ACLU with its * * * Washington seems ever to have heard of him before the "Hyde Amendment," that was not Hyde's first taste of celebrity in the nation's capital. Unlikely as it may seem now, given his girth, Hyde was an outstanding basketball player in his youth. He made All-Catholic at old St. George high in Evanston and went on to Georgetown University in Washington where, as a 19-year-old freshman, he held the mighty George Mikan of De Paul, later to become pro basketball's first giant superstar, to one free throw in the second half of the NCAA Eastern championships in New York in 1943.

Georgetown's starting center fouled out of the game, and then Hyde was assigned to guard Mikan, who at 6-feet-11 was 8 inches taller than he. "I could barely see under his armpits," Hyde recalls, "but I gave him a push every time he got the ball (and got away with it), and he only got one lousy free throw the whole second half. I got one basket, so I outscored him," Hyde recalls. "I was a skinny 180 pounds then," he adds ruefully. (Georgetown, incidentally, won the game, 53-49.)

Henry John Hyde was born in Chicago April 18, 1924. His father, of English Descent, was a coin collector for the telephone company; his mother, the former Monica Kelly, was Irish. He had one adopted brother, who died as a young man, and one sister.

Hyde and everyone close to him agree that his intensely Catholic Irish mother was the principal influence on his life.

He grew up in Rogers Park in an Irish environment in which, he says, the three institutions everyone put their faith in were "God, the Democratic Party, and the White Sox."

After his freshman year at Georgetown, Hyde joined the Navy and was sent to the V-12 officers training program at Duke University—where he also played basketball on a team that won the Southern Conference Championship.

He was commissioned in the Navy in October, 1944, and, just out of his teens, served as the skipper of a transport ship in the South Pacific until August, 1946. Then he returned to Georgetown to get his degree, going on to Loyola University law school in Chicago, where he graduated in 1949.

At a basketball game in Washington soon after the war, Hyde met his future wife. He insisted on taking her home in a cab because "this was no neighborhood for a young lady to be out in alone," Jeanne Simpson Hyde recalls. "That night he asked me out again," she says. "On our third date he asked me to be his prom date," and two weeks after that they were engaged. They were married in November, 1947, while Hyde was still in law school.

The Hydes are the parents of four: Henry Jr., 30; Robert, 27; Laura, 23; and Tony, 18, who is the only one still at home and who will be graduating from high school this year.

When Henry Hyde was in college, he was, true to his Chicago Irish heritage, a Democrat—a vehement one. He cast his first presidential vote for Harry Truman in 1948. "He was a feisty little guy, and I just couldn't warm up to the other guy (Thomas E. Dewey)," Hyde says.

"I was raised a Democrat. We were working people. The Republicans were WASPs, the entrepreneurs. My folks didn't have any money. I paid my high school tuition by doing janitor work. I went to Georgetown on a basketball scholarship."

But during the war, Hyde says, he began to have doubts about the Democrats. A fellow Navy officer, Hyde says, was—a Communist and had a lot of Marxist literature that Hyde borrowed and studied. "I became concerned," he says now, that (President) Roosevelt did not understand the Communist threat. . . . I thought the party of the working man was being taken over by a well-off academic elite that thought 'left was beautiful.' "

HYDE CONTENDS THAT ABORTION IS "NOT A BURNING ISSUE" IN HIS OWN DISTRICT

Finally, Hyde says, he decided the Democrats had "moved too far left" and, while still a registered Democrat, he campaigned for Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952.

Meanwhile, he had become a successful trial lawyer, well-known for his eloquence and skill in courtroom dramatics. His first political campaign was for Congress in 1962, and he lost to Roman Pucinski, now a Democratic alderman in Chicago.

Hyde took office as a state representative in 1967 and served in the legislature for four terms, until 1974, becoming Republican majority leader in 1971-72 until he fell victim to some intraparty warfare at the hands of former Gov. Richard Ogilvie and his supporters.

It was while serving in the legislature that Hyde first became involved in the abortion issue, opposing a bill to liberalize Illinois' abortion law. And it was in the process of that battle, he says, that he formed the attitude that has brought him his present prominence.

It was also in the legislature that Hyde pulled off what he still considers one of his proudest political achievements—passage of a law requiring county treasurers to deposit funds in interest-bearing accounts, a law that has produced millions of dollars in revenue and ended the cozy system under which favored banks got huge deposits of public money without having to pay any interest.

In 1974 Hyde won a five-man Republican primary race to succeed the retiring U.S. Rep. Harold Collier in Illinois' 6th Congressional District and went on to defeat former Cook County State's Atty. Edward V. Hanrahan in the general election. Mr. Hyde went to Washington and has been there ever since.

Hyde beat Hanrahan 66,000 votes to 57,000 in the 1974 race, and his victory margins have widened spectacularly since then; he beat Marilyn Clandy 105,000-69,000 in 1976 and Jeanne Quinn 87,000-44,000 in 1978. His Democratic opponent in this year's race is Mario Reda.

By the time he arrived in Washington, Hyde's Democratic past, like that of his hero, Ronald Reagan, had been long abandoned. Not only had Hyde become a Republican, he had become a staunchly, combatively conservative Republican. He makes no bones about it.

In a day when politicians seem always to be seeking the center, when liberals call themselves progressives and conservatives prefer to be described as moderates, Hyde is unabashedly, unblushingly on the political right.

The anti-communism that Hyde says first started giving him doubts about being a Democrat is now an important ingredient in his conservatism. So is the old-fashioned, flag-waving sort of patriotism that some people now seem to find corny.

Last January, Hyde, who does a lot of traveling abroad on the kind of congressional trips often criticized as junkets, made his first visit to Hanoi and Peking on a trip that also took him to Thailand, East Timor, Indonesia, and the Philippines. For all the recent American fascination with China, Hyde remains largely unimpressed. "A grim, dismal existence" is what Communist China looked like to him.

While they were being escorted around Peking, the guide pointed out to Hyde and his colleagues big portraits of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin hanging in a public square.

Never one to duck the direct approach, Hyde asked the guide if she thought portraits of Lincoln and Jefferson would ever hang along with those of the Communist heroes. The guide looked absolutely dumbfounded. Hyde recalls with a hearty laugh.

As far as he is concerned the Chinese Communists are "still interested in world revolution" and "I think we should count our fingers when we shake hands with them.

"I hope," he says, with a sarcastic dig at recent U.S. policy on allowing the Russians to buy U.S. high technology, "that we won't burden the Chinese with too much American high technology."

While in Peking he asked about the fate of the Catholic archbishop of Shanghai, who has been in prison for 20 years. Hyde feels that under President Carter's much-touted human rights program "we only burden our friends with human rights questions" while letting Communist regimes get away with murder.

Hyde is strong on patriotism, and he doesn't feel the United States gets all the credit it deserves in the world. What seemed to please him most about his January trip to Asia was seeing the American flag imprinted on the bags of rice being given to refugees in East Timor.

Hyde played a key role recently in the congressional move to honor the late movie star John Wayne with a special gold medal. Hanging on Hyde's office wall is a photograph of him and actress Maureen O'Hara, a leader of the Wayne medal campaign. "Without your assistance, Duke's medal might not have read John Wayne—American." O'Hara's inscription on the photo reads. "My thanks forever and ever."

Hyde's office walls also are lined with pictures of him with Ronald Reagan, the Pope, conservative columnist William F. Buckley, Jr., and assorted Presidents.

It clearly bothers Hyde that some people think of him as a "one issue" (abortion) politician. Hyde says it is "not even a burning issue" in his own district that takes in suburbs including Cicero, Berwyn, Melrose Park, Maywood, Franklin Park, Oak Park, and River Forest, and stretches to Addison Township in Du Page County.

Some of the other issues, almost all conservatively oriented, on which he is active include pushing for a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced federal budget and a bill to allow taxpayers to designate $1 a year of their income-tax payment to be used to reduce the national debt.

He also is sponsoring a constitutional amendment to limit U.S. Supreme Court justices to a single 12-year term, instead of their present lifetime appointments. He opposes the Equal Rights Amendment and draft registration of women.

And he is co-sponsor of bills to restore deductions for state and local gasoline taxes on federal income-tax returns and of a proposed "American Dream Act" to help more people buy homes. The idea is to allow "graduated mortgage payments," which would start out low and then increase over the life of the mortgage as the homebuyer's income increased.

Along with such larger matters, Hyde also is a firm believer that a politician must provide "personal service" to his constituents—an idea Chicago ward committeemen and precinct captains have turned into a high art.

Hyde currently is active in opposing any move by President Carter or Mayor Byrne to remove military facilities from O'Hare Airport to make room for construction of a new international terminal. Opponents of the Carter-Byrne plans contend moving the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard facilities at O'Hare would cost taxpayers millions of dollars and a proposed move to Cleveland of the Defense Contracts Administration office now at O'Hare would cost the Chicago area hundreds of jobs and a $20-million annual payroll.

Hyde goes back to his district almost every weekend to give speeches, attend church and civic and political functions, and listen to and help out with voters' complaints and requests.

"The weakness of the Republican Party in the suburbs is complacency," Hyde says. "Service to people is the secret of political success." And Hyde, on a weekend visit to his district, is the very picture of the skillful, successful, Chicago-style politician.

On the streets, in a coffee shop in Cicero, at a Lithuanian Independence celebration at St. Anthony's Catholic Church, he seems to know—and be known by—almost everyone.

In the coffee shop he has a big hello and a big slap on the back for Frankie Belmonte, the Cicero Democratic committeeman and candidate for mayor. "We work with them all," Hyde chortles as Democrat Belmonte moves on.

At one of his three offices in the district Hyde listens and issues instructions as his aides give him a rundown on problems constituents have come in with that week.

Soon Hyde is off on another story, about all the bizarre requests for help a congressman gets. There is the man whose daughter is engaged to a sailor at sea on an aircraft carrier. The sailor hasn't written for weeks, and the voter's daughter is distraught. Can Hyde get the Navy to order the sailor to write his daughter? Well, Hyde doesn't do it that way exactly, but the sailor gets the message and writes.

On the way to St. Anthony's, he talks about how the Lithuanians—fiercely anti-Communist—are "good people, the salt of the earth." In their neighborhoods, he says, echoing the conservative law-and-order theme, "you can walk the streets at night and feel pretty comfortable."

There is one stop on this particular winter weekend where Hyde is obviously a little uncomfortable himself. He has been invited to speak on abortion at a public-issues forum on Sunday morning at the Pilgrim Congregational Church in Oak Park. The church has a husband-wife pastoral team, and the church is part of the United Church of Christ, which has taken a stand basically against the Hyde Amendment.

Hyde is speaking from the pulpit of the church's small chapel to about 30 people. He starts out saying he is "not here to evangelize or proselytize," and "I am not an extremist." Then, in a style deliberately more restrained than the "stemwinder" speech he gives on abortion to groups that support the Hyde Amendment, Hyde says he feels that abortion amounts to the killing of human life. He talks about government protection for such lower species as the snail darter and the lousewort and the lack of such protection for the unborn child.

"I feel abortion is the ultimate in child abuse. . . . There is very little difference between squirting cyanide Kool-Aid into a child's mouth (as at the Jonestown massacre) and using a surgical instrument to scrape an unborn child out of its mother's womb," Hyde says.

There is a question from the woman pastor about the ethics of denying federal funds for abortions for poor women, while rich women can easily get abortions. Hyde responds that he's against all abortions unless the mother's life is in danger, and the Hyde Amendment is only a "stopgap" measure until a constitutional amendment banning abortions can be passed. "It's the unborn of the rich who are now absolutely defenseless," he says.

There are other questions about when a fetus actually becomes a person, some questioners taking the view that in the first three months of pregnancy the fetus is not yet a person and abortion therefore does not amount to killing human life.

To Hyde, "birth is just a change of address," and the fetus is a human being from the moment of conception—"Personhood is an endowment, not an achievement."

It all goes at least politely, and afterwards Hyde says of his restrained approach: "If they're my people (antiabortion), I'll wind their stems (in his speech), but if they're not, I just want to get out of there alive."

In an interview he also rejects the argument of some pro-abortionists that he, as a Catholic, is trying to impose his religious belief on a secular society. "That is nonsense," he says. "There are too many prominent Catholics not with us on this issue" (for that argument to stick). He mentions specifically Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, New York Gov. Hugh Carey, New York Sen. Daniel P. Moynihan, and Rev. Robert Drinan, a Catholic priest who is a member of Congress.

"I just wish some of the celebrated Catholics in this country . . . like Father (Theodore) Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame, one of the great show Catholics, would come out" and join him on the abortion issue, Hyde says. "The strongest advocate against abortion in the Senate is Jesse Helms (R., N.C.)," Hyde notes, "and he's a Baptist."

Hyde gets furious, too, about the ACLU complaining that the antiabortion movement is religiously motivated. When the ACLU was opposing the death penalty, he notes, they brought in clergymen of all faiths and tried to make the point that religious teaching opposed the death penalty. That suited them on that issue, Hyde says, but now, he adds, the ACLU takes the position that religious thought should have nothing to do with the abortion issues.

HE HAS BEEN DESCRIBED AS "AN INTELLIGENT BIGOT"

Hyde doesn't want to guess out loud how the Hyde Amendment will fare in its current test in the U.S. Supreme Court. He figures the anti-abortion movement is at least four years away from having enough votes in Congress to win approval for a constitutional amendment banning abortions. But he feels that the overall political tide, which runs in "cycles," is now running in a conservative direction.

He is convinced, he says, that "there are people to whom the paramount virtue is equality—as opposed to freedom, which has implications of inequality." But freedom, he says, "is more important to me than inequality. There will always be inequality, and we should try to minimize it by providing equality of opportunity." But if in the name of equality, "you take away all reward for effort, you're going to have the gray, gelatinous mass that is the society of most communist countries."

He thinks "the liberal orchestration" of recent history is "beginning to play itself out" because "the world isn't coming out according to the liberal plan. Liberal remedies have been found wanting. People are learning to see the limits of government."

Hyde himself prefers Ronald Reagan for President this year, though he could be comfortable with any of the other Republican candidates "except John Anderson," the liberal Republican who is an Illinois congressional colleague of Hyde. He thinks President Carter is "dangerous" ("rattling the scabbard" of the Persian Gulf and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan when "all he's got in it is a letter opener instead of a sword") but that Sen. Kennedy would be "disastrous."

Given the strong stands he takes and the direct approach he generally favors, not everyone, of course, is just wild about Henry Hyde. But even his bitter foes do not question his intelligence and his mastery of an issue. He is a "bigot," says one liberal woman who has known and disliked him for a long time, "but he is an intelligent bigot."

Sue Ellen Lowry, Washington lobbyist for the National Abortion Rights Action League, one of the principal foes of the Hyde Amendment, says Hyde is "somewhat obsessed" with the abortion issue and that it is "an issue of zealots." She says that Hyde, in his anti-abortion stance, proclaims himself "pro-life" and yet "on almost all other issues important to the quality of life in this country, he votes against them." She mentions specifically Hyde votes to "weaken minimum-wage laws" and curtail summertime school lunches for children. Lowry also is not impressed with Hyde's geniality. "He says some reprehensible things, but he's always smiling," she says. "I think he comes across as rather patronizing."

Hyde's colleagues in Congress, those who know him well, generally tend to have considerable admiration for his sincerity and intelligence even when they disagree with him. "I like him very much," says Rep. Paul Simon, the basically liberal Democrat from Carbondale, "and not just because he's a jovial fellow. But because he thinks, he has class, in a good sense. He has some very conservative views, but he has an open mind; he's learning all the time." Simon notes that Hyde lately has become an important defender of U.S. foreign-aid programs, which conservatives historically have passionately opposed. But Hyde, says Simon, "sees both the national interest and the humanitarian concerns" in such programs. "I think he is regarded by the public as a one-issue person," says Simon, "but he has more dimension than that."

Rep. Tom Railsback, a Republican from Moline who knew Hyde in the state legislature as well as in Congress, says he and Hyde don't always vote alike, including on abortion, "but he's one of my best friends." People who paint Hyde as an ogre "don't know him," Railsback says. "There is not a mean bone in his body. He is basically a very compassionate guy. His appearance kind of disguises his intellect. He is a very bright guy, and he is absolutely sincere."

Frank Sullivan, a Democrat and former press secretary to the later Mayor Daley, has known Hyde for more than 30 years, going back to Georgetown University days. He calls Hyde "the last of the idealists" and "next to Bob Hope, the best toastmaster I've ever heard." "It's easy to like someone who doesn't really stand for anything," Sullivan says, "but Henry takes very strong stands, and everyone likes him. He never gets petty, and he never gets ponderous."

For all his political celebrity status, Hyde lives a notably prosaic life away from the office. He and his wife, an attractive, matronly, gray-haired, soft-spoken woman, bought a new townhouse late last year in suburban Falls Church, Va. Neither Hyde nor his wife drink, and "neither one of us is party people," Mrs. Hyde says as she chats with a reporter in the living room of their blue-carpeted, white-walled living room.

Hyde's "idea of heaven," she says, "is to sit there in that chair and read." He is a constant and avid reader, mostly of history and politics and biography, and he is forever underlining with a yellow pen the parts of a book that strike him.

He is also something of a television fiend. "We have a TV set in every room except the dining room and bathroom," Mrs. Hyde says, and her husband never misses such public-affairs programs as "Meet the Press." Every night when he gets home from the office, he watches the MacNeill and Lehrer news program on public TV, on a set propped on the kitchen table.

And his favorite TV program? "Laverne & Shirley." Mrs. Hyde doesn't like it at all, but her husband won't miss it. "He loves it because it's so preposterous."

Hyde only recently has gone on the Scarsdale Diet. he is finding it a struggle, and he "is not ready to announce any success to the world yet." Until he went on the diet, his wife said, his favorite dish was "anything I put in front of him." His favorite restaurant was "right here" at home.

While he might enjoy a quiet home life, Hyde also clearly loves being a politician. "Yeah, I like it," Hyde says. "I haven't lost my zest for it."

Hyde's political ambition is now focused on running for the post of House Republican whip in the next Congress. His prospects are highly uncertain because Rep. Robert Michel, the Republican veteran from Peoria and current whip, is the favorite to succeed Rep. John Rhodes of Arizona as House GOP leader, and it is most unlikely that the party would bestow both its top leadership jobs on one state.

Nonetheless, Hyde says that is what he is aiming for—and back in 1946 the idea that he could hold the giant Mikan to one free throw in Madison Square Garden seemed pretty unlikely, too.●

A SALUTE TO EUGENE MACKE BENTLEY IV

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to salute a young man in Cleveland who has excelled in an area of athletics which has few black stars—ice hockey. At the age of 17, Eugene Macke Bentley IV has become the star of the Shaker Heights High School hockey team. He has also captured the attention of the sports enthusiasts in the Cleveland metropolitan area.

This achievement is the result of years of hard work. His hard work has been buttressed by the support of his parents, Dr. and Mrs. Eugene M. Bentley III.

"Macke," as his friends call him, learned to ice skate at the age of 4. When his family moved to Shaker Heights, he was enrolled in the ice hockey program at Thornton Park.

He immediately made the traveling team at Thornton Park. This was his first experience at organized team play. During the 8 years he participated in the program, he was elected captain of his team and was selected to the allstar team at each age level.

When he entered high school at Shaker Heights in 1977, he began to polish his already exemplary skills and made the school team. That year, his team won the Lake Erie league championship, the Baron Cup championship, the Thornton invitational championship as well as the State sectional and district championships. He also won his first high school athletic award—the "hat trick patch."

During Macke's junior year, he progressed to become the second leading point scorer on the team. This achievement, in turn, contributed to the team's 27-1-1 record. That year, the team won the Lake Erie League championship the Baron Cup championship, sectional and district State championships, and was runner-up in the State of Ohio finals.

Macke amassed the following honors that year: "hat trick patch," all Lake Erie league ice hockey team, all-scholastic ice hockey team, high school all-American ice hockey team and election as team captain for the next season.

As his senior year began, Macke knew that he would be challenged with his new position as the team's captain. This year, he met that challenge and surpassed everyone's expectations. The team's record this year was 24-4. The team won the Thornton Park invitation consolation championship, the Baron Cup championship as well as sectional and district championships before losing the State semifinals.

His list of accomplishments this year reads like who's who in high school athletics. He was named to the "hat trick patch" for the third consecutive year, all Lake Erie League team for the second time, most valuable player for the Lake Erie League, all-scholastic ice hockey team, Sun Press hockey player of the year and high school all-American ice hockey team.

Macke is an intensely dedicated young man. He set goals for himself and has more than surpassed them.

Undoubtedly, he has some of his father's dedication and perseverance. Dr. Bentley has an exhaustive list of accomplishments to his credit and is the vice-president of the Nation's largest black consulting firm, Polytech, Inc. His educational motivation is probably drawn from his mother who is the adviser to the Cleveland scholarship program.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to join me in saluting Eugene Macke Bentley IV. As we continue to bathe in the splendor of the U.S. ice hockey team's gold medal at the 1980 winter Olympics, Macke clearly has become our hope for medals in the future.●

GERALD W. JOHNSON

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, somehow I did not learn of the death of a truly remarkable writer, Gerald W. Johnson, until more than a week after his death.

It seems to me that the following article by James H. Bready, which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of Sunday, March 30, sums up my impressions of this prolific and long-lived commentator on America and its politics. As the article makes clear, among other things he was independent, gifted, and a gentleman.

I never met him, but what he said influenced me for about 40 years.

The article follows:

GERALD W. JOHNSON: LOOKING BACK OVER 30 YEARS

Gerald W. Johnson died March 22, in a North Baltimore nursing home, some months short of his 90th birthday. Had he sadly aspired to survive on into his 90s? Was he intending to try for 100? Lordy, lordy, as he used to say. No. On the contrary, since the removal from Bolton place to Bellona avenue, in January, his weight had gone down: he was eating less and less. That last Sunday, at noon, his greeting to a visitor was stark: "Is there any way to get out of here?" No bad marks for the nursing home, where nurses knew who he was and tried to be nice to him. But how unhappy a contrast with the life he was used to, with home and library (his working/reading room) and the freedom to move around. No one had the heart to apprise him of the plan for him and his wife to move out to Indiana, where their daughter Kathryn could look after them; the holdup being the need to sell the Johnsons' house. The plan could hardly have delighted him. He did perhaps realize that, wherever, he would have to be guarded against occasional moments of dizziness (which was why the last weeks' bed and chair straps). Even more than his weight, those winter weeks, it was his spirit that went down.

Because he had been more or less a shut-in during his 80s, thanks to the ice one day on a downtown merchant's sidewalk and a resultant broken hip, and also because his hearing had been bad for decades, Gerald Johnson's acquaintance among younger people was nowhere near as broad as he would have liked. They were aware of him as that rarity, a Baltimorean of national literary ranking, but they knew him only from print—one more of his books reviewed, one more demolitionary Perspective article homing in on this or that metropolitan evil, one final letter to the editor that lauded the President for keeping a cool head in the Tehran hostage crisis (his last one to *The Sun* was published November 19). Herewith, lest ever-younger people start becoming unaware who Gerald Johnson even was, some recollections. They go back only to when he was turning 60.

He was a hero then for the manner of his life, as much as the matter. Securely on a payroll, but professionally cramped and politically balked, he cut the umbilical—at age 53. Writing books instead of newspaper editorials was going to mean no pension, no office, no free copy paper and typewriter ribbons, no adjacent librarians and library clippings, no collective pace; it would mean staying home all day, and living on royalty advances—particularly, as a good Manhattan agent got him assignments from various publishers, at times it meant the pick-and-shovel feeling of working on articles and books that didn't much interest him. The obituaries, which noted that his ashes are being placed in Green Mount Cemetery, could have mentioned that the standard history of the cemetery, published in 1938 for its centennial, is by Gerald W. Johnson. Many newspaper people dream of telling off management, of writing for bookstore windows and library catalogues instead of for sanitation-truck pickups. Few of us ever venture the leap; very few land safely, and make a go of it. Gerald Johnson never hit the ten-bestseller lists, but "Incredible Tale" was Book-of-the-Month Club; if about half his three dozen titles are in the stacks at Pratt Library, the other half are open-shelf (or charged out); he couldn't afford insurance but he did buy a house at age 75; he was still writing for pay in his upper 80s—because he needed to; because, having so much to say, he wanted to. Often, in those letters to the editor, he gave away better stuff free than what other writers on the same pages were paid for.

In modern times, he was the first of many Sunpapers North Carolinians. A distinguished roster: R. P. Harriss, Miles H. Wolff, Burke Davis, Jesse Glasgow, Odell Smith, Bynum Shaw, Bob Murray, John Eslinger, Ralph Simpson, Lloyd Preslar, et many al. They have tended to move on—observing, as one puts it, that Gerald Johnson ahead of them had set the performance standards too high.

What was the nature of his excellence? Combinings, perhaps. Unlike most editorial writers, he sounded off to advantage on local, national and world. He was equally good on today and on waybackwhen. Immaculate in grammar and spelling and typing—in his first draft—he combined 1800s learning with 1900s idiomaticalness; and Baptist-forefather testamental with World War I earthy. Now he was solemnass, now uproarious. Lesser men spoke of a Gerald Johnson Law of Editorial Writing: the fewer facts the better; meaning, more suasion, less dullness. And: he stood out, from New Deal days onward, amid the frightened and the sour, for his mix of gloom and sanguinity.

He was born in Scotland county, N.C., the son (plus four daughters) of McIans and MacNeills. (This is a Robin Harriss story.) Generations back, McIan, sometimes spelled McKean, was translated, literally, into John-son. They still hold Johnson family reunions, down there. Gerald Johnson relished ancestry, but not ethnicity; Scotland itself would have been out of his way and he never went there. He was a southerner, but stayed on above the Potomac when book-writing gave him full choice of places to live. He was, simply and eagerly, an American.

He was a human being, with virtues, with faults. He revered Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson. As an old overseas sergeant of infantry, he tended to be disrespectful of those with military, corporate and other commissions who have never served in the ranks. One way to tease Gerald Johnson was to point out that he was the same age as Dwight Eisenhower. Nor were the Kennedys any heroes of his. That last Sunday at Edgewood Nursing Home, a visitor asked whom he liked for president, and the answer was unchanged from 1976: Jimmy Carter. Famously, Gerald Johnson got along with a Baltimore Republican, T. R. McKeldin; the latter smilingly proclaimed indebtedness to the former for some noble speechwriting. Yet Gerald Johnson lost something important, when McKeldin died: the influence of a man who liked and understood blacks.

Baltimore somehow overlooks, when counting its numerous blessings, the parties that Baltimoreans throw. With the best, anywhere. The individual best, well, so far in this century, was the one celebrating Gerald Johnson's 70th birthday. The guest list was drawn up by Gerald and Kathryn Johnson. As for a site, Kate Coplan chartered the staff lounge at Pratt's Central Building (hard liquor? on public property? When the party was repeated, five years later, Teddy McKeldin had become mayor, so no worry—except, he was a teetotaler). At one point, 1960's guest of honor saw, coming through the crowd toward him, Adlai Stevenson. The look on Gerald Johnson's face, the utter joy, is something to remember forever. Nobody having thought to mention it to The Sun reporter covering, who was J. Anthony Lukas, the fact that Stevenson's stopoff was a surprise went unrecorded. Then the sound apparatus failed to register Stevenson's handsome remarks; back in Chicago, uncomplaining, he reconstructed them, in writing.

Morris A. Soper, then 87, was 1960's toastmaster; to start, he addressed the new septuagenarian. "Dear boy," he said, and the house was his. Lou Azrael, presiding in 1965, had to put up with another surprise: Steve Bready on bongo drum and a classmate on trumpet, entering in mid-discourse to do Happy Birthday and For He's a Jolly Good Fellow—loud enough for the guest of honor to hear every note.

Usually, Gerald Johnson was doing the favor. His letter last June on Steve's death was tremendous. In the 1930s, after Augusta Tucker's novel had gone the rounds of half a dozen New York publishers, it was a letter from Gerald Johnson addressed high enough in Harper's that finally enabled "Miss Susie Slagle's" to become a book (and movie and TV show and item of basic Baltimoreana). Meantime, a man without pettiness, he did no disfavors. When it came time to print his obit—let Baltimoreans be impressed—The New York Times and The Washington Post spiked the wire-service accounts and each composed its own, glowingly. The Times credited him with writing mystery novels (he read them) and did not mention "An Honorable Titan," his 1946 biography of its owner, Adolph S. Ochs. At most, Gerald Johnson would have shrugged. At the nursing home, March 16, Robin and Margery Harriss were, unknowingly, his final visitors, and it was a perfect farewell: he blew her a kiss.

Kathryn Johnson was his curator during nearly 60 years of writing (a labor gloriously justified in the anthology thereby possible, "America-Watching," from Barbara Holdridge's Stemmer House, in 1976). Mrs. Johnson reports that from along the way, only a few never-published pieces and bits survive. For the published stuff, "America-Watching" is essential and invaluable. With time, dive into the reviews he did for Irita Van Doren's weekly New York Herald Tribune Books, and his Thursday byline edpage articles for The Evening Sun, as far back as 1924, then from 1926 when Hamilton Owens hired him, down to November 4, 1943 when he bowed out, reviewing a Navy Day parade along Howard Street. Don't miss an occasion when he was a reporter—of the 1966 World Series (we won!), via television, for the New Republic.

When Gerald Johnson was about to reach 60, I did a feature on him for The Evening Sun. Then "Books and Authors" started, and he became a natural subject for quinquennial birthday columns—in 1955, 1960, 1965, 1970, 1975. The trick was to make them all different. The best was 1975's: his boyhood, stuff that belonged in the autobiography he refused to write. Nice of him to stick around for 1980's column. What you should understand about Gerald Johnson is that he wasn't one to muck about with symbolism, with make-believe (he did write two published novels), with vanity (what a moment, two years after joining the editorial page here, when he explained an upcoming day's absence—he had to go back to North Carolina to accept an honorary doctorate). Live to be 100? Jee-rusalem! (This is a Walter Sondheim story.) What do numbers matter? But life mattered, so long as he could go on receiving the news of it, and responding to it in commentary. Baltimore and Maryland, the United States, the world beyond, the people small, great and middle-sized—his last spoken phrase, March 16, was a gentleman's: "You don't know how much I appreciate this." That day's newspaper having been located in a closet and spread out on the bed before him, section by section, Gerald Johnson sat there leaning forward in his wheelchair, and pored over what was going on everywhere.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, due to my absence on Thursday, March 27, I missed a number of votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 163: Agreeing to the rule to consider the conference report on H.R. 4986, the depository institutions deregulation bill. "Yes."

Rollcall No. 164: Agreeing to the conference report on H.R. 4986, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to authorize the automatic transfer of funds, to authorize negotiable order-of-withdrawal accounts at depository institutions, to authorize federally chartered savings and loan associations to establish remote service units, and to authorize federally insured credit unions to maintain share accounts. "Yes."

Rollcall No. 165: Agreeing to the conference report on S. 2269, to extend the Emergency Agricultural Credit Adjustment Act of 1978. "Yes."

Rollcall No. 166: Agreeing to H. Res. 608, authorizing an investigation and inquiry by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. "Yes."●

EAGLE SCOUT HONORS FOR MARK HANSEN

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor and privilege to recognize today the accomplishments of Mark Hansen, a constituent of mine from Westminster, Calif., who will be awarded the rank of Eagle Scout at a court of honor on Monday, April 14, 1980.

Attainment of the rank of Eagle Scout is truly a noteworthy accomplishment. In Mark's case, however, the achievement is magnified by the fact that he has reached Scouting's highest honor at age 14, and in the process earned a total of 24 merit badges. A clear indication of Mark's dedication to Scouting is reflected in the fact that he undertook two Eagle Scout projects. He not only organized a car wash to benefit the Behcets Foundation, but conducted a sail-a-thon in which he raised $1,232.42 for the Lung Association as well.

Mr. Speaker, Mark Hansen has truly earned the recognition of Congress. I ask today that all of my colleagues join with me in saluting Mark for his remarkable achievements.●

REPRESENTATIVE DRINAN TESTIFIES ON BEHALF OF OLDER AMERICANS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the testimony presented by Representative DRINAN on March 18 before the Platform Committee of the Democratic Party concerning older Americans. I commend him for his eloquent and accurate statement detailing the needs of the elderly and proposing methods to respond to those needs.

As Representative DRINAN points out, inflation is increasingly squeezing the already limited incomes of older Americans. It is therefore all the more important for the Congress to reassert its commitment to the advancement of the quality of life of our elderly citizens.

Our colleague, Father DRINAN, has proven himself to be one of the most dedicated advocates of the Nation's elderly. Now he has demonstrated that this commitment stretches beyond this House. He was truly the driving force behind the creation of the Platform Advisory Committee on Older Americans and I want to commend him for his leadership in this area. All of us concerned with the elderly owe him and the other four members of the task force—Ms. Billie Carr, Mr. Harry Matthews, Ms. Arwilla Davidson, and Dr. Elizabeth Welch—our gratitude for their work in drawing up these recommendations. I am especially pleased that one of the key planks proposes the total elimination of all age discrimination including mandatory retirement without exceptions.

I insert the full transcript of Father DRINAN's remarks in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF THE PLATFORM ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON OLDER AMERICANS

Members: Ms. Billie Carr, Mr. Arwilla Davidson, Hon. ROBERT F. DRINAN, Mr. Harry Matthews, and Dr. Elizabeth Welch.

We, the members of the Platform Advisory Committee on Older Americans, are pleased to present testimony today before the National Democratic Platform Committee.

However, before presenting our testimony, we wish the Democratic Party to know that we are extremely disappointed in the progress that has been made by the Party regarding the concerns of our older American citizens. To emphasize this point, we should all be aware that in writing the 1980 Platform it is possible to use, word for word, the same platform statement on older citizens that was written for the '76 Platform—that is how little progress we have made these past four years on behalf of older Americans.

Traditionally, the Democratic Party has stood as the Party of vision, our history a history of struggle and hope. Armed with knowledge of what is right, we have conquered what seemed insurmountable odds to chart in our country the course of full participation by blacks, women, and the young. The time has come to build on the foundation we laid for civil rights in the '60s and for women's rights in the '70s and establish in the '80s a record of concern and action to assure that older Americans have a full place in our national life.

Our older citizens make up 11 percent of the total population. This figure represents 24 million Americans and is expected to grow to 31.8 million by the year 2000. Seventy-five percent of the nation's population now reaches age 65. Approximately 20 percent of the men and 8 percent of the women over 65 years of age are employed. Most are concentrated, however, in low paying jobs that are part-time, agricultural or selfemployed. One-seventh of the elderly population have incomes below the official poverty level. According to a recent study, "older persons are subject to more disability, see physicians 50 percent more often, and have about twice as many hospital stays that last almost twice as long as is true for younger persons." Yet, due to major medical advances, the life expectancy of Americans continues to increase. In fact, the over-65 age group now represents the fastest growing segment of our population. If we do not take decisive steps now to overcome the cycle of poverty, unemployment and poor health which inflicts our older population, we will be condemning thousands more to a life of indignity at a time when they will be living longer.

These overwhelming statistics indicate the need for programs and policies which will improve the health care, employment, retirement income, housing, and social services available to the elderly. If the Democratic Party is to remain a "Party of the People", committed to the humane and compassionate principles for which this Party has traditionally stood, it must recognize the positive contributions that our older Americans have always made and will continue to make to help this great nation.

The Democratic Party must commit itself to the rights of older citizens to lead independent, productive, and secure lives. To meet this end, the following proposals are made:

1. The Democratic Party must make every effort to pursue policies and positions that will restrain or curb inflation, and it must make a real commitment to protect the elderly from the ravages of an 18 percent inflation rate.

At the grassroots level, the one concern voiced most often by the elderly is how to deal with the tremendous problem of inflation. As we well know, inflation pervades every aspects of our daily lives, making inroads on the purchasing power of all Americans. Those most seriously threatened, however, are the elderly and poor living on fixed income who are totally helpless in the face of an inflationary spiral which according to all indicators is expected to continue upwards.

If inflation persists, thereby undermining the financial soundness of pension and retirement systems, the elderly have no hope of being able to defend themselves financially. This reality is causing real and legitimate fear among the elderly who are having already to cut down on the basic necessities of life. Therefore in discussing the following proposals in the areas of health, energy, housing, social security, and so forth, it is critical that we view these proposals in the proper perspective: by recognizing the impact of inflation on all areas of concern to the elderly.

2. The Democratic Party must continue to attach a high priority to the development of a national health insurance system which will ensure comprehensive care of high quality for everyone.

While we celebrate the 15th anniversary of Medicare and the health protection it affords older persons, we are nevertheless distressed that senior citizens pay more now for health care than before the program was enacted. In fiscal year 1978, Medicare covered only 44 percent of the health care costs of older persons. Moreover, its acute, episodic illness orientation results in denial of the most pressing needs of the elderly: care for chronic illness and health maintenance. No coverage is provided for eyeglasses, hearing aids, dentures or outpatient prescription drugs. Coverage for mental health care is not on a par with care for physical illness, despite the fact that some 25 percent of suicides are committed by older persons.

Any program of national health insurance should incorporate the principles of preventive care and health maintenance. The acute, episodic illness orientation of the present system is no longer viable. A good example is the lack of Medicare coverage for routine phsyical check-ups. Because check-ups represent out-of-pocket costs by the individual, many elderly persons will put off or forego having their annual check-ups because they simply cannot afford them. As a result, many health problems go undetected until they are serious enough to require hospitalization—at which point, Medicare will begin to pick up the costs. On the other hand, if preventive measures are followed, the problem could be treated earlier, perhaps delaying or eliminating the need for hospitalization altogether. In terms of public health policy, a preventive focus would be not only more cost-effective in the long run, but would enable our elderly to continue leading full and productive lives through the maintenance of good health.

3. The Democratic Party must support steps to amend Medicare to include routine physical check-ups. It should also include coverage for much needed items as out-of-hospital prescription drugs and prosthetic devices such as eyeglasses, dentures, and hearing aids and for other preventive health services, particularly mental health services.

Efforts must be made to reduce escalating health costs. With health care costs doubling every five years, it is expected that national health cost will rise from $206 billion in 1979 to $368 billion in the fiscal year 1984. For an elderly person, the average cost of health care is expected to rise from $2,259 in 1979 to $3,868 in 1984, which represents a staggering 71 percent increase over a five year period.

Hospital costs continue to account for a disproportionate share of total health care costs. While inflation is a major factor, hospital costs outpace the inflation rate, rising faster than the costs of food, housing or fuel. Even with Medicare, the cost of hospitalization and other health care services is a particularly heavy burden on the elderly, who require the most health services but who have a limited income to pay for these services. Moreover, Medicare restrictions on home health and other community-based care continue to promote reliance on more expensive and often less appropriate care in hospitals and nursing homes. And under the present system of Medicare reimbursement, health maintenance organizations, which offer comprehensive, cost-efficient care are discouraged from enrolling Medicare beneficiaries.

4. Thus, the Democratic Party must support renewed, vigorous efforts to control spiraling health care costs through an equitable system of hospital cost containment and development of cost-efficient health care delivery systems such as health maintenance organizations.

Hospital costs are by law tied to the Medicare inpatient hospital deductible. As a result, this deductible has increased by 450 percent since 1965.

5. To help the elderly meet hospital costs, the Democratic Party must support steps to amend Medicare to prevent the deductible from rising for those persons over 65 years of age.

Moreover, shrinking Medicare coverage and the resultant increase in out-of-pocket payments has left many elderly persons vulnerable to unscrupulous insurance agents who prey on their fears, attempting to sell often unnecessary and duplicative "Medigap" policies.

6. As a consumer protection measure to guard against abuses, the Democratic Party must support the development of regulations providing standardized certification procedures for health insurance policies supplementing Medicare.

Older persons deserve to be able to live independently in their own communities in familiar surroundings. Greater attention must be paid to development of satisfactory community-based alternatives if we are to prevent the unnecessary institutionalization which has become a fact of life in America. These alternative services should include home health care, adult day health services, congregate and home-delivered meals, social services, and other health and social services necessary to maintain older persons at home. Not only are such alternative services preferred by the elderly, but they are the more cost-effective. According to a report by the General Accounting Office, "Until older people become greatly or extremely impaired, the cost of nursing home care exceeds the cost of home care including the value of the general support services provided by family and friends."

7. Thus, the Democratic Party must support efforts to develop community-based alternatives to institutionalization. While it is believed that much of the responsibility rests with State and local agencies, the Federal government should promote and encourage steps which address the proliferation and fragmentation of programs, act to remove undue impediments to community-based care, and undertake such reorganization as necessary to assure the most effective use of existing authorities.

Toward this end, it should support the Medicare Amendments of 1979, which would liberalize home health benefits for the elderly, and also the Medicare and Medicaid Amendments of 1979, which among other provisions would improve the quality and availability of long-term care services. The Party should also support the Medicaid Community Care Act of 1980, which would provide incentives for States to develop community care programs for the elderly and disabled.

8. Moreover, families who wish to care for their elderly relatives should be encouraged and assisted through a system of incentives such as tax credits and expanded day care programs for the elderly.

9. And, elderly persons who reside in long-term care facilities should be protected through enactment of a Bill of Rights, including enforceable penalties for abridgement or violation of those rights.

To improve the general health of the elderly, geriatric medicine must be given greater attention. The investment placed in research and training today will lead to a more satisfying and fruitful life for future generations of older Americans.

10. To this end, research and training in the field of geriatrics must be emphasized—specifically, to increase our knowledge of the aging process and to make greater use of space age technology to aid the elderly and handicapped.

The elderly also have a right to economic security. While great strides have been made to provide income security in the form of Social Security benefits (primarily through Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (OASI) benefits), some 3.3 million elderly persons remain in dire financial circumstances. And with inflation continuing to restrict the resources available to older persons, estimates indicate that in real dollar terms one-fourth of the elderly continue to live at "near-poor" levels.

11. To ensure economic security, the Democratic Party must not allow further erosion of Social Security benefits and should oppose any cuts in current benefits. To combat the effects of inflation, the Party should also support a twice-a-year living increase in the computation of OASI benefits. Moreover, a permanent financing formula consisting of one-third employee contributions should be adopted. This approach will not only ease the burden of payroll taxes on the working poor by allowing for a less regressive tax structure, but will place the Social Security program on a much sounder long-term financial footing without Social Security taxes becoming so onerous a burden that workers become alienated.

Of the elderly living in poverty, a disproportionate share are women. Because of sex discrimination in the job market, women continue to be paid lower wages than men. Their lower wages, plus their greater likelihood of having interrupted careers due to child raising, tend to result in lower Social Security benefits for women than men. In fact, their benefits as dependents are often higher than their primary benefits as salaried workers. Moreover, divorced women receive little or no Social Security protection in their own right, while widows under 60 years of age with no entitled children are not even eligible for benefits.

12. The Democratic Party must support steps to remove from the Social Security System the last vestiges of sex discrimination, to fully recognize the contributions made by working women, and to assure that older women and their dependents receive equitable treatment in the determination of benefits.

Of the elderly living in poverty, a disproportionate share are Blacks and other minority groups. Yet, these minority elderly continue to be underserved in many age-based programs. Often this failure is due to a lack of knowledge about programs on the part of minority elderly. More often than not, there is a lack of outreach by various programs to find these underserved groups.

13. The Democratic Party should support mandates providing greater minority representation among the administrators and service staff of aging programs. By including minority representatives who are sensitive to the needs of elderly minority group members, we will be better able to develop

strategies for ensuring better access to services for these underserved members.

As a nation, we should recognize the important contributions that older persons who are willing and able to continue working can make. According to the House Select Committee on Aging—

"Studies indicate that older workers can produce a quality and quantity of work equal or superior to younger workers, that they have as good, or usually better, attendance records as younger workers, that they are as capable of learning new skills and adapting to changing circumstances as younger workers, and that they are generally more satisfied with their jobs than younger workers."

While it is difficult to predict performance in older workers since individuals tend to age at different rates, the older worker invariably brings good judgment and experience to any job. And with the population growing older and forecasts of labor shortages, older workers should be provided with greater work opportunities. Performance and not age should dictate job opportunities.

14. Therefore, the Democratic Party must oppose mandatory retirement at any age. It should oppose age discrimination or age-based mandatory retirement in both federal and private sector employment. The Party should also support steps to develop a national policy encouraging the use of older workers in both federal and private sectors. Such a policy must include efforts to adopt flexi-time and part-time work schedules, shared jobs, retraining, and gradual retirement programs for older workers wishing to continue working or to pursue second careers. Moreover, the Democratic Party should support liberalization of the Social Security earnings test so that older workers will not be unduly penalized for staying on their jobs.

Hand and hand with increased job opportunities is the need for increased educational opportunities for the elderly. Learning opportunities will not only aid the elderly by improving work-related experiences but will assist them in remaining active and contributing members of their communities.

15. The Democratic Party should support efforts to increase educational opportunities for the elderly through new legislation to provide qualified older persons with tuition-free access to institutions of higher learning.

The lack of decent housing for the elderly remains a crucial problem. With persons over sixty-five living in 30 percent of the nation's substandard housing, adequate and affordable housing remains a primary concern for our elderly. New initiatives by the Federal government in this area should include housing for the elderly that is more than four walls and a roof overhead, but involves the type of congregate services such as health, social, and nutritional services that tend to enable older persons to remain independent in their own homes. All housing for the elderly must contain adequate facilities to protect them from violent crime.

16. To meet elderly housing needs, the Democratic Party must support efforts to expand congregate housing for the elderly. The Party must also support expansion of Section 202 Housing Program for the Elderly and Section 8 Rent Subsidy Program.

More than any other age group, the elderly are victims of violent crime. Concern over their public safety has led many elderly to lead restricted lifestyles—often resulting in extreme personal and social isolation for fear of leaving their homes or answering their doorbells.

17. The Democratic Party should support a Federal program to aid those States which adopt programs to indemnify victims of crime.

This year, heating oil cost consumers an average of 50 percent more than last year. Such costs are a real burden on low-income families who must forego other necessities in order to heat their homes. According to the Department of Energy, the median-income family spends approximately 10 percent of their income on direct household expenditures for energy, while the low-income family must spend 25 percent. For elderly persons living on fixed incomes, this poses a severe hardship. Moreover, unlike the young and healthy, elderly persons cannot simply turn down their thermostats to conserve energy, since this action may actually endanger their lives through a condition known as "accidental hypothemia". Even mildly cool temperatures can trigger accidental hypothermia, which results in a drop in one's deep body temperature and is fatal if not detected and treated properly.

18. In developing a permanent national energy plan, the Democratic Party must support the inclusion and sufficient funding of an adequate program of assistance to meet the particular needs of elderly persons. In addition, public utilities should be encouraged to provide discount rates to the low-income elderly and not to discontinue utility services to older persons during the winter months.

The programs encompassed by the Older Americans Act provide desperately needed nutritional and social services. Yet, they are severely underfunded. For example, some 500,000 persons participate each day in the hot lunch program, but there are still twice as many persons on the waiting list hoping to participate.

19. The Democratic Party must support increased funding of programs administered under the Older Americans Act. Moreover, administration of these programs should be directed by a Commissioner on Aging whose status will be that of an Assistant Secretary as originally proposed in the Act. State agencies are urged to follow this example in their own departments.

Lastly, we are deeply concerned over the lack of coordination of programs intended to serve the elderly.

20. There must be an immediate and thorough re-examination of the 134 existing programs for the elderly to insure better coordination at both the Federal and State levels. Moreover, a commitment must be made to develop outreach programs to advise senior citizens of the benefits available to them.

In conclusion, we believe our twenty proposals reflect the true concerns of all older Americans, and we strongly urge the Platform Committee to adopt these proposals as part of its 1980 Democratic Platform. It is the responsibility of this great Party to recognize the right of elderly persons to a dignified old age. The time to act is now if it is to carry out its responsibilities to all older Americans.●

EXPLANATION OF VOTES

HON. S. WILLIAM GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1980, while H.R. 6837 was under consideration by the House of Representatives, Mr. GREEN made the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, for clarification I wish to note that members of my family and I have a financial interest in the Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railroad and that line will be affected by certain provisions of the legislation currently pending before the House—H.R. 6837, the Passenger Railroad Rebuilding Act of 1980. Consequently, I will vote "present" on any amendments dealing with the Rock Island portions of the bill and any votes relating to the bill as a whole. However, I wish to emphasize that other provisions of the legislation, especially those authorizing changes in the Northeast Corridor Improvement Project which will upgrade passenger and freight service between Washington, New York, and Boston, are very important and I support them. If I were not compelled to vote "present" on final passage because of the Rock Island portions of the bill, I would certainly vote in favor.●

BUREAUCRATIC NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress enacted the Freedom of Information Act in order that citizens might obtain the information to which they are entitled about the workings of their Government. The purpose of the statute was to allow people of the United States broad access to Government documents and to insure that some response is received within a short period of time. For this reason, Congress required Government agencies to respond within 10 days of the receipt of a request under the Freedom of Information Act.

It is apparent that the Freedom of Information Act simply doesn't work as presently written. Government agencies habitually fail to respond within the 10 days prescribed by statute. It often takes a lawsuit filed under the Freedom of Information Act after the 10 days has expired in order to jolt the agency into action. Thus, a citizen interested in obtaining information to which he is entitled is forced to pay a lawyer and file suit before he can obtain the information to which the statute gives access. And even then, the answer is frequently less than responsive.

A perfect example of this situation was recently brought to my attention. On April 16, 1979, the president of Associated Builders and Contractors—ABC—a construction trade association representing more than 14,000 merit shop contractors, requested certain information from the Department of Labor regarding CETA procedures. By May 30, well after the 10-day period prescribed by statute, no response had been received. Suit was filed on June 22. The Labor Department finally responded—probably under prodding by the Department of Justice—by letter on July 20.

This is not the end of it. The Labor Department's letter was completely unresponsive to the request. It contained no documents and gave only the most general of answers to the question posed in the request.

However, the Government indicated that it would oppose disclosure of any further information. To proceed with the case would require interrogatories and depositions of Government witnesses and eventually a trial, and thus entail significant expense. At this point, ABC decided that the legal expenses required to pursue the trial procedure would simply be too great, even though the association remained convinced that it was entitled to such information under the act.

This situation demonstrates graphically the inadequacies of the statute, as administered by the various Government agencies. The agencies follow a seemingly intentional course of obfuscation, delay, and refusal to disclose. Despite the clear directive of the act, they seem to spend more time fighting disclosure than in actually attempting to comply. This is not the way the act should work. Congress should reconsider the statute, examine Government compliance with its terms, and enact remedial legislation to force Government agencies to observe the statute without requiring legal action by aggrieved citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I understand these delays. On a number of occasions I have been promised—repeat promised—information from the Department of Labor only to wait months for it and then only get it after repeated correspondence. Bureaucracy moves slowly and rarely in the right direction.●

PULLING JAPAN INTO THE BIG LEAGUES

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth L. Adelman, in his March 27 Washington Post editorial, presents still another case of concern over Japan's continued passive role in Asian Pacific defense. He contends, as more and more of us are, that Japan most definitely has the economic and technological capabilities to make a very valuable contribution to regional security—and it is high time that it did.

However, Mr. Adelman quite realistically acknowledges that this accommodation on the Japanese part is out of the question in the immediate future given the unwavering concensus among the Japanese people that the Japanese Peace Constitution does in fact set the legitimate and appropriate framework for the conduct of both national and international affairs. Thus, it is senseless for the United States to try browbeat the Japanese into doing something that they feel goes against the grain that nearly 30 years of postwar democracy has established.

Instead, Mr. Adelman proposes several nonmilitary ways in which Japan could contribute its tremendous economic strength to help alleviate some of the defense burdens shouldered by the United States, such as increasing its military aid to certain strategic allies, or assuming more of the costs for maintaining U.S. forces on its islands.

The point is, Japan can indeed play a more active role in enhancing regional security without necessarily violating its constitutional prohibitions. And, it is clearly the only conceivable way we can immediately ease the rising tension in United States-Japanese relations over this defense issue, not to mention build a more comprehensive defense relationship within our very important alliance.

I include the following text of Mr. Adelman's editorial so that others can read it:

PULLING JAPAN INTO THE BIG LEAGUES

Americans are losing patience with Japan, feeling they are being taken for a ride on economics while Japan enjoys a free ride on defense. Once-latent resentment is now surging.

U.S. international analysts see that Japan's postwar foreign policy has been yen-dimensional. What the Japanese tout as "all-directional diplomacy" smacks of downright accommodation to outsiders.

Last year, Japan scooped up Iranian oil after the U.S. cutoff, and its financial wizards advised Iran on how best to skirt the U.S. freeze of its assets. And already this year, Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira has characterized the Soviets as a "cautious, defensive people" as they were storming into Afghanistan.

Granted, the view from Tokyo gives rise to trepidation and some cause for accommodation. For the first time in the postwar era, the Pacific recently was barren of a U.S. aircraft carrier; indeed, the only carrier patrolling those waters was the Russian Minsk. This U.S. defense drawdown coincided with a three-pronged threat upturn: (1) uncertainty on the Korean Peninsula, which sends shivers up Japanese spines now as it has through the centuries; (2) a doubling of Soviet Far East naval operations and a massive military buildup on the four northern islands Moscow seized during World War II; and (3) turmoil engulfing the Persian Gulf, from which Japan imports 72 percent of its oil, which constitutes a whopping 53 percent of its total energy needs.

Such a cascade of concerns coaxes some Japanese toward greater accommodation. One eminent economist there unveiled a "new theory" on defense in the leading publication "Bungei Shunju." In case of Soviet attack, "the Japanese should receive the Soviet force coolly with both a white flag and a red flag. . . . So far we stand firm"—Michio Morishima wrote without noting the contradiction—"we can build a socialist economy . . . in a new life under Soviet dominance."

Japanese of sterner stuff urge defense increases above the announced 0.9 percent of GNP or $9.3 billion in the fiscal year beginning April Fool's Day. They point out that a Japanese defense boost to 5 percent of GNP (the U.S. and U.K. level) would boost the total defense efforts of Western allies by a robust 20 percent.

U.S. security types relish the thought. They now look to allies to share more of the common burden, particularly to Japan, which has the most to give—from the world's second-highest GNP—and which has given the least relatively: its 0.9 percent is near rock-bottom around the world.

But all this is wishful thinking. Barring some volcanic eruption such as a second Korean conflict or a first Sino-Soviet one Japan will not undergo a defense "break-out." Government there is strictly by consensus. A consensus has emerged that Japan's security is slipping but not that much should be done about it. Tokyo will stick to augmenting defense by a microscopic 1/100th of 1 percent of GNP each year for the next five.

Given Tokyo's refusal to bust the 1 percent barrier under current circumstances, what then can be done?

First and foremost, the United States can pull Japan into the big leagues of world affairs, to become an active player pitching in for the industrialized democracies. Last summer's economic summit paved the way as the first gala, summit held in Tokyo since the war.

To further this new role, Japan can help bail out distant yet desperate Western friends such as Pakistan, Egypt and Turkey.

Last year, Tokyo did give Pakistan $54 million, Egypt $115 million and Turkey nothing; but this year all should be vastly increased—by strong pressure from Washington if need be. For a large infusion of Japanese *economic* aid to such states serves vital and mutual *security* interests. Yet it avoids Tokyo's sending tremors through its own polity and through unforgetting Asian states that sudden Japanese rearmament might entail.

Second, Japan can also help bail out the United States in emergencies. It could purchase some or all of the American grain once destined for Russia and dispense it in Southeast Asia.

Third, Japan should assume more than its current half of the $1.2 billion doled out annually for U.S. forces stationed on its islands.

To come full circle, the Japanese should launch a full-blown national debate about their nation's role in the real world, the threats it faces from brazen Soviet expansion, the durability of childlike dependence on U.S. protection, etc. Surely the days of tolerating an "all directional" Japanese diplomacy have ended in Washington and should now end in Tokyo. It is mind-bending to think that Japan held recently a general election that evoked scarcely a peep on security issues—certain to be the democracies' burning issues of the 1980s.

In essence, capitalism's practitioners par excellence in Asia must come to heed the sublime words of their godfather, Adam Smith: "Defense is of much more importance than opulence."●

UPAO EDUCATORS MEET IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the University Professors for Academic Order began as a group because a number of concerned professors wanted to establish intellectual and physical order as well as standards of academic excellence on our college and university campuses. Its first meeting in 1969 was held here in Washington, D.C., and the group returned to the

District of Columbia this past December to hold its 10th anniversary meeting. During this decade, UPAO has continued to make a major contribution to the improvement of the education climate in the United States.

The December 1979 meeting included the distinguished junior Senator from California, Senator S. I. HAYAKAWA, a well-known educator before his senatorial career. A number of other distinguished educators also participated as the group examined the present situation of American higher education.

In order to bring to the attention of my colleagues information on this worthy organization, I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of the UPAO annual meeting written by Dr. Donald J. Senese. This article appeared in the UPAO's newsletter Universitas:

UPAO MEETING TACKLES CHALLENGES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Dr. Donald J. Senese)

Born in the tumultuous years of campus disorders of the late 1960s, University Professors of Academic Order held its tenth anniversary meeting on December 15, 1979, in the place and city where its first gathering had been held—George Washington University in Washington, DC.

A decade ago, a small group of college professors and academics gathered together to establish a national organization which upheld the function of the college and university to impart knowledge, wisdom, and culture rather than serve as a center for political activity and social activism. During this period, the war in Indochina extended to the university campuses as leftist professors and militant "professional" students used their time and status to "politicize" the academic institutions through strikes, protest marches, petition drives, etc. The Kent State incident became the focus of both the symbol and substance of the protests.

The war wound down, the Paris Peace Accords were signed, American troops came home, the college campuses calmed down, and then one day, weakened by a Congress refusing to provide aid and by the steady encroachments of its Communist enemies, South Vietnam fell under Communist control. The Communist noose tightened on Laos and Cambodia. The radicals on campus—students and professors—had helped stop the war, but as a subsequent event have shown, the killing did not stop and it still continues. The devastation of Cambodia is testimony to that misbegotten era. Present surveys, however, indicate that the college students presently on campus are more concerned with achieving a job and status and a good income, than with the complexities of international relations.

UPAO had a more far-reaching mission than restoring the physical order on campus. Its decade of existence has made it a force to establish intellectual order on campuses by upholding academic standards, encouraging quality in scholarship, and resisting what it views to be the great present threat to academic freedom—unionization of college and university faculty. Its annual meeting, promoted as a seminar on higher education, focused on the current maladies in higher education and sought some remedies for these persistent problems.

At this annual meeting, Senator S. I. Hayakawa of California gave the keynote address, highlighting his embattled career as president of San Francisco State College confronting radical students and professors. He identified the degree of radicalism of intellectuals with their distance from the nonverbal world. He noted that the "intellectuals" yearn for a government without politics—a condition achieved in such areas, he observed, as the Soviet Union and North Korea. He concluded by observing that although universities should be in advance of the public, it makes little sense to have the universities dominated by foes of the American political and economic system.

After the Senator's departure for an unusual Saturday Senate session on the so-called windfall profits tax bill, Dr. Howard L. Hurwitz, who took on the New York education establishment by refusing to bow to pressure in admitting students lacking qualifications, discussed the "disorder" which had afflicted American education leading to abuses through a watering down of curriculum and "students rights" movements. He recounted his experiences with faculty unionization, the "heritage of hate" remaining after a school strike, and such programs as bilingual education which ruin the very children they were designed to help. Dr. Hurwitz, one of the newly elected directors of UPAO, hoped the group would continue to be a force to bring "order" back into higher education.

A panel discussion focused on collective bargaining in education with Susan Staub of the Concerned Educators Against Forced Unionism (CEAFU) and David Denholm of the Public Service Research Council. Denholm stressed that "collective bargaining" and strikes are part of the same process. George Mason University Professors James T. Bennett and Manuel H. Johnson presented an informative paper based on extensive research showing that the disadvantages of faculty unionization outweighed the so-called benefits. Three reasons have been cited for unionization of faculty—fear of a budget cut, fear of job security, and fear of teacher oversupply. The authors concluded that unionization of faculty had not led to satisfactory dealing with these three issues in the past and it was unlikely that it would do so in the future. (Even in times of prosperity, Unions cannot protect jobs at institutions if the jobs no longer exist.) Although concluding that the benefit from collective bargaining for teachers is more perceived than real, the authors detailed how "costly" collective bargaining agreements could be—unionization brought a cut in funds for curriculum and faculty salaries and brought a new area of governance into the academic structure (e.g., a "union" structure was added to departments, divisions or schools, faculty senate); rewards in teaching were no longer based on performance; and a certain sacrifice of academic freedom resulted since teachers were unlikely openly to oppose the union policy. Faculty unionization, noted Bennett and Johnson, brought really not much benefit compared to the significant costs involved.

A highlight of the meeting was a stirring luncheon address by Dr. Russell Kirk, who had addressed the UPAO annual meeting in Florida in 1973. Kirk's address followed the theme of his recently published tome on education (Decadence and Renewal in the Higher Learning: An Episodic History of American University and College Since 1952, South Bend, Indiana: Regnery Gateway, Inc., 1979, 354 pages, $15) as he identified the quarter century of education "disorder" in American colleges and universities (e.g., growth of the multi-university, and decline of academic standards). Kirk saw signs of hope for the reconstruction of the American education system: (1) the diminishing number of students in institutions of higher learning may give a renewed competition for quality rather than quantity; (2) the diminished popular enthusiasm for college education may lead to a more realistic and critical examination and help to overcome the past over-expectation and exaggerated claims of a college education ("Everyone goes to college and can become a king"); (3) the increasing conservatism of the American public is extending to college undergraduates and the disruption of the 1960s is looked upon as a fad, a passing ideological fascination ("When the public is in a conservative mood, conservative ideas come back"); and (4) an increasing interest in a coherent curriculum will strengthen the attempt to integrate knowledge, develop order, and abandon a "cafeteria" approach to education subjects. Even Harvard University, noted Kirk, was moving away from the open curriculum and returning to requirement of essential subjects.

All was not roses as the scholar from Piety Hill reminded his audiences that large obstacles still worked against these reforms: the state of American primary and secondary schools was "ghastly still" with no improvement and the situation was made worse by a growing addiction to television, drug problems, and interference by the courts. The graduates of high schools, entering college as "functional illiterates," caused problems for the institutions of higher education. The unionization of teachers, led by the ideological cliques of unions like the National Education Association, substituted a desire for power rather than dedication to improved education. There was also the erroneous American preoccupation with vocational education leading to discarding courses of humane studies which did not give "immediate results." Kirk emphasized that the American public needed to be reminded that the higher learning does matter and that every society needs a certain number of people genuinely educated.

Kirk entertained the audience with his own bizarre examples of the failure of American education via students he had met. Noting G. K. Chesterton's words, "There is no joy without a cause," Kirk told his audience they would be bored if they didn't have a cause to fight for and urged them to continue the cause of harmony and order in education with all the resulting rights and obligations.

The afternoon session featured a videotape preview of Dr. Milton Friedman's new television series on the future of the American economy, "Free to Choose." The afternoon seminar included an open discussion led by Dr. Charles Moser's appraisal of some current university problems including how to deal with declining enrollments, upgrading faculty, grade inflation, improved curriculum, and incentives for faculty for professional improvements. Dr. Moser described recent developments at GWU. The discussion was lively as members sought to find the practical means to make institutions of higher learning a better embodiment of the task to promote wisdom and virtue.

Not a group to shy away from controversy, the UPAO members passed two resolutions. One supported the University of Maryland's decision not to hire a professed Marxist as the head of its department of government and politics and rejecting the censure of the University of Maryland by a rival organization of university professors. The resolution noted that the University of Maryland's action, in rejecting someone who would impose his views on students, had advanced and not retarded academic freedom. A second resolution opposed collective bargaining and compulsory unionism for faculty members as not being compatible with academic freedom and academic standards. Both resolutions passed unanimously.

After ten years, University Professors for Academic Order is a group alive and well and still active in the cause of excellence in college and university education. There are some hopeful signs for improvements in American higher education, as Dr. Kirk reminded the group, but there are also serious obstacles to this progress and much remains to be done. UPAO will not find itself short of challenges in its next decade.●

BALANCING THE BUDGET AND KICKING THE POOR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, what many of us regarded last year as the budding "proposition 13 mentality" has grown this year into the administration's and Congress move to balance the Federal budget. Last year, proponents of proposition 13 and individuals dedicated to cutting back Government spending advocated cuts in public sector jobs and services in the hope of getting tax relief. This year, advocates of the balanced budget seemingly have decided that programs for the poor, minorities, and our cities must be sacrificed in the hope of reducing inflation.

These gestures point out the growing conservatism in this country. They also point to the use of ineffective symbols by our leaders to please certain segments of the population at the expense of other segments with little or no political clout.

From my perspective, this means that 1980 will be the year of two races—the race for reelection and the race to balance the budget. These races are not mutually exclusive. If the politically powerful segments of this Nation are to help our leaders win reelection then the population segment with little political clout will be the victims of a balanced budget.

The odds on this race are becoming more evident every day as the Budget Committee moves to bring the first resolution to the House floor and the President proposes his new balanced budget proposal. The cuts in an attempt to balance the budget would eliminate or severely curtail programs designed to aid the poor and disadvantaged in this country. Translated, this means that there will be fewer jobs, less money for the essential items like food and housing, dwindling health care coverage, and energy subsidies for the already underfed, ill housed, and unemployed in this country. If we pass the Budget Committee's resolution, we will be forgetting the race that the disadvantaged and the poor are confronted with every day when they try to make ends meet.

Recently, I read an article by Carl Rowan on the devastating impact of just one program cut—the food stamp program. Taking into account cuts in other social programs, the impact as underscored by Carl Rowan would be devastating. At this time, I would like to enter in the RECORD Mr. Rowan's excellent article.

KICKING THE POOR

(By Carl T. Rowan)

Suppose you know of a poor family—a mother earning the minimum wage with three children—that gets $129-worth of food stamps each month (the average).

Suppose someone tells you that the children in that family eat in the school lunch program every day. Would you insist on taking away up to 45 per cent of the family's food stamp benefits as part of your program to cut the budget?

That is the kind of moral and human issue we Americans confront as we try to whip inflation by balancing the budget.

Sen. Jesse Helms has made his decision. He is sponsoring legislation that would save some $600 million a year by reducing food stamp benefits by over $9 a month for each child of school age in a household. An even more drastic cutback, about double that amount, has been suggested by the Congressional Budget Office.

These proposals stem from the belief that school lunch benefits "overlap" with food stamps and thus constitute duplication and waste. But that line of thinking outrages Americans who believe that the school lunch program "complements" food stamps and that no person can be well fed in the U.S. today on 58 cents per meal, which is the most the stamp program allots in its Thrifty Food Plan, the Agriculture Department's lowest-cost menu.

The food stamp fracas is just one of many current bits of evidence that in our society bad situations often produce terrible "solutions."

With President Carter's encouragement, much of the Congress is whacking away recklessly at the 1981 budget, as though it is trying to pound the life out of a snake called inflation. In its frenetic, sometimes conscienceless slashing, the Congress can inflict wounds upon this society that will last far longer than inflation.

One of the few laudable innovations in Mr. Carter's 1981 budget is a program to give meaningful training to the thousands of unemployed teen-agers who blight the streets of our cities. But now, in this atmosphere of Herbert Hooverism-gone-mad, House Budget Committee Chairman Robert N. Giaimo and a coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans, have voted to defer such training.

On paper this looks like fiscal frugality; in the real world it would pump poison into the social mainstream of America. For every million dollars "saved" by leaving these young Americans unable to cope in this society, you and I are going to pay billions in welfare, food stamps, Medicaid and losses through crime.

In the current madness, reactionary forces in Congress want to block child health programs, reduce legal services for the poor, repeal portions of the Truth-in-Lending Law so that a store that has signed an agreement that a family will pay $20 a month on its bill can demand that the family pay $40 a month—which could drive many families into bankruptcy.

Let me say more about the implications of putting the food stamp program on the anti-inflation "hit list." It illustrates perfectly what Rep. William Brodhead said to Giaimo:

"We can kick the hell out of poor people because they aren't numerous and they aren't represented (among the lobbyists) in this room. This is not political courage; this is a political cheap shot."

A recent Agriculture Department study found that only 1 in 10 families in its Thrifty Food Plan gets the recommended daily allowances of the seven basic nutrients. So a child fortunate enough to receive lunch at school is simply getting a better chance at a minimally adequate diet—just as other food programs for the elderly and pregnant women complement the food stamp program.

There are other flaws in the Helms proposal, but the most discouraging thing is what it says about the conscience of America in this era of anti-inflation panic. Over the past dozen years we documented the widespread existence of hunger in this country and we developed programs to wipe that blot off of our society.

Are we now ready to take a step backwards toward more hunger and malnutrition?●

ARCHBISHOP ROMERO AND EL SALVADOR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as events continue to unfold in El Salvador in the wake of the assassination of Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero, it is useful for us to consider the views of this dedicated man.

Two days before his murder, Archbishop Romero was interviewed by two reporters from KPFA-FM radio from Berkeley, Calif. A transcript of that interview was printed in the March 27, 1980, Los Angeles Times. I ask that it be reprinted here for all to review.

The interview follows:

AN INTERVIEW WITH ARCHBISHOP ROMERO

The following interview with Archbishop Oscar Arnulfo Romero of El Salvador was conducted by John Clements and Arnoldo Ramos for KPFA-FM, Berkeley, two days before the archbishop's murder Monday.

Question: The Carter Administration wants to give El Salvador about $55 million in economic and what U.S. officials describe as "nonlethal" military aid. What is your response to this offer?

Archbishop Romero: I have made this quite clear in my letter to President Carter last month. We appreciate this aid, but the conditions accompanying the aid will decide whether it will be welcome. What is important for us is that the aid not be used to repress our people. The aid must not bring U.S. intervention against our people. If those are the conditions, the aid will not be welcome by our people.

Q: Do you think such aid constitutes intervention?

A: The aid in itself is not intervention, and it is necessary. But this aid is only to the government, and it reenforces the government's program. It does not support a program drawn up by the people as a whole.

Q: Recently, the civilian-military junta now ruling El Salvador passed an agrarian-reform law. Critics charge that it is being used to cover up increased repression in the countryside.

A: The agrarian reform is, by all means, a good thing. It has taken away all the landholdings larger than 1,200 acres, and they are to be given to the people. In itself, this is good. but the danger is that along with the reform has come a state of siege, supposedly to keep the right from interfering with the reform. But, in reality, repression against the people has increased tremendously. In areas not affected by the reform, the military is quite active, the people are being repressed. People are fleeing the countryside, coming here to San Salvador, or going into the mountains to sleep, because if they are found at night by the security forces they will be killed. Armed troops search farmhouses, burn peasants' possessions and kill people. Terror is rampant in the countryside. The agrarian reform is in itself a good thing, but it is accompanied by torture and repression which distorts the good will implicit in reform, and therefore the law is not supported by the people. I cannot verify repression against specific organizations, but, since the reform is being carried out by the armed forces, the people fear it will lead to the militarization of the countryside.

Q: Recent press reports say there may be a significant number of U.S. military advisers in El Savador. Is that true?

A: I've heard of this. In my letter to President Carter, I asked him to refrain from direct military intervention in our country, because it would mean support for the repression of our people. Carter says any military aid would be in noncombat activity such as transport, communications and logistics. But this answer does not satisfy me, because the aid is going directly to the security forces, and it is well known that they are repressing the people. I don't deny that there are provocations by the left, but the response by the security forces is totally out of proportion. In many cases the repression comes down with no provocation at all. In fact there is a clear program aimed at destroying the popular organizations. Leaders of unions and other popular organizations are being systematically persecuted. Some people, looking just at the right wing, think that social injustice is responsible for all the violence. And there are those who see provocations from the left as the only problem, but really there are three sources of violence: the right, the left and the government. The people are confused, but we cannot see the popular outburst as just the demands of the left. The popular organizations are voicing the needs of the people. The demands of the people are just. But sometimes the people's anger goes too far and there are acts of violence which I do not support.

Q: Some observers consider the current upheaval to be caused by an extremist minority. Is this true?

A: There is a terrorist minority within the left . . . But, in the left there are two sectors, the popular organizations and the armed clandestine organizations. But they support the popular organizations because they articulate the basic needs of the people.

Q: The Carter Administration believes that unless the people of El Salvador support the junta only chaos will occur.

A: Those are not the only two alternatives. The United States is ignoring the alternative presented by the people, who are already involved in their liberation process.

Q: You have been criticized for overstepping the bounds of the church as a shepherd of your flock. How do you respond to this?

A: In good conscience I can say that I am very comfortable with my role as what you call the shepherd of my flock . . . The church cannot separate itself from the politics and daily life of the people. I must illuminate with evangelical light. I will criticize the bad and support what is good. Within this lies the autonomy of the church. I am not at the service of any ideology. I am at the service of the popular organizations, although not with the violent groups. I feel complete freedom to tell you, in this interview, the areas in which I disagree with the popular organizations and the areas in which I agree with them. And I have tremendous hope in the popular organizations. By involving myself in the people's struggle, I am not making an opportunistic move. I am taking the position which the church has to take.

Q: The Christian Democratic Party along with members of the armed forces make up the government. Does it have a broad, popular backing?

A: They have lost a lot of ground. Their intentions are good; they are operating in good faith, but, on the level of actions, it is clear that the people see them as responsible in part for the repression which is being carried out against them. Perhaps they are responsible for the reforms which, I repeat, are good, but they are also responsible for the broadening of repression. This confuses the people. They pass their reforms as if everything would be OK, and this makes the reaction by the popular organizations appear unjust. But the popular organizations are not reacting to reform. They are reacting to repression. And their moves are just.

Q: Do you have a message for Salvadorans in the United States?

A: Yes. Salvadorans, regardless of your faith, I think God has given us the role of supporting the people's struggle. Whether you live in El Salvador or not, you must participate in the Salvadoran process; you cannot regard the United States as a refuge. You can do magnificent things for your people.●

WEST GERMAN CANCER SPECIALIST VISITS THE UNITED STATES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the use of laetrile in treating cancer has been going on for years elsewhere. It is one of the standard treatments used in Germany, for example. Dr. Hans Nieper, a well-known cancer specialist from Germany, is a strong proponent of laetrile. He visited the United States this March and made some statements on this subject. I would commend his statements to the attention of my colleagues who have not yet cosponsored my bill—H.R. 4045—to legalize the use of laetrile, to thoughtfully consider his statements. What follows are excerpts from a press release dated March 15, 1980, by Gertrude Engels Public Relations Firms:

From Hannover, West Germany, Dr. Hans Nieper, 51, world-famous cancer specialist, who prescribes Laetrile, was recently honored in Beverly Hills, California. This charming doctor has every reason to boast of his triumphant career.

The dinner was hosted by Edith Goetz, daughter of the late movie mogul Louis B. Mayer. Among the guests attending were Fred MacMurray; his wife, June Haver; Red Buttons; his wife, Alicia; Nancy Sinatra; Jack Lemmon; Natalie Wood; Robert Wagner; Chuck Feingarten; Laura Mako, David Selznick, Jr. and many others.

Fred MacMurray, Alicia Buttons, and Chuck Feingarten, cancer victims are patients of Dr. Nieper.

Before returning to Germany, Nieper and his lovely wife, Helga, visited Washington and were feted at the Cosmos Club. Hosts were Dr. and Mrs. Dean Burk. Dr. Burk worked as a bio-chemist for 35 years at the United States Cancer Institute.

He is pleased with the results of his metabolic therapy, including Laetrile, enzymes and vitamins for cancer patients. He receives about 1,000 applicants per month from the states. He glowingly speaks of the many incurables whose symptoms he has completely controlled. He emphatically states, "Laetrile is officially declared a cancer supportive treatment in Germany and has been since the middle of the last century."

He recalls, "When I was a graduate student studying internal medicine in 1951, part of my official examination was to treat a patient suffering from stomach cancer and I remember so vividly the examining professor's suggestion to try Laetrile. As my practice grew, I became more absorbed with what Laetrile could remedy, and I have used it faithfully for the past 15 years with tremendous success."

Dr. Nieper was indeed surprised by the U.S. 10th Circuit Court of Appeals second decision, reversing and remanding the case back to Judge Luther Bohanon for further proceedings. Their first decision upheld the Oklahoma judge's decision that terminally ill cancer patients would get Laetrile under the affidavit system signed by a physician.

What happened since then? Have we lost faith in our doctors?

Dr. Nieper declared, "I cannot believe it. What is the stir of the Food and Drug Administration "Grandfather clause" to determine the validity of Laetrile when we have had success all over the world? We don't have this trouble in Germany."

Nieper explained the difference between injectables of Laetrile and the tablets. He stated, "No one dies from taking Laetrile; and occasional abrupt drop in blood pressure can be caused by large doses of the intravenously injected substance.

"The patient has to lie down for about one to two hours and must be monitored. This occurrence very seldom happens because the cyanide detoxication process takes place. Tablets of Laetrile work slower; therefore, tablets do not produce the low blood pressure."

"What do you prescribe for High blood pressure?" I asked.

"High blood pressure can be decreased by injection if necessary with sodium prusside, the magnesium salt of vitamin B-13."

Nieper explained, "I talked with the celebrities about metabolic diseases and the energy crises."

He stated that measures to prevent cancer were being taken by Natalie Wood, who takes bromelain (a product manufactured from pineapple plants.) Robert Wagner, Nancy Sinatra, and Red Buttons consume magnesium orotate (one gram per day). Jack Lemmon does likewise. Nieper also recommends selenium (one half milligram per day). Stephanie Powers "devours" bromelain and selenium by taking 2 capsules a day.

Neiper believes in carrot juice: 1 tsp. of cream added to an 8 oz. glass of carrot juice.

"What does the cream do?" I asked.

He answered, "The cream helps to absorb the beta carotene which inactivates the blocking shields on the surface of the cancer cells."

Neiper asserted that the effective preventive measures should be used before and after surgery.

For the past two years Nieper has been searching to eliminate cancer formation. He is working in concert with chemist Rudolph Klemke in Mannheim, Germany, on a steroid hormone, tumosterone, which is in the body. "This product can be synthesized and amplified by a natural mechanism. One needs education to understand it. It is a substance which inactivates cancer cells. I was able to prove that in clinical reality with our minute quantity this concept works. It is not generally available yet," said Nieper.

"In studies now we use tumosterone-like substances which are imitating the action because they are closely related chemically or by giving the precursors from vitamin D-2 derivates."●

AGC NATIONAL CONVENTION

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● **Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, over 8,000 Associated General Contractors, affiliates, and associates participated in the 1980 AGC national convention this week in Honolulu. Ival Cianchette of Pittsfield, Maine, was installed as the 1980 president at the convention, which was the largest in AGC history.**

My colleague from Kansas, Senator BOB DOLE, speaking on matters of tax and fiscal affairs, emphasized that current policies concerning inflation, taxation, and regulation have worked to crush economic growth and the moral fiber of our Nation. I commend the Senator's speech to my colleagues and ask that a portion of it be included in the RECORD:

A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

As we meet this morning, Americans are confronted with the highest interest rates in our history. Inflation of nearly 20 percent is tearing at the vitals of our society, the stock market has plunged below the 800 figure and no one knows where it will all end.

A week has passed since the President unveiled his latest anti-inflation package. It might best be described as nibbling the inflationary bullet, of course, how can you expect an administration to bite the bullet when it's spent the last 3 years firing blanks.

The President seems to understand the link that exists between runaway inflation and crushing interest rates. There is no way to avoid that connection, and no slogans that will solve one without tackling the other.

To bring interest rates down, we've got to get a handle on inflation itself. To do that—to exercise the political courage to say no when there are a lot more votes to be gained by saying yes—this is the ultimate test of a democratic system of government.

The American people do not deserve an economy worthy of a banana republic, but that is what they are getting. The phrase "economic crisis" is gaining more and more currency. But a crisis implied something sudden and unanticipated. Many of us in Congress have warned that compounded government deficits, combined with ever rising levels of federal spending and taxation, would bring the nation to a point where only wrenching, painful adjustments could dampen inflation.

Now it appears that the hour may have arrived, and public relations gestures and prime time press conference are not going to do the trick. The problem goes beyond appearances. People lack confidence in their ability to invest and gain over the long term, and that is a very dangerous sign for the economy. Less investment means lower growth, fewer jobs, a dwindling tax base. And yet, we have borrowed nearly a trillion dollars from that future, as the national debt continues to accumulate.

Last Friday President Carter unveiled yet another program to halt inflation. Rather, he unveiled parts of a program—according to Alfred Kahn, the President meant to talk about the need for regulatory reform, but that portion of this speech was omitted because several pages stuck together. This may be the first time Mr. Carter has gotten something to stick. It does not, however, help the President to convince the public that he has a serious, comprehensive program in hand.

Nor was Mr. Carter helped by stating he proposed $18 billion in spending cuts, when he meant to propose $13 billion. But that error dramatized the inadequacy of the administration's program—how much difference can $5 billion make in a $600 billion budget?

What then does the President offer? I have said it before and I say it again—the administration offers unprecedented increases in taxation, and will propose modest, short-term cuts in spending. Let us try to consider some of the details, painful though that may be. Unfortunately, most of the detailed spending cuts have yet to be made public. But what we have does not inspire confidence.

For example, look at some of the proposed cuts within the jurisdiction of the finance committee, where I serve as ranking Republican. $400 million to be saved by delaying a new Medicaid program for one year; $1 billion by delaying countercyclical revenue sharing for one year. These are not spending cuts, they are deferrals. What has become of the President's commitment to long-term spending restraint? On the taxation side, we do have specifics. Social Security taxes are up over $20 billion. The windfall profits tax will bring $13 billion. We will have an oil import fee later converted to a gas tax—adding another $10 billion, and $3 billion through withholding taxes on interest and dividends. Then again, in the "pre-crisis" Carter budget, inflation had already boosted personal income taxes by about $16.5 billion for fiscal year 1981—now the administration further proposes to squeeze the taxpayer, already hit by taxflation, even harder.

The Carter people don't mention that this will mean a further disincentive to savings and investment, at a time when we desperately need to encourage both. They haven't added up their new math—to discover that overall taxes will rise by about $92 billion in fiscal year 1981. To an all time record in Peace time—21.9 percent of GNP.

In short, we have a prescription for continued low productivity, sluggish economic growth—and fewer jobs. It is not an antidote to inflation, it is a program looking for a rationale—but then, what else is new in the Carter White House?

If the President has no answers for our dilemma, what can we do? I submit that we need deeper and lasting spending cuts, not just one-year deferrals—and a commitment to tax reduction in future fiscal years.

Tax policy in this country has tended, in recent years, to encourage consumption and discourage investment, savings, and capital formation. Among major industrialized nations, the United States ranks last in savings as a percent of income, last in fixed investment as a percent of GNP and last in productivity growth. This is no accident. It is not caused by the profligacy of our citizens. It is caused by tax policy.

The extreme progressivity of our income tax system is one problem. High tax rates for middle income taxpayers discourage productive activity. This problem is made more acute by inflation. Individuals often must pay a higher tax although they receive no real increase in their income. Such taxflation is, to me, the biggest windfall profit of all—and it is directly attributable to a federal government that equates a printing press with sound currency. We have a capital crisis in this country. Capital needed for investment is eroded because our tax system does not recognize inflation-caused underdepreciation of assets. It makes no sense to depreciate assets at a price that is only a fraction of their replacement cost. Investment is discouraged in other ways also. For example, dividends are taxed twice in our system—once as profit to the corporation and again as income to the recipient.

Tax reduction should take the form of indexing the income tax to inflation, to eliminate future revenue windfalls to the treasury: tax incentives for savings and investment: and some form of corporate tax relief to stimulate real, non-inflationary growth—perhaps by adopting one of the proposals for accelerating depreciation of capital assets. By planning tax relief for future fiscal years, we can avoid upsetting the current budget, yet give the nation a clear commitment to a policy of stable growth, and show our determination to battle our way out of the mire of stagflation. If we can do that, we will make the job of monetary policy easier. By deflating people's expectation of continuing inflation and slow growth, we will reduce incentives for incurring debt. Then the FED can permit interest rates to moderate, and we can all breathe easier. Those rates would never have gone so high had the President followed clear, consistent, fiscal and monetary policies over the last three years.

Now is the time for America to pass judgment on 3 years of Carter economics. The 1980 elections are truly a watershed. This year we will make decisions that determine for decades to come the shape of our economy, the extent of our individual freedoms and opportunities, and the leadership we give to the troubled world in which we live. In 1980, we will decide what promises we wish to keep, to ourselves and to humanity.

I hope that each of you will get involved in the decision-making process. We need to hear your voices. We require your viewpoint, and we can benefit from your imperishable conviction that the best economy is a free economy, and the best America is one in which opportunity's door is not closed off by the deadening hand of bureaucracy.

It is a fight that never ends—and in which we must all remain always on guard. Keep up the fight, and one day even Washington, D.C. may get the message that we can never spend our way to national happiness—but we very easily spend ourselves into national disaster.●

THE SOVIET UNION'S SELECTIVE TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● **Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said and written about the very great lead the United States has over the Soviet Union in matters of technology. What is not examined,** however, is that this lead is bigger in some areas than in others. Yes, we do have a lead in computer technology and in chemical and plastic technologies as well. But in weaponry the United States "retains a lead in defense technology but the Soviet Union is coming on fast and is ahead in some ways."

The words in quotation marks come from a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, an overview of the technology race. I commend it to your attention, for it underscores something many of us forget: The Soviet Union has the capability of concentrating its resources on weaponry. In many areas of defense the Soviet Union is either equal to or well ahead of the United States. We should stop being so smug about our technological lead in other areas and start realizing that the Soviet Union is putting all its efforts into becoming the strongest military power in the world.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Soviets Strive To Catch the United States in Technology and Make Some Gains," from the Wall Street Journal, March 21, 1980.

SOVIETS STRIVE TO CATCH THE UNITED STATES IN TECHNOLOGY AND MAKE SOME GAINS

BUT U.S.S.R. FACES OBSTACLES, AMONG THEM A SYSTEM THAT DETERS RISK-TAKING

Smuggling home a computer

The U.S. and Russia are glaring at each other again. With the Soviet Union swarming over Afghanistan and exiling its dissidents, the Carter administration has tabled SALT and seemingly put detente, too, on the shelf.

Whether it is the start of a new cold war or only a chilly spell remains to be seen. But U.S.-Soviet skirmishing is under way on several fronts: wheat, human rights, the summer Olympics, public opinion in Moslem lands.

As competition overshadows cooperation, one battleground emerges as critical. It is technology. How the U.S. and the Soviet Union fare in economics, defense and even world prestige in the future will depend increasingly on their scientific and industrial innovation. President Carter's embargo on high-technology exports to the Soviet Union—broadened this week—only underscores the importance of this rivalry.

It is almost reflexive to think of the Soviet Union as inferior in technology. But to some extent this impression is due to differing priorities: The Soviets may not be making their very best effort in, say, videotape recorders. On the other hand, the Soviets are mounting an expensive and high-priority effort to close the technological gap where they consider it most critical. How are they doing?

Secret science

The Russians, of course, aren't saying. They are so secretive about science and industry that visiting U.S. businessmen are sometimes barred from sites where equipment they have sold to the Russians is being installed. Soviet scientists often don't participate in international conferences at which papers are presented (and at which foreign colleagues can judge other nations' progress).

Outside observers thus aren't always certain, or in agreement, in their evaluations of Soviet expertise. Some see the Russians making rapid strides in specific fields. And there are some areas, such as welding techniques and high-voltage power lines, where the Soviet technology is thought to be superior.

But overall, a lot of observers seem to agree with Lawrence Klein, professor at the University of Pennsylvania and chairman of Wharton Economic Forecasting Associates, who says of Soviet technology: "The gap isn't closing. They're putting money into it, but I can't see that they're getting results."

Explaining the obstacles to innovation, many Westerners cite peculiarities of the Soviet economic system. At its most basic, the problem is a disinclination to take chances. "There is a constant fear among bureaucrats," says a U.S. metals executive, "that if an unproven technology doesn't work, they will end up in Siberia." But to a U.S. manager, one Western economist comments, "risk is an opportunity, because that's where the payoffs are."

Production lag

Many Russia-watchers perceive a broad gulf between laboratory and factory. In case after case, the Russians seem to be close to the West in their theoretical grasp of a field of technology but far behind in applying it.

It is necessary, too, to distinguish between military and civilian technology in the Soviet Union. The military gets priority in money and resources. It also is ultrasecret, and Westerners tell of cases where Soviet civilian industries have labored to invent devices that the armed forces already had.

But the Soviet system has some major advantages in the technology race. One is a large pool of workers with technical training. Soviet planners can allocate this manpower, along with other resources, strictly in accordance with national needs. They are freer of constraints of public opinion or environmental worries. And despite the Carter administration's clampdown on exports, they can buy or copy much western technology.

What follows is an assessment of Soviet technology in some important fields as seen by knowledgeable Western observers.

Computers

The Russians appear to trail the U.S. in all aspects of computer technology but particularly in the manufacture and use of the machines. One student of Soviet technology says, however, that "a catching-up process is definitely under way."

Large Soviet computers are modeled on the IBM 360, which the U.S. company introduced about 15 years ago, and on the IBM 370, introduced in 1970. But the Russians didn't begin mass-producing their versions, called Ryads, until the mid-1970s. Richard Merwin, a George Washington University professor and former IBM engineer, recalls a visit to Soviet computer centers: "It looked as though they had a set of manufacturing prints for IBM computers," he says. "Even the colors were the same."

Production is a big problem, however. Reinhold Sell, who researches East European markets for International Data Corp. of Waltham, Mass., says that though the Russians "are capable of duplicating any machine we have," when it comes to mass production they "almost always fall flat on their face." A major advantage the U.S. has is its ability to make huge quantities of sophisticated electronic parts cheaply.

Mr. Sell explains that the Soviets have trouble making precision parts and therefore don't use high-speed disc drives needed for quick access to computer memories. He also says the computer programs often don't do all they should because they aren't designed by manufacturers or users but by Soviet mathematical institutes. In addition, the poor quality of its telephone system keeps the Soviet Union from developing one important innovation in computer technology, communication among numerous machines.

A Rand Corp. study estimates the number of installed computers in the Soviet Union will be 40,000 to 42,000 by year-end, including minicomputers and special-purpose machines. The U.S. will have about 130,000 installed general-purpose computers and a half a million minicomputers.

An even wider gulf exists in the use the Soviets get from their computers. Mr. Sell says the Soviet Union seems to treat them as "fast adding machines," using them for repetitive tasks such as payroll and inventory calculation rather than sophisticated modeling or medical applications. "They're 20 years behind in the applications area and falling further behind," he believes.

Though the U.S. has halted high-technology exports to the Soviet Union and has even barred Soviet scientists from an international computer conference, observers doubt the freeze will hamper Soviet computer development in the long run. "There's no way we can keep the Soviets from getting our units," says Steven Puthuff, vice president of engineering for Memorex Corp. "They have been known to take a computer in the U.S. and break it down and carry the components out in suitcases."

But the U.S.-Soviet technological freeze has some more-immediate effects. The Carter administration has blocked shipment of parts for an IBM computer used at Russia's big Kama River truck plant.

It also held up spare parts for a Univac computer that Aeroflot, the Soviet airline, uses for international reservations. An executive of Sperry Corp., which built the computer, says the Russians' spare-parts supply normally would last only three to six months. Eventually, he believes, "that computer is going to become useless." Aeroflot expects to carry 3.6 million international travelers this year.

Even with the Univac working, says John Linvill, electrical-engineering chairman at Stanford University, "the Soviet concept of using computers for scheduling and storing data is incredibly behind us. On plane and hotel reservations, the difference is just astounding." He adds that "apart from the Afghanistan matter, I would have been wary of attending the Moscow Olympics. I don't think they can manage such a large influx of people."

Machine tools

The Soviet Union is catching up with the West in many areas of machine-tool technology, although perhaps not in sophisticated, computerized machinery.

"The Russians are two or more generations behind other countries, but they're catching up faster than a generation every 10 years," says William Ritter, vice president for international sales at Giddings & Lewis Inc., Fond du Lac, Wis.

They do so largely by acquiring Western technology. It is available from many countries besides the U.S., so that President Carter's embargo on sales of high-technology items to the Soviet Union may not have any great effect.

The North American distributor of Russian machine tools believes the Soviet Union is improving rapidly in certain basic areas. "Soviet technology is approaching a competitive position with the West in areas such as machining centers and boring, milling and drilling machines, where they've placed priorities," says Russell Gardner, sales manager for Stan-Canada Machinery Ltd., Toronto.

The president of one machine-tool concern adds that the Soviets "are principally making drills, simple mills and lathes rather than anything involving electronics." Developing countries offer a market for these basic machines.

Improving their machine-tool technology might seem a way for the Soviets to attack the practical production problems that hobble them in so many fields. Ironically, however, such problems also afflict the Soviets in manufacturing machine tools themselves.

"The Russians have absolutely no way of controlling and monitoring a plant the way we do in the U.S.," an executive of a big U.S. industrial-products concern says. "Some equipment isn't maintained and is in total disarray." Another industry source describes the quality of Russian machine tools as "all over the map from good to very poor."

Chemicals and plastics

The consensus is that the Soviet Union is well behind the U.S. in these areas and isn't catching up.

"The Soviets are not known for breakthroughs in chemical processes or plastics," says Melvin Duncan, an East-West trade consultant and former corporate director for East Europe at Union Carbide Corp. "What they have is either a reinvention of the West's or technology purchased from the West," he adds.

This seems to be so by design. Materials like polyester fibers and synthetic rubber and plastics aren't of high priority for the Russians. Leonard Triggiani, president of the research division of W.R. Grace & Co., notes that "the technology isn't that sophisticated or abstruse that they couldn't do it."

Thus, in a field where the Soviets do place emphasis, fertilizer, they have what Mr. Duncan terms "some of the biggest and best nitrogen production in the world."

One chemicals executive, who has visited the Soviet Union many times and has met with government ministers, believes bureaucrats there aren't even especially eager for innovation in such low-priority areas. He explains, "When a man makes an invention, what he is doing is creating trouble" in a centralized planning system.

Even in the technology needed to produce industrial gases, which are used in all kinds of basic industry, the Russians are still some years behind, says a spokesman for Air Products & Chemicals Inc. of Allentown, Pa. As a result, the Soviet chemical industry hasn't been much of a competitor in international markets.

Western experts agree that the embargo on high-technology exports won't hurt the Soviets much. Some say it will only divert business to Europe and Japan. And Mr. Duncan suggests it could even backfire. "It might slow them down for four or five years," he says, "but it could cause them to shape up their own efforts and make them stronger in the long run."

Weaponry

The U.S. retains a lead in defense technology, but the Soviet Union is coming on fast and is ahead in some ways.

The Soviets spent about $100 billion more than the U.S. on military research and development in the decade just ended, according to William Perry, under secretary of defense for R&D. "We've been losing our (technological) advantage year by year," he believes.

Analysts say the Soviet Union is even with the U.S. in aerodynamics, nuclear weapons and radar sensors. One says that the Russians have made rapid strides in night-vision equipment. Experts describe the Soviets as equal to or ahead of the U.S. in lasers and other focused-energy beams, which are a promising antiballistic-missile technology.

The Soviet Union also seems to be ahead in many categories of ground-combat equipment. Percy Pierre, assistant secretary of the Army for research and development, observes that in the past "we had a tendency to smirk at Soviet equipment as either crude and unsophisticated or as merely poor copies of Western equipment." That advantage has eroded, he believes, "to the point where the U.S. Army now is inferior in virtually every major category of items with which wars can reasonably be expected to be won."

The U.S. Army hopes to start restoring the balance with billions of dollars worth of new-model tanks, armored personnel carriers, helicopters and missiles that are just beginning to reach the troops. The Pentagon also is requesting a $3 billion increase in fiscal 1981 spending for research and development. F. X. Kane, a former Air Force space-program planner now with TRW Corp., notes that the Vietnam war turned many U.S. scientists away from military technology but adds, "That's starting to change."

In the air, the Soviets are believed to trail the U.S. in the accuracy of their missile-guidance systems, those for nuclear-tipped missiles as well as those for peaceful space missions. Russia turns out large numbers of warplanes, but of generally lower technology. It trails the U.S. in developing the low-flying cruise missiles.

There are two sides to competing with the Soviet Union in technology, observes Mr. Perry, the defense under secretary: "One half of that is enhancing our own R&D; the other half is to stop giving it away. They've gotten very significant benefits from the technology we've willingly sold them." Mr. Perry says Russians subscribe to U.S. technical publications and buy vast quantities of technical and patent data from the U.S. government.

Robert Hotz, retired editor of Aviation Week magazine, adds that "technical espionage in this country is hot and heavy. All their (the Russians) embassies are vastly overstaffed with people, many of whom have aerospace capacilities."

Mr. Hotz says he once asked a Russian friend why so much spying goes on when a lot of the purloined information could be gleaned from publicly available sources. He relates that the Russian, used to a society where publicly available technical information isn't worth much, replied, "We only believe what we steal."

THE STEEL SITUATION—MORE PROGRESS NEEDED TO PROTECT JOBS

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, America is facing a new round of decisionmaking that will set the progress of the steel industry for the next 5 years.

The recent decision by the United States Steel Corp. to bring antidumping suits against foreign steel producers, and the resulting decision by the Commerce Department to suspend the "trigger-pricing" system controlling imports dramatizes the need for a renewed congressional debate on the steel industry.

You will recall that in 1977 in the face of massive steel layoffs and plant closings across the country, the Congressional Steel Caucus was formed to coordinate Government policy to aid the steel industry and its workers, and insure a strong industry for our country.

The major result of that summer's work was the "trigger-pricing" mechanism, a pricing system designed to reduce foreign imports coming into the United States. In 1979 steel imports were 19.2 percent lower than in 1978. Over the 5-year period of 1974-78, before the "trigger-price" mechanism was in place, plant closings, phasedowns, and layoffs eliminated 42,700 jobs in Pennsylvania.

The year before the "trigger-price" mechanism was in place, total employment in Pennsylvania's primary metals industry was 176,870. A year after the pricing controls were in place, the average employment had jumped to 203,200. Moreover, we had seen the job situation stabilize throughout western Pennsylvania. The Steel Caucus work coincided with our successful community effort to retain as many jobs as possible at Johnstown's Bethlehem Steel plant.

The overall economic impact of these decisions is even greater since the steel industry remains Pennsylvania's No. 1 employer. Pennsylvania is also the biggest producer of anthracite and a major producer of bituminous coal. Since 1,660 pounds of coal are needed to produce 1 ton of steel, it is obvious why every decision concerning steel has a multiple effect on the State's economy. According to the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce, every million tons of steel produced creates an estimated 5,000 steelworker jobs and 15,000 ancillary jobs. Retaining and adding to those jobs is vital to west-central Pennsylvania.

So let us take a moment to focus on some of the key steel issues I believe Congress must face.

Imports.—We must assess the impact of the antidumping suit over the coming months. If it leads to lesser imports and more secure American jobs, then we are in better shape. Personally, I was very pleased with the constant progress made by the "trigger-pricing" system. I think it was a success. If imports make another spurt further threatening jobs of American workers, I will urge the Steel Caucus to intervene again with industry, labor, and the administration to find some new way to prevent further sagging of the American steel industry. The key is to control imports by whatever method proves best.

A second import question involves specialty steel. I joined in petitioning the White House to retain the specialty steel quotas but they were dropped beginning in February. If jobs in this segment of the industry—affecting our area at the Allegheny Ludlum plant in Leechburg—are threatened, then I will urge the Steel Caucus return to the White House demanding new import controls.

We simply cannot allow our American steel industry and our American steelworker jobs to be eaten away by foreign imports.

Modernization.—Domestic plant capacity utilization has increased in the last few years. That utilization must continue to improve, and ways must be found to use more capital in modernization and increased plant productivity. I have cosponsored legislation that would improve depreciation allowances and alter tax writeoffs in a way that would allow more plant expansion and improvement. Using new technology will strengthen the American steel industry and make jobs more secure.

Pollution control.—No one wants to go backward on environmental progress, but we need to allow room for American industry to grow and create jobs. Much of the steel industry's capital investment has gone into required pollution control equipment instead of plant modernization. I have sponsored one of several versions of legislation being considered to provide a speedier tax writeoff for industry of such equipment. This would do several things. First, it would provide an incentive to put the best available antipollution equipment in place; second, it would free more money for industry to use in steelmaking improvements. We must also work for reasonable pollution regulations so jobs and economic stability are not lost in our desire for clean air and water.

Coke.—We must solve the coke problems facing the steel industry so we can mine more metallurgical coal—also a boost to our coal industry—and also end the huge imports of coke that have been needed by the industry. Here again, we need reasonable environmental rules to keep the coke operations in production.

Defense.—Behind all of this lurks a key concern of mine—namely that we must have a domestic steel industry strong enough and with enough capacity and trained workers to insure that we could meet our steel production needs in a time of military crisis. Right now, that remains uncertain, and further shows why we must take these steps to insure a strong steel industry which is a key for all Americans.

All of the Nation has double-digit inflation, but we have also got double-digit unemployment throughout our region. The steel industry remains a vital key to future employment stability in our area and throughout all of western Pennsylvania. In recent years through the work of the Steel Caucus we have formed the basis for a government-labor-industry coordinated effort to work for a strong steel industry. This latest action on imports calls for a reevaluation of all our programs and goals, and a renewed effort to solve the remaining problems. I will be working as a member of the Executive Board of the Steel Caucus to continue to use the creative, productive skills of Congress to find additional solutions to the problems we face.

I believe it is now time to develop new ideas and initiatives along these lines to stimulate the steel industry. That is the goal for the remainder of 1980, and it is one which must be reached.●

PROTECTING ARTISTS' HEALTH

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I have the pleasure of introducing a bill that is the result of my 2-year investigation into the toxicity of artist supplies. I am sure that my colleagues will be shocked to learn that artists of all ages used materials which, if used incorrectly, can cause severe health side effects. In case after case artists have suffered blindness, neuromuscular disorders, and even death from the use of artist supplies. Yet these hazards could be prevented simply by the use of sufficient precautions when using certain materials. The following are a few of the numerous incidents which have been brought to my attention:

ARTISTS AFFECTED BY ART MATERIALS

One. Erica Barton, who has been an artist all her life, suffers from distal axanopathy (similar to muscular sclerosis) of both the central and peripheral nervous systems. The suspected cause is chronic exposure to hexane found in various 3M spray adhesives which Mrs. Barton used in her artwork. There is little expectation that she will ever recover completely or be able to return to her work as an artist.

Two. For a year and a half, Bruce Beasley, a California sculptor, ran a low-grade fever and broke out in shakes and sweats every time he climbed the stairs. A doctor finally traced his illness to the arsenic compound Mr. Beasley was using to color his aluminum sculptures. It took a year and a half for the artist to regain his health.

Three. Art professor Tadeusz Lapinski spent 7 months in a hospital fighting for his life against aplastic anemia—a blood disease—caused by the solvent benzene, which he used in photolithography classes.

Four. Sculptor Harry Bertoia, who recently died of cancer, had frequent exposure to poisonous copper alloy fumes, as well as silver solder and brass welding, which emit toxic fumes. Under current law, none of these products require warning labels.

Five. New York professional artist, Masuo Ikeda, suffered unexplained headaches, dizziness, and nausea, following 20 years of exposure to fumes from the acids and solvents he used in etching. After he was away from the studio for an extended period, his symptoms cleared up.

Six. Harvey Mueller, a potter, suffered blackouts in his studio. It was diagnosed that he had been subjected to barium poisoning while firing glazes containing barium carbonate.

A SOLUTION

There is a simple, inexpensive, and obvious solution to prevent the misuse of certain chemicals: On the label of each product that contains a potentially hazardous substance would be a listing of chemcials by their common name; the precautions to take when using the product; the physical side effects to be aware of when using the product; how to counteract the side effects; and, finally, how to properly dispose of the product.

The Federal Hazardous Substances Act now includes most of these criteria for products which could cause acute illnesses (immediate effect), however those which could cause chronic illnesses (long-term effect) are not yet covered. In the past, determining the chronic toxicity of most chemicals and substances was either too costly, too time-consuming, or technologically impossible. Fortunately, scientists have now developed tests for determining chronic toxicity of many substances, thus changes in the law that I am proposing are both timely and reasonable.

The bill that I have introduced today mandates proper labeling of all materials containing potentially hazardous substances. If the consumer decides not to follow the precautionary measures listed on the label, it is his/her choice. But, unless the user is sufficiently warned about the potential hazards of these products, we are remiss in our responsibility to protect the consumer.

THE RESPONSE FROM THE INDUSTRY

Art supply manufacturers have almost unanimously stated that they are opposed to my legislation. Their arguments include: there is no room on the label for such information; if they did place this information on the label it would be so small that it would be unreadable; the labels would have to be redesigned and hence increase costs—costs which would be passed along to the consumer; tubes of paint are often rolled up as they are used and the warning would be hidden and hence useless; if the tube was too small and the required information was explained on a sheet of paper given separately to the consumer the paper would most probably be misplaced; and so forth and so on.

Each of these arguments could readily be answered. Under present law each bottle of nail polish must have on its label—or the bottle itself—a complete listing of the chemicals found in the product. If this can be done on a small bottle of nail polish it can certainly be done on a tube of paint. If the warning information is found on the product and it is small, artists will still find ways to read the information, even if it means using a magnifying glass. The argument about increased costs for the consumer is specious. Every artist I have spoken to about this believes that if the cost per unit were increased to protect the health of the consumer, it would be well worth the investment. Once an artist reads a label and takes the necessary precautions to prevent physical side effects, it won't matter if the tube of paint is rolled up or the paper thrown away.

The most unreasonable argument I have heard from industry representatives is that, "If we place these warnings and information on the label, people may no longer buy the product and we are in business to make money." Such business people, Mr. Speaker, place profits over the safety of the very people who keep them in business.

In March 1979, I went before the National Art Materials Trade Association and asked for some outlines of plans to protect their consumer/public. To my knowledge, no response has been made. It is obvious that the industry is unwilling to regulate itself and is challenging Congress to take the necessary steps. I am certain that my colleagues in the House will join with me in helping to protect unsuspecting artists from the inherent dangers in so many products.

EXAMPLE OF INDUSTRY NEGLIGENCE

To the industry people who claim their labels are already sufficient, let me respond with just one example: Hexane is a chemical found in spray adhesives and rubber cement, though it is not listed on most labels. Technical Petroleum Co. of Chicago manufactures hexane. Illinois Bronze buys hexane from Technical Petroleum and is told in writing that the chemical causes headaches, dizziness, nausea, blurred vision, and "possibly even nerve damage known as peripheral neuropathy." Yet the Illinois Bronze label on their adhesives used as artist supplies only reads. "* * * inhalation may cause discomfort or illness. Get fresh air * * *."

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

To provide my colleagues with an idea of the scope of this problem, I have prepared a list to show a few of the professions which routinely use hazardous chemicals and the health-related problems associated with various degrees of use of the chemicals:

Painting

Gum Acacia (gum arabic), can lead to: Severe respiratory allergies and skin allergies.

Flake White (cremnitz white, white lead, Pigment White I), can lead to: Teratogen (causes developmental malformations) and suspected mutagen. Lead poisoning.

Phenol (carbolic acid), can lead to: Death. Very corrosive to skin.

Printing

Chrome Green (Milori green, pigment Green 15), can lead to: Human carcinogen, teratogen, suspected mutagen.

Molybdate Orange (Pigment Red 104), can lead to: Human carcinogen, teratogen, suspected mutagen.

Sulfuric Acid (oleum), can lead to: Death. Chronic bronchitis and emphysema. Corrosive to skin.

Ceramics, glassblowing and enameling

Beryllium Oxide, can lead to: Death. Chronic skin ulcers. Lung damage.

Manganese Carbonate, can lead to: Serious nervous system disease.

Arsenic Oxide (arsenic trioxide), can lead to: Death. Human carcinogen.

Sculpture

Fluorspar (fluorite, calcium fluoride), can lead to: Skin irritation, anemia, loss of appetite, teeth defects.

Cedar Wood Dust, Western Red (Thuja plicata), can lead to: Skin allergies, asthma, bronchitis, and gastrointestinal irritation.

Organic Phosphates, can lead to: Paralysis, convulsions, anesthetic effects.

Metalworking processes

Beryllium, can lead to: Death. Chronic ulcers. Lung damage. Cancer.

Cadmium, can lead to: Severe lung irritation. Cancer, Anemia.

Iodine, can lead to: Burns, respiratory irritation. Can be fatal.

Photography and photoprocesses

Acetic Acid, can lead to: Skin corrosion, chronic bronchitis. Can be fatal.

Cathechin (catechol, pyrocatechol, o-dihydroxybenzene), can lead to: Allergies, acute poisoning, vomiting. Can be fatal.

Sulfamic Acid, can lead to: Corrosive to skin, eyes, respiratory system.

Crafts

Ammonia (ammonium hydroxide), can lead to: Severe respiratory irritation. Skin corrosion. Can be fatal.

Ocalic Acid, can lead to: Severe skin corrosion and ulcers, kidney damage, gangrene.

PUBLIC AWARENESS

Over the past 2 years, innumerable articles on this subject have appeared in the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, the Washington Post, as well as regional and local papers throughout the country. Art Hazards News, Art Workers News, Ocular Magazine for Visual Artists, and a host of other trade papers have started regular series on this vital subject. One of the country's leading experts in the field, Dr. Michael McCann, has recently published a 378-page book entitled "Artist Beware" that explains in detail the dangers involved with the misuse of hundreds of artists products and chemicals.

At my request, the Consumer Product Safety Commission undertook a major study of this problem. Battelle Columbus Laboratories was commissioned to determine which art professions were most susceptible to the health hazards inherent in artist products; which chemicals used by these artists were hazardous; and, which companies produce and distribute the products. Their three-volume study was released in December 1979. It gives conclusive evidence that the health-related problems precipitated by the misuse of art supplies is an industrywide problem.

THOSE AFFECTED

A 1975 Louis Harris poll found that 39 percent of individuals over age 16 (56.7 million people) are currently engaged in woodworking, weaving, pottery, ceramics, and other crafts where harmful products may be used. The poll also found that 16 percent of persons over age 16 (21.8 million people) are currently engaged in painting, drawing, and sculpture.

National studies performed at some of our country's most prominent schools of art have shown that 40 percent or more of the students suffer from health problems related to artist materials. Fortunately for those students, the schools have taken the necessary steps to correct the health-threatening situations.

School aged children are also using art and craft materials in and out of the classroom. Based on my investigation, I believe that most of the typical children's art materials are quite safe. However, unsuspecting parents may buy art supplies for their children which are not safe and they would have no way of knowing otherwise. Worse yet, many products that adults use in producing artwork can have adverse effects on their children, through constant exposure to fumes and dust. If parents and artists were aware of the potential dangers, they could take the necessary precautionary measures to insure their children's health.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, a summary of the legislation follows:

SECTION 1. Amends the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (FHSA) to include "chronic toxicity" under the definition of hazardous substances. This section also provides the Consumer Product Safety Commission with the authority to issue regulations concerning substances that cause chronic illnesses.

SECTION 2. Defines the term "chronic toxicity" as any substance which causes tumors or cancer, has an adverse reproductive or genetic effect, has an adverse effect on the central nervous system or peripheral nervous system, or any other chronic effects as determined by the Commission. The section goes on to add the word "chronic" to the term "toxic."

SECTION 3. Mandates that all labels of products containing substances that cause chronic or acute illness have: (a) a description of the physical side effects that could result from the misuse of the product; (b) a description of how to counteract the possible physical side effects resulting from misuse of the product; (c) a description of the proper precautionary measures to avoid misuse; and, (d) instructions for safely disposing of the product. Substances which may be carcinogenic must carry the following: WARNING: HAS BEEN SHOWN TO CAUSE CANCER IN ANIMALS.

SECTION 4. Includes technical amendments to the FHSA and mandates that all labels of products containing substances that cause either chronic or acute illness provide instructions for procedures to counteract possible health side effects.

SECTION 5. Allows the Consumer Product Safety Commission two years to issue appropriate regulations under this Act.

The complete text of this bill follows:

H.R. 6977

A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to establish labeling requirements applicable to substances which cause chronic health side effects, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(f)(1) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(1)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clauses:

"(E)(i) Any substance or mixture of substances which possesses chronic toxicity (as defined in paragraph (g)(2)(A)), if such substance or mixture is capable of being ingested, inhaled, or absorbed into the human body through any customary or reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse (including any reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse by children).

"(ii) The Consumer Product Safety Commission shall have the authority to issue regulations, in accordance with the procedures prescribed in section 553 of title 5, United States Code, which provide that any particular substance or mixture of substances shall not be classified as a hazardous substance under subclause (i) if the Commission determines that such substance or mixture does not present any risk to humans if such substance or mixture is ingested, inhaled, or absorbed into the human body through any customary or reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse (including any reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse by children).

"(F) Any substance or mixture of substances which the Consumer Product Safety Commission determines, in accordance with the procedures prescribed in section 553 of title 5, United States Code, or in accordance with the procedures established in section 3(a), to possess chronic toxicity (as defined in clause (B), clause (C), or clause (D) of paragraph (g)(2)), except that a substance or mixture shall not be considered to be a hazardous substance under this clause unless such substance or mixture is capable of being ingested, inhaled, or absorbed into the human body through any customary or reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse (including any reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse by children).

"(G) Any substance or mixture of substances which—

"(i) possesses chronic toxicity, as defined in subclause (A), subclause (B), or subclause (C) of paragraph (g)(2), or as determined under subclause (D) of paragraph (g)(2); and

"(ii) is present as a contaminant in any household substance or mixture of household substances;

if the Consumer Product Safety Commission determines, in accordance with the procedures prescribed in section 553 of title 5, United States Code, or in accordance with the procedures established in section 3(a), that such substance or mixture is capable of being ingested, inhaled, or absorbed into the human body through any customary or reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse (including any reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse by children).".

SEC. 2. Section 2(g) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(g)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the paragraph designation;

(2) by inserting ", and to any substance which possesses chronic toxicity" after "body surface"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(2) For purposes of this paragraph, substances which possess chronic toxicity include the following:

"(A) Any substance which causes tumors or cancer (or which is metabolized to a substance which causes tumors or cancer) in humans or other mammals, including—

"(i) any substance which—

"(I) the Secretary of Health and Human Services (or the head of any bureau, administration, or other organizational unit in the Department of Health and Human Services); or

"(II) the International Agency for Research on Cancer;

reviews and determines to cause tumors or cancer in humans or other mammals, if any such determination is based upon valid studies and procedures; and

"(ii) any substance which is regulated by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, or the Occupational Safety and Health Administration as the result of a determination that such substance causes tumors or cancer in humans or other mammals, if any such determination is based upon valid studies and procedures.

"(B)(i) Any substance which causes any adverse reproductive effect or any adverse genetic effect.

"(ii) For purposes of this clause, adverse reproductive effects and adverse genetic effects include any birth defect, toxicity to a fetus, sterility or impaired reproductive capacity, spontaneous abortion, any mutagenic effect, and any damage to genetic material.

"(iii) Any determination of the Consumer Product Safety Commission that a substance causes any adverse reproductive effect or any adverse genetic effect shall be based upon valid studies and procedures. Such studies and procedures may include the use of human subjects, experimental animals, micro-organisms, culture cells, or other test systems.

"(C)(i) Any substance which causes any adverse effect upon the central nervous system or any peripheral nervous system.

"(ii) Any determination of the Consumer Product Safety Commission that a substance causes any adverse effect upon the central nervous system or any peripheral nervous system shall be based upon valid studies and procedures. Such studies and procedures may include the use of human subjects, experimental animals, or other test systems.

"(D) Any substance which the Consumer Product Safety Commission determines (in accordance with the procedures prescribed in section 553 of title 5, United States Code, or in accordance with the procedures established in section 3(a)) to possess any form of chronic toxicity, other than those forms of chronic toxicity specified in clause (A), clause (B), or clause (C), if such substance or mixture is capable of being ingested, inhaled, or absorbed into the human body through any customary or reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse (including any reasonably foreseeable handling, use, or misuse by children).".

SEC. 3. Section 2(p) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(p)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (1) thereof—

(A) by inserting ", in the case of any substance other than any substance or mixture of substances which is defined as a hazardous substance under clause (E) or clause (G) of paragraph (f)(1) and other than any substance which possesses chronic toxicity (as defined in paragraph (g)(2)(A))," after "(1) which"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following: "(K) in the case of any hazardous substance which causes any physical side effect, a statement which describes the nature of such side effect and explains procedures which may be followed to counteract such side effect;";

(2) in subparagraph (1)(I) thereof—

(A) by striking out "and storage" and inserting in lieu thereof ", storage, and disposal"; and

(B) by striking out "or storage; and" and inserting in lieu thereof ", storage, or disposal;"; and

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (2) as subparagraph (3), and by inserting after subparagraph (1) the following new subparagraph:

"(2) which, in the case of any substance or mixture of substances which is defined as a hazardous substance under clause (E) or clause (G) of paragraph (f)(1) and which possesses chronic toxicity (as defined in paragraph (g)(2)(A)), states conspicuously (A) the information required in clause (A), clause (B), and clause (I) of subparagraph (1); (B) the phrase 'WARNING: HAS BEEN SHOWN TO CAUSE CANCER IN ANIMALS' on any substance which has been determined to possess chronic toxicity (as defined in paragraph (g)(2)(A)), based upon any valid study or procedure using experimental animals; (C) the phrase 'WARNING: HAS BEEN SHOWN TO CAUSE CANCER IN HUMANS' on any substance which has been determined to possess chronic toxicity (as defined in paragraph (g)(2)(A)), based upon any valid study or procedure using human subjects; and (D) precautionary measures which describe actions to be followed and actions to be avoided in connection with any use of the substance; and".

SEC. 4. Section 20(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1275(a)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ", 2(p)(2)," after "sections 2(p)(1)";

(2) in clause (i) thereof, by inserting "and section 2(p)(2)(D)" after "section 2(p)(1)(F)";

(3) in clause (ii) thereof, by striking out "and" at the end thereof; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(iv) instructions for procedures to counteract side effects under section 2(p)(1)(K); and".

SEC. 5. The amendments made in the foregoing provisions of this Act shall take effect at the end of the 2-year period following the date of the enactment of this Act. The Consumer Product Safety Commission shall have authority to issue regulations (in accordance with the Federal Hazardous Substance, Act, as amended by such foregoing provisions) during such 2-year period for purposes of carrying out such amendments, except that the effective date of any such regulations shall not occur before the end of such 2-year period.●

THANKS, VA

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in this time when public servants are being hit from several different directions, it was a good feeling to receive the following letter from an old friend and constitutent, Mr. Clyde Roberts, publisher of the Arizona Range News in Willcox, Ariz.

The letter speaks for itself and I wanted to share it:

ARIZONA RANGE NEWS, INC.,
Willcox, Ariz. March 4, 1980.

Hon. MORRIS K. UDALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MO: I want to express my deep appreciation for the kind treatment of a friend at the VA Hospital in Tucson by their staff.

Last night, I took Fred Potterf, Benson, to the VA Hospital for examination.

The admission desk clerks were courteous, and sent him to receive medical assistance immediately.

The doctor in charge began his examination at once. He examined him thoroughly, and ordered lab tests and X-rays.

I remained in the waiting room during the examination, but he reported to me on their findings and progress at regular intervals.

Most important, the medical officer in charge showed that he cared about the patient. His kindness and consideration for the patient were obvious to me.

This was my first visit to a VA Hospital. Although a former combat veteran, I've been blessed with good health.

In any facility such as the VA Hospital, there are bound to be complaints. We're both aware of this, but I want you to know how delighted I was with Potterf's treatment.

Furthermore, I want you to know I appreciate the good work and the many accomplishments you have done for the people of your district.

There's hardly a day goes by that I don't remind some "hardhead" of the many good things you have done for our district. You have my support again, naturally.

I would like the persons involved in handling Fred Potterf's case to be thanked for me.

Keep up the good work, and hope to see you on one of your trips down our way.

Sincerely,

CLYDE S. ROBERTS.●

DRUG ABUSE—THE CAUSE—PREVENTION

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Speaker, my purpose is twofold: First, to do whatever I can to curtail drug abuse within our society, and to laud the Burbank Elks Lodge 1497 for its enlightened drug abuse prevention program.

The key to the program, according to Daniel E. Goodwin, chairman of the drug abuse committee, is to destroy the myth that drug use is tolerable or chic or acceptable.

The crux of the Elk's drug abuse preventive program is as follows:

DRUG ABUSE—THE CAUSE—PREVENTION

To prevent drug abuse it is first necessary to establish the cause and how it is spread. Scientifically the understanding of a phenomenon or solution of it is the simplest one that covers all the facts.

The cause of drug abuse is people believing it is alright to use drugs to get high. That is the germ that causes drug abuse.

To understand how a person comes to believe an idea we must realize that a person is a living human being and as such has certain built in instincts and needs. He needs to eat, sleep, make love, needs clothing, needs a roof over his head, warmth, etc. He has a need and a desire to survive. For his survival he has natural curiosity. In his evolution he learns. He has found he not only learns from experience, but if he listens to others he can learn from their knowledge without having to try every way himself. In other words, he has become conditionable. Just like Pavlov's dogs.

Knowing people are conditionable and how to condition them is a knowledge in the field of sales, marketing, public relations, propaganda and hypnotism, amongst others. Even animals use it in the mating pattern. The steps are very scientific and they really work because they have been tried and used and proven over billions of times and thousands of years. The steps are: attention . . . interest . . . desire . . . action. It is called AIDA. Since this is the way we accept all other ideas, this too, is the way the idea it is alright to use drugs to get high is accepted, or if we want to use the word "bought" we can. It is the same.

Drug abuse is spread by one person (a doper) who believes the drug rationale—it is alright to use drugs to get high—sells, or turns on at least four others. They in turn become missionaries for the idea, spreading it to twenty others, who spread it to a hundred, etc. At the ninth time, it is one million and at the eighteenth time it is a million million.

The spread of drug abuse or popularization of it can be followed. The use of marijuana was first brought up from Mexico. It was introduced and caught onto by our musicians, then people that associated with them. They believed it helped them to play better. Many show people dropped out of the drug scene when it reached the point where some were skin popping their babies with heroin to keep them from crying.

Before drug abuse reached epidemic scale the country as a whole was becoming pill oriented. Use a pill for this and that—an upset stomach, a headache, dieting, sleeping, tranquilizers—doctors passed out pills for everything. To merchandise the idea, or make it socially acceptable, the missionary work was assisted by experiments with LSD claiming a wider consciousness. Many psychiatrists and psychologists helped spread the disease by very authoritative statements on the inocuousness of marijuana, or LSD not realizing that using any drug to get high was spreading the drug rationale (it is alright to use drugs to get high). Also many were publicizing and pushing to make marijuana legal.

Everyone that uses drugs remembers by whom and when they were turned on. Usually it was someone in their peer group. Generally it was in a room where the drug was available and others were using it. There, the drug, usually marijuana, was offered—try it, it will make you feel good. The whole sales process, or steps were gone through. Attention, interest, desire, and if they did smoke, the action. How it actually affected the person, what they thought of the person offering, how much they believed the missionary statements—it won't hurt you, it's not a narcotic, it's not habit forming, it helps glacoma, it's good for asthma, you want to be one of the crowd, makes you more sexy—"aw, come on, try it." If you try it, and like it, and continue to use it, you have bought the drug rationale—it is alright to use drugs to get high.

The gradient to drug addiction is the same as the sales AIDA. First, using occasionally, regularly, heavy and then the fourth step, addiction or necessity. Between the third and fourth step something happens to a persons mind. Because they are using heavy they are practically physically addicted and being a living human being, they have living problems. You know if you go out a door and the door sticks you have a living problem. When answering a living problem (regardless if it is sex, work, parents or any other troubles) with drugs or alcohol at that point one becomes addicted or an alcoholic. There is like a post hypnotic suggestion impressed on the brain that the only answer is to use. This is the mental addiction. To unbend the mind at this stage, one has to almost be born again.

In the steps to hard drugs, every addict remembers the sales pitch he got from an old hipe when he got turned on to the so called hard stuff. "Instead of smoking ten or twenty times, one sniff, or shot will turn you on all day. The higher you go, the better you feel. Why ride in a Ford when you can drive a Cadillac?" Many pushers claim every addict is really reaching for an over dose.

Every user is a source of infection to a non-user and reinfection to any other user or ex-user. Many ex-users, that are now clean from hard drugs, are a source of infection if they believe it is alright to use soft drugs.

Since man began living with others he has been conditioned into following social acceptance of the group, by the instinct to survive. If he acted differently or looked differently, he was killed or ostracized. That is how mob psychology, or custom works. Our epidemic is caused by it becoming socially acceptable to use drugs to get high. To stop the epidemic we must make it socially unacceptable to use drugs to get high, or to associate with anyone who does.

The last phase of AIDA is when a person has actually become addicted to the use of drugs and has to use them, thinking they will solve a living problem. In thinking of the drug problem, too many people put the cart before the horse and say drugs are used because of the living problem, such as being a member of some down-trodden minority group, domestic troubles, lack of parental understanding, a general feeling of inferiority, etc. when in actuality this is not so. The beginning of the use of drugs is simply being sold on the idea it is alright to use drugs to get high. To become totally addicted, one must actually be using drugs heavy, having become physically addicted and then turning to the drugs to solve a living problem he also becomes mentally addicted, thus making total addiction.

Now that we understand how the idea of using drugs is bought, what are we going to do about it? The first step in preventing drug abuse is to have the people themselves, now handling the drug abuse problem understand that the cause of drug abuse is the idea that it is alright to use drugs to get high; that it is spread by one doper selling his idea to others and being spread geometrically; that there are no "soft" or "hard" drugs—it is using any drug to get high that is causing the problem. Until they know this, they are in no position to handle the drug problem. The reason that the education on drugs has not been effective is that the individual drugs have been minutely explained together with the effects of each individual drug so people have become curious about the drugs and it starts them on the AIDA step or brings their attention to the use of drugs. However, in the education of drugs it must be spoken of generally and shown that the use of any drug to get high is detrimental to mental and physical health. The only way to stop the drug problem is to make it socially unacceptable to abuse drugs or be in the company of, or even associate with anyone who does. The only way to merchandise an idea is to be truthful about it. What we have to show is that the idea it is alright to use drugs to get high is a lie. It is a "con" game; it is propaganda. The simplest way to show this is real live pictures and examples of people that have followed the idea, what has become of them and how they have lost their way in life. What we need now is the greatest publicity campaign on the idea that it is not alright to use drugs to get high—it may kill you or you may lose your whole way of life.●

PITTSBURGH CHAMBER TESTIFIES AT HEARING

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

• Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, many States, including Pennsylvania, are now adopting State implementation plans (SIP) to comply with provisions of the Federal Clean Air Act. Allegheny County in Pennsylvania opened a series of hearings on the SIP last week.

Among the many witnesses testifying at the proceedings was the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, which has a great interest in the future of that city and the surrounding area. I believe my colleagues would be interested in the chamber's position on this matter as outlined by Mr. J. David Barnes, chairman of the board and president of Mellon Bank.

COMMENTS OF THE GREATER PITTSBURGH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON THE ALLEGHENY COUNTY SIP

Good morning, my name is J. David Barnes, Chairman of the Board of the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce and President of Mellon Bank. The Chamber has over 2,000 members in the Greater Pittsburgh area and is grateful to have this opportunity to appear today to present its comments on the proposed Allegheny County SIP revisions.

At the outset I would like to stress that The Chamber is dedicated through its Environmental Affairs Task Force to the objective of attaining clean air to the extent necessary to protect the public health of our community. At the same time, we believe it must be recognized that as important as this goal is in itself it must be tempered in order to obtain a balance with the other elements of community goals and objectives that will also improve the quality of life. These include the social, economic, and employment goals as well as other important aspects that insure a balanced community environment. We strongly believe that the SIP must contain realistically attainable environmental regulations and must avoid requirements that would lead to unnecessary limitations on job developments, employment disruptions, adverse economic consequences and other dislocations in our community.

Over the past several months, many segments of our community have been working together through the various technical and management SIP meetings to develop an appropriate SIP proposal. This represents a positive approach to a community-wide problem, as all parties have been working objectively to solve the remaining air quality problems by means which will not disrupt the fabric of our local economy and society. Certainly this approach to attainment of clean air is commendable and has great advantages over the purely political or philosophical approach of trying to legislate clean air in the absence of factual information.

Unfortunately, however, several of the original recommendations of the Allegheny County technical and management SIP committees are not included in the final draft of today's SIP proposal because of the outside interference of the state and federal governments. Specifically, Allegheny County's technical consultant, Engineering Science Incorporated, recommended the "bubble concept." This was approved by various Allegheny County technical and management committees. In fact, Allegheny County had drafted a proposal "bubble concept" regulation. Subsequently, however, Pennsylavania DER told Allegheny County that they would not approve a bubble concept at this time and that it must not be part of Allegheny County's SIP. This uncalled-for action is extremely unfortunate since the federal EPA has already sanctioned the "bubble concept" approach and, if omitted from our SIP, could cause Pennsylvania to be uncompetitive with other manufacturing states, thereby jeopardizing thousands of jobs in this region.

We believe that the bubble concept as originally recommended by Allegheny County's committee should be included in the SIP for Allegheny County. The use of the bubble concept allows the operator of a facility having several sources of emissions or potential emissions, to develop, in cooperation with the environmental agencies, a plan which would achieve the most cost-efficient level of control needed to attain clean air goals. The bubble concept can be developed in a manner which is effective, enforceable and consistent with the air quality improvement goals of the state as well as the EPA program. We strongly urge that the final draft of the Allegheny County SIP proposal being considered here today be revised to include opportunities to utilize alternative emission strategies within the bubble concept thereby allowing our emission sources the opportunity to utilize the advantages of this approach.

The second area where the original plan was overturned—this time by the federal EPA—and in which we have a grave concern, represents a more realistic approach to the provisions for "replacement and modernization of production facilities" under provisions for the definition of new sources and the conditions for permitting new sources. Without these provisions, Allegheny County's current industrial capacity and related jobs will be adversely affected. We believe that facilities which are constructed or rehabilitated expressly to replace or preserve older or outmoded facilities in the County should be constructed without added permit limitations as long as the source owner/operator can demonstrate that a net decrease in air emissions will occur. The presently proposed SIP contains provisions that are needlessly stringent, administratively difficult and not in harmony with the the balanced approach to improving air quality. One of these conditions requires that all sources that an individual owns in the state must be in compliance or on a compliance schedule.

On the surface, this does not seem to be controversial until one discovers that compliance is based on new interpretations of existing regulations—and these interpretations are constantly changing. Suddenly, technology that does not now exist could be required in order to obtain a new permit not only for new sources but also for all renewal, whether or not they are located in clean areas. As you can see, this provision could have a substantial impact on businesses within a community which may want to replace or rehabilitate obsolete equipment with new—but due to economic conditions are unable to do so since the cost of replacement or rehabilitation would have been vastly increased by the new permit conditions or because the source owner has other facilities in Pennsylvania (which, although located in clean areas, would themselves be subject also to the new technology requirements). We therefore strongly recommend—as Allegheny County originally intended and as supported, in our opinion by the very recent Federal court decision (*Alabama Power Co.* v. *Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 78-1006 (D.C. Circuit June 18, 1979)—that replacement sources which do not increase emissions should be exempted from all conditions of Federal EPA's offset policy.

Our third area of concern is in regard to the present monitoring network in Allegheny County. We are encouraged that the Air Pollution Bureau is re-examining some of the present air pollution monitoring sites. We would further encourage that this item be considered a top priority and a determination be made to see if the monitors are presenting a representative picture of air quality. We feel that it is unrealistic to locate monitors in areas that do not depict air quality in our communities and is not representative of the air that our citizens breathe.

These sites must conform with the rules and regulations governing monitor siting. They should inform our citizens of the general quality of air in Allegheny County. We believe that certain monitors are strongly influenced by heavy traffic in their vicinity or other localized factors, and therefore, in reality are representative of only a few areas instead of the populated areas of our community. We are not advocating that the monitors ignore pollution problems where they exist. However, we strongly believe that the present system is not properly developing data useful for a meaningful understanding of the County's air pollution problem nor does it provide input that depicts how air quality improvement might be better attained for our communities. We urge that an integrated monitoring and modeling effort should be established in the SIP.

Our fourth comment is in regard to non-traditional sources of pollution, such as construction sites, parking lots, roadways, etc. We believe that research may be necessary to identify and classify all of the sources within the non-traditional source category. Such a complete classification would assure that, first, these new control efforts are necessary; second, that the standards set are reasonable and attainable; and third, that the controls, if implemented, will in fact reduce pollution.

All too often our regulators place "the cart before the horse"; imposing regulations before the necessary research is completed. In many cases, the route the regulator chooses is neither cost-effective or more importantly, the regulation, when complied with, does not result in measureable improvement in the air quality or public health.

The final comment I would like to make centers on the fact that over the past 30 years the air quality in Allegheny County has been steadily improving. As demonstrated by the table, the number of air pollution episodes and episodes with alerts have dramatically decreased. An Air Pollution Episode is a period of time during which high air contaminant concentrations are or may be brought about by meteorological conditions which interfere with the natural dispersion of air contaminants. An Air Pollution Episode is defined to exist only when either a County-Wide or Localized Air Pollution Watch is in effect.

A County-Wide Air Pollution Watch is a period of time, defined solely on meteorological criteria, during which poor dispersion of air contaminants may occur throughout Allegheny County.

An Alert Stage is one of the three degrees of severity of air quality deterioration which can occur during a County-Wide Air Pollution Watch, and which require specific control measures. An Alert is not necessarily county-wide, but can occur only during a County-Wide Watch.

As displayed on the chart our County has experienced a marked reduction in the number of pollution episodes. In 1974 there were 26 episodes; in 1979 there were 9. This is a 65-percent reduction. In the category of episodes with alerts, in 1974 there were 11; in 1979 there were 3. This is a dramatic 73-percent reduction. The major factor behind this reduction is the tremendous effort, expenditures, and most importantly commitment to clean air that was and continues to be made by local business and industry.

In closing, I would like to stress that we all know that Allegheny County must submit a SIP which demonstrates attainment by December 31, 1982. If we fail to submit such a SIP, the consequences would be severe. First, the County will be subject to additional federal demands and controls, placing additional economic hardship on our businesses and industries; and second, the federal government could delay, or even, halt federal grants and fundings to our area. The latter consequence could literally stop all economic growth and development in our region.

In conclusion, let me re-emphasize that the Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce is supportive of the goal of attaining air quality that is adequate to protect public health. We are prepared to work with the County toward achieving this goal while continuing to maintain the essential balance of social, economic, employment, energy and the many other objectives that are also very important to the well-being of the citizens of our community. We urge that the several changes we have recommended be incorporated in the SIP before submittal for final approval.

On behalf of the many Greater Pittsburgh members I wish to thank you for this opportunity to present these comments to you today.●

WHO WILL HAVE THE LAST LAUGH?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 31, 1980

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the disarray of the Carter administration in both foreign and domestic policy has become an open scandal. It reminds me of an army beaten and driven from the field of combat, totally unable to regroup and take a stand. Things are so bad that Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany is said to have remarked recently: "We don't trust you any more. Your policies are too inconsistent, your actions too indecisive."

If this were all we had to contend with, we might count ourselves fortunate. But it would seem that the Governments of the Persian Gulf region are taking lightly the threat of a Soviet invasion. Confident to the point of arrogance in their ability to destroy the oil fields and sabotage the pipelines if the Soviets attack, the Persian Gulf Governments are almost begging to be the victims of a quick strike. Do these Mideast leaders really believe that the Soviet Union would stand idly by and allow them to blow up oil fields? They do not know that the Soviet Union no doubt has its agents in every oil field in the area, ready and able to stop any attempt to sabotage? And any widescale attempts at sabotage will be met by the Soviet Union with massive and bloody reprisals, even by the standards of this bloody region. And yet the Persian Gulf leaders chuckle with bemused contempt when they listen to warnings of a Soviet takeover. Do they really believe the Communists will send them a telegram announcing a desire to take over the oil fields? Do they really believe the threat will come totally from outside the area and not partially from the region itself?

At this point I insert in the RECORD, "A U.S. Foreign Policy in Disarray," from the New York Times, March 21, 1980, and "Persian Gulf Nations Call Soviet Threat a Joke * * *" and "* * * While Moscow Prepares To Have the Last Laugh," both from the Chicago Tribune, March 1980:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1980]

A U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN DEEP DISARRAY

(By Richard Burt)

WASHINGTON, March 20.—A few days before Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's recent visit with President Carter, a ranking representative of the Bonn Government sat in the White House and listened to an American official complain about West Germany's reaction to the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan.

Asked why Bonn was so reluctant to follow Washington's lead in imposing economic and political sanctions against Moscow, the West German envoy is said to have replied: "We don't trust you any more. Your policies are too inconsistent, your actions too indecisive."

The comment highlighted a concern shared by a growing number of American foreign-policy officials. After a series of setbacks and surprises, including the Administration's repudiation two weeks ago of its vote against Israel at the United Nations, foreign-affairs specialists in and out of government are questioning whether the United States can chart a long-term course in foreign policy and stick to it.

A POSITIVE DEVELOPMENT

For the moment the Administration has been strengthened by the announcement yesterday that President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt and Prime Minister Menachem Begin of Israel would visit Washington next month in an effort to make a progress on the issue of Palestinian antonomy. Nonetheless, a member of the White House staff said, the Administration has "a long way to go in reversing the impression that we don't know what we are doing."

Several officials, while acknowledging that Administration policy has often appeared uncertain, maintained in interviews that the United States was in a particularly complex era in international affairs. The combination of Soviet activism with rapid change in the third world, they said, has made it difficult if not impossible for Washington to adhere to a consistent line in dealing with Moscow or with such volatile regions as the Middle East.

SELF-IMPOSED HANDICAPS

At the same time many officials said that American policy suffered from a variety of self-imposed handicaps, among them these:

Failing to reconcile conflicting views in making policy. Some of the officials said that contrary to protestations in the Administration, its dealing with the Soviet Union continued to be torn between the approach favored by Zbigniew Brzezinski, Mr. Carter's national security adviser, and that advocated by senior State Department officials. While Mr. Brzezinski and the State Department are said to have agreed that Moscow's move into Afghanistan required a firm response, the officials reported that in recent days there were sharp differences over whether new restrictions on trade and the export of advanced technology to the Soviet Union should become permanent elements of American policy, as they now have with regard to technology.

Staking out positions that must be scrapped. After declaring that the presence of Soviet combat troops in Cuba was "unacceptable" last September, Mr. Carter was forced to back away when it became clear that Moscow would not remove them. Recently, the Administration was embarassed when it assigned high priority to reviving security links with Pakistan, only to have the Government there turn down an offer of $200 million in military aid.

Sending confusing signals about policy. Moscow's intervention in Afghanistan was decribed by Mr. Carter several weeks ago as causing the "most serious crisis since World War II." Then he surprised visitors and officials alike this month when he declared at a White House banquet for Chancellor Schmidt that the action had created a "potential crisis." Similarly, in the early weeks of the crisis in Iran, the Administration seemed to reverse its position several times on whether to threaten military force to retalitate for the seizure of the American Embassy and its staff. Later Mr. Carter agreed to the dispatch of an international commission to investigate the situation after saying repeatedly that the hostages must be freed before he would endorse such a move.

Catching foreign governments off guard with unexpected initiatives. In 1978 Mr. Carter set off a furor in the Western alliance when, with almost no warning, he decided against production of the neutron bomb. Officials said that the Administration's decision in January to boycott the Olympic Games in Moscow and to ask other countries to do the same also came as a surprise to allied governments.

CENTRAL CAMPAIGN ISSUE

The coherence and consistency of the Administration's record abroad have emerged as a central issue in the Presidential campaign, with Senator Edward M. Kennedy asserting last month that the Soviet Union's decision to move into Afghanistan might have been prompted in part by Mr. Carter's uncertain handling of the dispute over its troops in Cuba.

On the Republican side, both Ronald Reagan, the front-runner for the nomination, and George Bush have criticized the vote against Israel in the United Nations Security Council and other moves, particularly the decision against starting production of the neutron bomb. In conversations with reporters, Henry A. Kissinger, the former Secretary of State, who called recently for a new bipartisan consensus of foreign affairs, was unusually blunt in his criticism of the Administration, saying that an increasing number of foreign leaders no longer felt that they could do business with Washington.

A number of officials maintained that a basic problem underlay the diversity of difficulties besetting American policy: the apparent inability of Mr. Carter and his senior advisers to establish an effective system for making important decisions and carrying them out. "Our failure to make clear and consistent policy is the biggest problem we face," said a ranking State Department official.

Other officials said the United Nations episode demonstrated that it was time for a shake-up in the foreign-policy area along the lines of the changes made last summer among domestic advisers. On the other hand, officials in both the State Department and the White House said that the Administration's problems were so deep-seated that the blame could not be put on individuals.

In analyzing the basic problem, the officials attribute largely to Mr. Carter's early decision to establish an open and decentralized system of decision-making. Rejecting what he termed the Lone Ranger style of diplomacy associated with Mr. Kissinger's period in government, Mr. Carter, when he entered the White House in 1977, created a so-called collegial policy process that enabled several senior officials to mold important decisions.

As a result neither Mr. Vance nor Mr. Brzezinski has been able to gain the upper hand in policy debates and both have been forced at times to defer to the views of other senior people, including Vice President Mondale, Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and Hamilton Jordan, Jody Powell and Robert S. Strauss of the White House staff.

More recently Lloyd N. Cutler, the White House counsel, and Hedley Donovan, Mr. Carter's adviser on domestic and international matters, have been involved in major debates.

WIDE RANGE OF VIEWS AVAILABLE

White House officials stressed that the open style of decision-making had succeeded in exposing Mr. Carter to a wide range of views. However, some said the system suffered from important drawbacks.

In some cases, such as charting policy toward the Soviet Union, they said, the Administration has been caught in what one of them termed the bureaucratic crossfire between the firmer line promoted by Mr. Brzezinski and the more conciliatory stance sought by such aides as Mr. Cutler and Mr. Vance's expert on Soviet affairs, Marshall D. Shulman.

In other cases, such as Mr. Carter's unexpected action on the neutron bomb, Mr. Vance and Mr. Brzezinski are said to have adopted similar views, but the President relied on advice from other quarters. While Mr. Vance and Mr. Brzezinski are said to have favored the bomb, Mr. Carter is said to have listened to Andrew Young, then United States representative at the United Nations, in deciding not to proceed.

The problem of coordinating disparate views has been intensified by the reliance placed on informal sessions, such as Presidential breakfasts with senior officials, for making important decisions. In particular, there are complaints that decisions reached at the President's regular Friday breakfast with senior foreign-policy officials were sometimes ambiguous and were imperfectly communicated to the rest of the Government.

WARNING APPARENTLY IGNORED

The officials said that in a report six months ago Philip Odeen, a management consultant and a former aide to Mr. Kissinger, warned Mr. Carter that decisions taken at the breakfasts "are not systematically translated into action." The officials said that the advice was ignored.

Other officials said that the United Nations episode underscored another serious problem: the intrusion of domestic political considerations into the international arena. Arguing that the disavowal of the vote was much more embarrassing than the communications mix-up that led to it, a ranking State Department official criticized Mr. Strauss, Mr. Carter's campaign chairman, and other political advisers for intervening and persuading Mr. Carter to repudiate the action.

"Sure the vote was bound to antagonize the Israelis and thus cost the White House some Jewish votes in Florida and New York," the official said. "But to create the impression that our foreign policy is a hostage to Presidential campaign politics undermines our effectiveness all over the world."

At the White House few officials disagreed with this assessment, but they said that the problem was hardly unique. They noted, for example, that Mr. Reagan's drive for the Republican nomination in 1976 led President Gerald R. Ford to shelve efforts to complete a strategic arms treaty with the Russians when the negotiators were close to agreement.

Although Government officials as well as critics of the Administration see little chance of insulating foreign policy from domestic politics, a debate is under way on how Mr. Carter's approach to making vital decisions could be changed. Writing in the current issue of the magazine Foreign Policy, I. M. Destler, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment in Washington, suggests that there would be less disarray if the President's national security adviser spent less time trying to influence decisions and more time serving as a neutral manager of the policy-making process.

Mr. Destler says that rather than serving as "low-profile, inside operators," national security advisers such as Mr. Brzezinski and Mr. Kissinger before him "have become highly visible policy advocates, identified with particular viewpoints and involved in specific negotiations." He adds that "for the sake of clarity, consistency and responsibility, the President's most important foreign policy counselor must be, clearly and visibly, his Secretary of State."

—

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 19, 1980]

PERSIAN GULF NATIONS CALL SOVIET THREAT A JOKE * * *

AL-AHMADI, KUWAIT.—The threat of a Soviet invasion of gulf oil fields may seem real to American military strategists, but to oil men in the region, it is a joke.

"No way," said Sulaiman Mutawa, a director of the Kuwait Oil Co. (LOC). "It simply can't be done. I don't know who dreams up such problems."

Oil industry experts from Kuwait to Abu Dhabi are convinced the idea of a Soviet blitzkrieg to seize, pump, and use the crude oil of a gulf producer is straight out of James Bond spy novels.

No one disputes that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan brings the Russians uncomfortably close to the source of 60 per cent of the West's oil imports. Few deny that the Russians will have to import oil themselves by the end of the decade if not sooner.

But no one expects them to come over the dunes to get it.

"Trying to take over the oilfields by force," said an American oil executive in Abu Dhabi, "is like trying to grab a very fragile vase with red hot tongs. The second you touch it, it shatters.

"Same with the oil fields. The second you try to grab them, they will be destroyed. All you will be left with is blowing sand.

"Let me tell you—taking over an oil field is not just pushing a few buttons," said Mutawa in his office at the headquarters of the KOC in Al-Ahmadi.

Nothing could be more vulnerable to sabotage than the fragile, widely spread, highly pressurized installations that make up an oil field. In a Russian grab there would be no shortage of homegrown saboteurs in this fiercely anti-communist region.

Oil production could be choked off at any of dozens of points in the network. First at individual wells—Kuwait has 700, Saudi Arabia 800. Then at pipelines from each producing well to gathering centers. Then in the centers which separate gas and crude oil, which surface together. Then at larger pipelines which carry crude to row on row of "tank farms" near coastal shipping terminals.

"As soon as these people get wind of an invasion, and presumably they would have some warning time, the first thing they will do is blow up the gathering centers, all of which have police guards," said the American oilman, for 10 years an adviser in the United Arab Emirates.

"It would not take a genius to blow one up. They are rather combustible with all that pressurized gas and crude oil."

If gas separators in the gathering stations are "disturbed," wells are immediately closed and all production halted. Destroying the gathering station power plants would cut off electricity to pump oil, push it through pipelines, or perform other processes like gas or water injection.

Rebuilding a blasted gathering station would be a major enterprise, requiring some of the most sophisticated oil industry technology.

Under the best conditions, industry sources estimate, this would take the Russians two years. All new equipment—pumps, turbines, separators—would have to be produced and flown from the Soviet Union, which cannot satisfy its own oil industry needs. Last year it had to go to the West for relatively simple items like drill bits and pipe which were in short supply.

Even it if could be rebuilt, the cost would be enormous. A U.S. congressional study estimated repairing the gathering center at Abqaiq, Saudi Arabia, destroyed by accident in May, 1977, to cost $100 million.

Even if the Soviets could make the fields operational again, how could they be kept in operation?

"There are miles and miles of pipeline running across the open desert," said the American oilman. "It is the easiest thing in the world to rip a hole through some pipe with an explosive charge.

"Do you patrol the pipes? Rubbish Saboteurs would be constantly nipping in as soon as your patrol went by. The only way to safeguard the pipes would be to have men stationed along them every few hundred yards."

Saudi Arabia alone has more than 3,000 miles of pipe connecting its wells. A fence to protect its five principal fields would enclose 10,000 square miles—twice the size of Connecticut.

Probably the biggest headache would be finding skilled personnel to keep the fields running.

"We have 5,000 highly trained people here working on a 24-hour-a-day rotation," said Mutawa about Kuwait. "They would not be too cooperative to a foreign occupier."

If the Russians could solve all these problems, how would they get the oil back home to use it? This problem really draws smiles from oilmen.

Unless the Soviets built a pipeline across Iraq or Iran—which would take years, assuming they could manufacture enough pipe—they would have to ship the oil out in tankers.

Not only is the Soviet tanker fleet wholly inadequate for such a task, it would be exposed to all manner of harassments, blockades, and mining operations.

"We are not afraid of any action by Russia," Kuwait's foreign minister, Shaikh Sabar Al-Ahmad Al-Saban told UPI.

"This is something we are 100 per cent sure about. Not only Kuwait, but all the gulf. You have to know that: 100 per cent."

* * * WHILE MOSCOW PREPARES TO HAVE THE LAST LAUGH

NEW YORK.—While American attention has focused on the Soviet forces in Afghanistan and the U.S. naval response in the Indian Ocean, Israeli and Western military planners have been watching with growing concern the establishment by the Soviet Union of what they term an outer circle of danger.

They refer to the thousands of unmanned tanks and hundreds of cocooned or crated aircraft sent to Libya by the Russians, the steady introduction of the most advanced Soviet weapons to Syria, and the methodical buildup of Soviet, East German, and Cuban strength in weapons, communications systems, and advisers in Southern Yemen and Ethiopia.

Military men such as Ariel Sharon, the Israeli minister of agriculture and a seasoned general, believe that whatever the Soviet Union's preoccupations in Afghanistan, it intends to "go for the oil in the Persian Gulf."

One analyst said that the Soviet Union had been positioning weapons and equipment in the Middle East for six years. The United States Defense Department has begun to arrange for its own prepositioning of military supplies aboard ships close to the Persian Gulf so they could be used by marines flown from the U.S. in the event of a crisis.

Military analysts in Israel, Europe, and the U.S. maintain that the most likely users of the idle weapons in Libya are the Russians themselves.

Libya has 2,000 Soviet medium tanks, the 10th largest tank force in the world. The Libyan army deploys a tank brigade with a strength of just under 100 tanks. The air force, with 200 combat planes, relies for crew on Soviet, North Korean, Palestinian, and Pakistani airmen.

According to U.S. officials, there are at least 300 more aircraft in Libya, including sophisticated MiG-25 interceptors. Some have been assembled, but others are still in crates; all are serviced and guarded by Soviet personnel.

Col. Muammar Khadafy, the Libyan leader, has said that the arms have been assembled so that his country can serve as "the arsenal of Islam" in a new war with Israel.

Sharon also reported that the Soviet Union was expanding the Libyan military support system. According to his information, the port of Bardia, on the coast northeast of Benghazi, is being deepened and the shore installations are being expanded.

With regard to the other military concentrations cited by the Israeli minister, U.S. and British intelligence sources have reported steady increases in the numbers of Soviet, East German, and Cuban military personnel serving in Southern Yemen and Ethiopia as instructors, as commanders of special units in the armed forces, as pilots, and as supervisors of military construction.

Reviewing the extent of the dangers around the outer circle, Sharon sees little in present U.S. military preparations that provides a credible answer to future Soviet moves, nor was he impressed by the measures taken thus far.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

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

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

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

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 1, 1980, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 2

8:00 a.m.

Appropriations

*Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Agriculture.

1223 Dirksen Building

Armed Services

Research and Development Subcommittee

To continue closed hearings on S. 2294, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for military procurement programs of the Department of Defense.

224 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.

Finance

Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to extend the temporary limit on the public debt.

S-207, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2383, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for housing, community development programs, and the urban development action grant of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1393, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 for programs under the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act.

6226 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2458, to extend the President's reorganization authority through April 6, 1981.

Room to be announced

Judiciary

To resume hearings on S. 2377, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for programs administered by the Department of Justice.

2228 Dirksen Building

*Veterans Affairs

Business meeting, to consider S. 1188, to revise the vocational rehabilitation program administered by the Veterans' Administration.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for energy and water development programs.

1114 Dirksen Building

*Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Commission on Air Quality, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and U.S. Army cemeterial expenses.

1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Office of Territorial Affairs.

1224 Dirksen Building

Armed Services

Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 2294, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for military procurement of the DOD, receiving testimony on active duty, reserve, and civilian manpower programs, and on the manpower requirements for mobilization.

212 Russell Building

Budget

To continue consideration of the first concurrent budget resolution setting forth recommended levels of total budget outlays, Federal revenues, and new budget authority.

6202 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for hazardous materials programs of the Department of Transportation.

235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the protocol to the Multilateral Trade Negotiations customs valuation agreement.

2221 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider pending legislation and nominations.

4221 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor Subcommittee

Business meeting, to markup S. 2337, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1983 for the Legal Services Corporation.

4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence

To continue hearings on S. 2284, proposed legislative charter governing the intelligence activities of the United States.

5110 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorizations Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

Select on Small Business
To resume hearings on Title I, Research and Development Contracts, of S. 1860, proposed Small Business Innovation Act.
424 Russell Building

1:00 p.m.
Office of Technology Assessment
The Board to hold a joint meeting with the Technology Assessment Advisory Council on pending business items.
EF-100, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the defense establishment.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for energy and water development programs.
114 Dirksen Building

*Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Aviation Administration.
1318 Dirksen Building

Armed Services
Procurement Policy and Reprogramming Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1687, to eliminate certain limitations imposed on excess profits from contracts with the Department of Defense for the construction of aircraft or naval vessels, S. 2232, to exempt those contracts of $1 million or less from accounting requirements with the Department of Defense for the construction of aircraft or naval vessels, and S. 2331, to eliminate certain limitations imposed on excess profits arising from any contract with any military department for construction or manufacture of certain aircraft, or any contract with the Secretary of the Navy for construction or manufacture of certain naval vessels.
212 Russell Building

Select on Intelligence
Budget Authorizations Subcommittee
To begin closed markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for intelligence activities of the U.S.
S-407, Capital

2:30 p.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of the Occupational Safety and Health program.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 3

8:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Research and Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 2294, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for military procurement programs of the Department of Defense, receiving testimony on civil defense.
224 Russell Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed revisions to S. 2240, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for NASA.
5110 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Select on Small Business
To hold oversight hearings on a S.B.A. report on retail auto dealers and current economic impact on them.
424 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Agriculture.
1114 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 1010, proposing a twelve-month commission to study the international applications of U.S. antitrust laws as they related to the effects on U.S. antitrust policy on international commerce.
3302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Civil Service and General Services Subcommittee
To resume joint hearings with the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Human Resources on proposed legislation to curb the Federal Government's use of consultants.
357 Russell Building

Judiciary
To continue hearings on S. 2377, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for programs administered by the Department of Justice.
2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1858, to acknowledge National Guard members as Federal Government employees and grant them rights enjoyed by all Federal employees; and on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.
457 Russell Building.

*Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 500, proposed Consumer-Patient Radiation Health and Safety Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the National Institute of Building Sciences.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for certain programs of the Department of Energy.
1224 Dirksen Building

Armed Services
Research and Development Subcommittee
To continue closed hearings on S. 2294, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for military procurement programs of the Department of Defense, receiving testimony on Navy research and development programs.
224 Russell Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Economic Stabilization Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the economic impact of foreign auto imports.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for ocean pollution research and monitoring programs.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the climatic effects of carbon dioxide buildup in the atmosphere.
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the defense establishment.
S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Highway Administration, and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
1223 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on S. 2141, to establish priorities in the payment of claims against the People's Republic of China.
4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nominations of Odell Horton, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee; John T. Nixon, to be U.S. District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee; and Norma H. Johnson, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Columbia.
2228 Dirksen Building

Select on Small Business
To hold hearings to review food marketing proposals and their relationship to antitrust laws and small business.
457 Russell Building

3:00 p.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 864, including amendment No. 1674, and S. 2379, bills to facilitate the formation of U.S. export trading companies to expand export participation by smaller U.S. companies.
5302 Dirksen Building

APRIL 4

10:00 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment-unemployment figures for March.
2222 Rayburn Building

APRIL 15

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 2153, 1486, and 1572, bills to provide an exemption from OSHA regulation for certain workplaces with good safety and health records.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Inspector for Alaska pipeline,

and the Energy Information Administration of the Department of Energy.
1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of the Treasury.
1318 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
*International Finance and Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2097, proposed Joint Export Marketing Assistance Act, and on the substance of S. 2040, proposed Small Business Export Expansion Act and S. 2104, proposed Small Business Export Development Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

*Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1981 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee receiving testimony from officials of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and for the Office of Hearings and Appeals.
6226 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1455, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue coal leases on other Federal lands in the State of New Mexico to the owner of a specified coal lease upon surrender of such lease; and S. 1529, a private relief bill.
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:30 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the Maritime Boundary Settlement Treaty with Canada (Exec. U, 96th Cong., 1st sess.), and the Agreement on East Coast Fishery Resources with Canada (Exec. V, 96th Cong., 1st sess.).
4221 Dirksen Building

APRIL 16

9:00 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on the recruitment and retention of qualified health-care professionals to staff the Veterans' Administration's health-care facilities.
412 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings on S. 2153, 1486, and 1572, bills to provide an exemption from OSHA regulation for certain workplaces with good safety and health records.
4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1424, proposed International Health Act.
6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Gallery of Art, and the Commission of Fine Arts.
1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of the Treasury.
1318 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1981 for the international affairs programs of the Department of the Treasury S. 2271, to increase the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, and S. 1963, to control Government purchases and sales of gold.
5302 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2193, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for the United States Railway Association.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the role and accountability of the National Security Advisor.
4221 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 2377, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for programs administered by the Department of Justice.
357 Russell Building

Select on Intelligence
To begin closed markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1391, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 for the National Climate Program.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearing on S. 2153, 1486, and 1572, bills to provide an exemption from OSHA regulation for certain workplaces with good safety and health records.
4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the development of children who benefit from adoption by facilitating their placement in adoptive homes.
457 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of the Treasury.
1114 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Parks, Recreation and Renewable Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1842, proposed National Heritage Policy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
To continue hearings on the role and accountability of the National Security Advisor.
4221 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on H.R. 2102, to modify the law regulating the devise or descent of interests in trust or restricted property on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in North and South Dakota.
357 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of the Treasury.
S-146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To resume hearings on the Maritime Boundary Settlement Treaty with Canada (Exec. U, 96th Cong., 1st sess.), and the Agreement on East Coast Fishery Resources with Canada (Exec. V, 96th Cong., 1st sess.).
4221 Dirksen Building

APRIL 18

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1223 Dirksen Building

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 2377, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for programs administered by the Department of Justice.
2228 Dirksen Building
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.
1202 Dirksen Building
2:00 p.m.
Finance
Social Security Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 5295, S. 248, 1287, 1418, 1498, 1554, 2034, 2083, and 2208, bills to correct certain problems with the social security earnings limitation as a result of the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216), eliminating the monthly earnings test.
2221 Dirksen Building

APRIL 22

9:30 a.m.
*Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings to assess the political, military, economic, and social factors affecting world oil production and consumption over the next decade.
3110 Dirksen Building
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy
1223 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of the Treasury, and on the U.S. Postal Service.
1318 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1865, proposed Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.
4232 Dirksen Building
Select on Indian Affairs
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.
5110 Dirksen Building
2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of DOD
1224 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of the Treasury.
S-146, Capitol

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine the need for a central data monitoring service in V.A. hospitals for veterans with surgically implanted pacemakers.
412 Russell Building
10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Endowment for the Arts.
1223 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Executive Office of the President.
1318 Dirksen Building
*Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 2489 authorizing funds for fiscal years 1981 and 1982 for the U.S. Coast Guard.
235 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2470, proposed Powerplant Fuels Conservation Act.
3110 Dirksen Building
Rules and Administration
To receive testimony on Senate Resolution 207, to create a Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control; and to consider other legislative and administrative business.
301 Russell Building
2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 24

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
1318 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Bureau of Land Management.
1223 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Executive Office of the President.
1114 Dirksen Building
2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
1318 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 2470, proposed Powerplant Fuels Conservation Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

APRIL 28

9:30 a.m.
*Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 2377, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for programs administered by the Department of Justice.
228 Dirksen Building
10:00 a.m.
*Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation Subcommittee
To review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1981 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the Economic Regulatory Administration, the Energy Information Administration, and the Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Solar Applications, all of the DOE.
3110 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal years 1981 for the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.
1224 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Office of Personnel Management, Merit Systems Protection Board, Federal Labor Relations Authority, U.S. Tax Court, and President's Commission on Pension Policy.
1318 Dirksen Building
2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1223 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the potential for improved automobile fuel economy between 1985 and 1995.
3110 Dirksen Building
Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation on the recruitment and retention of qualified health-care professionals to staff the Veterans' Administration health-care facilities, S. 759, to provide for the right of the United States to recover their costs of hospital, nursing home, or outpatient medical care furnished by the Veterans'

Administration to veterans for non-service-connected disabilities to the extent that they have health insurance or similar contracts, and S. 1523 and H.R. 4015, proposed Veterans Senior Citizen Health Care Act.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for conservation programs of the Department of Energy.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Elections Commission, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, Committee for Purchase From the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped and the Administrative Conference of the United States.
1318 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on Federal agencies spending practices that occur just prior to the end of the fiscal year—"hurry-up spending problem"—focusing on administrative and legislative proposals to remedy this situation.
3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1223 Dirksen Building

MAY 1

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Land and Water Conservation Fund of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the General Services Administration.
1114 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on Federal agencies spending practices that occur just prior to the end of the fiscal year—"hurry-up spending problem"—focusing on administrative and legislative proposals to remedy this situation.
3302 Dirksen Building

*Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 2377, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for programs administered by the Department of Justice.
2228 Dirksen Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on issues Congress might consider which would affect youth in the coming decade.
6226 Dirksen Building

MAY 2

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 6

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Agriculture.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Military Construction Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for military construction of the DOD.
1223 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the U.S. Geological Survey.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 13

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Park Service.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 14

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of the Interior.
1223 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 15

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 16

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies.
1318 Dirksen Building

MAY 21

9:00 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To resume hearings on the Federal Government's efforts to assist Vietnam-era veterans in readjusting to society, and the use of excepted appointments for disabled veterans.
412 Russell Building

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine issues affecting infant mortality, and preventable birth defects.
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 29

9:30 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to establish a cost-of-living increase for service-connected disability compensation.
412 Russell Building

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Inspector General of the Veterans' Administration.
412 Russell Building

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 2

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Transportation
S-126, Capitol

*Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on title II, proposed Youth Education and Training Act, of S. 2385, proposed Youth Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 3

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To continue hearings on title II, proposed Youth Education and Training Act, of S. 2385, proposed Youth Act.
4232 Dirksen Building