

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FAREWELL ADDRESS OF THE
PRESIDENT

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, President Jimmy Carter delivered his farewell address on January 14, 1981, which was televised across the Nation. He spoke on several topics that should be remembered in the years ahead. I offer a copy of his address so that it may be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FAREWELL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

Good Evening. In a few days I will lay down my official responsibilities in this office, to take up once more the only title in our democracy superior to that of President, the title of citizen.

Of Vice President Mondale, my Cabinet, and the hundreds of others who have served with me during the last four years, I wish to say now publicly what I have said in private: I thank them for the dedication and competence they have brought to the service of our country.

But I owe my deepest thanks to you, to the American people, because you gave me this extraordinary opportunity to serve. We've faced great challenges together, and we know that future problems will also be difficult, but I am now more convinced than ever that the United States, better than any other country, can meet successfully whatever the future might bring.

These last four years have made me more certain than ever of the inner strength of our country, the unchanging value of our principles and ideals, the stability of our political system, the ingenuity and the decency of our people.

Tonight I would like first to say a few words about this most special office, the Presidency of the United States. This is at once the most powerful office in the world and among the most severely constrained by law and custom. The President is given a broad responsibility to lead but cannot do so without the support and consent of the people, expressed formally through the Congress and informally in many ways through a whole range of public and private institutions. This is as it should be.

Within our system of government every American has a right and a duty to help shape the future course of the United States. Thoughtful criticism and close scrutiny of all government officials by the press and the public are an important part of our democratic society. Now, as in the past, only the understanding and involvement of the people through full and open debate can help to avoid serious mistakes and assure the continued dignity and safety of the nation.

Today we are asking our political system to do things of which the founding fathers never dreamed. The government they designed for a few hundred thousand people now serves a nation of almost 230 million

people. Their small coastal republic now spans beyond a continent, and we also now have the responsibility to help lead much of the world through difficult times to a secure and prosperous future.

Today, as people have become ever more doubtful of the ability of the government to deal with our problems, we are increasingly drawn to single-issue groups and special interest organizations to ensure that whatever else happens our own personal views and our own private interests are protected. This is a disturbing factor in American political life. It tends to distort our purposes because the national interest is not always the sum of all our single or special interests. We are all Americans together—and we must not forget that the common good is our common interest and our individual responsibility.

Because of the fragmented pressures of these special interests, it's very important that the office of the President be a strong one and that its constitutional authority be preserved. The President is the only elected official charged with the primary responsibility of representing all the people. In the moments of decision, after the different and conflicting views have all been aired, it's the President who then must speak to the nation and for the nation.

I understand after four years in this office, as few others can, how formidable is the task the new President-elect is about to undertake, and to the very limits of conscience and conviction, I pledge to support him in that task. I wish him success, and Godspeed.

I know from experience that Presidents have to face major issues that are controversial, broad in scope, and which do not arouse the natural support of a political majority.

For a few minutes now, I want to lay aside my role as leader of one nation, and speak to you as a fellow citizen of the world about three issues, three difficult issues: The threat of nuclear destruction; our stewardship of the physical resources of our planet; and the pre-eminence of the basic rights of human beings.

It's now been 35 years since the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima. The great majority of the world's people cannot remember a time when the nuclear shadow did not hang over the earth. Our minds have adjusted to it, as after a time our eyes adjust to the dark.

Yet the risk of nuclear conflagration has not lessened. It has not happened yet, thank God, but that can give us little comfort—for it only has to happen once.

The danger is becoming greater. As the arsenals of the superpowers grow in size and sophistication and as other governments, perhaps even more in the future dozens of governments, acquire these weapons, it may only be a matter of time before madness, desperation, greed, or miscalculation lets loose this terrible force.

In an all-out nuclear war, more destructive power than in all of World War II would be unleashed every second during the long afternoon it would take for all the bombs and missiles to fall. A World War II every second—more people killed in the first few hours than in all the wars of history to-

gether. The survivors, if any, would live in despair amid the poisoned ruins of a civilization that had committed suicide.

National weakness, real or perceived, can tempt aggression and thus cause war. That's why the United States can never neglect its military strength. We must and we will remain strong. But with equal determination, the United States and all countries must find ways to control and to reduce the horrifying danger that is posed by the enormous world stockpiles of nuclear arms.

This has been a concern of every American president since the moment we first saw what these weapons could do. Our leaders will require our understanding and our support as they grapple with this difficult but crucial challenge. There is no disagreement on the goals or the basic approach to controlling this enormous force. The answer lies not just in the attitudes or the actions of world leaders, but in the concern and the demands of all of us as we continue our struggle to preserve the peace.

Nuclear weapons are an expression of one side of our human character. But there is another side. The same rocket technology that delivers nuclear warheads has also taken us peacefully into space. From that perspective, we see our earth as it really is—a small, fragile and beautiful blue globe, the only home we have. We see no barriers of race or religion or country. We see the essential unity of our species and our planet. And with faith and common sense, that bright vision will ultimately prevail.

Another major challenge, therefore, is to protect the quality of this world within which we live. The shadows that fall across the future are cast not only by the kinds of weapons we have built, but by the kind of world we will either nourish or neglect. There are real and growing dangers to our simple and most precious possessions: The air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land which sustains us. The rapid depletion of irreplaceable minerals, the erosion of topsoil, the destruction of beauty, the blight of pollution, the demands of increasing billions of people, all combine to create problems which are easy to observe and predict, but difficult to resolve. If we do not act, the world of the year 2000 will be much less able to sustain life than it is now.

But there is no reason for despair. Acknowledging the physical realities of our planet does not mean a dismal future of endless sacrifice. In fact, acknowledging these realities is the first step in dealing with them. We can meet the resource problems of the world—water, food, minerals, farmlands, forests, over-population, pollution, if we tackle them with courage and foresight.

I've just been talking about forces of potential destruction that mankind has developed and how we might control them. It's equally important that we remember the beneficial forces that we have evolved over the ages, and how to hold fast to them. One of those constructive forces is the enhancement of individual human freedoms through the strengthening of democracy and the fight against deprivation, torture, terrorism, and the persecution of people through the world. The struggle for human

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

rights overrides all differences of color, or nation, or language. Those who hunger for freedom, who thirst for human dignity, and who suffer for the sake of justice, they are the patriots of this cause.

I believe with all my heart that America must always stand for these basic human rights at home and abroad. That is both our history and our destiny.

America did not invent human rights. In a very real sense, it's the other way around. Human rights invented America. Ours was the first nation in the history of the world to be founded explicitly on such an idea. Our social and political progress has been based on one fundamental principle, the value and importance of the individual. The fundamental force that unites us is not kinship or place of origin or religious preference. The love of liberty is the common blood that flows in our American veins.

The battle for human rights, at home and abroad, is far from over. We should never be surprised nor discouraged because the impact of our efforts has had and will always have varied results. Rather, we should take pride that the ideals which gave birth to our nation still inspire the hopes of oppressed people around the world. We have no cause for self-righteousness for complacency, but we have every reason to persevere, both within our own country and beyond our borders.

If we are to serve as a beacon for human rights, we must continue to perfect here at home the rights and the values which we espouse around the world: A decent education for our children, adequate medical care for all Americans, an end to discrimination against minorities and women, a job for all those able to work, and freedom from injustice and religious intolerance.

We live in a time of transition, an uneasy era which is likely to endure for the rest of this century. It will be a period of tensions, both within nations and between nations, of competition for scarce resources, of social, political, and economic stresses and strains. During this period we may be tempted to abandon some of the time-honored principles and commitments, which have been proven during the difficult times of past generations.

We must never yield to this temptation. Our American values are not luxuries, but necessities—not the salt in our bread but the bread itself. Our common vision of a free and just society is our greatest source of cohesion at home and strength abroad—greater even than the bounty of our material blessings.

Remember these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

This vision still grips the imagination of the world. But we know that democracy is always an unfinished creation. Each generation must renew its foundations. Each generation must discover the meaning of this hallowed vision in the light of its own modern challenges. For this generation, ours, life is nuclear survival; liberty is human rights; the pursuit of happiness is a planet whose resources are devoted to the physical and spiritual nourishment of its inhabitants.

During the next few days I will work hard to make sure that the transition from myself to the next President is a good one, that the American people are served well. And I will continue as I have the last 14

months to work hard and to pray for the lives and the well-being of the American hostages held in Iran. I can't predict yet what will happen, but I hope you will join me in my constant prayer for their freedom.

As I return home to the South where I was born and raised, I look forward to the opportunity to reflect and further to assess, I hope with accuracy, the circumstances of our times. I intend to give our new President my support, and I intend to work as a citizen, as I have worked here in this office as President, for the values this nation was founded to secure.

Again, from the bottom of my heart, I want to express to you the gratitude I feel. Thank you, fellow citizens, and farewell. ●

PUNXSUTAWNEY PHIL PREDICTS MORE WINTER WEATHER

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to notify the Congress of the United States that my most famous constituent, Punxsutawney Phil, today made his annual weather prediction. It is now certain that we will have 6 more weeks of winter, although it will be mild and bearable.

Last week, knowing Groundhog Day was coming, I spoke with Dr. Richard Hallgren, Director of the National Weather Service, to caution him against any forecast before today. He admitted that the Government's weather agency faced a major problem. Dr. Hallgren told me:

Eleven months out of the year, when the Weather Service makes its monthly forecast, we feel very confident, but in one month we know we can be upstaged just a few days after our prediction. We have a problem with the February forecast because we know that Punxsutawney Phil's forecast could completely outdate what we have done.

And, yes, once again Punxsutawney Phil has made the absolute, official declaration for the upcoming weather. Please allow me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official proclamation issued this morning at Gobbler's Knob in Punxsutawney, the weather capital of the world. With this forecast, we overwhelm whatever scientific data the Weather Service may bring to its prediction, because there clearly is no better weather predictor than Punxsutawney Phil.

Hear ye Hear ye! To all faithful followers assembled here on Gobblers Knob, Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, and to all believers around the world: I, Charles M. Erhard, Jr., President of the Punxsutawney Groundhog Club hereby proclaim that his Imperial Majesty King Philip has emerged from his snow covered borrow at 7:27 this morning.

Squirming and twisting his sleek, furry body in a much liverlier manner than in past years, the King of All Weather Prognosticators seemed temporarily confused by the unpredictable nature of the winter thus

far. But just a few seconds later as all those here in his following can attest, Phil definitely saw his shadow, albeit less black and less ominous than upon other occasions, but he saw a shadow none the less! Having spoken momentarily with his Majesty, he stated that he really would like to have cooperated with President Reagan in working out a time of new beginnings, but the mighty woodchuck has decreed that this is one time when the tried and true must remain as is!

So, as we all have seen, once Phil spotted the unmistakable warning of six more weeks of bearable winter weather, he has turned and quickly returned to his Royal Residence, the borrow atop Gobbler's Knob.

So, there will be six more weeks of fairly mild winter weather. That is the official word today, Monday, February 2, 1981 from the Weather Capital of the World, Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, the home of the only reliable weather forecasting groundhog! ●

WALTER MONDALE

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, the attached article by my good friend and constituent Michael Sanford McGuire appeared in the January 14, 1981, issue of the Livingston Chronicle, which is a newspaper in Livingston, Calif., in my district. Mr. McGuire's article is about former Vice President Walter Mondale who is a very good friend of mine, and I wish to share the article with my colleagues:

VICE PRESIDENT MONDALE

(By Michael Sanford McGuire)

Come January 20, Walter F. Mondale will vacate room 2203 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building after serving four years as Vice President of the United States, President of the Senate, and as a member of the National Security Council.

Most Americans err in not closely and continuously studying the conduct of our vice presidents, for—as the saying goes—the occupant of that office is but a heartbeat away from the highest position of responsibility in the free world. The competence—or lack thereof—of our vice presidents to assume the presidency in the wake of a tragedy should be of concern to us all.

My judgment is that Mr. Mondale has done an excellent job as Vice President, but—considering his long public record—it would have been a surprise had he performed otherwise.

At age 20, Mr. Mondale successfully organized and managed Minneapolis Mayor Hubert H. Humphrey's first campaign for United States Senator.

At age 22, Mondale managed Orville Freeman's campaign for Minnesota state attorney general. Freeman later was elected governor of that state, and then served as U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

After the Freeman campaign, Mondale entered the U.S. Army for a two-year period before graduating from law school at the age of 28.

Just four years out of law school, he became, at age 32, attorney general for the state of Minnesota. During his four years in

that office, Mondale earned a solid, favorable reputation for his stands in the areas of antitrust law and consumer protection.

In 1964, the 36-year-old Mondale entered the Senate, where he served twelve years.

It may never have made the newspaper headlines, but Senator Mondale probably did more than any Senator in the history of this Republic to try to assist the tiny victims of child abuse. Indeed, most of his endeavors in the Senate revolved around providing a voice in Washington for the very young, the elderly, and all those without the ability, time, or financial resources to lobby the Congress for themselves.

In the field of international relations, the senator fought hard for the sound principle that, in a democratic society, the elected representatives of the people have a right to know where and when American men are being sent to fight and die, and he fought for the right of our representatives to have some "say so" in the conduct of war.

I did not happen to agree with Mondale at the time on that point, but I have come to see how terribly wrong I was.

Walter Mondale's first major project as Vice President was to travel to Western Europe and Japan to demonstrate American concern for the world economy by paving the way for an economic conference of the industrialized nations.

A collapse of any major allied nation's economy could have led to a severe depression in the United States. That is precisely what happened fifty years ago.

Whatever can be said about the state of our economy, we must admit the situation today would be much worse had the present administration not had the wisdom and foresight to begin early to enter into many public and private discussions with our Asian and West European allies concerning the economic status and future of the entire free world.

The Vice President travelled not only to Japan, but to our own San Joaquin Valley to speak with and listen to many, young and older, who share our problems and concerns.

At 53, Walter Mondale is still a young man. His is a needed voice of compassion and moderation. After a brief vacation from the challenges of the past several years, I trust we will hear more from him.

I am looking forward to it. ●

JAMES J. KILPATRICK
COMMENTS ON GLOBAL NEEDS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a change of administrations inevitably brings loose talk about where sweeping and dramatic changes in policy can be made. Two such areas, ironically linked, are foreign aid and environmental policy. While those who have carefully studied both topics understand how they are linked, and how important global environmental concerns are to the national security of the United States, I have found recent news accounts of pending proposals from the new administration to be quite discouraging in their apparent shortsightedness.

Perhaps for this reason, I have found a recent guest editorial by the well-known conservative columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, in a well-known conservative journal, *Nation's Business*, to be a refreshing bit of common-sense. For my colleagues who may have missed this commentary, I wish to place the editorial in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* at this time.

[From the *Nation's Business*, February 1981]

THE COMING CATASTROPHE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Five years ago, Scribner's published an English translation of Jean Raspail's "The Camp of the Saints." The novel had been well received abroad, but here in the States the liberal reviewers killed it with ridicule or with silence. The plot was intolerable to them. Raspail was predicting that somewhere around 1995 or 2000 a horde of wretched, starving have-nots would swarm like locusts upon Southern France and ravage the food, the property and the lives of the haves. This was a nightmare novel, chillingly told.

Raspail's prophetic work came to mind the other day, when I finally got around to reading "Global 2000." This was a report submitted to President Carter last summer by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Department of State. It is an immensely important study, staggering in its implications, and if you wonder why it has received so little attention, I can only surmise that in Washington we are inundated by reports, and at the time of publication this must have looked like merely one more report.

It is much more than that. The authors have pulled together the best projections of experts in a dozen fields—population, food production, natural resources and the like—and have compressed them into a single word: catastrophe. If we fail to heed the clear warnings of this study—if we fail to take sensible actions now—we will invite terrible consequences just two decades hence.

The population projections alone are enough to cause serious concern. By 2000, the world's population will have increased to about 6.35 billion, a gain of 55 percent over 1975. The more developed countries will increase slowly; The United States may have 248 million inhabitants, up 16 percent; Western Europe can anticipate a population of 378 million, up 10 percent. But the less developed countries will soar. By 2000, Mexico can expect a population of 131 million, up 119 percent. Mexico City will be the largest city in the world, with a population of perhaps 31.6 million—three times as large as New York is today. Africa's population will double; China will go to 1.3 billion and India to 1 billion.

How are these billions of human beings to be fed? In most of Asia, and in poor areas of North Africa and the Middle East, a calamitous drop in food per capita is projected. In these areas, "the quantity of food available to the poorest groups of people will simply be insufficient to permit children to reach normal body weight and intelligence and to permit normal activity and good health in adults." The number of seriously malnourished people will roughly double, from about 600 million today to 1.3 billion two decades hence.

What these projections suggest is that the great grain and rice producing nations must redouble their efforts. An answer cannot be

found in putting more land in production, because most good land already is under cultivation. Increased reliance upon fisheries could help, but "unfortunately, the world harvest of fish is expected to rise little, if at all, by the year 2000."

Other concerns cry out for thoughtful attention. The world's forest resources are in deep trouble. By 2000, growing stock per capita is expected to decline 47 percent worldwide and 63 percent in less developed countries. Water supplies, already short in many areas, will get worse.

One thing leads to another: As urban sprawl continues, valuable cropland goes out of cultivation. As forested hills are denuded, erosion takes over. For want of fuel wood, millions will be forced to burn animal dung, thus robbing the soil of organic nutrients.

The authors emphasize that their projections are conservative. They do not allow for drought, or wars or agricultural pestilence. On the other hand, they do project technological developments that will enhance productivity. They do not assume breakthroughs in fusion energy or solar energy. They acknowledge the increased risk that goes with increased production of electrical energy in atomic plants, and grimly but matter-of-factly they point to the mounting problem of disposing of atomic wastes.

Yes, this is a gloom and doom report, made all the more disturbing by the constrained and dispassionate style in which the authors lay out the evidence. But it is not a report without hope. Their message, finally, is that the impending catastrophe can indeed be averted—or at least minimized—if sensible public policies are put in motion now. New methods of safe and reliable birth control must be developed. The world will need new varieties of fast-growing trees. New techniques of aquaculture and desalination will have to be found.

Above all, a sense of urgency has to be aroused. Otherwise, our children and grandchildren may soon discover that Jean Raspail wrote not fiction, but fact. ●

THE 33D ANNIVERSARY OF SRI LANKA'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, it gives me the greatest of pleasure to share with my colleagues a report on the achievements and aspirations of the nation of Sri Lanka, which on February 4, will celebrate the 33d anniversary of its independence.

I wish to thank the Ambassador of the Republic of Sri Lanka, W. S. Karunaratne, for providing me with the following information, outlining the progress and promise of Sri Lanka, the Resplendent Land:

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF SRI LANKA, NATIONAL DAY—4TH OF FEBRUARY 1981

On February 4th, 1948 Sri Lanka regained her independence from the British, the last of three nations that had colonised her over the preceding four centuries, the others being the Portuguese (1505-1658), and the Dutch (1658-1796).

The year 1981 also marks the 50th Anniversary of the granting of universal adult franchise in the modern political history of the nation. Although the experience and practice of adult franchise existed in Sri Lanka even in historic times, this was only at the local level of government; the government at the national level was monarchical. In 1931 elections were held at the national level on the basis of universal adult franchise for the first time. Since then all elections in the country have been held on this basis. Today, every citizen of the country over the age of 18 years has a vote.

Since 1948 seven general elections have been held in Sri Lanka and as the result of six of these elections the government in power has been defeated and the major opposition party (either by itself or in coalition with other parties) has been voted into power. Sri Lanka has a multi party system. Over the past sixteen years voter turnout at general elections has averaged over 80 percent.

Women in Sri Lanka have always actively participated in politics. The first general election held on the basis of universal adult franchise in 1931 also saw a woman elected to the national legislature which was then called the State Council.

From 1948 till 1972 Sri Lanka, while being an independent nation, still retained, in common with certain other nations, the British monarch as Head of State. On May 22nd 1972 a Republican constitution was adopted by which the Governor-General, who had represented the British Monarch was replaced by a titular President nominated by the selected Head of Government (the Prime Minister). This constitution set up a unicameral legislature instead of the bicameral one that had hitherto existed. It also changed the name of the country back from Ceylon to its traditional and historic name, Sri Lanka.

Mr. J. R. Jayewardene, under whose leadership the United National Party had been returned to office in July, 1977, had consistently campaigned for the establishment of an executive Presidential system. Such a constitution was promulgated on February 4, 1978. It draws from the constitutional practices of the United States, France and Britain, adapting them to the needs and aspirations of Sri Lanka and her people. Sovereignty of the people is exercised through Parliament which has been declared supreme. Legislative power is vested in Parliament. The President has no right of veto over legislation passed in Parliament. There is strict separation of powers between the legislature, the executive and the judiciary.

Sri Lanka, has living within its area of 25,000 square miles a variety of ethnic groups (Sinhalese, Tamils, Moors, Burghers, Parsis) who are adherents of almost an equal variety of religious beliefs (Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Zoroastrians). The guarantee of fundamental rights and equal opportunities to all citizens is given by the constitution where the chapter on fundamental rights embodies all 30 clauses contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations.

In foreign affairs Sri Lanka has chosen to follow a policy of strict non-alignment. Both in the 95 member non-aligned movement of which she was Chairman from 1976 to 1979 and also in the UN, of which she is a member, she bases her actions and initiatives on the principles established at Bandung in 1955 and on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Her consistent aim has been to work within

this framework towards the furtherance of reconciliation among nations, the peaceful settlement of disputes among them, and the evolution of an international milieu where nations of diverse ideological persuasions could move together towards the betterment of the lot of all nations and peoples, and particularly the underprivileged.

Since 1948 Sri Lanka has pursued a domestic policy of betterment of the lot of her population both through the provision of basic needs and through the stimulation of economic growth. Basic needs support measures in the field of health, education and food, coupled with a strong family planning programme have helped evolve a healthy, literate and educated people. Life expectancy is 64 years for males and 67 years for females; the death rate is 8.1 per 1000; the literacy rate is 88 percent. The quality of life has been rated high and set at 83 on a scale of 100. With the gradual improvement of the lot of her people the government has been able to phase out some of these support measures. However, Sri Lanka's earnings have been and still are inadequate to meet the needs of development being vulnerable to price movements in international commodity markets. So, although successive governments have addressed themselves to the problem of economic development, its solution still has eluded them.

The present government, which came into power in 1977, has focussed sharply on economic development as a major commitment of its programme. It has approached the question in two main areas—agricultural self-sufficiency and the production of adequate power through the Mahaweli Development Programme, and the attraction of foreign investment for industrial development, mainly through the setting up of Free Trade Zones.

In the first stage of development of the Mahaweli Programme five dams are to be constructed and land opened for agriculture with financial assistance from a consortium of countries comprising the United States, Canada, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden and Japan together with the World Bank and the IDA. This stage is expected to irrigate around 117,000 hectares of land and generate around 500 megawatts of power.

In the area of industrial development, the initial period of decontrol and deregulation in the economic field soon after the present government came into power, cleared the way for the entry of foreign investment, both within the Free Trade Zones and outside them. One zone has been parcelled out and a second is being created. Attracted by the package of tax and other incentives and the complete infrastructure facilities given, 130 industrial ventures from 25 countries have so far signed agreements for operation in the zones. Most recent among them is Motorola semi-conductors which is to set up a factory for the assembly and testing of semi conductor devices. Currently 23 factories are in production and 19 others are in various stages of construction.

The number of foreign investment proposals approved for establishment in Sri Lanka outside the framework of the Free Trade Zones has also grown from 33 in 1978 to 138 during the first nine months of 1980.

The period from 1978 to 1980 has also seen 11 new foreign banks and credit companies given permission to operate in Sri Lanka on an offshore basis. They comprise four from the United States (Chase Manhattan, Bank of America, Citibank and American Express), three from the Arab

World (BCCI, Bank of Oman and Bank of Dubai), three from Europe (Algemene Bank Nederland, Indo-Suez and European Asian) and one from Hong Kong (Overseas Trust Bank). In the field of trade, too, the pattern of imports has shown an emphasis on development. Imports of intermediate goods has risen from 38 percent of total imports in 1978 to 40.5 percent in 1979. Imports of investment goods has risen from 23 percent of total imports in 1978 to 24 percent 1979. Both these categories are essential for development. By contrast, imports of consumer goods has fallen from 38 percent of total imports in 1978 to 35 percent in 1979. The comparison becomes that more forceful when one considers that the value of imports in these three categories, in terms of SDR's has grown from 744 million in 1978 to 1114 million in 1979.

This trend continues. In the first half of 1980 imports of intermediate goods rose to 43.4 percent of total imports, investment goods remained at the same level as 1979 and imports of consumer goods declined further to 32.5 percent.

The objective of all these efforts is to endeavour to ensure that the gains of the country in the fields of political development and awareness, education, health and other basic needs are consolidated by the creation of adequate economic opportunity for her people. For it is only by doing this that Sri Lanka can enhance the quality of life of her people, promote human rights and enrich and stabilise her democratic institutions. ●

UKRAINIAN CULTURE CENTER HONORS NATALIE SLUZAR

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recognition for the outstanding public service of Natalie Sluzar, the Ukrainian Culture Center in Los Angeles honored her at an awards dinner last December 13. Ms. Sluzar was on the staff of the White House Office for Ethnic Affairs, and was instrumental in forging closer links between the Government and the Ukrainian community. I am honored to bring to the attention of my colleagues the tribute given Natalie Sluzar in Los Angeles:

[From the Ukrainian Weekly, Jan. 4, 1981]

L.A. UKRAINIANS HONOR SLUZAR

LOS ANGELES.—Natalie Sluzar, Assistant to Dr. Stephen Aiello at the White House Office for Ethnic Affairs, visited southern California from December 13 to 19 under the auspices of the Ukrainian Culture Center of Los Angeles.

The highpoint of the visit was the presentation of the Ukrainian Culture Center's Distinguished Public Service Award to Ms. Sluzar on December 16 by its president, Dr. Roman Kulczycky.

The award was presented in recognition of Ms. Sluzar's "significant contributions to improving the quality and effectiveness of communication between the White House and local communities through her work in the Office for Ethnic Affairs and for her outstanding work in enhancing the reputa-

tion and visibility of the Ukrainian American community in official Washington circles."

The award also recognized Ms. Sluzar's assistance to the Ukrainian Culture Center in its endeavors in the areas of public relations, cultural matters and anti-defamation activities.

Following presentation of the award, Walter Lesiuk introduced Mykola Novak, pioneer immigrant and the first president of the Ukrainian Culture Center (1944). Mr. Novak presented Ms. Sluzar with a copy of his book, "Guardians of Ukraine," which is a pictorial history of Ukrainian community in the United States since 1926.

Ms. Sluzar's topic at the award ceremonies was "Ethnicity in the 1980s."

Ms. Sluzar arrived in Los Angeles on December 13, where she was met by Dr. Kulzycky and Mr. Lesiuk and later that day, was a guest at a dinner hosted by Mr. and Mrs. Nestor Wasylyn and their family.

During her visit, Ms. Sluzar had an opportunity to meet with the pastors and parishioners of both the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Ukrainian Catholic Church in Hollywood and of St. Andrew's Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Los Angeles. Ms. Sluzar was also a guest at the annual Christmas dinner of the Kobzar Ukrainian Choir of Los Angeles.

Before her departure on Dec. 19 for San Francisco for a meeting with representatives of Chinese American and Ukrainian American organizations, Ms. Sluzar was interviewed by S. Shumsky of the Ukrainian American radio program. ●

MX MISSILE REFERENDUM

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD an article from the Reno Evening Gazette which summarizes the results of an MX missile referendum which was on the ballot of almost half of all Nevada counties on November 4, 1980. In every county where the question, "Do you want MX constructed in Nevada?" appeared on the ballot, the answer was a definite "no."

While we Nevadans do not believe that national security should be subject to a popularity contest, neither do we believe that the residents of our State should be ignored. These are the people whose lifestyles, jobs, businesses, farms, and communities will be enormously affected by the dragstrip deployment of the MX missile. As my colleagues know very well, the people of Nevada are among the most patriotic of Americans, and we firmly believe in a strong national defense. But we are not convinced that this particular method of deploying the MX missile is perfect or sacred. It will consume billions of gallons of our scarce water; it will scar a relatively pristine area with 10,000 miles of roads and it will change the Great Basin forever.

All of this damage will take place in order to put into place a system which

is designed to meet a SALT treaty which has never been approved, a system which major defense experts question and a system which will not even meet our immediate defense vulnerability.

Given all of these negative factors, I strongly feel that the Nation is asking Nevada to make a long-term sacrifice which will not, in fact, result in the best defense system for our country. It is my sincere hope that this Congress and the new administration will take a long, hard, and objective look at the current deployment proposal for the MX missile.

[From the Reno Evening Gazette, Nov. 5, 1980]

NEVADA VOTERS SAY NO TO THE MX MISSILE
(By Pat O'Driscoll)

Construction of the controversial MX missile system in Nevada was strongly opposed Tuesday by voters in the eight counties that had MX questions on the election ballot.

Voters in Mineral County in south central Nevada were divided on the issue, opposing Nevada deployment of MX by a narrow margin. Nye County, too, was relatively close compared with the runaway 70-30 margin in some counties.

Although the non-binding advisory question on the ballots of almost half of Nevada's 17 counties cannot in itself prevent the massive, multibillion-dollar defense system from being built in Nevada, anti-MX forces view it as more evidence their cause has popular support.

With 100 percent of the vote counted in other counties, the results were:

<i>MX Missile</i>	
Washoe County:	
Yes	19,995
No	41,901
Churchill County:	
Yes	1,180
No	3,844
Humboldt County:	
Yes	698
No	1,894
Lander County:	
Yes	334
No	1,006
Mineral County:	
Yes	1,092
No	1,201
Nye County:	
Yes	1,543
No	1,889
Pershing County:	
Yes	360
No	795
White Pine County:	
Yes	937
No	2,199

Voters in six of the counties were asked if they favor construction of MX in Nevada, but in Churchill and White Pine counties, the question narrowed to how voters feel about building it in their own counties.

Gov. Robert List said Tuesday night the MX question outcome didn't surprise him. "I've known for a long time that's the way the people of Nevada feel," he said, adding that Nevada must continue to stress that in Congress, "where the decision is going to be made." He said that although Nevada Sen. Howard Cannon believes it's too late, "I don't agree. It's an expensive system and its so costly environmentally. . . ."

Glenn Miller, a Reno spokesman for NO MX (Nevadans Opposing MX), said the vote

should send a strong states' rights message to President-elect Ronald Reagan. Miller also said Reagan's past suggestion that the missile system could be deployed in existing missile silos in the Midwest "is good from the Nevada desert viewpoint," although not for those who want to scrap the controversial missile program.

Sylvia Baker, a vocal leader of NO MX (Nevadans Opposing MX) in Eastern Nevada, said the results were "better than I had hoped. But I had the impression from almost everybody I've talked to over the last year that at the very least they were very uneasy about MX."

The prospect of Ronald Reagan in the White House makes Mrs. Baker "somewhat hopeful" that the federal government "will take another look" at putting the controversial missile in Nevada. "In spite of the fact that they (Reagan's forces) are in favor of increased defense spending, they are still skeptical about the (MX) basing mode," she added.

Mrs. Baker said that within the month, NO MX will write to most U.S. senators and representatives, "especially the new ones," to register opposition to MX.

Bill Vincent, state coordinator of Citizen Alert, a major anti-MX force, also said the response was better than expected.

He also said the MX proposal will likely be reviewed completely by the new administration because Reagan's chief military advisers have "considerable doubt" about deploying the nuclear missiles in the Nevada desert.

The MX vote does not bind the counties that put the issue on the ballot, the Congress, or the Air Force, the military branch that would operate the missile system.

The Air Force's top MX official, Brig. Gen. James McCarthy, said the MX referendums were premature because the vote was taken before all the evidence was in.

"I haven't seen any of the results, but some of the counties that are voting are clearly not affected directly by MX," McCarthy said Tuesday night. "It seems premature to take a position on the issue when information about the MX system provided in the (upcoming) environmental impact statement is not yet available."

The twice-delayed environmental review, which will be used by Congress and the president to make an official MX siting decision, is now due out in mid-December, six months behind schedule.

McCarthy said the information contained in the environmental review will change skeptics' minds.

"It will reflect adverse impacts that very clearly the system will cause. On the other hand, it will show, in a positive vein . . . the impacts in some areas will not be nearly as bad as others may suggest and show many positive effects of the system as well," said the general.

The Air Force has said the positive effects include thousands of new jobs and millions of dollars in payroll.

A midsummer poll by a non-profit, Phoenix-based public opinion firm found 63 percent of Nevadans opposed to the MX project. A more detailed Nevada poll last February by the Nevada State Journal and Reno Evening Gazette found broad disagreement on MX among Nevadans.

That poll, in which a scientific sample of 500 persons was surveyed, 39 percent favored MX, 37 percent opposed it, and 24 percent were undecided.

Of that, Washoe County registered the strongest opposition, with 47 percent op-

posed and 36 percent in favor of MX. In the rural counties, meanwhile, 43 percent were against MX and 28 percent in favor, with a large number—29 percent—undecided.

The strongest support for MX in that poll was in Clark County—44 percent in favor—but Clarke does not have an MX question on the ballot.

Only three of the nine counties with MX ballot questions—Lander, Nye and White Pine—would actually have the MX system on their soil, although anti-MX forces argue the impact would be felt statewide.

Ironically, the county that would probably feel the MX impact the greatest, Lincoln County, didn't have an MX question on the ballot. Nor did Eureka County, another Central Nevada county likely to be an MX site.●

PRELUDE TO VICTORY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1981, I introduced House Joint Resolution 68, a joint resolution designating September 5, 1981, as "Battle Off the Virginia Capes Day." On pages 138-139 of the RECORD for that day, I inserted a statement outlining the reasons for that resolution.

Today, I would like to share with my colleagues a most generous editorial which appeared in the Newport News-Hampton, Va., Daily Press on Saturday, January 17, endorsing this effort and pointing out the appropriateness of recognizing the continued value of naval strength.

I hope that a strong effort will be made in the coming months to insure that this forgotten battle will receive the recognition it deserves.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The editorial follows:

PRELUDE TO VICTORY

As a fitting prelude to the celebration of the Yorktown victory in the Revolution 200 years ago this October, Congressman G. William Whitehurst of Norfolk has just asked Congress to issue a memorial proclamation commemorating France's role in the naval victory in the Battle off the Virginia Capes. It should do so.

That oft-forgotten victory by Adm. Francois de Grasse prevented the British navy from sending relief vessels from New York to Yorktown to evacuate Cornwallis' besieged army. Thus the British commander on Oct. 19, 1781, was compelled to surrender his 7,500-man army and its massive equipment. That led to American independence.

George Washington, who led the armies of America and France to triumph at Yorktown, said that de Grasse was "the arbiter of our victory."

It is heartening to know that the U.S. Post Office is issuing special stamps honoring both the de Grasse naval victory in the Chesapeake Bay off Cape Henry and the Washington-Rochambeau achievement at Yorktown.

As Congressman Whitehurst so rightly declares in his resolution, "The celebration of our nation's 200th birthday . . . will reach

another climax in 1981 with the commemoration of the surrender at Yorktown.

"A major ceremony has been planned for this October, and national recognition will be given to this great event . . . Insofar as naval activity was concerned, no action was more vital to American success than the leadership of Admiral de Grasse in the Battle off the Virginia Capes. . . ."

America must not forget the value of naval strength to her security, now as in 1781.●

OFF WELFARE, INTO WORK

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 30, 1981, our distinguished colleague, PAUL FINDLEY, had an editorial printed in the Washington Post entitled "Off Welfare, Into Work." I would urge my colleagues to read his fine article and consider the budgetary implications carefully.

The editorial follows:

OFF WELFARE, INTO WORK

(By Paul Findley)

In seven communities around the country, able-bodied food stamp recipients now face a requirement to work off the value of the benefits they receive in public service jobs. Budget-cutters watching these "workfare" pilot projects see a welfare reform gold mine. Policymakers should go prospecting and stake a claim.

The work projects under the food stamp program have been operating for over a year. According to USDA figures, 88 percent of the food stamp recipients obligated to work dropped food stamps rather than take a public service job. Only 12 percent actually worked the few days a month needed to continue receiving food stamps.

San Diego was the largest project and accounted for about 50 percent of the cases. It included a beach area where many transients were apparently using food stamps to help finance extended vacations. They simply moved on when faced with a work requirement.

The proportion of food stamp dropouts would have been much smaller without the San Diego resort data. Yet overall, the work projects encouraged numerous people who are employable to leave food stamp rolls and find private-sector jobs.

Providing jobs instead of welfare promises to deliver taxpayer savings by reducing welfare rolls and outlays. And those who take public service jobs gain valuable work experience and a reinforcement of their incentive to get into the economic mainstream. Work can break the welfare syndrome and lead to a better life for those in need.

The new administration is looking to accomplish just that. President-elect Reagan pioneered in welfare work programs as governor of California. His program helped move employable people into regular jobs.

Even liberals are seeing advantages to work instead of welfare as the best way to help the poor. Columnist William Raspberry wrote last June, "We are starting to think less about how best to take care of people, and more about ways to move them toward self-sufficiency."

For a decade, the United States has struggled with the fact that our current welfare

system discourages able-bodied recipients from working. When a welfare recipient earns income, the government lowers his or her welfare payments accordingly. Working brings only a very small net increase in total income.

The major welfare reform proposals of the past decade sought to counter this. But those reforms would have resulted in enormous increases in welfare costs and, therefore, died in Congress. We need a work incentive without a corresponding increase in welfare and its costs.

Work projects are the answer. They encourage the able-bodied on welfare to get regular jobs in the private sector since they must otherwise work in public service jobs. In San Diego, one food stamp recipient had been a movie theater manager but had not been able to find another job after being laid off. She did so well in the work project that she landed a regular part-time job with the county.

Finding jobs for welfare recipients involves some added administrative costs. But they are worth it—and extra costs should likely be more than paid by savings as increased welfare dropouts reduce welfare costs, on the one hand, and by the value of the public service performed by participants, on the other.

There is also a social value. Welfare recipients learn useful skills and actively contribute to society while associating with others instead of stagnating at home. And most important, through work programs, welfare families—adults and impressionable children alike—can learn that a full-time, regular job means progress. Unfortunately, that is not the case under our present welfare system.●

GALBRAITH'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON ECONOMIC POLICY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the following statement, Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith makes some perceptive points about the strengths and limitations of fiscal versus monetary policies, as well as some policy recommendations for our country. I would recommend that all Members read Dr. Galbraith's views.

The statement follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS ON ECONOMIC POLICY

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

The important, indeed decisive, failure of the consensus has been in the macroeconomic management of the economy—its failure to deal effectively with inflation and unemployment. This was a major part of its promise. No one can doubt that an attack here is justified—that this is a point of conspicuous vulnerability. There is verification in the fact that in those industrial countries which have succeeded in combining high employment with stable prices, West Germany and Austria being the notable examples, the economic and social consensus has remained invulnerable.

In the two decades following World War II, the primary need of macroeconomic management was to counter deflation and unemployment. In the United States and

elsewhere this was done by increasing expenditures and reexpenditures from borrowed funds through low interest rates and easy lending conditions—monetary policy. And it was accomplished by increased public services and expenditure or by reduced taxes and increased private expenditure—fiscal policy. None of these measures involved any serious political conflict with any important economic interest. Nor do lower interest rates, lower taxes, or higher public expenditures encounter any serious public objection. Since prices were relatively stable—a not surprising thing in the context of the concern for deflation and unemployment—union wage settlements and their effect on prices were not a matter for great anxiety. Everything was pleasant in those years for economists and economic policy. It was something to which economic policy makers became accustomed.

But in those years—roughly from 1948 to 1969—changes were in process that drastically altered both the economic and the political context of macroeconomic policy. Corporate concentration, a singular and indubitable feature of capitalist development, however sophisticated the denial, continued. So did the power of corporations to hold and increase prices—to escape the discipline of the market. Trade unions were still of only slight power in the United States at the beginning of World War II. In the other industrial countries they had been weakened by depression or suppressed by fascism. Now, after the war, they asserted their claims everywhere with increasing confidence and effect and, as earlier noted, set the pattern for all wages. Corporations, in turn, after ritualistic objection, passed the cost of wage settlements on to the public. Farm prices in the industrial countries were also now supported by governments. And with OPEC, third world countries entered the game.

The game, in effect, was to set aside the market and win the power to raise prices and incomes. When used, this power became the new and intractable form of inflation. Prices could still rise as a consequence of strong demand. But prices now also rose as the result of the strong upward pressure of corporations, trade unions, farmers, oil producers, and other organized power.

This new development was admirably designed to weaken the economic and social consensus and encourage attack. With inflation the costs of government go up and so do taxes. When taxes, property taxes in particular, are relatively stable, they are much less noticed. When they are going up, they are greatly visible and much resented. This resentment is then transmuted into an attack on all public services. And the inability to control inflation conveys a further impression, not unjustified, of government inadequacy or incompetence.

As damaging to the consensus were the measures which were taken to deal with inflation. Monetary policy was the first resort. This requires no legislation, only a pliable central bank. Here Professor Friedman, the omnipresent and, by a wide margin, the most eloquent figure in the great conservative revolt, comes to the foreground again. Control the money supply, have it increase only as the economy expands, and you control everything. There may be some initial discomfort and unemployment; presently all will be well.

Unfortunately central banks have not yet learned to control the money supply with any precision. Nor under modern circumstances, when money can be anything from

currency to bank deposits to savings deposits to unused lines of credit, is it at all clear what is to be controlled. Controlling what you don't know you are controlling is difficult. And running through all monetary action is a disconcerting uncertainty about the relationship between action and effect. In 1979 in the United States there was an intense discussion over whether tighter bank lending and higher interest rates would cause a recession. The most self-confidently learned participants said it would and were wrong. Then in 1980 there was a further tightening, and the experts turned out to be right. Thus the recession that coincided so admirably for the Republicans with the election. There is a strong case against a policy that has a largely random result.

Going on from the uncertainty of the connection between action and effect, monetary policy has other adverse consequences. It discriminates sharply against those industries, housing being the notable case, which rely on borrowed money. Strong corporations (unlike Chrysler) with capital from earnings and the ability to pass costs along in prices are much less affected. Working against inflation through a reduction in investment spending, monetary policy has a highly adverse effect on productivity. And most important, it works against the inflation caused by corporate, union, and other organized power only as it creates enough unemployment to soften union claims and enough idle plant capacity to make it difficult for corporations to raise prices. To get price stability in this way requires very strong monetary action. Even though the recent recession was painful, politically and otherwise, it did not arrest—has not arrested—inflation. This, given the new power of organization, was altogether predictable.

The reliance on monetary policy has thus been deeply damaging to the economic and social consensus. Fiscal action which controls demand by controlling private and public consumption would have been less so. It is more predictable in effect, it does not favor the large firm over the small, and, since its restraining effect is on consumption, it is not directly damaging to productivity. Unfortunately fiscal policy—higher taxes, reduced public expenditure—is, to put it mildly, politically inconvenient. For this reason policy makers in recent times, looking as ever for soft solutions, have been reluctant to use it. Instead we have combined inflation with tax reductions and compensated with ever more severe monetary policy.

But fiscal policy also works against the inflationary pricing of strong corporations and strong unions only as it creates a substantial amount of idle capacity and of unemployment—until a recession becomes the restraining influence on wages and prices. Economic change—corporate concentration, trade union strength, other power to influence income—has thus rendered all of the measures of the old consensus against inflation ineffective except as they induce idle capacity and unemployment. Such has been the fate of the macroeconomic management, which was one of the three pillars of the consensus.

The arrival of the Reagan administration in the United States will not be very useful to those who would like to move on from the consensus. That is because its design for economic management incorporates all of the old elements of failure in a somewhat exaggerated form. As a result, adherents to the old consensus will be able to accumulate

negative capital merely by sitting quietly and awaiting the failures. Specifically, the Reagan administration promises higher defense expenditures, which are certain. And it promises lower taxes, which are almost certain. And it promises to reduce total federal expenditure by reducing the relatively small volume of noncontractual civilian expenditures, i.e., expenditures other than for interest, social security, and the like.

This it cannot do; and the consensus not being vulnerable in respect of these residual expenditures the administration will make itself wonderfully unpopular if it seriously tries. With lower taxes and public spending as high as or higher than before, fiscal policy under President Reagan will, if anything, be more inflationary than in the past. The new administration promises further that the present rather primitive arrangements for restraining wages and prices will be abandoned; indeed, these cannot be tolerated by scholars for whom all forms of government regulation are repugnant—for whom the market, however deteriorated, is still a totem. So there will have to be greater reliance than ever before on monetary policy. As the arch-exponent of monetarism, Professor Milton Friedman has great days ahead.

This will not be his unalloyed good fortune. There are grave disadvantages in being associated with a policy that, however persuasively it is defended, does not work. Professor Friedman has already been forced to disassociate himself from Chile and Israel where he was once celebrated as a prophet. And the Friedman policy in Britain has so far produced only high inflation, deep internal stagnation, the highest unemployment since the Great Depression, and some indication that Professor Friedman would like to detach from Mrs. Thatcher as well. But deep as is my compassion for an old friend, my present concern is for the effect on the adherents to the consensus. Their tendency will be to relax comfortably in the discovery that monetarism means either high unemployment and high rates of inflation or a little less unemployment and yet more inflation. Were it otherwise, were there here a simple formula for solving our troubles, it would have been in general use long before now.

What will be needed by defenders of the consensus is not relaxation but a vigorous effort to bring it abreast of the changes that rendered it vulnerable. This means, as noted, better tests of what is sufficient and affordable in public services and public welfare. It means all possible steps to ensure better public management. But it requires, most of all, acceptance of the logic of modern corporate, union, and other organized power and its effect on price-making and inflation.

A firm resourceful use of fiscal policy is still necessary. When demand presses on resources, there must be increased taxes, and these must be primarily on the affluent. This is the alternative to the excessive—and disastrous—reliance on monetary policy to limit demand or a heartless manipulation of the public services to the poor. I would urge increased use of indirect taxation on objects of upper-income or luxury consumption; it is hard to have tears for those who must pay more for luxury automobiles, furniture, housing, attire, or entertainment. Even those so taxed have some reluctance in pleading hardship. There must also be a general stand against tax concessions to the rich, and this applies to virtually all talk of incentives. Lurking behind the word incen-

tives, we must never forget, is always the wish of someone for more income.

Corporations now have an admirable tendency to invest when they foresee a profit; tax reduction does not turn a prospective loss into a profit. It is the pride of the modern corporate executive that he gives his all to his enterprise; it is insulting to him to suggest that he grades his effort to his after-tax income. And he would be fired were he thought to do so. Taxes on unearned income and inheritance are good for the work ethic; over time they return the rich and their offspring to useful toil. It is one of the oddities of our time that we think the work ethic to be particularly ethical for those in the lower income brackets. A well-considered use of leisure by the affluent is a mark of civilized behavior.

But we must also have direct action to hold wages and salaries to what can be afforded at current prices. And likewise, and as firmly, there must be action, enforced as necessary by law, to restrain industrial prices where market power is great. No market principles are violated when the state moves to fix those prices that, as the product of industrial concentration, are already fixed. And other income that is subject to organized enhancement must similarly be subject to restraint. This is not as great a task as is sometimes imagined. The centralization of market power by corporations, unions, and farm organizations that causes inflation in its modern form greatly reduces the number of firms and organizations that must be controlled. It is not the classical market that is being replaced. That has obviously gone forever and that is the problem.

Thus the task. The consensus must, of course, be defended at its positions of present strength. But here there will be great support from circumstance. The real task is to repair, renew, and redesign it at its points of present failure.●

EUROPE ON \$223 MILLION A DAY

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the February 1981 Washington Monthly contains an excellent article by Joseph Nocera, "Europe on \$223 Million a Day," which calls for a thorough keelhauling of our European foreign policy.

Get hold of the entire article, but here is a preview:

Western Europe is the great sacred cow of American foreign policy. We haggle endlessly over whether West Germany should up its contribution to Western defense spending by two percent instead of three, but we almost never stop to ask the larger question: When was the last time the foreign policy establishment took a fresh look at whether it still makes sense even to have a joint Western defense or a NATO umbrella? Or whether it was really in America's best interest to continue spending upwards of \$81 billion a year to keep NATO in business? Or whether the strategic interests of West Germany and those of the United States are still virtually one and the same? In the world of foreign policy, these are all "givens"—accepted as truth by just about

everyone. But they shouldn't be; the postwar world whence they came is now so far in the past that these beliefs are precisely the ones that need to be called into question. That isn't happening largely because the people who are in a position to question the dogma are the very ones so tied to it. These people include not only the diplomats who live and work in Europe, but the journalists who write from there, the military brass who operate from there, and even the congressmen who junket there.●

WILLIAM K. HOWARD

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, March 11, 1981, William K. Howard, a most dedicated and respected man, will be honored on the occasion of the inaugural Israel salute to the film industry of California. In acknowledgment of Bill Howard's concern for people everywhere, the Torch of Freedom Award will be conferred upon him by an eminent representative of the State of Israel.

William Howard is president of the Hollywood Film Council, and in addition to his personal attributes which have earned him this honor, has personified American Labor's unreserved and unstinting support of Israel for 33 years.

Bill Howard is a fourth generation Californian, born in Pasadena. He served as a bomber pilot in World War II from 1942 to 1945, and upon leaving the service became affiliated with the film industry as a costumer. In 1963 he became the business representative of the Motion Picture Costumers Local 705—I.A.T.S.E. and M.P.M.O., continuing in that office to date. In 1973 he became president of the Hollywood Film Council. For the past 18 years he has unstintingly devoted his time and energy as president of the California State Theatrical Federation, as board chairman; chairman of the Finance Committee, and member of the board of trustees of the Motion Picture Industry Pension Plan. He is a member of the executive committee of the board of trustees of the Motion Picture & Television Fund; the board of directors of the Motion Picture Costumers Federal Credit Union; the board of trustees of the Hollywood Canteen Foundation; the Permanent Charities Committee; the Motion Picture Academy of Arts & Sciences.

Bill has served his State as a member of the Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Board for both the motion picture and the television industry, and his city as membership chairman of Mayor Bradley's Film Development Committee as well as the recording secretary of the Hollywood Broadcast Labor Council.

Recognizing that only in an economically secure Israel can his brothers and sisters in the democratic labor movement there maintain their dignity, their jobs, and their way of life, William Howard supports the reaffirmation of AFL-CIO to support Israel and Israel bonds.

I ask the Members to join me in extending our heartfelt commendation to William K. Howard for his dedicated service to his community and to his ideals.●

UNITED STATES SHOULD SUSPEND NICARAGUAN AID

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, former Secretary of State Ed Muskie, on Thursday, January 29, in an interview with Washington Post editors, revealed convincing evidence that arms to leftist guerrillas fighting in El Salvador are coming from Nicaragua. Mr. Speaker, if this is true, then the United States should suspend further assistance to Nicaragua at once. I have addressed this day a letter to President Reagan spelling out this abuse of neutrality by the Nicaraguan Government and urging the President's stipulation to an immediate American aid embargo. I have also written Secretary of State Haig requesting his support for an immediate Nicaraguan aid cutoff.

Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1980, at the time when this House voted for foreign aid to the leftist Sandanista government in Nicaragua, some of us warned that American generosity in this instance would be abused. But that vote carried over our objections by the thin margin of 202 to 197. Congress at that time did write into the legislation the proviso that should Nicaraguan aid be misused to aid leftists in Central America, there would be an immediate American aid cutoff. We now have that clear evidence of Nicaraguan abuse of American aid assistance. Arms and supplies used in El Salvador's bloody leftist assaults are flowing through Nicaragua. And to quote former Secretary Muskie, "certainly with the knowledge and to some extent the help" of Nicaraguan authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the administration and the Congress jointly to urge an immediate halt to American assistance to the Sandanista government in Nicaragua. Nicaraguan neutrality is a fiction favoring a Cuban and Soviet-backed takeover by anti-democratic forces in El Salvador and in Central America.●

PROPOSED RULEMAKING TO
INFLUENCE LEGISLATION

HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues a glaring example of regulatory excess which has been proposed by the Internal Revenue Service in the Federal Register of November 25, 1980. The proposed regulations relate to the treatment, for tax purposes, of expenditures for attempts to influence legislation. If implemented, these proposed regulations will have an adverse effect on the small business community. The proposed regulations will also have a significant impact on the tax treatment of an individual Member's own legislative activities. I have prepared a letter to the President asking that he place an immediate freeze on these proposed regulations pending a public hearing and further consideration of the potential effect. The text of the letter, which will be sent to the President on February 11, is as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On November 25, 1980, the Internal Revenue Service published in the Federal Register a notice of proposed rule-making, relating to the treatment of expenditures for attempts to influence legislation. We are deeply concerned that these proposed regulations will have a severe negative impact on the small business community.

The current rule provides that if an organization does not spend a "substantial" amount of its funds on grass roots lobbying, its members may deduct all dues or membership fees paid to the organizations. The proposed regulations would establish a three factor test to be used as a guideline for determining whether an action or communication is an attempt to influence public opinion, and therefore non-deductible. An organization must then evaluate all expenditures on the basis of this three factor test in order to determine the total outlay for grass roots lobbying. Every organization must furnish a statement to its members indicating the percentage of funds used for such efforts. Using the figure provided, the member must then calculate the amount of the corresponding percentage of his dues or fees which was used for grass roots lobbying. This amount is non-deductible, and is subtracted from the total dues paid by the member to determine the deductible figure.

We are concerned that the promulgation of these regulations will have serious consequences for the small business community. Because of the fundamental change involved in defining a "substantial" amount as any amount, the regulations will have the potential to severely diminish the role of small organizations in grass roots lobbying. The resulting increase in the tax liability of the members will be a disincentive to the members for participation in these organizations, and an unwarranted increase in the tax burden for these members.

The proposed reporting requirement obviously imposes an unnecessary and excessive burden on the organizations involved. It de-

mands an extensive amount of paperwork and places a much greater burden on the smaller organizations who may not have the accounting capability for such analyses. These proposed regulations will discriminate unfairly against the smaller organizations, and against their members who use the services they provide. We question the need for such regulations, especially when according to an IRS spokesman, there is no evidence of any violation of the present rules.

The results of the 1980 elections clearly illustrate that the American people want less regulation and less government intrusion in their lives. To impose these regulations refutes the overwhelming mandate of the voters. We recommend that you place an immediate freeze on these proposed regulations to prevent their promulgation pending an assessment of the impact on the small business community. This is an opportunity to demonstrate to the public that the new administration intends to curtail over-regulation and excess. We appreciate your consideration in this matter.

I hope that you will consider this matter carefully and lend your support to this petition to the President.●

INSPECTORS GENERAL MUST BE
NONPARTISAN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues the recent dismissal of 15 Inspectors General at major Federal agencies. This action may be counterproductive to the administration's stated goal of fighting waste and fraud.

One critical task facing the new administration, and facing this new Congress, is to make the Federal Government lean and cost effective. The elimination of waste and incompetence is not a Republican or Democratic priority; it is a managerial priority, the achievement of which is essential if we are to restore public confidence in our form of government. But it is important that we distinguish partnership and false economies from genuine reform.

I am seriously disturbed by President Reagan's recent decision to summarily dismiss all 15 agency Inspectors General. The President can and should remove any top agency official whose work is not of the highest caliber. But the administration has hardly had time to examine the records of these 15 individuals and find them wanting; it has removed them without regard to whether their records are good or bad. The White House now indicates it will permit the dismissed Inspectors General to reapply for their old positions. Whether those reapplications will be taken seriously we cannot now know.

I urge the President to consider carefully and individually the records and credentials of each of the Inspectors General. Many of these women and men have developed important and needed expertise regarding the abuses in their agencies, and we can ill afford to wait for new officials to learn what the dismissed ones had ferreted out over a protracted period. I am very concerned that, a year or two from now, we will read about an important investigation that foundered because of the dismissal of the knowledgeable investigating official.

I understand Mr. Reagan's expectation that every Inspector General be "meaner than a junkyard dog," but I hope that he recognizes that meanness alone will not get the job done. An Inspector General must have the skill to grasp the complex activities of the agencies he or she monitors. Above all, the Inspector General must have the resolute backing of an agency head committed to disciplining inept program managers, and to implementing changes which audits and investigations reveal are necessary.

In filling these positions, the administration must be scrupulously careful to avoid creating the appearance that loyalty to President Reagan or the Republican Party is a relevant consideration. Any Inspector General who believes he or she was hired on that basis may well act accordingly, suppressing facts that might be embarrassing to the new administration. The purpose of Congress in creating these positions would be defeated if the Office of Inspector General were politicized in this manner.

An important story about the Inspectors General appeared in this morning's Washington Post. It is an article worth reading, and I commend it to the attention to my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

FIRED U.S. WASTE FIGHTERS BARE
GOVERNMENT FOULUPS

(By Charles R. Babcock and Patrick Tyler)

There are 15 men and women out there in the federal bureaucracy who could tell President Reagan where a lot of bodies are buried as his administration begins its much-heralded search for waste, fraud and mismanagement in federal programs.

They make up the corps of inspectors general at major federal agencies. But, instead of debriefing them, Reagan fired them all last week.

Inez Smith Reid, the inspector general at the Environmental Protection Agency, for instance, could talk about the \$133,000 worth of unused airline tickets dating back to 1972 that she found under a secretary's desk during a recent audit.

Thomas F. McBride, the former Watergate assistant special prosecutor who was inspector general at the Agriculture Department, could detail the widespread use of food stamps as an underground currency to buy drugs, illegal weapons and cars.

June Gibbs Brown, the IG at the Interior Department, might volunteer her discovery

that a youth camp director in Missouri ordered 1,072 pairs of leg chaps, 3,736 pairs of work gloves, 112 stepladders and 1,509 desk calendars, all for a camp that was scheduled to enroll 136 youngsters.

The IGs' tales of waste and fraud range from the trivial to the enormous, from the Energy Department employee who was caught running up \$100 in long-distance telephone bills between his office and a pornographic story "hotline" in the Midwest to the mortgage bankers in Puerto Rico who set up phony housing sales to siphon off millions from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

When Reagan abruptly fired the IGs last week, some Democratic sponsors of the 1978 inspector-general legislation criticized the move as politicizing the fledgling corps. Congress' intent, they said, was to create independent, nonpolitical offices in the major executive departments, through the president has right to replace the IGs.

Reagan aides did say the fired inspectors can reapply for their jobs in the new administration if they think they can meet the new president's challenge to rip into waste and fraud like a "junkyard dog." Several IGs are trying to stay on.

During his presidential campaign, Reagan continually declared the elimination of "waste and fraud" a top priority. He tied the success of his entire tax-and-budget-slashing recovery program to finding and cutting tens of billions of dollars in fraud and waste from government programs.

When asked during his televised campaign debate with President Carter how he would cut spending while cutting taxes and increasing the defense budget, Reagan replied, "I believe there is enough extravagance and fat in government."

He cited the Carter Cabinet secretary who once estimated that there was \$7 billion of fraud and waste in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare alone, and the General Accounting Office estimate of the "tens of billions of dollars that is lost in fraud alone."

While hard figures on the magnitude of waste and fraud are elusive, several members of the outgoing class of Carter inspectors general agreed in interviews that they barely denied the problem. They also contend that, while fraud is prevalent, mismanagement and inefficiency do the greatest damage to taxpayers' wallets.

Like good bureaucrats, the inspectors say that they would do better if they only had more help, that they don't have enough auditors and investigators to police the multibillion-dollar programs. Some say they have been hampered by backbiting in their own offices, lack of support from Cabinet officers, or the difficulty of merging sometimes incompatible audit and investigative staffs.

But their biggest complaint is that program managers in the various agencies aren't held accountable for correcting the problems the IGs uncover.

"Cabinet officers need to start demoting and firing program managers for inattention and negligence to waste and fraud issues," said Agriculture's McBride.

Donald L. Scantlebury, director of the GAO's accounting and financial management division, which investigates waste and fraud for Congress, is sympathetic to the IGs' frustration. "I think the [IG] concept is working out well," he said. "But it's a little early to expect dramatic results."

The idea of putting independent inspectors inside the Cabinet agencies was resisted

by the executive branch for years. The first inspector general's office was set up at Agriculture in 1962 after internal audits failed to uncover the schemes of Texas fertilizer swindler Billy Sol Estes. But Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz abolished the office during the Nixon administration.

The first statutory inspector general was established after a House investigation found that HEW had only 10 investigators to oversee a \$118 billion program. A 1978 law set up IGs in 13 additional agencies. The Department of Energy got an inspector general a year later. Because of hiring freezes, however, only about 5,300 of an authorized 5,900 slots for auditors and investigators have been filled.

The Defense Department, which doesn't have an inspector general, does have 18,000 auditors and investigators to oversee a \$185 billion budget. By contrast, the Department of Health and Human Services, HEW's successor, has only about 700 auditors and 100 investigators to watch over a \$260 billion budget.

Several of the inspectors general regard the required semiannual report to Congress as their greatest weapon against unrepentant federal program managers. "Without that statute we wouldn't last eight seconds," one outgoing IG said.

Some of these reports are filled with undecipherable statistics, while others are highly readable chronicles of program abuse. McBride's latest report, for example, tells of two Greenville, S.C., men who sold five cars and trucks, 32 firearms and some marijuana to undercover agents in return for food stamps. In Gary, Ind., the assistant fire chief was convicted of selling \$11,000 in food stamps for \$7,000 cash to undercover agents from McBride's office.

Paul R. Boucher, IG at the Small Business Administration, said in a report early this year that five farmers who received \$1.4 million in SBA disaster aid loans at 3 percent interest diverted some of the funds to 10 percent interest certificates of deposit, and bought stocks and tax-free municipal bonds with more of the funds.

Richard B. Lowe III, who has been acting IG at the gigantic HHS, said he was upset to learn that the Social Security Administration doesn't have adequate controls to prevent employees with access to computers from diverting benefit checks to themselves.

The greatest cheaters, according to the audits, are not individual welfare or health care recipients, but doctors and pharmacists and other providers of services who overbill the government. A recent HHS audit screen detected abuse in laboratories in the Los Angeles area that led to an FBI undercover investigation called "LabsCam" and several kickback indictments.

EPA's Reid, with only 95 auditors, has been trying to police the nation's largest public works project—the \$30 billion sewerage construction effort designed to clean up the nation's rivers—and she says she loses sleep over the vast areas of EPA operations she couldn't even look at.

"Because of poor management, the federal government is losing millions, perhaps billions of dollars," she said.

When Energy Department inspector general J. Kenneth Mansfield looked into a synfuels pilot plant built by Ashland Oil, he found that firm had put up a \$1 million brick administration building instead of the prefabricated model called for by DOE. As it happened, the elaborate new building was adjacent to an Ashland refinery.

Too late to recover the government's loss, Mansfield called for sweeping management

changes on the project, some of which were adopted.

Several of the outgoing IGs voiced the concern that Reagan's pledge to cut billions in waste will fall on its face unless their successors get more help.

To put a serious dent in waste, they said, the president will have to increase support for the program, especially within the Office of Management and Budget and in some agencies where sub-Cabinet administrators have starved the inspectors' budgets, cut travel funds to do audits, refused to place all auditors directly under the control of the inspectors and, in some cases, attempted to head off investigations.

"I personally would not want to continue [in the job] without a commitment that the agency wanted this kind of work done or that they intended to support it," said Interior's Brown. She said she found then-Secretary Cecil D. Andrus a pleasure to work for, but that he was seldom there to back her up when program chiefs ignored her audit findings or refused to recoup challenged expenditures.

Reid said that then-EPA Administrator Douglas Costle never returned her memos. "To this day I don't know what his feeling was about the program," she said.

The day after the Energy Department's Mansfield released a report critical of a top aide to former Energy Secretary Charles W. Duncan Jr., Duncan called the surprised inspector into his office and asked him to consider a job in Paris, even though the department had no office there.

Most of the fired inspectors have been on the job less than two years, and some of them said they were deeply wounded by Reagan's action.

"I really like my job and want to keep it," said former prosecutor Boucher at SBA, who in the waning hours of the Carter administration blew the whistle on a presidential assistant who got Carter to sign an order quadrupling the size of a minority aid program even though Congress had forbidden it.

A career man in Carter's Senior Executive Service, Boucher sent in his reapplication for the job to Reagan Thursday.

One inspector general summed up his view of Reagan's firing this way:

"Everybody wants a strong IG operation until it starts investigating them. The administration may start out thinking they want junkyard dogs, and what they may end up getting is French poodles." ●

REBIRTH OF PATRIOTISM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, why do we not honor our war veterans as we do the hostages?

In this period of thanksgiving for the safe return of our 53 Americans held hostage for 444 days in Iran, I congratulate all Americans for a rebirth of patriotism and national unity. Our released hostages certainly deserve recognition for what they endured during their captivity, as well as for the low profile they themselves have maintained.

As released hostage Michael Metrisko said, "We are not heroes. We were just doing our jobs. The guys from Vietnam deserve this. They did not get it."

I hail Mr. Metrisko's view that our Vietnam veterans deserved a far better welcome home than they got. The veterans fulfilled their commitment to their country in a time when duty to one's country was not fashionable. But those men who came home after fighting that unpopular war were given a raw deal by the public. Instead of a heroes' welcome, they were, in many circles, scorned and ostracized.

Further, let us not forget those eight servicemen who lost their lives in the aborted attempt to rescue our hostages last April. Very little has been said or done to honor those men who volunteered and who suffered a far higher percentage of casualties than in most military operations in a declared war.

I can only hope that this renewal of public support of public servants for a difficult job well done is the setting of a new precedent to honor all, not merely some, of the men and women who have suffered in the line of duty to their country. ●

TRIBUTE OF OLIN E. TEAGUE HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to hear of the death of our former colleague, Olin E. Teague, who served in this House more than 30 years as a great Representative of his district, his State of Texas, and his country.

I served with Olin Teague on the Board of Technology Assessment and was very impressed with his intelligence and wisdom. Even more, I came to know his gracious and generous manner and to appreciate his strong and abiding patriotism.

Sometimes the Second World War might seem like ancient history to some of our younger Members, but the experiences of that era are fresh in the minds of many of us who lived through it. I would tell our younger Members that we had some heroes, and Olin Teague was one of mine.

A young infantry combat officer, he was decorated 11 times and spent 2 years in an Army hospital recovering from wounds he had received on the battlefields of Europe. Nobody deserved more the honor to be buried in Arlington National Cemetery. He was elected to Congress in 1946.

Olin Teague was a serious legislator. His major committee assignment was the Science and Technology Committee, which does not often generate the big emotional issues of electoral poli-

tics. But here was where he knew he could make a lasting contribution to future generations, and he served as chairman of that important committee with great distinction.

After Olin Teague retired at the conclusion of the 95th Congress, I missed his steady hand and leadership in the matters of science and technology. It is very sad that he lived only 2 years in retirement.

I join my colleagues in expressing our heartfelt condolences to his family. ●

PHARMACISTS NEED PROTECTION

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress we came close to achieving a long-held goal of registered pharmacists and retail druggists throughout the country—providing them the protection of the Federal Government and drug enforcement officers should the pharmacy be robbed of federally controlled substances.

However, the 96th Congress adjourned before final action could be taken, and it is therefore necessary to begin all over. I have reintroduced legislation, H.R. 351, providing a penalty for the robbery or attempted robbery of any controlled substance from any pharmacy, and invite my colleagues to join me as cosponsors.

Drugstores have become primary targets; pharmacists and customers are beaten and even killed by criminals and addicts determined to steal these controlled substances. The local community pharmacist is totally at the mercy of these criminals who need a fix or have a shopping list of drugs for sale on the street. The pharmacist usually is forced at gunpoint to meet the demands of the criminal.

Drugs such as amphetamines and barbiturates can command as much as \$25 or \$30 on the street for one pill. A couple of 100-tablet bottles can mean as much as \$5,000 to a drug-dealing criminal.

Support for pharmacy protection is building, as evidenced by the following comments:

In the following message to Stanley Siegelman, editor-in-chief of *American Druggist* magazine, C. R. Walgreen III, chairman of Walgreen Co. in Illinois, clearly states the urgency of speedy congressional action to make drug-related burglary and robbery Federal crimes:

Pharmacy, the highly efficient and cost-effective arm of the nation's health care system, is today threatened by a growing plague of burglaries and robberies of pharmacists by addicts and illicit-drug dealers.

The criminal side-flow of Schedule II pharmaceuticals from pharmacy to street use and abuse is turning into a tide. The list of victimized—and dead—pharmacists is rapidly lengthening.

Pharmacy's pride is complete professional service to physicians and patients—the prompt, convenient availability of any prescribed drug, and the personal, face-to-face communication between pharmacist and patient.

Today, however, as a defense to growing crime, more and more pharmacists must elect not to stock target drugs. Today, more and more pharmacists must dispense drugs from behind impersonal bulletproof glass. The constant threat of crime is beginning to change the face of pharmacy.

It is time, it is past time for more meaningful deterrents to drug-related crime, for stiffer penalties. The signal need is for swift congressional action to make drug-related burglary and robbery federal crimes.

Now, tens of thousands of pharmacists, with one urgent voice, call upon Congress to unanimously enact positive, protective federal legislation. Now, without delay . . . to give clear warning to criminals and drug traffickers. Now, without delay . . . to save the lives of pharmacists and to save traditional pharmacy service for the people of America.

Sincerely,

C. R. WALGREEN, R. Ph.

Chairman, Walgreen Co.

At its 68th annual meeting, the National Drug Trade Conference adopted a resolution as follows:

Controlled Substances Crime as a Federal Offense. Since the number of felonious crimes related to controlled substances is escalating, and is a serious threat to the lives and safety of pharmacist practitioners, their customers, employees and supplies, the National Drug Trade Conference urges that Congress enact legislation making it a federal offense to commit controlled substances crimes involving assault or deadly weapons and that the Drug Enforcement Administration lend its support to enactment of such legislation.

The National Drug Trade Conference included delegates from the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, the Drug Wholesalers' Association, the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the National Wholesale Druggists' Association, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, and the Proprietary Association.

In an "Open Letter to Members of the 97th Congress," the officers and executive committee of the National Association of Retail Druggists, pledged to assist the Congress in "supporting legislation to assure that owners, employees, and customers are protected from harm and intimidation by criminals by making robbers of controlled drugs from pharmacies Federal offenses."

Finally, I wish to share with my colleagues the January 1981 editorial in *American Druggist* magazine by editor in chief Stanley Siegelman:

OPEN LETTER TO RONALD REAGAN:
PHARMACISTS NEED PROTECTION

(By Stanley Siegelman)

Mr. President, the pharmacists of America urgently need your help. They are targets of an unprecedented wave of violence. Drug-seeking marauders are invading pharmacies, committing brutal acts and dark deeds.

An editorial in this space, published in September 1980, listed 50 pharmacists who had been murdered in their drug stores. Additional names of pharmacists who have been shot, stabbed, and otherwise assaulted reach us almost daily. What is needed is a law that would make drug-related crimes against pharmacists a Federal offense.

You have consistently maintained that citizens should not look to "Big Brother"—the Federal government—for solutions to all problems. But the pharmacist's case is exceptional. Federal regulations impose on him unique responsibilities as the guardian of controlled substances—narcotics, barbiturates, amphetamines. Yet, Federal law fails to protect him as he carries out this mandated function. The inequity of the situation is palpable.

Violence against pharmacists is forcing drug stores out of business. When this happens—often in depressed areas—local residents are deprived of badly needed health services. Ironically, the more efficient the Drug Enforcement Administration becomes in drying up the sources of illicit drugs, the more do criminals focus on the hapless pharmacist.

We do not assert that extending Federal jurisdiction will necessarily solve the problem. But it would help considerably—especially in localities where law enforcement is sub-standard. If the prospect of Federal pursuit deters a single robbery or break-in, and saves the life of a single pharmacist, justice will have been served.

Since our initial editorial on this subject appeared, expressions of support have poured in from pharmacists across the country. They are aroused, angry and fearful.

The drug store was never intended to be a battleground. The pharmacist's white jacket was not meant to be blood-stained.

Today, many pharmacists are compelled to practice their profession with a loaded gun on hand, for self-protection. It is impossible, under such circumstances, to perform well. They may, for example, fail to advise patients on the correct usage of medications—a function of great importance. It is difficult to concentrate on what one is doing or should be doing when one has to eye each new face warily.

Mr. President, the pharmacists of America overwhelmingly approved your candidacy. You received 64% of their vote, according to our surveys. They voted for you partly in the expectation that your administration would take a strong stand against those who assault law-abiding citizens.

Pharmacists are precious assets in the nation's health care provider system. They deserve protection.

As you assume the reins of office, you are in a position to help. With the momentum of your electoral mandate, you can inspire legislative action.

The practicing pharmacists of America—130,000 strong—look to you for leadership.

I again urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 351, and protect pharmacists and their customers from drug-seeking criminals.●

CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing an amendment to the Clean Air Act to allow the construction of a polluting facility during a construction ban if its operation will result in less pollution overall.

The current construction ban in California, due to the lack of an automobile inspection program, has halted the construction of new wood-burning boilers at a Louisiana-Pacific plant in Antioch, Calif. When completed and operating, these wood boilers will replace two oil-fired boilers and actually emit less pollution. In addition to saving about 500,000 barrels of oil a year, the wood's lower cost will improve the economic health of the plant and protect its 450 jobs.

My amendment to allow the construction of these wood boilers was developed with the assistance of plant management and scores of employees who are dependent upon plant modernization for their jobs.

This construction ban is designed to force the California Legislature to pass an automobile inspection program in order to help reduce excessive air pollution levels in the State. While I understand the law's intent, it is contrary to the goals of the Clean Air Act to prevent a building program that will reduce pollution, protect jobs, and reduce our dependency on foreign oil. I will be requesting the Energy and Commerce Committee to adopt my amendment during their consideration of the Clean Air Act this year, and I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense reform.

The text of the amendment follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 110(a)(2)(I) of the Clean Air Act is amended by adding at the end of the section "or unless such construction or modification shall result in the reduction of emissions of such pollutant from an existing stationary source."●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, HASKELL, N.J.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, this week Catholic Dioceses throughout our Nation will be celebrating Catholic Schools Week and in my congressional

district, State of New Jersey, St. Francis of Assisi School, Diocese of Paterson, located on Father Hayes Drive, Haskell, N.J., will be commemorating this annual observance having as its theme, "Choosing a Tradition—Catholic Schools". With special ceremonies throughout the week bringing together their students, faculty, and parents in a common bond of communion and understanding, working together in the hopes of giving today's youth the fullest and most complete educational experience which will better prepare them for living in our complex world.

Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of the week's program will be a special testimonial dinner—called Tradition Night—honoring their most esteemed former pastor, Father Hayes, and their distinguished first principal, Sister Anne. Their recollections and commemoration will span three decades as they reflect on the history of St. Francis Church and St. Francis of Assisi School.

With your permission I would like to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress a brief history of the church and school and the outstanding good works of the revered clergy and highly capable sisters who diligently worked, in service to God and to our people, in bringing spiritual leadership and quality education to their parishioners. The brief history of the church and school as provided to me by Sister M. Concepta, FSR, chairperson of Catholic Schools Week, reads, as follows:

GROUND BROKEN FOR NEW CHURCH

Working continuously to raise money for the erection of a larger church for a rapidly-growing parish, Father Hayes acquired ground on Ringwood Avenue for a new church that would be unique in design and expressive of the people's love of God. Dignity and reverence were paramount in the House of God he planned for Wanaque.

On October 1, 1950, Father Hayes broke ground for the new St. Francis Church. On that day, Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament was held outdoors. On December 16, 1951, the cornerstone was laid, and the Most Reverend Thomas A. Boland officiated at the dedication.

FIRST MASS IN NEW CHURCH

On Monday morning at 9:30 A.M., December 17, 1951, the Most Reverend Thomas A. Boland offered the first Mass in the new St. Francis Church. The first Sunday Masses were celebrated in the new church on December 23, 1951, by Father Hayes and Father Murray. The building was designed by Brother Cajetan Baumann, O.F.M.

Father Hayes next devoted himself to drawing up plans for a new Catholic school, also to be designed by Brother Cajetan, to accommodate the hundreds of new families moving into the new housing developments in Wanaque. These plans had reached the hands of the bidders when Father Hayes was called to be Guardian and Superior at St. Joseph's Seraphic Seminary in Callicoon, New York. The Mayor and Council drew up a resolution to name the street adjacent to the new church "Father Hayes' Drive" in memory of the good he had done

in the borough during his six years of spiritual leadership here. He quickened faith through his deep sincerity in performing the offices which brought God close to the people. The lives of many were enriched by this understanding priest and holy man.

NEW ST. FRANCIS SCHOOL

On June 25, 1952, Father Godfrey Weitekamp, O.F.M., who had served over seven years in mission work in Georgia, was appointed Pastor of St. Francis Church. This Jubilee Year begins the fourth year of his fruitful labors in Wanaque and it is in his capable hands, the task has fallen of suitably celebrating the fifty years that God in the Blessed Sacrament has reposed on the altars of St. Francis Church in the Borough of Wanaque. Two months after his arrival on August 17, 1952, ground for the new school was broken and on the Feast of the Purification, February 2, 1953, the children moved into the new St. Francis School. Archbishop Boland gave this building his blessing as his last official act in the Diocese of Paterson on January 8, 1953.

A near-by order of teaching Sisters, the Capuchin Franciscan Sisters of the Infant Jesus, took over the education of the Catholic children in this borough in September, 1952, at which time there were 240 children enrolled. Reverend Mother M. Veronica, O.M. Cap., provided the rapidly growing school with the needed faculty of sisters, headed by Sister M. Anne, O.M. Cap. principal. The teaching staff at this jubilee time consists of Sister M. Gesuina, Sister M. Elizabeth, Sister M. Assunta, Sister M. Paschal, Sister Kathryn Marie, Miss Naomi Gilpatrick and Mrs. Julia Kane. Sister M. Anne—Principal.

In June, 1955, there were 364 children in St. Francis School and for the first time, one teacher for each of the nine grades. There were 70 children in the 1955 kindergarten graduating class and 23 in the eighth grade graduating class. A Mothers' Club was organized that, along with other organizations, worked untiringly with the pastor not only for the welfare of the parishioners, but to materialize the dream of four buildings on the St. Francis grounds, devoted to the service of God.

Mr. Speaker—

Whereas the cultural, historical, and economic achievements, even the basic health, well-being and longevity of a State and Nation depend in large measure upon how well we educate each generation charged with the trust of carrying out its responsibilities and traditions;

Whereas expanded educational opportunities are necessary to meet the educational needs of our young people and permit those of our teaching profession who have acquired the most modern, technological and scientific knowledge available to translate their professional acumen effectively and meaningfully into an educational program that will provide optimum service to the youth of America;

Whereas there is a desperate need to wholeheartedly support the continuing and increased investment in educational development in our Nation through the dedication and fullest utilization of all available resources—public and private—to effectively reconcile our objectives and provide an

educational system compatible to our total resources that can achieve the quality of education and way of life that we seek for ourselves and future generations to enjoy and reach even greater heights of fulfillment and purpose;

Whereas this year's national observance of "Catholic Schools Week" is being celebrated during the week February 1 to February 7 and the theme is "Choosing a Tradition—Catholic Schools"; and

Whereas Catholic Schools Week affords all of us time to think about the needs, the importance, and the hopes for education to satisfy the high idealism of our young people and an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the excellence and quality of the educational opportunity offered to every individual in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations and best of wishes to the clergy, faculty, students and parents of St. Francis of Assisi School and join with them in observing the period February 1 through February 7, 1981, as Catholic Schools Week. ●

SCIENCE EDUCATION: AN AREA WHERE MORE RESOURCES ARE JUSTIFIED

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to receive the second administration budget request of fiscal year 1982, each Member of Congress will undoubtedly examine each budget category from his or her own level of awareness and overall perception of what constituents want. One area which may unfortunately fall below the threshold level of perception, or otherwise seem relatively unimportant, is science and engineering education. As one who has followed this subject for nearly two decades, I am quite familiar with the trends over the years and the critical role Congress has played during this time.

The truth is, in spite of consistent congressional support and our insistence on greater attention to science and engineering education than the administration, whether Republican or Democrat, has wanted, the U.S. posture in science education has slipped. Our Nation's slip in productivity seems to be linked to our slippage in training technically competent people and our Nation's level of scientific literacy is lower than that of countries like Japan, who are now our chief economic rivals.

It would be wise if this Congress examined each budget proposal of the Carter and the Reagan administrations with care. Among those areas deserving specific attention is the status of science and engineering education. We owe this country's future an adequate intellectual base to deal effectively with the needs of the future.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I commend a recent editorial from Science magazine which describes this issue in much better terms than I have. The editorial follows:

[From Science, Jan. 23, 1981]

SCIENCE EDUCATION: RHETORIC AND REALITY
(By William D. Carey)

In 1980 the federal government seemed, at last, to have discovered the low estate into which science education in this country has fallen. The Secretary of Education and the acting director of the National Science Foundation (NSF) delivered to the President, at his request, an assessment in a report which did not whitewash the facts. Headlining their recommendations was a call for "A new national commitment to excellence in science and technology education for all Americans."

That was in October. By Christmas, hopes for federal leadership in the "new commitment" were jolted by the Administration's markup of the 1981 budget of the NSF, with a cutback in support for science education. Never mind that the report to the President had warned that "there has been, over the past fifteen years or so, a shrinking in our national commitment to excellence and international primacy in science, mathematics, and technology." When budget imperatives confront the needs for science education, the budget prevails. Science education continues its decade-long record as NSF's habitual loser.

In the past 12 years, the total budget of NSF has more than doubled in current dollars, while in constant dollars the funding of science education has suffered a two-thirds erosion. In 1970, funds for science education amounted to 27 percent of NSF's total budget, but for 1981 the science education share is down to 7.5 percent. If all were well with the state of science and engineering education, there might be nothing to complain about. But if the Secretary of Education and the acting director of NSF are right in what they report, there is a great deal to complain about. The meaning of the budget action is that the government has chosen to disregard its own findings on the predicament of science and engineering education.

Budget policies are seldom models of economic or political logic, as we have come to realize. But there is this much to be said of them: they are symbolic proxies for the nation's values, expressed in consensus terms. They serve to signal, however imperfectly, the government's view as to how national priorities should be ordered. What we must ask, then, is what inputs go to construct this process of ordering. When a President is sufficiently aroused to call for a fitness report on science and engineering education in the United States, and is given bad news, it would be reasonable to suppose that even painful budget choices would take the findings into account. Instead, the latest budget actions have brought science education in NSF to its smallest share of resources in the last 30 fiscal years. If state and municipal

governments, trapped between rising costs and taxpayer revolts, take their cues from the federal government and economize at the expense of science education in the schools, the road back to "excellence" will indeed be a long one.

President Carter will soon send his budget for 1982 to the Congress, whereupon President-elect Reagan will promptly recall it and substitute his own. If the passion for squeezing government's "controllable" outlays should take advantage of the vulnerability of the science education budget, lumping it in with other discretionary programs that make up the celebrated "coast-to-coast soup line," matters would become desperate very quickly. The Reagan Administration has the opportunity, without compromising prudent economic policies, to reorder priorities and set a positive course toward rebuilding America's excellence in science and engineering education. ●

TONY CUNHA: DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO AGRICULTURE

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, 1980 was the last of 37 years that Tony Cunha devoted to serving agriculture at three different universities. In retiring from his post as dean of the school of agriculture at California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, he leaves behind a distinguished career as a visionary agriculturalist, a scholar in the truest sense of the word, and a reputation as grand master of the academic fields in which he so diligently studied.

My colleagues in the House who have an interest in agriculture would find his record of accomplishment fascinating. Tony Cunha was raised as I was—on a dairy farm in Los Banos, Calif. He went on to learn agricultural sciences at California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo, then at Utah State where he began work in animal nutrition. His Ph. D. followed, from the University of Wisconsin. At Washington State University he taught for 4 years before moving on to chair the Department of Animal Science at the University of Florida—a position he held for 25 years. From there he was made dean of the school of agriculture at California State Polytechnic University in Pomona, where he now serves as dean emeritus and university consultant in agriculture.

By no means were Tony Cunha's contributions confined to the classroom. In 1962 he served as president of the American Society of Animal Science. Six years later the Morrison Award, a cash payment of \$2,000, was presented to him for distinguished research in animal nutrition. Gamma Sigma Delta awarded him \$500 in 1976 for internationally distinguished service to agriculture, and he holds no fewer than 39 other campus, State, na-

tional, and worldwide honors recognizing his achievements.

There is more to the Tony Cunha story. He has edited or contributed to the publication of 20 books and over 1,200 professional articles. He has lectured extensively and observed in dozens of foreign countries different methods of livestock production. For 5 years he chaired the Animal Nutrition Committee of the National Academy of Science National Research Council. At about that time he also was a member of the Board of Agriculture and Renewable Resources, and he chaired the Swine Nutrient Requirements Committee for 10 years. Furthermore, while teaching at the University of Florida he received an appointment as distinguished service professor and is now distinguished service professor emeritus of the institution.

Tony Cunha's credentials do not stop there. He helped organize the first two World Conferences on Animal Production. He served as a member of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, and on four national committees making recommendations on future programs to increase animal food production, three of which he chaired. And a few years ago he was appointed to the Joint Committee on Research for the Board of International Food and Agricultural Development.

I hold Tony Cunha's views on public policy for agriculture and world trade in the highest regard. One cannot direct but the highest measure of respect for his philosophy on global food issues and the management of farm operations for the broadest economic benefit. It is with great pride, Mr. Speaker, that he is a leader in California's agriculture community—the principal interest I am privileged to represent in Congress. For his distinguished service to academia and his commitment to the advancement of agricultural and animal sciences, a special tribute and the very best wishes upon his retirement as dean. ●

CONGRESSIONAL TERM LIMITATION BILL

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a constitutional amendment that will provide long-needed reform of the terms of service for Representatives and Senators.

This joint resolution lengthens a Representative's term from 2 to 4 years and limits House Members to 12 years and Senate Members to 18 years of consecutive service. In addition, it would divide the House of Representa-

tives into two classes so that fully one-half of the House is elected every 2 years.

There is growing sentiment in the Congress and at the Nation's grassroots level that a limitation on congressional term limitation would improve the performance of the legislative branch through greater consistency and responsiveness. It is my view that a congressional term limitation in conjunction with an increase in the Representative's term of service would greatly improve the operation of Congress by making the political process more democratic and by insuring a steady and orderly turnover of personnel in the House and Senate.

I urge my colleagues to take a serious look at this issue.

The text of the joint resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 150

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide four-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives and to limit the number of consecutive terms that Representatives and Senators may serve, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to be valid only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen for a term of four years by the people of the several States. Immediately after the Members shall be assembled in consequence of the election for the term beginning on the date on which this article takes effect, they shall be divided as equally as may be into two classes. The seats of the Representatives of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, and of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, so that as close to one-half of the Members as the division into two classes allows may be chosen every second year.

"SEC. 2. A person who is a Member of the House of Representatives for three consecutive terms of four years each may not be a Member during the two-year period beginning immediately after the end of the third such term.

"SEC. 3. A person who is a Senator for three consecutive terms of six years each beginning more than one year after the ratification of this article may not be a Senator during the two-year period beginning immediately after the end of the third such term.

"SEC. 4. No person shall be elected as Senator who, on the date on which such election is held, is a Representative with more than one year remaining in his or her term unless such person has, before such date, submitted a resignation as Representative, such resignation to be effective no later than noon of the first January 3 occurring after the date on which such election is held.

"SEC. 5. This article shall take effect at noon of the first January 3 which occurs

more than one year after the date of the adoption of this article and on which terms of Representatives begin."●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID LILIENTHAL

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, when David Lilienthal died last week at the age of 81, the country lost one of its finest, most dedicated, and most articulate public servants.

As a young lawyer and administrator, David Lilienthal attracted the attention of President Roosevelt, who in 1933, chose him to serve on the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. His dedication to this bold experiment in regional development brought him widespread accolades and made him a natural choice as TVA Director in 1941. During his 12 years with TVA, he maintained an enduring belief in democracy and the good that TVA could do for the people of the valley. At the same time, he was committed to a cautious, sensible approach to resource development.

His successes and his talents made him a natural choice of President Truman to serve as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. During his confirmation hearings, his loyalty to the country was unfairly attacked, and he responded with an eloquent and impassioned rebuttal. The "Lilienthal Credo" as it became known, was the subject of numerous editorials and was compared with the noblest declarations in the history of man. The following is an excerpt:

I believe—and I conceive the Constitution of the United States to rest upon, as does religion—the fundamental proposition of the integrity of the individual; and that all government and all private institutions must be designed to promote and protect and defend the integrity and the dignity of the individual; that that is the essential meaning of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, as it is essentially the meaning of religion.

Any form of government, therefore, and any other institutions which make men means rather than ends, which exalt the state or any other institutions above the importance of men, which place arbitrary power over men as a fundamental tenet of government, are contrary to that conception, and, therefore, I am deeply opposed to them . . .

One of the tenets of democracy that grows out of this central core of a belief that the individual comes first, that all men are the children of God, and that their personalities are therefore sacred, carries with it a great belief in civil liberties and their protection, and a repugnance to anyone who would steal from a human being that which is most precious to him—his good name—either by imputing things to him either by innuendo or by insinuation. And it is especially an unhappy circumstance that occa-

sionally that is done in the name of democracy. This, I think, can tear our country apart and destroy it if we carry it further.

I deeply believe in the capacity of democracy to surmount any trials that may lie ahead, provided only that we practice it in our daily lives.

And among the things we must practice is that while we seek fervently to ferret out the subversive and antidemocratic forces in the country, we do not at the same time, by hysteria, by resort to innuendo, and smears, and other unfortunate tactics besmirch the people—cause one group and one individual to hate another, based on mere attacks, mere unsubstantiated attacks upon their loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lilienthal was a rare individual who enriched the lives of all around him. Tennesseans will always have a special place in their hearts for him.

The Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority wrote an eloquent tribute to David Lilienthal which I would also like to share with my colleagues.

STATEMENT BY TVA BOARD ON DEATH OF DAVID LILIENTHAL

David Lilienthal's death is a very personal loss to all of us at TVA. His dedication to the principle that technology can help to make men free without despoiling the natural environment, was a source of lasting inspiration to everyone involved in government.

Lilienthal's faith in democracy was a special source of inspiration to TVA, both during his 14 years on the TVA Board and in subsequent years. He stated his own belief so well in "TVA: Democracy on the March":

"The physical job is going to be done; of that I think we can be sure. But . . . if the people are denied an active part in this great task, then they may be poor or they may be prosperous but they will not be free."

Under his leadership as a founding Director from 1933 until 1941, TVA became known as one of the most exciting experiments in government in our history. Under his leadership as Chairman from 1941 until 1946, TVA was recognized as one of the most successful.

Even after he retired from government, Lilienthal never lost his intense interest in the future of the Nation and especially of TVA. On a return visit to the Tennessee Valley in 1979, he declined to look backward, instead exhorting TVA employees not to give up their commitment to the original dream of TVA—a better life for the people of the Tennessee Valley.

It is for his steadfast devotion to the principle of the greater good of mankind and for the way he carried it to fruition at TVA, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and later as a vocal advocate of sensible development of the world's resources that David Lilienthal will be best remembered.

David Lilienthal stood out as a giant. We extend our deepest sympathy to his family and his many close friends.●

THE TIMES AND THE POST BACK THE PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, if I awake tomorrow and find that the Sun has risen in the West and that roses are blooming in my front yard, I will not be surprised for truly we live in an age of miracles. This, at least, is how I interpret the fact that the Washington Post and New York Times published editorials, on the same day, supporting President Reagan's decision to decontrol oil. I know we are supposed to have a new beginning, but this is going a bit far. After all, both of those newspapers found the candacy of Ronald Reagan to be something between a bad joke and cosmic disaster. Now, suddenly, without warning, they are warmly embracing precisely those policies which he has long stood for.

I welcome this age of miracles, but I must say its all happened very quickly.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD "Decontrol, at Last" from the Washington Post and "Yes, Decontrol; But Now What?" from the New York Times, both published on Thursday, January 29, 1981.

The articles follow:

DECONTROL, AT LAST

President Reagan was absolutely right to decontrol oil and gasoline prices, quickly and without qualification. It is an essential step toward a rational energy policy. You can dismiss all of those tendentious claims about the added cost to the consumer. The added cost to the consumer will probably be in the range of zero. More than five-sixths of the country's crude oil supply is decontrolled. Home heating oil was decontrolled five years ago. As for gasoline, competition is holding actual retail prices well below the legal ceilings. For the country as a whole, these controls have brought nothing but harm, and the end of them will bring nothing but benefit.

The controls were wrong in theory when President Nixon imposed them in 1971. They were demonstrably wrong, as much costly experience already showed, when Congress insisted on perpetuating them in 1975. President Carter wisely began the process of decontrol last spring. The schedule was a gradual one running into next fall, when the law will expire altogether. Mr. Reagan has now sped up that final process by eight months.

Why were controls wrong? Because they disguised the dangerously high cost of oil to the American economy. The control system required refiners with cheap, price-controlled domestic oil to subsidize other refiners' imports. That held the price to American consumers far below the cost of the imports. Americans used a lot and kept the flow of imported oil high. That seriously damaged the country's balance of payments and eroded the value of the American dollar.

The high level of American imports helped create the very tight market that en-

abled the exporting nations to double their prices in 1979. By now, the price to the American consumer is undoubtedly higher than it would have been in the absence of any price controls at all. As an attempt to protect the American economy from higher oil costs, the controls have been an unmitigated failure.

Prices have been rising, inevitably, even under the controls. They aren't going to rise any faster in the absence of controls, unless another world shortage develops. Decontrol may even slow the rise a little. The control system contained a number of hidden subsidies—including the usual fat subsidy for the independent refiners—that will now lapse, saving the public a little money.

At worst, in another international shortage and panic like the one in 1979 following the Iranian revolution, prices will indeed rise. How much? It depends on the scale of the shortage. There could be a squeeze on the supply line as early as this spring, if the war continues between Iran and Iraq. But in return for higher prices at the gasoline pump, you will get insurance against a return of the gasoline lines. Those lines were created by the price ceilings, and the cumbersome allocation rules that they required. Having been through two memorable episodes of gasoline lines, most Americans would surely prefer the next time around to pay in money rather than time, anger and anxiety.

YES, DECONTROL OIL; BUT NOW WHAT?

President Reagan is right to end the price controls on oil immediately, eight months ahead of schedule. The effect of that decision will be to raise the cost of fuel by an additional 5 to 10 cents a gallon. But price increases are a necessary if unpleasant part of the process of adjusting to energy scarcity.

Decontrol alone does not, however, constitute an adequate oil policy. It is not likely to protect the economy against temporary shortages like those experienced in 1974 and 1979. Nor will it significantly reduce dependence on foreign oil imports in the long term.

The price controls imposed on domestic oil and refined fuels after the 1973 Arab oil embargo were intended to deny American producers the fruits of the OPEC monopoly. They did offer some price relief, but they also reduced the incentive both to conserve oil and to explore for more. Equally damaging was the tangle of price regulations created by controls, delaying modernization in the refining industry and providing billions in unearned, if legal, profits for refiners and retailers who know their way around Washington.

President Carter wisely pronounced the control system a failure last year and ordered it phased out by next September. President Reagan is now on the verge of speeding the pace. The danger is that he will listen to advisers who believe that decontrol and repeal of the "windfall" tax are all that is needed for an energy policy. Unleash industry, they contend, and it will find all the energy America needs.

But a free market alone cannot possibly eliminate dependence on the OPEC nations. Higher oil prices have helped to reduce imports over the last three years, both by cutting demand and increasing exploration. Still higher prices will surely help in the same way. Decontrol will have succeeded even if it did no more than arrest the downward spiral in domestic production. But few analysts believe that America could become self-sufficient in liquid fuels at anything like current prices.

At least in theory, freely priced oil could prevent chaos caused by gasoline shortages, as in the summer of 1979. Once dealers are free to charge even a dollar or two more per gallon in a time of critical shortage, they would ration the available gas far more effectively than did the gasless Sundays and long lines. But it is hard to believe that American motorists would long tolerate such enormous price increases. The public resents the trend of oil company profits. An emergency that increased their profits tenfold would quickly produce demands for more formal rationing or much higher oil taxes.

Oil decontrol, in other words, is no magic bullet. To minimize import dependence, Government intervention must supplement market forces. Heavy taxes on gasoline, rebated dollar for dollar to the public, would probably accomplish the most with the least economic dislocation. No one would get rich at the public's expense. Yet those who needed to use their cars would have adequate access to fuel; those who didn't would have a powerful incentive to conserve.

There are other means to the same end, such as tariffs on oil imports or tougher fuel economy standards for automobiles. But one prerequisite for a debate on their relative merits is leadership from the top. The sooner President Reagan accepts the reality of energy scarcity the sooner that debate can begin. ●

COAST-TO-COAST DROUGHT AFFLICTING UNITED STATES

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, in a newsletter which I sent to my constituents in 1979, I pointed out that water could well be our next crisis, and the nationwide drought in recent months has clearly proven the accuracy of that prediction. I am including at this point in the RECORD a news article from the February 2, 1981, edition of the Washington Post which further documents this precarious situation.

In the 96th Congress, I introduced a resolution calling for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Water Resources, but no action was taken. Because matters have clearly worsened, I have reintroduced my resolution; it is now House Resolution 38, and I would urge my colleagues to join me in this effort. The lack of water has now become a national issue, and it is now nearly past time to establish some sort of national water policy. For further background, let me refer my colleagues to page 28224 of the October 12, 1979, RECORD, and page 29701 of the October 25, 1979, edition. I feel very strongly that this is an issue that we cannot afford to continue to ignore.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

COAST-TO-COAST DROUGHT IS UNIQUE IN
ANNALS OF WEATHER RECORDING

MEMPHIS.—For the past four months, a single weather pattern has gripped virtually

the entire United States, causing a coast-to-coast drought unique in the annals of weather recording.

Water emergencies have been declared all along the East Coast; farmers from Colorado to Pennsylvania are seeing damage to winter crops and are fearful about their spring ones; ski resorts, despite some snow in the past few days, have reported disastrously low levels, even bare ground in several areas that usually have 60 or 70 inches.

The drought's most visible effects are in the Midwest. The Mississippi River, which draws water from 40 percent of the United States—from the Rockies to the Appalachians and from Canada to the Gulf—dropped off the water gauge at Memphis in early January.

Officials installed additional gauges, but by the 10th of the month, the river had sunk below the lowest water level ever recorded at the city. And it continued to drop until last week when it hit 24 feet below normal, the lowest since records began to be kept when Mark Twain used to pilot vessels past Memphis more than 110 years ago.

The low water has struck fear into the hearts of the river pilots. Scores of towboats and barges have run aground in the mud and sand between Illinois and Louisiana, closing the river to traffic at least six times since Christmas and for up to five days at a time.

"I've just come from a meeting with many of the captains of these boats and some of them have been on the river 25 years or more. They say they have never seen anything like it—drought, yes, but never continuing for such a long time," said Les Sutton, president of Dravo-Mechling Barge Co.

"If the drought continues, I can imagine things just gradually getting worse and worse, with river closures of up to a week or longer, and finally the [Army] Corps of Engineers will just not be able to maintain the channel at all," he said.

The Mississippi barges normally carry over half the grain, 20 percent of the crude oil, and 15 percent of the coal transported in the United States each year. In the past month, 126 towboats and 1,455 barges have run aground even though barge owners have reduced loads by 15 to 20 percent to lessen the draft of their vessels.

The economic losses to the barge transport industry are estimated in the millions of dollars, some of which is being passed through to food, chemical, oil, and manufacturing companies, which are suffering losses of their own in some cases because of the fouled river traffic.

The weather system causing the drought is one of the most unusual national patterns ever recorded. Many meteorologists feel it marks the end of a 40-year cycle, the end of the extremely good weather the nation has experienced since the Dust Bowl days. They believe that the United States is in for severe and highly erratic weather conditions like those that brought record snow, cold, and drought in three of the past four years.

"This is a very unusual, a unique weather pattern for the nation," said Roland Loffredo, chief hydrologist with the National Weather Service. "I've never seen anything like it and I don't think anyone else has either."

"Rain and snowfall is below normal in virtually every area of the United States—I've never seen a pattern so broad. In the Midwest, the rainfall is up to 15 inches or more below normal," Loffredo said.

According to several meteorologists who have analyzed the situation, there are two reasons for the current weather pattern, both extremely unusual:

First, there are two very large and very persistent high-pressure systems that have planted themselves over the West Coast and Rocky Mountains and remained there for four months. In America such long-lived weather centers were almost unheard of until 1977, when a similar one blocked the West Coast for months. Last summer, another pressed down on the Midwest and part of the East, causing record high temperatures and continuing the water deficit that began the previous winter.

Second, the "jetstream"—a bundle of powerful steering currents that move at speeds up to 300 miles per hour at 30,000 feet above the earth—is not where it normally is. This is important because its high-speed wind currents drive storm systems before them as they meander across the continent.

Normally the jetstream would wander straight through the middle of the country from west to east, pushing storms into a position where they could pick up moisture from the Gulf of Mexico and, as they spin clockwise, deposit it on the Midwest and East.

When the jetstream alters course the meteorological results are dramatic.

In 1977, it skipped up and crossed Canada instead of the United States, dropping down south only when it reached the Great Lakes. This left the West in extreme dryness while the Midwest and East experienced severe Arctic cold mixed with snow created when the icy air met moisture moving northward from the Gulf of Mexico.

This year, because of the very long-lived high-pressure system sitting on the West Coast, the jetstream jumped again up into Canada. However, this time it has not turned south at the Great Lakes. It has continued across to the north and straight to the Atlantic Ocean.

So one great engine that drives the nation's storms is missing us almost completely.

One good dose of rain and snow did blast its way across the West last week, dumping up to nine inches of snow over parts of the Midwest over the weekend.

"That will be great for the ski resorts for about two weeks," said a spokesman for the National Weather Service in Denver. "But that is the only storm that has broken through the dry pattern dominating the nation's weather." By the middle of this week the Washington area should receive some rain from that system, but probably not enough to appreciably affect low river levels, ground water levels, or reservoir depletion.

"That one storm has passed through . . . and we've gone right back and set up the very stable high pressure area that has caused the drought. It looks like we are going right back into the dry weather, and possibly for some time to come," the spokesman said.

And even a good dose of rain won't go far toward replenishing the Mississippi. "If it rains 24 hours a day from now until next week," said an Army Corps of Engineers spokesman, "that won't even bring it [the river] up to its old record [flow]."

The fear of those who own boats and barges on the Mississippi, and the fear of the thousands of farmers whose lands lie in the Mississippi basin, is that this drought will not confine itself to the winter in which it can do limited damage. They fear it will

remain through February and even into March or April.

"Everything now depends on having heavier-than-normal rains in the late winter and spring," said Loffredo. "We are already at the bottom limits on our reservoirs and river levels. And we are still operating at a deficit from the dry conditions last summer, and even last winter. So we have to try to rebuild the water levels of three winters ago.

"If we don't get those rains, the situation will get very serious. Very serious," he said.

The National Weather Service, is now predicting rain below normal levels for all the United States in the next 30 days, except for a patch of the West including Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and part of Colorado.

This prediction, if it turns out to be correct, means that the drought will continue through February, bringing the country toward a major climatic disaster in the spring.

Some farmers have already reported that winter wheat appears stunted, and if the drought continues through the winter, a large percentage of their crops will be lost. To grow well in the spring, winter wheat must be planted in a moist soil, and then get a good snow cover to protect the sprouts from temperatures below zero degrees Fahrenheit, which can kill them. The current crop in most places had too little soil moisture to begin with, and now has little or no snow cover. Under these conditions the crop may be killed at temperatures even several degrees above zero.

In the Washington area, the Occoquan Reservoir has dropped from a 100-day supply of water to less than 40 days' worth. Another supply of fresh water for Washington residents, the Potomac River, has slumped to the second-lowest level in the 50 years that records have been kept. The Potomac is flowing at 1.3 billion gallons per day; normal flow is over 7 billion gallons.

If the drought continues, the river by next month could drop to 700 million gallons a day—the danger level in terms of its ability to supply Washington with water.

The Chesapeake Bay had a record low inflow of fresh water in January, only about 20 percent of normal.

Normally, at this time of year, 55.3 billion gallons of fresh water flow into the bay every day; in January the average was 11.5 billion per day. This dribbling flow into the bay represents the rainfall and stream conditions over the entire 65,000-square-mile area of the Middle Atlantic states, and it was the lowest since records began to be kept 30 years ago.

As a result the salt front, where the ocean's salt water meets the flowing fresh water of the bay, has begun to move. No longer held back by the force of fresh water flowing from rivers into the bay, the salt front has now moved 28 miles inland.

Similar drought conditions exist throughout the East, with record lows being set on streams in New Jersey, especially the Delaware River, which fell to 25 percent below the lowest level ever recorded. Reservoir levels that feed New York City have fallen to less than two-thirds of capacity.

Notices of fines totaling \$4.2 million have been sent to thousands of businesses and residences in New Jersey in an effort to enforce the state's water rationing plan. The residents of wealthy Greenwich, Conn., have been asked to cut their water use by more than half, as that community is now left with less than an 18-day supply. ●

THE GOOD NEWS DEPARTMENT

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may have seen the article in Sunday's New York Times business section about the condition of U.S. exports. In fiscal year 1981 our agricultural exports are expected to reach a record high of \$48.5 billion according to the Economics and Statistics Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This represents a 20-percent gain over the previous year's figure which valued farm shipments from the United States to our foreign trading partners at \$40.5 billion.

For California's agriculture community, which I am most proud to represent here, our farm exports belong in, what one California economist called, the good news department of our trade picture. From a news article written by John Johnson of the Fresno Bee, which I will include in the RECORD following my remarks, a better than average year is predicted for California farm exports. It is interesting to note that if California were a separate nation, it would be exceeded only by the United States, itself, in cotton exports.

The contribution of my home State's farmers to our overall business in world trade is important to the entire country, especially when we take into account our sizable imports of foreign oil.

With our economy in desperate need of brightening, there is much we can do to expand California's good news department.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The article follows:

FARM EXPORTS HELP KEEP STATE AFLOAT

A third of California's agricultural products last year ended up in South Korean garment shops, in Japanese fruit bowls and on the shelves of European nut lovers.

In fact, according to an economist from Security Pacific National Bank, farm exports are helping the state keep its economy from sinking under rising foreign oil prices.

In the first half of 1980, California agricultural exports amounted to \$2.7 billion, a 35 percent increase over the first half of the previous year, according to Gladys Moreau.

Her export forecast for 1981, delivered at a Fresno City and County Chamber of Commerce luncheon Wednesday, was for another good year, although not as good as this year. The reason is that the 1980 cotton crop is not as good as the 1979 "bumper crop," she said.

Another factor is the continuing worldwide economic slowdown, which means a reduction in buying power abroad.

But Moreau still predicted a 25 percent increase in the value of foreign exports—better than an average year.

Calling agricultural exports the "good news department" of America's foreign trade, Moreau pointed out that farm ex-

ports recently produced a \$1.6 billion surplus for California. That alone offset nearly half of the state's overall deficit, which she attributed to imports of expensive foreign oil.

"If agriculture was not doing so well, the state would really be in trouble," she said.

California's five major export crops are cotton, fruit and nuts, grains, oil and fats and meat and meat products.

"If California was a nation, it would be second in the world (behind the rest of the United States) in cotton exports," she said.

She said the outlook for cotton internationally remains good, in part because oil price increases are forcing up the cost of synthetic, oil-based materials. There also has been a fashion revival of interest in cotton clothing.

Much of America's cotton winds up in garment houses of nations with cheap labor, where it is made into clothing and resold.

California exports 90 percent of the nation's nuts, mostly walnuts and almonds, many of which wind up on European tables.

But California's biggest customers abroad are Asian countries, which account for 75 percent of the state's farm exports. By contrast, Europe receives only 18 percent of the farm exports, Moreau said. But that represents an increase of 7 percent over last year, which is a hopeful economic sign, according to Moreau.

Questioned about the future, she said grains will be in demand, because many nations cannot feed themselves.

But there are some uncertainties in Japanese trade, she said. The Japanese are among California's best customers in fruit and meat products.

On the one hand, Japan has lifted some trade restrictions on American farm products. But on the other, if overt pressure is brought on the Japanese to reduce their exports of small cars to take the pressure off Detroit, there could be retaliation.

Moreau said she doubts anything that drastic will occur, however. She said Japan probably will quietly, and voluntarily, reduce auto exports.●

IS IT TIME TO SWITCH OFF TAX DOLLARS FROM PUBLIC TELEVISION?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, syndicated columnist Patrick J. Buchanan recently raised serious questions about the future of public television. Given the fact that the Reagan administration is committed to cutting the Federal budget drastically, is there any reason why tax dollars should any longer support public television? Buchanan offers a convincing argument that the Reagan administration should take a long, hard look at public tax-supported financing of public television. We are going to be debating subjects like this so I thought it would be worthwhile to bring this column to your attention.

Mr. Speaker, I insert "Time To Switch Off Public Television" by Patrick J. Buchanan, the Chicago Tribune, January 29, 1981:

TIME TO SWITCH OFF PUBLIC TELEVISION

(By Patrick Buchanan)

WASHINGTON.—Early on in the Reagan administration the proposition that federally created agencies are immortal may be tested.

In a still-secret report to budget director Dave Stockman, the transition team for public radio and TV makes the unanimous recommendation "that federal funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting be phased out."

The arguments arrayed for pulling the plug on CPB, and letting its creatures, the Public Broadcasting System and National Public Radio, sink or swim are familiar but more compelling when Congress is considering a cut in food stamps.

First, says the secret report, CPB has few functions to justify the \$8 to \$10 million in administrative overhead it gobbles up annually in its handsome headquarters office on 16th Street, a door or two down from the Soviet Embassy. Three of every \$5 it gets annually from Congress are disbursed to local PBS stations according to a mechanical formula which could be handled by a first generation computer.

Second, federal funding—which provided almost every dime of CPB's money—has ceased to be the major source of funds for public broadcasting, which now leans on corporations, foundations, states, local governments, universities, and individuals.

Third, the outstanding public television shows—such as Sesame Street and the MacNeil-Lehrer Report—have never been primarily dependent upon federal subsidy.

Most important, argues the transition team, technology is making moot the original argument for taxpayer subsidies to public television. With cable TV coming on stream, cassettes, video discs, and direct satellite transmission, public television is no longer the "alternative" to commercial fare, but, rather, a redundancy, a superfluity with a dubious claim to further taxpayer support.

(While an earlier draft of the transition report recommends putting CPB through cold turkey—i.e., zero funding, as soon as possible—the final report recommends a phasing out beginning in fiscal 1983, to give public television time to adjust to a competitive environment.)

"The Reagan administration has a unique opportunity," the report reads. "It is possible and feasible in the 97th Congress to lift the federal tax burden of public broadcasting and begin to put it on a stable, long-term, self-sustaining basis—free of government involvement and control."

While the annual taxpayer subsidy to public TV, less than \$200 million in a budget approaching \$700 billion, is relatively small, the administration's decision will be a test of its willingness to take on a powerful, articulate constituency which will not surrender its subsidized entertainment without a fight.

In the winter issue of the scholarly Wilson Quarterly, communications professor Stuart Shorenstein asks—and appears to answer in the negative—the question: "Does Public Television Have a Future?"

His arguments parallel those of the confidential transition report:

"To be blunt, PBS has neither the freedom nor the resources to compete with the commercial networks in news or public affairs programming. It has no overseas bureaus, no central news desk, no equivalent of the networks' evening news programs. PBS barely covered the 1980 Republican

and Democratic conventions. Even the best of public TV's news shows, like the "MacNeil-Lehrer Report," do not approach the popularity or the visual range of CBS "60 Minutes."

"Ratings are not PBS' strong point either. PBS' prime-time ratings share is about 3.5 per cent; even the most popular shows on public TV such as the periodic National Geographic specials have never reached more than 16 per cent of television households. A commercial show with that rating would be cancelled at once."

"Public television's dilemma is that if it can't attract large enough audiences, many of its funding sources—e.g., corporations, foundations, and the federal government, not to mention the audience itself—may dry up; if it gears its programming to the ratings game, it will betray the principles on which it was founded. . . ."

For 18 years, the taxpayers have been subsidizing public broadcasting. Time enough to put it on its feet. As the transition report notes:

"Citizens should be allowed to see, hear, and pay for what best meets their needs and desires. There is no more basis for the federal government to play a leading role in this process than there is for the government to play a similar role in the publication of novels or textbooks or in theatrical productions." Amen.●

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 additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 3, 1981, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 4

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Labor-Management Services Administration, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the Employment

Standards Administration of the Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the prospective nomination of Ray A. Barnhart, of Texas, to be the Federal Highway Administrator of the Department of Transportation.

4200 Dirksen Building
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to extend the temporary limit on the public debt.

2221 Dirksen Building
10:30 a.m.
Special on Aging
To hold hearings on the estate tax impact on older women.

1224 Dirksen Building
2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

S-128, Capitol
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Mine Safety and Health Administration of the Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building
Finance
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation to extend the temporary limit on the public debt.

2221 Dirksen Building
4:00 p.m.
Office of Technology Assessment
The Board, to hold a general business meeting.

EF-100, Capitol

FEBRUARY 5

10:00 a.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, departmental management programs, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped of the Department of Labor.

1114 Dirksen Building
Armed Services
To resume hearings on proposed fiscal year 1982 authorizations requests for Navy and Marine Corps programs of the Department of Defense.

212 Russell Building
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nomination of Donald P. Hodel, of Oregon, to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

3110 Dirksen Building
Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nomination of Edward C. Schmults, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Attorney General.

2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 6

10:00 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment-unemployment situation for January.

2128 Rayburn Building

FEBRUARY 17

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
International Finance and Monetary Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 144, to promote the formation of U.S. export trading companies to expand export participation by smaller U.S. companies.

5302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Services Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review those programs administered by the Department of Transportation.

1318 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Center for Disease Control of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 18

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
International Finance and Monetary Policy Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 144, to promote the formation of U.S. export trading companies to expand export participation by smaller U.S. companies.

5302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To continue hearings on committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To continue hearings on committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981.

301 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 20

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Resources Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Panama Canal Commission; and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation of the Department of Transportation.

1318 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 23

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, scientific activities overseas, and retirement pay program for commissioned officers of the Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 24

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Health Care Financing Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds through fiscal year 1985 for the airport development aid program.
235 Russell Building

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1981, and other legislative and administrative committee business.
301 Russell Building

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1981 from the Disabled American Veterans.
318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Human Development Services of the Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 25

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Social Security Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Aviation Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds through fiscal year 1985 for the airport development aid program.
235 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Inspector General, Office for Civil Rights, policy research programs,

and departmental management programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
1114 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 26

9:30 a.m.

Special on Aging
Organizational business meeting, to consider its rules of procedure for the 97th Congress, and other pending committee business.
Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain departmental management programs and the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Coast Guard of the Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 270, to provide for the deregulation of the radio broadcasting industry.
235 Russell Building

FEBRUARY 27

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 270, to provide for the deregulation of the radio broadcasting industry.
235 Russell Building

MARCH 2

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for elementary and secondary educational programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army Cemeterial Expenses, the Office of Consumer Affairs, and the Consumer Information Center.
1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for impact aid programs, and emergency school aid programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Transportation; and the National Transportation Safety Board.
S-126, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for library and learning resource programs and vocational and adult education programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 4

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for educational, rehabilitation, and research programs for the handicapped of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain student financial assistance programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 5

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain school improvement programs, special institutions, and Howard University of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institute of Education, fund for the improvement of postsecondary education, educational statistics, educational research and training activities overseas of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 10

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institute of Building Science, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Credit Union Administration, and the Office of Revenue Sharing (NYC).

1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Community Services Administration.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Administration, Research and Special Programs and the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation.

S-126, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, and the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 11

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Railroad Retirement Board, domestic operations programs of ACTION, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the President's Commission on Ethical Problems in Medicine.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 12

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Metro).

1318 Dirksen Building

MARCH 16

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 17

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Veterans' Administration.

1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration of the Department of Transportation.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 18

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 19

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Na-

tional Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).

1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 20

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

1114 Dirksen Building

APRIL 1

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Selective Service System.

S-126, Capitol

APRIL 8

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Council on Environmental Quality, and the National Regulatory Council.

S-126, Capitol.

APRIL 22

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

9:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Science Foundation.

1318 Dirksen Building

1420

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 2, 1981

MAY 12

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 20

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 21

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and

Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.
1224 Dirksen Building

JUNE 2

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and certain independent agencies.

1224 Dirksen Building