

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I again rise to express my concern about the adverse effects of the executive pay ceiling on the quality of our Senior Executive Service. As many are aware, we are in the midst of a major exodus of top managerial and technical talent from our senior ranks.

Why? These employees have had a single 5½-percent pay raise since 1977 while the cost of living has increased by over 47 percent during the same period. Because of the pay cap, we now have some 33,000 top executives and lesser management employees all at the pay ceiling. As a result, in many cases, there are four to seven tiers of management being paid the same salary. With the upcoming October 1 increase, GS-14's will be paid the same salary as our top ES-6 senior executives; an intolerable and inexcusable situation.

Within the last 3 years, retirement of the highest ranking Federal employees aged to 55 to 59 have risen from 18.2 percent to 95 percent, and there is no question that pay is the cause of their unprecedented and alarming increase. And who is benefitting from this exodus? The private sector. As indicated in June 1, 1981, Newsweek article entitled "The Federal Brain Drain," the private sector is reaping the benefits of these unexpected retirements. Now that the first Space Shuttle has been successfully completed, for instance, NASA expects to lose much of its team to private industry where salaries are sometimes triple what NASA pays. "We're losing the best people because there are jobs in industry for these people," says Dr. Robert Wiseman, who hires scientists and engineers for the Department of the Army. The Newsweek article goes on the cite similar problems at the National Institutes of Health which has been rebuffed by five outside candidates for the top jobs in the Cancer Cause and Preventive Division because the capped \$50,112 salary is far from competitive.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the above mentioned Newsweek article be inserted in the RECORD, and, again, beseech my colleagues in the Congress and the administration to focus their attention and efforts on resolving this very serious problem.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very timely article which appeared in the June 18, 1981, edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "Uncle Sam's Hemorrhage of Senior Managers."

[From Newsweek, June 1, 1981]

THE FEDERAL BRAIN DRAIN

Roy McKinnon liked his job. In over 26 years as an FBI official, he headed the investigation into the 1969 murders of United Mine Workers leader Joseph Yablonski and his family, helped negotiate an end to the Indian uprising at Wounded Knee and last year he was promoted to an assistant director of the bureau. But his \$50,112-a-year salary had been frozen by a pay cap ordered by President Carter and a change in government benefits threatened to cut his monthly pension by \$250 a month. So last January, at 50, McKinnon took early retirement. It wasn't just the money. "My career was built on the credibility of the agents working for me," he says. "Under the circumstances people might have thought, 'This guy's a damn fool to stay on'."

McKinnon is not a statistic—one of hundreds of top Federal employees who have left government recently. The resulting "brain drain" is becoming so great that many agencies can't find good managers or technical experts to run billions of dollars worth of programs. Within the last three years, retirement of the highest-ranking Federal employees aged 55 to 59 has risen from 18.2 percent to 95 percent. Many younger civil servants are quitting too, taking private-sector jobs that pay up to triple their government salaries. They include some of the best and the brightest in government, including Dr. Robert Levy, who ran the heart, lung, and blood program for the National Institutes of Health, and Donald K. (Deke) Slayton, who was flight test manager for NASA's space shuttle. "If you really want a bloated bureaucracy populated by incompetents who can't make it in the private sector, the surest way is to stay with the [pay] policies we're following now," warns Rep. William Ford of Michigan.

Many say the problem began when Jimmy Carter tried to reform the civil service. In an effort to improve incentives, a Senior Executive Service was created for about 8,000 top employees. They gave up some civil-service job security in return for financial incentives that included promises of hefty pay increases and sizable bonuses for jobs well done. But, strapped for funds, Carter soon scaled down the bonuses and, except for one small pay raise in 1979, decided not to remove a pay ceiling imposed in 1977. With their pay frozen, many employees began to leave. In addition, the pay ceiling produced a phenomenon called "pay compression." Executives in the top seven civil-service categories ended up with the same \$50,112 maximum salary. A promotion no longer meant a pay increase and an employee who managed 2,000 people often earned no more than his subordinates. "It's not a matter of a living wage," insists Paul Lorntzen of the Federal Executive Institute

Alumni Association. "It's a matter of getting talented people to run the Federal government at the highest levels."

The private sector is reaping the benefits of the government brain drain. Now that the first space shuttle has been successfully completed, for instance, NASA expects to lose much of its team to private industry where salaries are sometimes triple what NASA pays. "We're losing the best people because there are jobs in industry for those people," says Dr. Robert Wiseman, who hires scientists and engineers for the Department of the Army. The National Institutes of Health has been rebuffed by five outside candidates for the top job in the Cancer Cause and Prevention Division because the minimum salary of \$50,112 is far from competitive.

The drain is likely to continue. President Reagan has abandoned for now a campaign promise to raise executive salaries, and Congress is prohibited by law from increasing the pay of the Senior Executive Service without raising its own. And that, in the midst of budget cuts, is unlikely. Congress could change the law and grant increases to the bureaucratic elite, but it probably won't.

"There's a kind of professional jealousy on the Hill that if we can't get a raise, the bureaucrats aren't going to get one either," says one Congressional aide. In an age of budget cuts and government-as-villain politics, the senior bureaucrats are not likely to win much public sympathy. But if the drain continues, the Federal bureaucracy will end up even less efficient than it is now.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 18, 1981]

UNCLE SAM'S HEMORRHAGE OF SENIOR MANAGERS

(By Joann S. Lublin)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. government is suffering a serious "brain drain" of its most experienced top managers and Congress could hardly care less.

Thus a promising experiment in improving government efficiency may be in danger of extinction.

The experiment involves the Senior Executive Service, created by the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. A cadre of top civil servants gave up certain job protections in return for the right to win bonuses for superior performance. These officials oversee 1.7 million workers and a nearly \$700 billion budget, so any boost in their productivity could have a vast ripple effect on government efficiency, a much-stated goal of the Reagan administration.

But the lack of any recent pay raises for the 6,700 senior federal executives and the setting of limits on expected bonuses are hurting morale and contributing to an unprecedented wave of resignations and early retirements. More than 45 percent of nearly 1,000 senior executives polled recently said they may leave the government within the next two years. Many agencies also face increasing difficulty in recruiting qualified replacements from the private sector.

A report released yesterday by the President's Advisory Committee on Federal Pay criticized the widening gap between federal

and private-sector salaries. "We're losing a serious investment in people" from the resulting "alarming" executive brain drain, committee Chairman Jerome Rosow told a news conference. "You can always get a warm body" to replace federal managers, he went on. "But what's the long-term impact?"

"The government is losing and the country is losing" from the inevitable employment of inexperienced top managers, says Robert Wiseman, 57, a retiring SES member who has had trouble recruiting top engineering scientists for the Army.

The Reagan administration recognizes that "the loss of key individuals is going to (have an) impact on the effectiveness of implementing its program," admits George Nesterczuk, an associate director of the Office of Personnel Management, who oversees the SES. He adds a note of hope, however: "It may just be a matter of time before we can turn that whole thing around."

"The whole pay thing" affects not only the Senior Executive Service but also 26,300 middle managers in the government. Despite big differences in their duties, all these officials' salaries remain frozen at \$50,112 because of Congress's refusal in March to grant raises to them and to itself, the judiciary, the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet. This so-called "pay compression" is "very galling, especially when people who have a great deal of responsibility running an organization bigger than many corporations are getting the same thing as minor functionaries," says Sally Greenberg, Mr. Nesterczuk's predecessor.

Congressional reluctance to invite public outcry over big pay boosts is nothing new. But federal executives' salaries rose only about 35 percent during the 1970s, compared with an 84 percent increase for other white-collar federal workers and a 125 percent rise for private-sector executives, reports the General Accounting Office. The GAO says inflation during the decade eliminated 31 percent of the federal executives' purchasing power.

Senior U.S. officials would feel less unhappy about their compensation if Congress hadn't also curtailed bonuses. Under the 1978 law, up to half of an agency's SES positions could receive awards of up to \$20,000 a year. But last summer Congress cut those eligible to 25 percent and the OPM knocked down that share to 20 percent after hearing reports of favoritism and use of the bonuses to sidestep the pay ceiling rather than reward performance.

Now the Reagan administration is fighting renewed congressional support for eliminating the senior executives' bonuses altogether—which the House voted to do last year. "This isn't the kind of cut that's really going to hurt people, like cutting back on food stamps or low-income housing," says Aubrey "Tex" Gunnells, a House Appropriations Subcommittee staffer. "You go out to Podunk and see if you can convince them to give someone in government making \$50,000 a \$10,000 or \$20,000 bonus for doing his job."

Nonetheless, poor prospects for pay raises and bonuses have doubled the usual employee turnover rate to 18 percent or 20 percent among SES members at NASA, the Air Force and other agencies. NASA expects to soon lose 30 senior officials who played important technical roles in the recent space shuttle project. "That can have an adverse impact on the continued development of the shuttle," says Carl Grant, NASA personnel director.

Many bonus-winners leaving the government land much better-paying jobs in the private sector. Dr. Robert Levy, 44, is quitting as head of the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute to become Tufts University's health sciences vice president for twice his \$60,000 government salary. After getting a \$5,000 bonus last year, he saw little chance of winning another this year because of the restrictions. "But I wasn't so much frustrated with the SES," Dr. Levy says, "as with the fact that I work seven days a week . . . and I'm rapidly moving into debt." Three of his children will attend Ivy League colleges next fall.

Filling Dr. Levy's job and other SES vacancies can't be done easily. The pay ceiling means "you take second best" for top research posts, a National Institutes of Health official says. Five "well-qualified" outside candidates recently rejected offers for one such position.

The Army wanted to consider promoting a middle manager to be a command, personnel director. The man, who had been in an executive training program for two years, decided that a move from San Antonio to Atlanta without a pay raise would be too costly. The Army's civilian personnel director, Fred Newman, says, "We're going to have to go for the less knowledgeable person with less expertise. It's like bringing up someone from a farm team like the Alexandria Dukes to play for the New York Yankees."

These problems are not lost on the Reagan administration. Though the President is committed to reducing the bureaucracy, "We want effective people in there," says Donald Devine, director of the Office of Personnel Management. Without a first-rate civil service, he adds, "You're going to be wasting billions of dollars." ●

COLORADO MAY JOIN REBELLION

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed Associated Press wire story with a Denver dateline indicates that the mood in Western States is still strong to transfer Federal unappropriated lands to States for control. My bill, H.R. 3655, would allow for the orderly transfer of Federal lands to States to control and manage in a sound "multiple use" manner.

Support for the Sagebrush Rebellion is evidenced by the Colorado State Senate's recent 21 to 9 vote to support transferring millions of acres of public lands to the States.

I urge my House colleagues to read the article. The Sagebrush Rebellion is a viable and lively issue which Congress must consider seriously.

COLORADO MAY JOIN REBELLION

DENVER.—The Colorado Legislature gave final approval Tuesday to a bill that would place the state in the thick of the Sagebrush Rebellion, leaving Gov. Richard Lamm to decide whether to veto the proposed state takeover of federal land.

The bill, which seeks to transfer 22 million acres of federal land to state ownership,

was readopted Tuesday by the Senate on a 21-9 vote after senators accepted several House amendments.

Lamm has voiced opposition to many aspects of the Sagebrush Rebellion, particularly the possibility of wilderness land being opened up for development, but he has not stated specifically whether he would veto the bill.

If signed into law by Lamm, the bill would establish a commission to plan and oversee the transfer of 14 million acres of Forest Service land and 8 million acres of Bureau of Land Management land. None of the property could be sold to private interests without approval of two-thirds of the Legislature. ●

THE TOBACCO DEREGULATION ACT OF 1981

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Tobacco Deregulation Act of 1981, which would get the Government out of the tobacco business. My legislation would eliminate the tobacco allotment system, repeal the loan-price support system, charge user fees for tobacco services, and increase the tax on a pack of cigarettes by 2 cents without increasing its sales price.

I have introduced this legislation because I feel that this industry needs to be deregulated. Significant economic benefits will accrue through passage of this bill. A free enterprise environment for tobacco will benefit both the actual tobacco farmers, and tobacco product manufacturers, and will encourage tobacco exports. This legislation will generate an extra \$700 million in revenue without increasing the retail price of tobacco products. In addition, elimination of the support program would save over \$100 million yearly in administrative costs and loan subsidies.

What follows is a brief description of the tobacco industry, the mechanics of the current Government price support program and its problems, and an analysis of my bill and its benefits. Throughout my research in this area I have tried to obtain the most accurate statistics available. However, as people in the industry are aware, many times different sources of information do not compare precisely with each other, figure for figure. In preparing my remarks I have tried to use those figures which have the largest acceptance.

During my review of this industry I sought information from many different Government agencies and private groups. These organizations include: Department of Agriculture/ASCS, Tobacco Institute, Tobacco Tax Council, Congressional Research Service, Flue-Cured Tobacco Cooperative Stabiliza-

tion Corporation, General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, USDA/ESS, USDA/Tobacco Group, International Trade Commission, American Medical Association, Health and Human Services/Office of Smoking and Health, Tobacco Merchants Association of the U.S., Tobacco Associates Inc., National Association of Tobacco Distributors, and others.

BACKGROUND

There are almost 1 million acres of tobacco grown in the United States each year. The 1980 tobacco crop produced about 1.8 billion pounds of leaf. 975 million pounds were used domestically while 815 million pounds were exported. While over 275,000 farmers grow tobacco, for most of them it is not their principal crop. There are about 95,000 commercial tobacco farmers. A commercial farmer is one who has an agricultural income of over \$2,500, of which at least one half must be from tobacco products. The average commercial farmer has a farm of about 130 acres of which only 7 acres are planted in tobacco.

There are many types of tobacco, some of which are not under the Government's allotment system which restricts the amount of acreage that can be planted. Flue-cured and burley tobacco make up over 90 percent of the tobacco crop and both of these are under the acreage or acreage/poundage allotment system.

Each acre of tobacco produces about 2,000 pounds of leaf. While prices vary significantly, the average price per pound is about \$1.50. Simple arithmetic shows that an average acre of tobacco has a value of about \$3,000. Under the allotment system if a farmer does not own all of the allotments he needs, and only 16 percent of the flue-cured tobacco farmers do, he must rent allotments which cost a great amount of money—\$1,000 per acre per year. The same land without an allotment, used to plant corn or soybeans for example, would cost an average of only \$60 to rent. Therefore the "monopoly rent" for tobacco is in excess of \$900 per acre, or an approximate value of at least \$900 million per year nationwide.

Predictably, our tobacco exports have run into trouble in recent years. In the last 15 years the U.S. share of the world market has declined from 60 percent to less than 30 percent. Imports of tobacco have greatly increased over the same period—by about 300 percent. Most experts agree that one of the major causes of this import/export problem is the artificially high fixed price of tobacco.

The taxes on tobacco products are very significant. There is an 8-cents-a-pack Federal tax on cigarettes, which accounts for about 98 percent of the Federal taxes on tobacco. Each year between \$2.4 and \$2.8 billion is generated in revenue for the Federal Gov-

ernment. States and municipalities also have cigarette taxes, generating additional billions of dollars.

GOVERNMENT TOBACCO SUPPORT SYSTEM

The allotment system, which I briefly described before, limits the planting of tobacco on the basis of acres or pounds depending on the type of tobacco. To own an allotment the person must also own the land to which it has been assigned. An allotment owner can rent out his allotment and have it apply to another area of land. There are over 500,000 assigned allotments.

The loan program, which buys tobacco that is not sold at commercial auctions, offers interest rates at about 14 percent for 1981. Payments are not made on a monthly basis; instead the entire loan, including interest, becomes due when the tobacco is sold. If the tobacco under loan is sold for less than the loan amount, the Government absorbs the loss. The Government finances the program through the Commodity Credit Corporation, which in turn transfers most of the administration to the tobacco associations. About \$270 million in loans will be made in fiscal year 1981.

One very serious problem with the tobacco support program is the large volume of surplus tobacco leaf which is accumulating. The Government now has over 600 million pounds of tobacco worth about \$981 million. No one is quite sure what to do with the tobacco surplus.

The Government grades tobacco, issues permits for warehouse operations, and inspects them to insure they meet proper standards.

The cost of the Government's tobacco support system is frequently disputed. Tobacco interests claim that the program only costs \$57 million over the past 40 years. However this figure only represents the amount of loans lost in the past. There are other costs associated with the program. Administration costs about \$15 million a year. The inspection and grading service has a price tag of about \$7 million a year. There is also another \$8 million in miscellaneous costs. The largest area of disagreement among various groups is how much of a loan subsidy there is. The tobacco farmers are saving about \$100 million each year having the Government finance the loan program at reduced rates compared to a commercial rate of 20 percent. However if the subsidy is defined in terms of the difference between the actual loan rate and what it cost the Government to borrow the money, the answer is less clear. Since some of the tobacco loans were made in earlier years with interest rates of less than 10 percent, it can be contended that there is some subsidy. This may amount to between \$10 to \$20 million. Recent administrative action by the USDA has adjusted the loan interest rate terms to move toward a "cost to the Government"

rate on all future loans. Another cost to the Government, which has loan program officials concerned, is the potential loss of all or part of the surplus. Tobacco spoils after some years of storage. If the Government cannot sell the tobacco surplus, the loss could be in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

TOBACCO DEREGULATION ACT OF 1981

My bill affects the tobacco industry in the following four ways: Repeal Allotment System—this action would reduce the costs of production by about one-third—by eliminating the "monopoly rent"—and allow farmers to plant tobacco freely. While owners of land with allotments would lose their allotment designation, they would still have their land and still be able to plant tobacco. A USDA study indicated that the impact of this repeal would cause fewer acres of tobacco to be planted in the first year or so of deregulation, with the number of total acres planted increasing slightly every year thereafter.

Repeal of the loan program—Under provisions of the bill the Government would no longer buy tobacco that wasn't sold at commercial tobacco auctions. The price of tobacco would decrease, encouraging exports and putting the brakes on imports. Repeal would also act as an incentive to grow only high grade tobacco. Farmers who now grow lower quality tobacco crops, which often ends up under loan and in the Government inventory, would have a hard time selling them on the commercial market. Under these provisions the Government would no longer continue to accumulate tobacco, halting the growing problem of tobacco surpluses.

Inspection and grading—The inspection, licensing and grading services now performed by the Government will continue to be operated by the Government under the bill's provisions, but user fees will be assessed to cover the costs. Congressman WAMPLER has introduced legislation for the administration which does the same thing.

Federal excise tax—This legislation calls for a 2-cents-per-pack increase in the Federal excise tax on cigarettes. The tax increase would generate about \$700 million in revenue, absorbing most of the \$900 million production cost decrease resulting from elimination of the allotment system's monopoly rents. The rest of the production cost decrease could be realized by the tobacco farmers and the manufacturers as extra profits.

Since this extra profit would amount to less than 1 cent a pack, it would be unlikely that the manufacturers would lower the price of a pack of cigarettes. While it can be argued that in most cases any cost reductions in the manufacture of a product should

be passed on to the consumer, it is clearly not desirable in the case of tobacco, which is harmful to health. It is essential that the benefits of tobacco deregulation be passed on to all of the people as taxpayers through increased Government revenue.

Additional points—The tobacco crops will continue to be covered by the Federal crop insurance program. The research and extension service for tobacco will not be affected by this legislation. Among other things, this program researches ways to eliminate the harmful effects of smoking. Also, the tobacco statistics gathering program will not be affected. The tobacco surplus would, hopefully, be sold as quickly as possible at the best price, mainly to export markets.

SUMMARY

This legislation would get the Government out of the tobacco business. Only allotment holders would be adversely affected by this legislation. In many cases the allotment holder does not do the farming. This bill would transfer the approximate value of these unjustified monopoly rents to all of the people by way of excise tax to the Treasury. This legislation would help tobacco farmers by lowering the cost of production, be of some financial benefit to the tobacco manufacturers, reduce Government regulation and bureaucracy, save the Government about \$100 million in loan subsidies and administrative costs, generate an extra \$700 million in Government revenue, and increase tobacco exports, while not affecting the price of a pack of cigarettes. It is time to return this industry to the free market and get the Government out of the tobacco business. ●

CERCEMAGGIORE ORGANIZATION OF GREENSBURG HONORS SPECIAL GUESTS

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in July a very special parish in the 21st Congressional District will honor all of its members 80 years of age and older during its celebration of La Madonna Della Libera. The Cercemaggiore Organization of Our Lady of Grace Church is composed of a group of very proud and very sensitive people. They strive to preserve their heritage and the history of the small town in Italy on the side of an Appenine Mountain, Cercemaggiore.

La Madonna Della Libera is a church about 3 miles out of Cercemaggiore which houses a statue of "La Madonna." Our Lady of Grace Church has a similar modernized version of the statue created by Father Albanese.

The story of La Madonna Della Libera dates back to 663 in the city of Benevento. Constantine, the Emperor of Constantinople, invaded Italy to try and regain his empire. The attack was vicious and the people of Benevento prayed to La Madonna (Blessed Mother) for protection. They drove Constantine back to Sicily and had a statue of La Madonna carved. They venerated her as the "Libera" the one who saved them. This devotion spread throughout the area and many statues were created for the various villages. Many of these statues were destroyed during the time of the Iconoclasts and the Satacens. In 1415 a statue of La Madonna Della Libera was found in Cercemaggiore and the town's people appealed to the bishop to build a chapel on the spot where it was discovered. An earthquake in 1456 destroyed the chapel but did not destroy the deep running strength and devotion of the people. A larger and more appropriate shrine for the Madonna was constructed.

The Cercemaggiore Organization of Greensburg is to be commended for its efforts to commemorate its heritage. Those to be honored during the July festivities include: Mary DeVone, Mary Basile, Libera Rose, Angelina Spino, John Spino, Michael Sabatine, Patsy Salvatore, Antonio Cepullio, Michael Pietrarroia, Mary Comptella, Dom Masto, Mary LaFuria, Mateo Felice, Mike Petroy, Nancy DeFloira, Mateo Felice, Biasa Rose, Anthony Sabitino, Marion Cassette, Elizabeth Pedicono, Lucy Colonna, Theresa Salvatore, John Cassette, Nicolina Pietrarroia, Joe Salvatore, Mildred Roy, Mary Basile, Josephine Testa, Lucy Uliaino, and Florence Daversa. ●

DENNI HLASATEL CELEBRATES 90TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce to my colleagues in Congress that this year marks the 90th anniversary of the only Czechoslovak daily newspaper in the free world, Denni Hlasatel, which is headquartered in Cicero, Ill., in my district.

Founded on Chicago's West Side in 1891, Denni Hlasatel remained there until March 1979, when it moved to Cicero, which is currently the heart of the Czechoslovak community.

The aim of Denni Hlasatel is not only to present the news, but also in propagating a rich Czechoslovak heritage and culture, and assisting in the struggle for freedom in Communist-ruled Czechoslovakia, a once prosperous and progressive Eastern European nation with a proud history.

I know my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating all those associated with the publishing of Denni Hlasatel, whose contributions of time and talent have made this publication such a success.

Members of the board of directors include: Josef Kučera Jr., Karel Samal, František Hrala, Ella Tollefson, officers, Antonin Slovacek, Josef Kučera Sr., and Josef Krninsky, board members.

Recent past presidents include: František Bulin, Vaclav Zolman, Karel Sámal, Anton Jurcik, Milo Tuma, Vladimír Spatny, Jaroslav Rezabek.

Current staff members include: František Hrala, circulation manager, Martin Podhrazsky, assistant circulation manager, Rose Kučera, advertising manager, Erich Jaksch, managing editor and expedition staff, Vladimír Lasky, expedition manager, Dagmar Meixner, Dana Hoffmann, Marie Cermak, graphical department.

Members of the editorial staff include: Josef Svachna, Dr. Libor Bram, Josef Vasak, Josef Markvart, Věra Cousin, Dr. Stanislav Hoffrek, Tomáš Jilek, Dr. Josef Kalvoda, Dr. Leopold Rozbořil, Rudolf Kopecky, Antonín Paleček, Dr. Jiří Veselý, Dr. Karel Hujeř, Dr. Mikuláš Ferjenčík, Jaroslav Mecu, Dr. Svatopluk Ježek, Dr. Oldřich Ducháč, Dr. Miloš Šebor, Dr. Rudolf Kreml, Alexander Koren, Anton Dusek, Bohuslav Kobilha, M. J. Broucek, Florian Skácel, Josef Herman, Jan Reban, Zdenek Pražák, Přemek Kocián, Václav Vostresz, Alois Hovorka, Antonin Dolejš, Zdenek Slavík, Dr. Hrubecský, Ema Jarošová, Vlasta Matelová, Dr. Alois Rozehnal, Eduard Fusek, Bohumil Tobyska, Josef Tomanek, Josef Hanak, Karel Rehka, Dr. František Hradil, Msgr. Ludvík Nemeč, Msgr. F. B. Vanek, Václav Ženíšek, S. Pokormy, Dr. Frank Mareš, Jaroslav Fajkus, Ota Hora, Dr. Jaroslav Kratochvíl, Jiří Španek, Dr. Jan Dočkal, L. Janacková, Dr. Professor Vilimsky, M. Špírková, Bohuslav Lastuvka, Professor Tabák, E. H. Moldrik, Josef Maleček, B. Vobliza, Jaroslav Navrátil, Robert Mach, and countless others who have devoted their time and energy for the Hlasatel.

On May 21, the Illinois House of Representatives adopted a resolution offered by Representative Judy Topinka, honoring the Denni Hlasatel on the commemoration of its 90th anniversary. In recognition of this auspicious occasion, and because of our high regard for our Czechoslovakian-American citizens who have contributed so much to the fabric of American life through their patriotism, and their love of freedom, I am pleased to offer this resolution for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(Offered by Representative Topinka)

Whereas, May 1, 1981 marked the 90th anniversary of the founding of the Denni Hlasatel (Czechoslovak Daily Herald), the only Czechoslovak daily newspaper in the free world; and

Whereas, Ever since its founding in 1891 as a result of a printers strike which caused the folding of another Czechoslovak newspaper, the Denni Hlasatel, which presently operates out of Cicero, Illinois in the heart of the Czechoslovak community, has been a Chicago institution and a dependable source of information as well as a forum for discussion of issues important to the Czechoslovakia community; and

Whereas, The original founders of the newspaper included Dr. Edwin Hare, Frank Sirovatka, Frank Stejskal and Vladimir Spatny, whose relatives are still actively involved with the newspaper; and

Whereas, Although the Denni Hlasatel had a modest beginning, its circulation rose to over 100,000 during the period between the two World Wars and by the late 1960's could be proclaimed the largest foreign language daily newspaper in the United States; and

Whereas, Over the years its contributors and subscribers have included such noted citizens as Governor Otto Kerner, Chicago Mayor Antonin Cermak, Cook County Treasurer John Toman, Cook County House of Corrections Director Edward Denemark, Dr. Andrew Toman and Congressman Adolf Sabath; and

Whereas, Besides fulfilling the function of presenting the news, the Denni Hlasatel has been a highly effective instrument for propagating the rich Czechoslovak heritage and culture as well as assisting in the struggle for freedom in the Communist-ruled Czechoslovakia; and

Whereas, Its reputation for excellence and outstanding service to the Czechoslovak community is being continued today by the dedication and energy of the Circulation Manager Frantisek Hrala, Assistant Circulation Manager Martin Podhrzsky, Advertising Manager Rose Kucera, Managing Editor Erich Jaksch, Expedition Manager Vladimir Lasky and the many dedicated members of the staff as well as the members of the board of directors; therefore, be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Second General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we join the friends and supporters of the Denni Hlasatel in celebrating its 90th anniversary; that we congratulate all those who had a role in making this celebration a reality; that we commend the newspaper for 90 years of outstanding service to the Czechoslovak community as well as to the general public; and, be it further

Resolved, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to Denni Hlasatel, with the best wishes of the people of Illinois and the members of the House.

Adopted by the House of Representatives on May 21, 1981.

GEORGE H. RYAN,

Speaker of the House.

ANTHONY J. LEONE, JR.,

Clerk of the House. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATIONS TO HARRY
McCONVILLE

HON. DOUGLAS APPEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. APPEGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Harry McConville, of East Liverpool, Ohio, for recently receiving the Distinguished Service Award from Kent State University for 16 years of outstanding service to the university.

This award is the highest honor the university can bestow upon nonacademic personnel. From the beginning, Mr. McConville was active in the founding of the East Liverpool campus of Kent State University 16 years ago. He has served as a member of the advisory board ever since and is currently chairman of the advisory board.

Mr. McConville's leadership and interest in education and community service is evident in his numerous other civic activities. After his return from active military duty during World War II, he organized the first youth booster sports program for East Liverpool High School athletes. For many years, he served as a member of the East Liverpool Board of Education. Frequently, he has been chairman of the board for the cancer fund-raising drives.

Throughout his life, Harry McConville has given freely of his time, his talent, and his knowledge to community service. He is highly regarded, and well liked by all who know him. Harry is a model for all of us and I extend to him my heartiest congratulations. ●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
HON. JOHN MURRAY, JR., OF
NEW JERSEY, CHAMPION OF
OUR VETERANS, COMMUNITY
LEADER, AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 27 the residents of my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join with the Bernard Armitage Post No. 360, American Legion of Paterson to honor one of American Legion's most illustrious past post commanders, distinguished citizen, community leader and good friend, the Honorable John Murray, Jr., whose standards of excellence throughout his lifetime have truly enriched our community, State and Nation. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in appreciation of all of his good works

and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife Agnes Eleanor, sons James and John, daughter Bonnie (Mrs. Gregory Puzio) and granddaughter Kristin Marie Puzio.

John Murray has indeed earned the highest respect and esteem of all of us for the quality of his leadership, compassion, and benevolence in distinguished service to our country and our people.

Mr. Speaker, John Murray was born in Kilmarnock, Scotland, February 25, 1922. He arrived in the United States when he was 5 years old and settled with his family in the city of Paterson. He was educated in the Paterson school system attending Public School No. 20 and graduated from the Paterson Vocational School in 1940.

John moved to Hawthorne, N.J., in early 1942, and was inducted into the U.S. Army the following year, on January 28, 1943, to do battle in World War II. He was assigned to the European theater of combat as a ground aircraft observer with the rank of corporal in Headquarters Battery 792 AAA AW BN. He was among those brave and valiant soldiers who were decorated for their valor and courage in distinguished service to our Nation receiving five major battle stars for service in air defense of England and Wales, Normandy, Northern France, Belgium, and Germany.

Mr. Speaker, our great country and all of our people can be justly proud of John Murray's outstanding contributions in service to our country. He received his honorable discharge from the Army on February 10, 1946, and has continued to serve in civilian life as an esteemed member of the American Legion as post commander, vice commander, adjutant, service officer and hospital chairman.

In Passaic County John served under 10 commanders as veterans service officer and was elevated to vice commander and county commander in 1970. He is presently serving his third 3-year term as executive committee member of the New Jersey State Department, American Legion.

At the department level he has served as a vice commander, Re-Hab Hospital Committee member, Civil Service Committee and was the first New Jersey American Legion hospital representative at the East Orange VA Restoration Center organizing off station trips for many groups of patients to big league baseball and NFL games throughout our Nation.

For the past 5 years John has been the Department of New Jersey legislative chairman where he has diligently sought benefits through State and Federal legislation for the veterans and their families. As the American Legion delegate on the New Jersey Allied Council of Veterans Organiza-

tions, he holds the same prestigious position. He is a member of both the American Legion Legislative Council and the National Security Council.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his lifetime John Murray has forged ahead with dedication, devotion and sincerity of purpose in seeking equity and justice for our people. We applaud his knowledge, training, hard work and personal commitment that has enabled him to achieve the fullest confidence and strongest support of the people of our community. In his career pursuits he currently serves as a court officer with the Passaic County Sheriff's Department.

John Murray has been a staunch and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs and we applaud his leadership endeavors in the vanguard of the veterans of America. It is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of our way of life here in America and I appreciate the opportunity to call your attention to his lifetime of outstanding public service. I particularly commend to you his unselfish and untiring devotion and dedication in seeking justice and fair play for all of our veterans and their families.

Mr. Speaker, we do indeed salute a champion of our veterans, community leader and great American—the Honorable John Murray, Jr. of New Jersey. ●

ROGER WILKINS ON THE BLACK CAUCUS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Almost 30 years ago, my first political hero, Adlai Stevenson, promised to talk sense to the American people. That is an admirable goal, but if you are a certain kind of person it is hard to get an audience no matter how much good sense you have to dispense.

Take the Congressional Black Caucus, for example. When President Reagan unveiled the outlines of his economic program, he invited anybody who disagreed with his analysis to suggest an alternative program. Well, the Black Caucus picked up his challenge. The Caucus did not just put out a paper opposing this cut or that or supporting this program or that. It put out an entire budget document and an analysis of the Nation's condition to support it. "We did not just say they are taking away from the poor and giving to the rich and so we are mad, we may riot." District of Columbia Delegate and Caucus Chairman Walter Fauntroy said, "We said we see the Nation differently. Here is what we think and here are our conclusions."

Unfortunately, according to Fauntroy, most of the Nation's press did not hear

what it was the Caucus was trying to say. When the expected words about riots did not come, most papers either ignored the story or gave it short shrift, as the New York Times did, covering it with a short wire service story that ran deep inside the paper.

Essentially, the Caucus disagreed with the President that our inflation results from Government spending and regulations. Instead, it looks to terrible balance-of-payments deficits, the high costs of energy, housing, food and health. These, the Caucus says, are the main sources of our inflation and they must be attacked head on.

In looking at the balance-of-trade problem, for example, Mr. Fauntroy argues that American industry has to start paying a great deal more attention to those areas where it can still compete effectively in world markets, invest more in promising new fields and stop propping up industries that cannot or will not buckle down to efficient, cost-competitive products. And though it does not dispute the Nation's need for a strong defense, the Caucus thinks the administration's program puts too little emphasis on the social, political, and economic problems that concern other nations as much as Soviet expansionism concerns us. Thus, political and cultural exchanges are beefed up in the caucus program and economic aid is strengthened. There are no battleships in the caucus document.

One problem the country has had since January is that nobody has challenged the administration's assumptions effectively. The Caucus tried. Too bad nobody could hear it.

This is Roger Wilkins for Spectrum. ●

SHIFT FROM FEDERAL TO PRIVATE DOLLARS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, with the growing realization that the Federal Government cannot afford to be all things to all people has come a corresponding recognition that we need to do more as individuals and as private citizens to deal with our problems.

Americans have a deserved reputation for generosity and caring. The long tradition of charitable and philanthropic work and voluntarism in this country is one in which we can all take pride and which we can draw upon as an example in renewing the private network of assistance.

The need to intensify private efforts in this field was recently the subject of an editorial published in my district by the Oxnard (Calif.) Press-Courier. As the Press-Courier points out, the result of such a shift in emphasis from Federal dollars to private dollars could well mean stronger and more effective programs. The inevitable weight of overhead and regulations attending Federal programs can be eased and money directed to the areas of most need by people on the scene.

One way to assist this revitalization effort would be for this House to pass one of the half dozen or more bills which have been introduced in this session to allow the use of the charitable deduction by all taxpayers, whether or not they itemize or use the long or short income tax form.

This legislation, which has been introduced by many Members, including Messrs. ASHBROOK, HORTON, ROE, HINSON, and myself in the general membership, and Messrs. GEPHARDT and ROUSSELOT on the Ways and Means Committee, would provide a needed incentive for charitable giving and a shot in the arm to private organizations engaged in this work.

The logic of this approach is testified to by the fact that Mr. GEPHARDT's bill has attracted over 284 co-sponsors—many more than half the Members of this House.

I hope we will not delay any longer in taking the steps needed to have a functioning, viable, and strong network of private assistance in place as these programs are phased over from the public to the private sector, and would ask that the Press-Courier editorial be printed in the RECORD. We can give a helping hand in this situation.

HELPING HAND NEEDED

The drive for austerity in the federal budget is posing a problem for private social agencies and other non-profit organizations which have grown to rely on federal funds to cover part of their expenses. In the future, there will be less money from Washington to go around.

This should not mean that the country is entering an era of neglect of the needy, or the starvation of those endeavors in the arts and humanities which have enjoyed federal subsidies in recent years.

What it does mean is a shift back toward local responsibility for many charitable activities, and a renewed reliance on private, voluntary contributions.

The net result could be stronger and more effective programs. A longstanding criticism of the disbursement of federal grants is that too much money was eaten up in bureaucratic overhead, and funds were going into programs that did not justify their cost. A greater reliance on local, private financing can produce social services that are better aimed at true needs, and more accountable to those providing the funds.

The big question, however, is whether private foundations, community fund-raising organizations, and other philanthropies will have the resources to do what should be done.

The Independent Sector, an umbrella group of philanthropic organizations, recently warned that it will be caught short unless there is a greater flow of money into its coffers.

Contributions to private charitable organizations, said the Independent Sector, have been growing at the rate of about 9 percent a year—well behind the inflationary curve.

As a result, non-government funding is having trouble meeting present commitments, not to mention the wave of new requests expected in the next few years.

If the slimmed-down federal budget means fewer federal dollars flowing into community agencies, the tax cut now taking shape in Congress promises to leave more dollars in private hands.

It is to be hoped that taxpayers will recognize their obligations to respond more generously to fund appeals from private organizations now relying all the more on their voluntary support. ●

FAIRFAX SYMPHONY
ORCHESTRA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the mandate of the 1980 election has set the Congress and the administration to the task of redirecting the role of the Federal Government. Many of the responsibilities previously assumed by the Government will now be assumed by the people. One such example is the country's arts and humanities programs.

It is commonly recognized that Government will always need to subsidize more elaborate and expensive forms in order to preserve our American culture for future generations. It will become increasingly important, however, for programs to succeed because the people want them to continue. This is not difficult when programs are sensitive to the needs of the community. One of the best examples of this success is the Fairfax Symphony Orchestra, a northern Virginia organization which has grown steadily for almost 25 years.

The Fairfax Symphony is a 116-member orchestra that has a stated purpose "to bring to Fairfax County and environs an outstanding season of symphony concerts featuring international artists as well as local performers." The orchestra's members include professional musicians, music teachers, and students plus part-time musicians who represent a variety of professions and interests. The symphony also sponsors a variety of other activities including, "Hello, Symphony" and the chamber orchestra—for elementary children, concert previews, open rehearsals, workshops, and masterclasses by noted artists. The year-round program emphasizes the involvement of the community in the arts with particular emphasis on the opportunities for the entire family.

A highlight of the symphony's program is the seven-program concert series for the summer, held in conjunction with the Shenandoah Valley Music Festival. The Fairfax Symphony is the orchestra-in-residence for the festival which is held on the grounds of the Orkney Springs Hotel the evenings of July 25, 26, 28-31, and August 1. The summer series provides an opportunity to enjoy the magic of the

symphony's music in a relaxed mountain setting.

The Fairfax Symphony's service has been rewarded by overwhelming success in the community it serves. The orchestra should be commended for its excellence and merits increased support from northern Virginia as a model for the rest of the country. ●

DR. KOOP ANSWERS QUESTIONS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most puzzling actions undertaken by the Congress in recent years is the failure to agree to the President's nomination of Dr. C. Everett Koop to be Surgeon General. There have been any number of myths, half-truths, and downright lies told about Dr. Koop. Recently he had the chance to set the record straight.

At this point I wish to include in the RECORD "Choice for Surgeon General Says He's Suited for Post, Defends Stand Against Abortion", from the Wall Street Journal, June 19, 1981:

CHOICE FOR SURGEON GENERAL SAYS HE'S SUITED FOR POST, DEFENDS STAND AGAINST ABORTION

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan wants to appoint Dr. C. Everett Koop, a 64-year-old pediatric surgeon, as U.S. Surgeon General.

Although Dr. Koop has many medical accomplishments to his credit (including successful separations of Siamese twins), his strong views on abortion and other issues have raised questions about his ability to perform objectively in a top federal health-policy job. Among other duties, the Surgeon General commands such agencies as the Public Health Service, the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration.

Congress is considering legislation to remove an age ceiling that now makes Dr. Koop ineligible for the job. Meanwhile, he is working in the Department of Health and Human Services as a deputy assistant secretary. In his first public interview about the Surgeon General job, Dr. Koop talks about his qualifications and his views on national health problems and issues.

Q. An American Public Health Association official has stated that, while you may be a highly skilled physician, your background for Surgeon General is "wholly inadequate." How do you respond?

A. I think of public health as anything that aids the health of the public, and I believe there have been things in my career which contributed to the public health.

I was as instrumental as anybody in making anesthesia safe for children. And I went on the road and tried to point out the public health concern that one should have about cancer in children—that all lumps are malignant until proven otherwise. I have spent a lot of time working in other countries—33 to be exact.

Q. How do you answer the charge that, because of your strong views on abortion, you would have a harmful influence on federal

health policy? For example, you have called amniocentesis, a test for determining whether a fetus has genetic defects, "a search-and-destroy mission" because it often leads to abortion.

A. Amniocentesis is a search-and-destroy mission. Only 3% to 5% of the people who have amniocentesis keep their babies if a congenital defect is found.

And many of the congenital defects are things that I have spent my entire life correcting. I know from 35 years' experience that the children I have operated upon are loved and loving, innovative and creative people.

My position on abortion is that of the President, the Secretary of Health, the assistant secretary and the Republican platform. But I am a law-abiding citizen. As a government official I can do nothing that is not the law of the land, and it is not my intent to disrupt anything that is considered legal and proper.

Q. Some of your opponents quote your 1979 statement that most of the mainline Protestant denominations "have made pro-abortion statements illustrating their superficial theology, lack of morality and an insensitivity to the eventual reward for their depravity." Do you consider that an extremist statement?

A. That statement was made to some of the mainline Protestant denominations, and the term "depravity" describes their understanding of the nature of man. To lift it out of the theological context is very misleading.

Q. Legislation under consideration by Congress would declare that human life begins at conception. With such a federal law, states could bar abortions for almost any reason. If the human life bill becomes law, how might it affect public health?

A. If such a law is enacted, the public health problem would be to find alternatives to abortion for American women who were pregnant and didn't want to be. It would mean, I think, a much larger stake in adoption procedures on the part of the Public Health Service.

On the question of when life begins, a biologist referring to an earthworm, a dove or a baboon will tell you that it begins at conception and ends with the death of the organism. It's only when men get to talk about the highest form of life—man—that they begin to say, "Well, we're not sure when life begins."

Q. Getting back to the public health questions of banning abortions, what about the victims of rape and incest who become pregnant?

A. Fewer than 3% of the abortions done in this country are for true life-of-the-mother reasons, for genetic defects of the child, or for incest and rape. So, it seems logical and predictable that the states will make accommodations for those causes.

Q. What about the potential problem of illegal abortions?

A. If there are illegal abortions, they'll be done by the same clean, sterile, efficient techniques now used for legal abortions. So I don't think you have to face a lot of things that took place when illegal abortion was being practiced in back alleys.

Q. What national health problems would concern you most as Surgeon General? Would you be as opposed to cigaret smoking, for example, as were your immediate predecessors?

A. The evidence of cigaret smoking in reference to lung cancer is absolutely unassailable. But other major health issues that the

public has to face are the manner in which we deal with two segments of the population; the disabled and the aging.

Those two segments are interrelated, because a disabled person is really handicapped only if you and I haven't provided for his disability. He frequently will develop another disability because of the first, and sometimes a third because of the second. An example is scoliosis, or curvature of the spine, which can lead to diminution of pulmonary functions. And if that is uncorrected, it leads to a disorder of a cardiovascular nature.

Q. Many physicians and nearly all pharmaceutical companies are down on the FDA these days for its slow pace of new drug approvals. Do you believe the FDA has been overly cautious?

A. When you see something like the FDA's action in preventing . . . the problems that came to Europe with Thalidomide, you say: "Isn't it marvelous we have such a protective agency?" but there has been legitimate criticism that some drugs which have been used abroad and have proven not to have detrimental side effects have been very slow to get approval here.

Our new FDA director, Dr. Arthur Hayes, feels this situation keenly, and I believe you're going to see some very remarkable changes.

Q. Recently the U.S. was the only nation to vote against the World Health Organization code for the regulation of infant-feeding formulas. The WHO guidelines would ban direct advertising of breast-milk substitutes and would prohibit distribution of free product samples. They also would prevent companies from paying staff commissions and bonuses on sales of infant formula. How do you feel about this issue?

A. I don't disagree with the administration's position. Even though mothers in the Third World breast feed in the beginning—and we thoroughly endorse that all the way along the line—there comes a time when they have to have something else. It's far better in the community to use an infant formula than it is to use coconut milk or some other non-nutritious thing, which they have to use because they haven't got cow's milk.

We are totally in favor of the impact of the code, but the way the code was worded went against what we consider the hallmark of our existence, namely our Constitution and our free enterprise system.●

TRIBUTE TO WOODY

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute of this Congress time to reflect upon the accomplishments of Henry Swayze of Preble, N.Y. Henry "Woody" Swayze, was a county legislator in Cortland County. He served for 14 years as a county and town representative. Woody was elected chairman of the Cortland County Legislature in 1979 and continued to serve in that capacity until his death.

Woody, not content to be just a legislator, was involved in many community activities, serving in the police

and the Preble Fire Department. He was also a member of the Preble Recreation Committee and the Preble Child Development Committee. A tireless worker for the Republican Party, he was elected the 1980 Outstanding Republican for Cortland County.

In addition to his numerous civic contributions, Woody, a victim of lung cancer, actively campaigned against cigarette smoking, speaking to elementary school children in the area.

Woody was proud to be a Republican. An outstanding legislator, he always worked hard for his district, his party and the people of Cortland County. He will be missed.●

VISTA MONEY DOES NOT HELP THE POOR

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, it is time to end VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America). For years, a wide range of VISTA projects have promoted left-wing political activity, but have done little or nothing to help the poor—the ostensible purpose of the VISTA program. VISTA workers have harassed private businesses, antagonized local communities, and lobbied State legislators—despite a prohibition on such political activity. VISTA's "advocacy" programs are, in the words of nationally syndicated columnist Donald Lambro, "a million light-years away from the grim day to day problems of the poor."

It is only appropriate, as we get ready to consider how we should reconcile current law with the spending reductions mandated in the first budget resolution, that we carefully examine each and every possibility for additional spending cuts. Mr. Lambro cites, in his article, a number of instances where political or social organizing activity has supplanted direct assistance efforts and he makes reference to a report, issued in 1978 on VISTA program abuses, by the House Appropriations Committee. I commend the attention of my colleagues to both the article and the report, and ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Lambro's column be inserted in the RECORD at this time:

VISTA MONEY DOESN'T GO TO POOR

(By Donald Lambro)

WASHINGTON.—VISTA, the government's corps of poverty workers, has for years been deeply engaged in legislative lobbying, grassroots political action, social engineering, and sometimes even union organizing.

An eye-opening 113-page investigative report issued by the House Appropriations Committee in 1978 accused VISTA of all these things and more, but Congress chose to ignore them.

More recently, Reagan administration investigators have been digging through the

agency's files, uncovering endless examples of a broad range of so-called "advocacy" activities and causes that are a million light-years away from the grim, day-to-day problems of the poor.

When VISTA (Volunteers In Service To America) was first created in 1964 as part of Lyndon Johnson's war on poverty, its purpose was simple and direct: Finance a group of volunteers to go out among the poor to help them to help themselves. The focus was to be on encouraging the poor to reach out to available opportunities that would help them escape poverty, not become institutionalized within it.

Tragically, VISTA became a tool for leftist ideologues bent on combating big business, engaging in social and political issues, lobbying state legislatures, and generally working to overturn, in their words, "the system." Instead of working in the ghettos among the poor, government investigators found VISTA volunteers working for a cadre of political and social activists among working class constituencies.

Here, taken from VISTA's own files, are a few of the organizations to which VISTA workers have been assigned, along with a brief description of their activities:

Dane County Welfare Rights, Alliance, Madison, Wis.: Fundraising; disseminating information on legislation developing advocacy programs; training leaders.

Cleveland Women Working, Cleveland: "Upgrading the pay and status of low-income women office workers through education, advocacy and organizing task forces of working women."

Louisiana ACORN (Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now), New Orleans: Community organizing and involvement in state tax reform, energy issues, and property tax reform.

Arkansas Consumer Research, Little Rock: "Consumer ecology advocacy; research issues; assist community groups and disseminate information pertinent to prevent consumer injustices."

Arkansas American Civil Liberties Union Women's Rights Project, Little Rock: "To establish methods to bring information and deal with the multi-issues and needs of women to the communities."

Harford County Commission for Women, Bel Air, Md.: "To promote the economic, social and political equality of women in Harford County and recommend legislation; compile a women's resource directory; organize county women's groups."

National Coalition, Washington, D.C.: Develop an expanded clearinghouse "on state and federal legislation by updating to include newly enacted and proposed legislation."

Susquehanna Legal Services, Philadelphia: "To organize, train and develop self-sustaining community welfare advocacy groups in seven counties."

New York Public Interest Research Group Citizens' Alliance, Albany: "To organize five new chapters of Citizens' Alliance in New York."

Community Action for Legal Service, Inc., New York: "Work on class action litigation."

New England Small Farm Institute, Inc., Amherst, Mass.: "To organize small farmers in Rhode Island."

Not only do many of these advocacy and special-interest organizations have nothing to do with the truly poor, but they involve political and lobbying activities far afield from VISTA's original purposes.

In many cases, instead of helping the poor to become self-sufficient, they are helping

the poor to become increasingly dependent upon government demanding that social welfare programs be expanded.

"Volunteers my foot," said an administration official who has been pouring through hundreds of VISTA files. "The federal government is paying young people to go out into the states and localities to change laws, influence legislation and organize special interest groups." ●

EXTENDING VOTING RIGHTS, OR STALLING?

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Times points out that the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights is not moving too fast in its consideration of the legislation to extend the Voting Rights Act.

Key portions of the Nation's most effective civil rights law expires in August 1982. The time to move toward extension is now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the June 23, 1981, editorial be printed in the record.

[From the New York Times, June 23, 1981]

EXTENDING VOTING RIGHTS, OR STALLING?

President Reagan's open call to Attorney General Smith for a study of the Voting Rights Act was strange yet understandable. Mr. Reagan need hardly remind Mr. Smith, his old friend and counselor, that the Justice Department has heavy responsibility under that law and a big stake in whether Congress renews it next year. And given the department's 16 years of experience in enforcing it, Justice doesn't need to start an investigation from scratch.

Yet the President takes pains to point out, to Mr. Smith and the public, that the act has been both effective and controversial. He wants a report—by October—on whether the law, for all its accomplishments, "continues to be the most appropriate means" of guaranteeing voting rights. The Administration, under pressure from all sides to take a stand on extending the act, wants to buy time.

The time is at once too short and too long. Too short, if the quest is for a remedy to voting discrimination that is remotely comparable in effect to the Voting Rights Act. This most important of all civil rights laws was a century in the making. Hundreds of lawsuits showed how Southern states used literacy tests, racial gerrymanders and other tricks to steal the ballot from blacks.

Only the 1965 act, with its requirement that any proposed voting law changes first be cleared with the Justice Department, could give minority members a real chance to vote, win elective office and redeem the promise of political power.

But in legislative terms, October is too far off. Granted, the act's key provisions don't expire until August 1982. But there will be endless, bitter lobbying in the Senate, where hostility is strongest and the delaying power greatest. That's why House supporters prudently started early and the Judiciary subcommittee has nearly completed its hearings, amassing an impressive case for renewal.

Significantly, Representative Henry Hyde, Republican of Illinois, who has attended all the hearings, now says that the burden is on Southern jurisdictions to prove that the pre-clearance requirement for voting law changes is no longer needed.

Congress can't wait while the Administration gets its act together. Nor should it be asked to. Mr. Smith doesn't need much time to gather evidence, especially not if he is willing to listen to these words from his client: "I am sensitive to the controversy which has attached itself to some of the act's provisions. . . . But I am sensitive also to the fact that the spirit of the act marks this nation's commitment to full equality for all Americans, regardless of race, color or national origin."

The Administration can demonstrate its own commitment by taking President Reagan at his word, literally and promptly. ●

THE TACTICAL NUKE TEMPEST IN A TEAPOT

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive military minds in the world is that of retired Adm. Noel Gayler. Every time I hear him I am struck by his ability to look behind the conventional wisdom and zero in on the heart of the underlying national security problem.

He has now addressed the question of tactical nuclear weapons in typically cogent fashion. While my view of the neutron weapon is somewhat different from his, he makes a far more important fundamental point, which seems to elude the sheeplike apostles of the conventional who supply most of our military commentary.

Admiral Gayler's fundamental point is that long-range theater nuclear weapons are of no military significance. They do not do anything that cannot be done by existing strategic forces. If they are used to attack a target on Soviet soil, there is no way this will be less escalatory or provocative than if a strategic weapon were used against the same target; similarly, if London is attacked and destroyed by a Russian missile, the retaliatory policy of the West will be not one whit different if the missile is a strategic SS-19 or a tactical SS-20.

If I may extend Admiral Gayler's reasoning one step further, a corollary to his proposition is that the current emphasis on arms limitation of theater nuclear forces is a sham. If we want to insure the survival of our Nation, strategic arms limitation is the key, beginning with the SALT II Treaty already signed but not ratified.

I now insert Admiral Gayler's article, from the Washington Post of June 17, into the RECORD.

STICKING BY OUR GUNS

(By Noel Gayler)

(This is the first of three articles on defense by Admiral Gayler, who has participated in strategic nuclear planning, and who served as director of the National Security Agency and, before his retirement, as commander of all U.S. forces in the Pacific.)

Chancellor Helmut Schmidt came to see us at a time when the NATO West was troubled over nuclear weapons based in Europe. He has had to tell his own party, the Social Democrats, to shape up on this issue, or find a new leader.

With full American support, he's taken a firm line. So have other NATO governments. But their electorates are not necessarily on board. And if there's one clear lesson of the Vietnam War, it is that military policy, without supporting political consensus, is a loser. The basic issue is that most Europeans don't want to fall under Russian military conquest of domination, with all the odious apparatus of Communist totalitarian rule. But they also don't wish to take a serious or unnecessary risk of being eradicated by nuclear weapons. Most people will think these are reasonable concerns.

In the past some Europeans have made a choice, under the slogan of "Better Red than Dead." More robust characters have reacted in the spirit of our own Patrick Henry: "Give us liberty or give us death." But these are not the only alternatives. Both security and freedom for Europe are possible. They require that as allies we see clearly what the military needs are, and that we act on that knowledge.

The first nuclear proposal now before the allies is that NATO must "match" the Soviet medium-range ballistic missiles targeted on Europe (SS20) with medium-range ballistic missiles of our own (Pershing II or cruise missiles) based in Europe. This may or may not be a good idea. We have made it a touchstone of the unity of NATO, and Chancellor Schmidt's loyal support to that ideal should command admiration and respect. The deployment plan is seen also as a necessary, if paradoxical, step to the negotiation of balanced nuclear force reduction. Let's hope the negotiating strategy works.

But there are a few things we should understand about it:

Europe is under no special or unusual danger from SS20s. There are plenty—very many more than plenty—of Russian intercontinental-range missiles, which can strike any target in Europe, simply by shortening the trajectory. It makes no real difference to the target where a missile comes from—only where it lands.

You don't have to "match" any weapons with an equal and opposite weapon of your own. Late in the 19th century, battle cruisers were built to rule the seas. They had 11-inch guns to sink other battle cruisers, 8-inch guns for cruisers, 6-inch guns for light cruisers, 4-inch guns for destroyers, 3-inch guns for torpedo boats and (I guess) small arms to repel boarders. Then British Admiral "Jackey" Fisher had a remarkable insight: 11-inch guns that could sink a battle cruiser could also sink any smaller ship! The all-big-gun Dreadnought was built, and all other big warships were obsolete. Our intercontinental weapons are our big guns.

European-based NATO missiles impart no special freedom of action or autonomy to the European allies. It is inconceivable they could be used without American consent.

The basis on which to judge the proposals is the extent to which they contribute to or

lessen the nuclear threat to Europe and to the unity of NATO.

The second nuclear issue before NATO is the so-called neutron bomb. President Carter first supported this notion, then snatched it back. Secretary Weinberger recently floated the idea. Secretary Haig slapped it down, for reasons not central to its merits. No one doubts the idea will surface again. It has powerful supporters. What about it?

The "neutron" weapon is one of a class called "tactical" nuclear weapons. These are weapons smaller (but still enormous) in yield, designed to be used by military forces against military forces. Some examples are artillery shells, short-range missiles and aircraft bombs. They have great destructive power and their use entails grave risks. What are those risks?

The enemy will certainly retaliate in kind, and he will up the ante. Rapid escalation to total nuclear war is a strong possibility, once the nuclear firebreak has been crossed.

Russian incursion will be fought on allied soil. Noncombatants will be killed in the hundreds and thousands, and these will be our friends and allies. Since our friends may well object to this outcome, the alliance may be fractured at the outset.

Even if we enjoy two miracles in series—there is no escalation and the alliance holds together—we will be far worse off militarily after a tactical nuclear exchange than before. That is because we have the more critical and vulnerable targets: ports, airfields and lines of communication central to our defense.

The so-called neutron weapons (also called enhanced radiation weapons) are designed to meet some of these objections. Most, but not all, of the energy comes out as radiation that kills or injures living creatures but does little damage to material. There is, however, an irreducible minimum of heat and blast, which is still very large by ordinary standards. Are they very different from "conventional" nuclear weapons in practical effect? No. Are they more dangerous? Perhaps, if they serve to lower the threshold to nuclear war. Are they really necessary to defeat tanks? No. There are better alternatives.

There is another difficulty, of a different kind. Rightly, no president with all his marbles is likely to release nuclear weapons for use, except in the most extreme circumstances, if even then. The risks are simply too high to make the game worth the candle. The Commander in the field therefore has an uncertain weapon on which he can never rely. Much better that he have effective means to victory that he can be confident will be available to him. We can have such means, if we will.

What are some of these alternatives? Weapons that effectively kill tanks, by finding them and hitting them. Weapons that ensure our aircraft are superior to the enemy's. Means to find and kill submarines and protect our ships at sea against aircraft and missiles. Weapons to stop infantry on the ground. Most important means to control information, the key to tactics and to battle. All of this, without resort to nuclear weapons. All of this, fundamentally, by technology well suited to the American and European genius and far ahead of the adversary.

Given political will and economic support NATO can field the forces necessary to defend ourselves. We have no need to resort to the unmeasured hazard of nuclear weapons. We need be neither Red nor dead.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL FIREFIGHTERS' DAY

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues' support of a joint resolution that would designate the second Saturday in August as National Firefighters' Day.

As you know, thousands of small towns and communities across the country depend upon the services of volunteer fire companies. We in the Second District of Connecticut, for instance, rely almost entirely on volunteers to protect our lives and property from fire. These dedicated men and women freely sacrifice their time and often risk their lives to provide their neighbors with prompt, effective fire protection. Through the efforts of these brave individuals, thousands of lives and millions of dollars worth of property have been saved.

In many small towns in my district, volunteer firefighters provide many other vital services as well. They drive emergency medical vehicles, perform first aid, coordinate rescue operations, and help make our communities safe places in which to live.

The job of a volunteer firefighter is not easy. In many communities, members of volunteer fire departments must make do with older, less sophisticated equipment than that of their paid counterparts in large cities. These individuals, however, take great pride in their work and their equipment, and often they help raise the funds to pay for their units' expenses.

I think we all appreciate and admire the efforts of these men and women. We realize how much our communities depend upon volunteer fire departments. These organizations perform tasks that our villages and towns cannot pay for, but cannot afford to do without.

Summer is traditionally the time when volunteer fire departments sponsor fundraising drives, hold conferences, and organize local activities to recruit new volunteers. Designating one day in August as Volunteer Firefighters' Day would provide a focal point for these activities and would help attract local and national attention.

Volunteer firefighters are ready and willing to help their communities all year long. I think that the least we can do in return is set aside one day a year to honor them.●

FEDERAL FIREARMS OFFENSE BILL

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, last February, in this very Chamber, I joined several of my colleagues in introducing the Federal firearms offense bill, which if adopted would require mandatory sentencing of criminals for felonies committed with firearms. At that time I believed, as I do now more than ever, that such a measure would correct what I and many others consider to be a wretched situation—the growing number of handgun crimes in this Nation.

History since has intensified my concern. Everyone in this Chamber, in this country, remembers where he was on that fateful afternoon of March 30. We are beginning to look back on that day with some ease, secure in the knowledge that President Ronald Reagan, Press Secretary James Brady, Secret Serviceman Tim McCarthy, and D.C. Policeman Thomas K. Delahanty are well on their way to recovery. But have all our wounds healed? On the same day that President Reagan was shot, 60 to 70 Americans were killed by handgun fire, according to statistical averages. Can a Nation, which rightfully professes to offer its citizens the opportunity to achieve man's highest ideals, and which welcomes others to its shores with the knowledge that here, the dignity of man is held supreme—can a Nation such as ours afford not to reevaluate its traditional approach to handgun violence?

I ask you: can America continue to avoid the fact that more than 24 million households—almost a third of the households in this country—were touched by crime in 1980? Can we neglect the fact that 95 percent of the policemen killed in the line of duty between 1961 and 1970 were felled by handguns? Can we overlook the fact that gun dealers today sell to the mentally ill, criminals, dope addicts, convicted felons, juveniles, as well as good citizens. Can we not pay attention to FBI uniform crime reports, which indicate that there were 21,456 reported murders in 1979; that 50 percent of these were committed with handguns; or that a violent crime occurs every 27 seconds, a murder every 24 minutes, a robbery every 68 minutes, an aggravated assault every 51 seconds, and a forcible rape every 7 minutes?

I argue vehemently that we cannot, and in support of this, I will today introduce two additional bills which I believe complement H.R. 2127. The first would prohibit the importation of parts of firearms if the importation of such firearms is currently prohibited.

For, although the import of the "Saturday night special"—the gun used to shoot President Reagan—is technically illegal, the import of parts for these guns is not. And so, consequently, parts are shipped into the United States and assembled here. My second bill would require a 21-day waiting period between the time one purchases a handgun and the time one can obtain it. Such a law would provide a cooling-off period for those individuals who could be purchasing a firearm in an irrational state of mind. Pennsylvania has paved the way for legislation of this type with its own statute providing for a 2-day waiting period.

My original bill, H.R. 2127, would impose a 5-year mandatory prison sentence with no parole option for those individuals convicted in a U.S. court of a felony in which he or she used or carried a firearm, an 8-year sentence for second-time or subsequent offenders. That proposal, together with these additional bills, comprise what I believe to be an effective three-prong approach at the Federal level to a growing problem. The three methods would provide a uniform deterrent to handgun crime.

In February, I pointed out that, of the three major pieces of firearm legislation passed in the United States in this century, all were instigated by public outrage to violence involving the use of guns. Gangster-type violence of the "tommy-gun era" prompted the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. The assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy 5 years after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy prompted the passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and the Gun Control Act. At that time, I mentioned the tragic deaths of John Lennon and Dr. Michael Halberstam. Today, we have come through the attempted assassinations of yet another American President and of a world religious leader, Pope John Paul II. Since January 1 of this year, more than 2,600 Americans have been reported dead as a result of handgun violence. Can a nation that seeks the elimination of international terrorism as a major foreign policy goal continue to ignore the subject of firearms controls while the frequency of gun use in assaults at home continues to rise?

Once more we are reminded, in letters from constituents, and in editorials across the country, that the United States is the only leading Western nation without sufficient curbs to firearms violence. In my mind, mandatory sentencing, a 21-day waiting period, and prohibition of the importation of certain handgun parts is a way to begin deterring more stringently the gun crimes which plague our citizens.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

If my firearms package is not the cure for this illness, at the very least it constitutes a viable treatment.

Thank you.●

TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND
WILLIAM CLARK

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, my former pastor and friend, Father William Clark of Park Ridge, Ill., recently announced his retirement after 13 years as pastor of Mary, Seat of Wisdom Parish. Father Clark is a most gifted priest, and I know his services will be sorely missed at Mary, Seat of Wisdom, but I am pleased that he will be continuing in his ministry as a part-time pastoral care staffer at Lutheran General Hospital. Undoubtedly, his great understanding, kindness, and compassion will be a special blessing to the patients he will come in contact with.

I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Father Clark on his retirement, and wishing him many, many more years of success in his priesthood.

I am pleased to share the following newspaper article from the Park Ridge Herald concerning Father Clark's retirement and new duties:

RETIRING PASTOR TO JOIN LUTHERAN
GENERAL STAFF

The Rev. William Clark will join the pastoral care staff of Lutheran General Hospital in early July.

Fr. Clark will retire after 13 years as pastor of Mary, Seat of Wisdom Parish, but will continue to serve the community as a chaplain at Lutheran General. His ministry will be directed primarily to the sacramental needs of Catholic patients.

Fr. Clark will blend his particular denominational-sacramental ministry into the comprehensive personal ministry available to every patient through staff chaplains of all faiths. His presence will enhance the opportunities for Catholic patients to have greater access to the resources of their faith.

Fr. Clark holds a master's of education degree from Loyola University and a master's of theology degree from St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein. He taught education at St. Mary of the Lake Seminary from 1940 to 1948 and served as associate pastor of Our Lady, Help of Christians from 1948 to 1955. From 1955 to 1965 he taught courses in theology and marriage at Mundelein College. He served as pastor of Our Lady, Gate of Heaven parish from 1965 to 1968. In 1968 he succeeded Fr. Ed Dowling as pastor of Mary, Seat of Wisdom Parish.

"We're excited that Fr. Clark, after 44 years of active parish ministry, is joining our staff part time," said the Rev. Lawrence Holst, chair of the division of pastoral care. "His pastoral experience will be a blessing to patients and the staff of the pastoral care division."●

THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER
REACTOR: ITS TIME HAS
PASSED

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of the Joint Commission on Atomic Energy, a member of the Science and Technology Committee and as one concerned with the energy future and security of our Nation, I feel compelled to speak in opposition to the construction of the Clinch River breeder reactor in Tennessee. I have been deeply involved in this debate for over 4 years now, and the time has come to finally lay this project to rest.

For those who claim that this is a test vote on nuclear power; it clearly is not. For those who claim uranium shortages; uranium prices have dipped to an unprecedented low due to slack demand and enhanced recovery techniques. For those who claim increased electrical demand requires the premature commercialization of breeders; electricity demand growth rate has slowed significantly from previous expectations. And finally, some of the supporters themselves claim that the technology will not make economic sense before 2020 at the earliest.

In these times of fiscal restraint, Clinch River breeder reactor proponents want an exemption for their project which will allow them to spend upward of \$3 billion Federal dollars on elusive benefits. I have no sympathy for special pleas such as this one.

The following Los Angeles Times editorial appearing during the debate on Clinch River in the Science and Technology Committee clearly expresses my concern with the project and the intellectual dishonesty of supporting its construction if one is truly interested in solving this country's energy problems in a responsible fashion.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 10, 1981]

THE BREEDING OF A BAD BARGAIN

For reasons that remain obscure, one of the programs that most deserve the Reagan Administration's budget ax didn't get the chop: the controversial breeder reactor proposed for construction at Clinch River, Tenn. Fortunately, a bipartisan majority of the House Science and Technology Committee has moved to kill the project anyway.

The Clinch River project, which has been in the works for 10 years, involves the construction of a \$3 billion nuclear power plant that in theory could produce more fuel than it burned.

One problem is that the breeder reactor would both produce and consume plutonium, a nuclear material that can be used to produce atomic weapons. Another is that if the breeder ever makes economic sense it will not be until well into the next century.

The project was essentially held in limbo during the Carter Administration, which rightly felt that its construction would destroy the credibility of the U.S. effort to persuade other nations to forgo the use of plutonium as a power reactor fuel. The anti-plutonium campaign was part of a strategy aimed at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

In a move that was perhaps intended to please Senate Majority Leader Howard H. Baker Jr. of Tennessee, a strong backer of Clinch River, the Reagan Administration requested authorization for \$230 million to begin construction of the Clinch River project in 1982.

The House Committee, considering that proposal as part of a \$3.6 billion energy research budget, voted instead to kill the project.

Interestingly enough, opposition to the Clinch River breeder was spearheaded by a group of economy-minded Republicans, led by Rep. Claudine Schneider of Rhode Island, who were convinced that the project would be a bad bargain for the taxpayers.

The case for the breeder reactor has leaned heavily on claims that the nuclear power industry faced a potentially serious shortage of uranium fuel, and that breeders would be needed to meet a high rate of growth in demand for electricity and to reduce the need for imported oil.

In fact, known reserves of uranium have dramatically increased. Estimates of growth in electric power demand have been scaled back. And breeders would not have had more than a marginal effect on oil imports anyway.

The House committee action is not final. Efforts will be made to restore the authorization on the House floor and in the Senate. The Reagan Administration should think about its position again. By withdrawing his support for Clinch River, the President could save the taxpayers at least \$2 billion without damage to the national interest. ●

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE OF RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago President John Kennedy captured America's spirit of idealism in a speech at the University of Michigan that led to the creation of the Peace Corps.

Last Friday, the Peace Corps' new Director, Loret M. Ruppe, a distinguished and accomplished lady who is coincidentally also from the State of Michigan, challenged former Peace Corps volunteers to help rekindle that spirit of idealism in America.

In a speech at Howard University, the wife of our former colleague, Phil Ruppe, said that the future of this important arm of American foreign policy depends to a great extent on our willingness as a nation to reach out to the less fortunate in the world.

In a world of conflicting values, the Peace Corps remains a beacon of

sanity and an expression of the best that is in us as a nation, she said.

Quoting from President Kennedy's speech 20 years ago, Mrs. Ruppe reminded us that the answer to whether a free society can compete depends upon the willingness of its citizens to contribute part of their lives to their country.

Those words are no less true today than in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mrs. Ruppe's remarks to my colleagues.

ADDRESS BY LORET MILLER RUPPE BEFORE THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE OF RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

I very humbly approach this podium to stand before you who have been and continue to be the lifeblood of the peace corps. You, assembled here, have served your time in service to your country and to the peoples of another land—presenting the "Best That Is In US"—the best that is in America—the caring, sharing—the idealism of the "1960's" and "1970's." I salute you and this administration salutes you.

I only wish it had been within my power, particularly my budgetary power, to bring in from those 61 countries where they currently work—to make this world a more peaceful place—our 5,400 peace corps volunteers, your brothers and sisters in the field, who right at this very moment are laboring in the schools, farms, villages and barrios to show the real heart of America to a skeptical world—a world made a little less skeptical by your 20 years of work.

I wish they could join us here as we meet to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the peace corps and to examine and discuss, through speeches, seminars and workshops where we, as people touched by peace corps, are to go in the "1980's."

I wish they could queue up, form a long line and come up one by one to this microphone and tell us just what they are doing today. Some would undoubtedly be from the very village, school, agricultural project or health center where one or many of you out there also worked to make life a little better, a little easier, or even a little more possible for people of other lands—creating a climate of peace and understanding. Some could be involved right now in the very projects you started when you were a volunteer/carrying on the mission. . . .

Let us imagine that they are here; let us keep their spirit here; let us have the idealism of the "1980's" present in this room also. For the same idealism and dedication that propelled you forward to volunteer to be a member of the peace corps propels our young people, our young-at-heart people, our mature people, throughout our land. Reporters are constantly asking me, "Is idealism dead? Is it gone?" That vast reservoir of hope and sustenance—sustenance that makes our short stay here on earth truly worth something.

That spirit was real, and John Kennedy touched it in a glorious burst of enthusiasm in that late night speech on the University of Michigan campus, October 14, 1961. That spirit was real when Sargent Shriver so capably transformed Kennedy's ideals into an operating agency in a scant six months. Is that spirit dead today? The answer is no, no, no, a thousand times no, for without that hope and spirit, America would become a desert of forlornness, a mass of mechanization, a material mound with no heart and no soul surrounded by a world of craving for

not just food, pure water, education and health, but rather like all of us, craving for a life of substance, rather than a clawing for existence.

I must observe, however, that perhaps we are closer than we would like to be to this frozen wasteland.

Perhaps? Statistics that show alcoholism and drug abuse among our teenagers are at a record high, while many of them wallow in a surplus of goods, or in another extreme, feel they wallow in a well of loneliness with no hope of securing that which America has so glibly promised them via their TV's, stereos, and magazines or their lack of same perhaps. Statistics show suicide as the second highest cause of death among our young people. A widespread urge to wipe one's footprints completely off this planet would indicate that young Americans, maybe Americans of all ages, no longer hope—no longer see the goals and ideals that sent you in this audience to volunteer for service in a foreign land to help in the cause of world peace.

But what is that long line of volunteers which right now stretches from Guatemala down to Paraguay, from Jamaica to Santa Lucia, Tunisia, and Niger to Botswana, and Nepal, Thailand, the Philippines to Samoa? That line remains unbroken and idealism survives.

There are American volunteers right this very moment, Americans of all ages responding to their Nation's call and to their own inner beckoning, the call of the needs of the developing world. A call which is greater now and more our duty to answer than even in 1960. The global 2000 report, The Brandt Report, the daily and nightly news all attest to this great need. The Peace Corps is alive and well and this present Administration and this Director intend to keep it that way.

Where is peace in this world today? Well, I know and this Administration knows one place where peace truly is and that is in the person-to-person approach of the Peace Corps. We still give peace a chance. . . .

We take the time to know the language of a people so that our volunteers can truly communicate, and in this Administration we hope to. Our volunteers live with the people to better understand their pride in cultural history, their feelings, their goals. Our volunteers motivate the people they live and work with to take that first step upwards—whether it be schooling, health care, a latrine, fish ponds, a community well—the blessing of pure water so that their children can have a better life. It's an inch at a time but every inch counts and every inch brings our world just that fraction of space closer to being more at peace, more at rest.

I pledge in the "1980's" we will continue that inch-by-inch approach which truly meets the development needs of the world that calls to us.

How will we do that? What will be our agenda for the "1980's"? First and foremost we will continue to improve on the selection process of volunteers and the training of both language and skills.

On my trip to Guatemala, Honduras and Ecuador, I asked our volunteers and staff, "what is the key to the best volunteer? How can we ensure that, out of those we select from many who apply, we are selecting the one who will truly perform up to the host country standards and our standards?" The universal answer was—motivation. If the person has proper motivation, he will succeed as a volunteer. In this time of budget constraints it is even more imperative that

we learn now to attract this elusive quality—a thing money cannot buy.

I feel we should follow the trail all the way back to recruitment. Our recruiters must be highly qualified and extremely well trained. We are going to see that they are. I feel there should be more care given to the interviewing. I recently talked to an outstanding volunteer couple from North Carolina. He is designing and helping build a model farm project in Ecuador for the subsistence farmer. He told me his original recruiter said he did not see where he fit into the Peace Corps at all. If it had not been for this volunteer's determination to be in the Peace Corps, we would have lost his important talent. Again, we must keep looking for motivation, and we will continue to succeed.

Now, since my arrival in February, after my nomination was announced, I have been impressed by the dedication and commitment of the people who work at Peace Corps/Washington. In line with the President's economic recovery program, our agency experienced budget cuts. Peace Corps immediately went to work on outlining ways we would meet this challenge. They informed me that Peace Corps is used to doing the best with whatever it is given. . . . My first priority was to take as much of the cut as possible here in Washington.

You see, on my agenda for the "80's" there is a pyramid. And on the top of that pyramid, or chart, or graph, or whatever you want to call it. But at the top is the volunteer. Just below is overseas staff; then returned Peace Corps volunteers. And at the base, or if some of you want to say "the bottom," is Peace Corps/Washington. I feel we are a service organization. We were created to support the volunteers who are doing the real work of the Peace Corps overseas and to help former volunteers when they return.

Now I know none of this is new. I know that Peace Corps is famous for reinventing the wheel, but for the Peace Corps, the wheel is already right. We intend to make it travel the highway—and it is a "high way"—the way it was manufactured, crafted, to hug the road. That road will lead to the continuing success of America's finest graduate school in international understanding—The Peace Corps.

We are busy—in our agenda for the "1980's"—laying the base for our budget in FY 1983. We feel if we can show Congress, OMB, the state department a well run, smoothly functioning, cost-effective agency, we have come part of the way. That is only one step, however. . . .

The real challenge is to let more people know—in Congress, here in Washington, and all across the country, particularly the American taxpayer—that this has been and continues to be a success story. The Peace Corps has not only been a beacon of sanity in a world of conflicting values—"a true expression of the best that is in US"—a small response of America to the heavy responsibility it bears as the wealthiest nation in the history of the world. But it has truly helped the countries it has been in and is in now, and it has promoted world peace and friendship for America in a world with more needs and more new friends than ever. Forty percent of our exports now go to the developing world. That means more jobs for America.

Here is where you become the agenda of the "1980's." We need you. We need you to recommit yourselves. You are still Peace Corps volunteers. You might have thought your time of service was over, but I think by

being here—by taking the time—a precious commodity in this too busy world of ours—by sacrificing money and energy to come here this hot summer weekend, you know you are still in the Peace Corps. And I tell you, as director of the Peace Corps—and I know from Sargent Shriver down the line of directors, they will back me up—Peace Corps needs you in the "1980's" now more than ever.

We need you to continue the job of educating your fellow American citizens to the reality of that world out there. That world is steadily, shrinking, increasingly becoming more and more interdependent.

You must let America know that:

When a child dies of dysentery or measles

When a woman has to walk two miles to a stream for water and then search for several hours for wood to cook with

When a farmer or villager has no source of income

When its youth and men flee to the cities which have no jobs for them

When rain forests are stripped and no new planting done

When infant mortality hovers at 50 percent and malnutrition between 50 and 70 percent

When a million refugees languish in Somalia, Sudan and Bangladesh

. . . . Then let's face it America—the world is not at peace.

You, in this audience, must convince the public that foreign aid—the type of aid we're involved in—is a necessary and sound investment for the future of America for unless we convince them in the "1980's", unless we build a constituency for our kind of development work, our budget will continue to be—it has been—a series of continuing resolutions—uncertainty of funding—shrinkage or little, if any, growth.

So for the "1980's" our work is cut out for us. We at Peace Corps/Washington must build and sustain a network of support in Congress, at OMB and in the state department. It is there but it must be nurtured. We must build toward our fiscal year 1983 budget. I must tell you at least 15 American ambassadors have visited me at Peace Corps headquarters and said they feel that our volunteers working in their countries are the most positive presence of America in that country.

I have let the President, Members of Congress and many reporters know that the president of Guatemala, the minister of agriculture and the peoples of the camps unanimously praised Peace Corps. That in Honduras, President and Mrs. Paz, the minister of natural resources, of education: The whole village of Sabana Larga gathered in their dirt-floored, open-window (no glass) school, and the village mayor stood with tears in his eyes and said, "Thank you, America, for sending us these helpers. We know we are poor, but you are helping us and our children."

Or the man who showed us his Peace Corps-inspired latrine out in his backyard. A young volunteer from Oregon had shown him how to construct it; his initials were in the cement floor. He stood erect and said, "America has helped me make a better life for my family." That's ever one story: the outhouse . . . so beautiful—much better than his home. He only shows it to company!

Everett Alvarez recently toured Tunisia. He found the same reception—friendship, regard and the constant request for more well trained volunteers.

When I meet volunteers I like to ask, "How did you get interested in the Peace Corps?" So very many answer back, "Oh, I was always interested in it. I wanted to be a volunteer since I was thirteen or fourteen."

It is obvious to me that they knew about the work of the volunteers from an early age, junior high or before

But what do I hear now. I was in west Texas in February. People there said, "Oh, is Peace Corps still around?"

I was at an embassy here in Washington this week. The wife of a noted columnist when I was introduced as the new Director of the Peace Corps—showed great surprise and said, "Does Peace Corps still exist?"

We have a serious problem of identity, and my challenge to you is in that agenda for the "1980's."

We must reinvigorate and resurrect the whole spectrum of the public's knowledge of our organization. Otherwise, in the "1980's", we will be unable to have the wide pool of talent and skills we need so desperately.

So I am counting on you—your presence—your influence at the school level—in the media—with the public—your help in recruiting—and your ideas for reaching out for scarce skills.

How can we attract more foresters? Biologists? Agronomists? How can we reach out to early retirees? How can we motivate middle management? In summary, what can we do to make these people want to share with the Peace Corps?

This is our challenge, it is the challenge I give to you this morning, for you to take with you through your experiences over the next two days and in the coming months. It is a new and important time, for old and tried ideas. We need you at the Peace Corps, just as we always did.

In the words of John Kennedy, at the beginning of this enterprise, at 2 a.m. from the steps of the Michigan union twenty some years ago:

"On your willingness to do that, not merely to serve one year or two years in the service, but on your willingness to contribute part of your life to this country . . . I think will depend the answer to whether a free society can compete. . . . Unless you comprehend the nature of what is being asked of you, this country can't possibly move through the next ten years in a period of relative strength"

I know you in this audience comprehend what is being asked of you, because a free society continues to compete. There is a greater purpose for us all, in the pursuit of Peace, relentlessly, and with care, until it truly exists around the World.

Thank you for being here. ●

MY BELOVED VIRGIN

HON. RON de LUGO

OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, Guy Henry Benjamin is a man from the Virgin Islands of whom we are very proud! He grew up in St. John and became the first St. Johnian to graduate from the Charlotte Amalie High School in St. Thomas. After graduation, Benjamin began teaching immediately while continuing his own studies during the summer. He earned a

B.A. from Howard University and a master's degree from New York University and returned to the Virgin Islands to continue his career in education. In recognition of his tremendous contributions in the area of education, the legislature of the Virgin Islands changed the name of the Benjamin Franklin School to the Guy H. Benjamin School.

Mr. Benjamin's latest success is a book entitled "Me and My Beloved Virgin—St. John, U.S.A." This book is a collection of anecdotes and reminiscences of the author's childhood on St. John. It is a beautiful collage of island folklore interwoven with personal experience and feeling. The book details the closeness and importance of the family; describes the beauty and bounty of St. John's natural environment; illuminates many portions of the islands culture and heritage; and notes—with sadness and hope—the changes taking place in his beloved homeland and the opportunity such changes offer. This accounting is a view of a way of life which may have disappeared forever.

No doubt, Guy Benjamin has a great love and respect for the land of his birth. It is evident that this deep affection for St. John is shared by many of its current residents—all copies of the book were sold within 2 days of its release. Needless to say, the people of St. John have shown their appreciation and unspoken understanding of the author's deep-rooted sentiments.

I was fortunate enough to receive a copy of this wonderful publication. If one would like to get a "flavor of the islands", I would highly recommend "Me and My Beloved Virgin." It is a sensitive and entertaining look at life in St. John.

Certainly, every resident of the Virgin Islands is grateful for the contributions of Guy H. Benjamin. I, along with the people that I represent, thank him for a job well done and wish Mr. Benjamin the very best as he undertakes future literary endeavors. ●

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON OSHA COTTON DUST STANDARD

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its long-awaited decision upholding the OSHA cotton dust standard last week. The Court's unequivocal decision is of the greatest significance, not only to tens of thousands of textile workers but to all working people whose health and safety is jeopardized on the job.

This victory marks the end of a decade-long battle for safe working

conditions by the men and women who labor in our mills. In 1970, when the Occupational Safety and Health Act was debated by the Congress, the proven health effects of cotton dust—specifically byssinosis, or "brown lung"—were a prominent part of the debate. For years following enactment of that law, the textile workers of this country had to wait for promulgation of a decent cotton dust standard while two administrations distorted the goal of the OSHA law and generated unwarranted opposition to its goals.

Finally, the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union was forced to sue the Secretary of Labor in order to secure a standard, and the courts ordered the Secretary to develop one.

And still the years dragged by, as thousands of mill workers endured unsafe conditions and suffered terrible disabilities. When a standard finally was proposed, it was subjected to some of the most rigorous reviews of any recent Federal regulation, including 14 days of public hearings which produced 105,000 pages of testimony.

No sooner was the standard finally promulgated than textile manufacturers challenged it in court and in the Congress. Only concerted action by the House of Representatives prevented adoption of a Senate rider prohibiting enforcement of the standard while the courts had the issue under review.

The major issue in this case, as in other OSHA cases which have arisen is the question of whether a standard must meet a "benefit-cost" test. The Reagan administration believes that OSHA standards should be subjected to such a test, although the courts have repeatedly concluded, as the Supreme Court did last week, that the law makes no provision for rejecting a health standard solely because of costs to an industry.

We would do well to recall the words of Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas during the Senate debates on OSHA. "We are talking about people's lives," Senator Yarborough reminded his colleagues, "not the indifference of some cost accounts." The issue remains the same today.

If the question were squarely presented: Choose between an industry's profit margin or the health and safety of your constituents, who in this House would knowingly and publicly sentence his own constituents to disability or death from dangerous working conditions? Why are we more inclined to consider such a result in the abstract, or for someone else's constituents?

I would think that an administration as concerned about costs to Government and taxpayers' burdens as this one would recognize the enormous public expense of unsafe working conditions. Relaxation of the worker safety laws would certainly produce both benefits and cost. But the bene-

fits would be enjoyed by industry in the form of higher profits, and the costs would be borne by injured and disabled workers, and by the taxpayers who are compelled to care for them.

The Subcommittee on Labor Standards, of which I am chairman, held hearings on this subject—the public costs of hazardous working conditions—soon after the Reagan administration unwisely asked the Supreme Court to permit a reconsideration of the prior administration's argument on the cotton dust case. According to witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, 48,300 people who would be protected by the standard would be left unprotected under the industry's alternative. At an estimated cost per victim of \$100,893, the cost of the industry alternative to the cotton dust standard would be about \$5 billion.

Much of that cost would come from public sources, as do most of the benefits to victims of occupational disease from all sources today. Rarely does the responsible industry or the workers' compensation system pay for occupational disease costs. Instead, the bill is passed along to the taxpayer through social security, medicaid, welfare, veterans' benefits, and a host of other taxpayer-supported programs, most of which this administration also wants to cut.

The public bill for occupational disease exceeds \$3 billion a year, while the private, responsible employer pays a small fraction of that amount. So when the Government makes a decision to expose workers to preventable occupational hazards, it is not only deciding to injure workers, but to hand the taxpayers a multibillion dollar bill, and we cannot ignore that fact.

The textile workers of this country, and all American workers, won a major victory in the Supreme Court's decision on the cotton dust standard. But the significance of this victory goes far beyond the issue of cotton dust, because the Court reaffirmed the original, sound intent of the OSHA law: We will not place one person's profit ahead of another person's health. In fact, the Court ruled, the OSHA law does not require that OSHA standards be the most cost-effective and does not require OSHA to make a benefit-cost evaluation of its proposed standards.

The law requires that the agency take action to safeguard the health and safety of American working men and women, and that goal is as sound today as when it was overwhelmingly supported by Congress in 1970.

The OSHA law requires that health standards be "feasible" which, according to the Supreme Court, means "capable of being done". Congress itself

set this standard, the Court reminded us:

Congress itself defined the basic relationship between costs and benefits by placing the "benefit" of worker health above all other considerations save those making the attainment of this "benefit" achievable. (*American Textile Manufacturers Inst. v. Donovan*, slip op. at p. 17, emphasis added).

The Court continued:

Any standard based on a balancing of costs and benefits by the Secretary that strikes a different balance than that struck by Congress would be inconsistent with the command set forth in §6(b)(5). Thus, cost-benefit analysis by OSHA is not required by the statute. (*Ibid.*)

Despite this clear congressional intent, virtually every standard promulgated by OSHA to protect workers from toxic substances and harmful physical agents has been challenged by the affected industry on the grounds that OSHA had not selected the most "cost-efficient" approach. OSHA officials have long argued that, based on the law, it cannot make its decisions on such cost-benefit criteria, and the Court's decision upholds that ruling.

There is little doubt that protecting workers from cancer on the job, and from other terrible conditions like asbestosis, silicosis, and byssinosis, can be more costly to industry than ignoring safety. "Congress understood that the act would create substantial costs for employers," the Court recently noted, "yet intended to impose such costs when necessary to create a safe and healthful working environment." (*Ibid.*, at p. 27) Let us recall Senator Yarborough's words: "We are talking about people's lives."

With this issue behind us, hopefully for good, I expect that OSHA can get on with the job of protecting workers from the many hazards that still endanger the health and safety of tens of millions of Americans. I do not mean the picky, insignificant kinds of standards which were rightly criticized and which have been removed from the books. Instead, I mean the severe dangers, the carcinogens and those which cause genetic and birth disorders which were too long ignored while attention and effort was diverted to less significant problems.

I believe that all American workers and our other citizens as well want a reinvigorated and rebuilding American economy to be one in which the health and safety of the working man and woman are not sacrificed, but instead where they are protected to the maximum extent of our capability. The decision of the Supreme Court in the cotton dust case sets us properly on that road again, and I believe we are long overdue in fulfilling that commitment to the people of the United States.●

A TRIBUTE TO TOM COCHRAN

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I recently learned of the death of Tom Cochran, a widely respected attorney, civic leader and churchman, of Independence, Mo.

Throughout his life, and even during his last months, he inspired those around him with his love of life.

He first acquired prominence as an attorney, serving as president of the Missouri Bar Association in 1976. He had also been chairman of the American Bar Association's Young Lawyers Section and of the ABA Family Law Section. Mr. Cochran was a high priest of the RLDS Church and was pastor of the Walnut Park congregation from 1966-68. He cofounded the Sports, Leadership, and Arts Spectacular, an event which now draws over a thousand young men and women annually. He was also vice president of the Kansas City chapter of the American Diabetes Association.

In 1980, even though his health was failing, he became president of the Independence Neighborhood Councils. Tom Cochran was concerned with giving to society, making the world a better place to live. I was proud to call him my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the memory of Tom Cochran for his courage in the face of adversity, his tremendous civic conscience, his devotion to his church, and most important, for his unflinching love of life. All who knew him are richer because of his example.●

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS STRIKE BLACKMAIL

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, a settlement may have been reached by the professional air traffic controllers organization, but the unsettled events of the last few days were enough to anger Americans everywhere. Arizona Lions Club members, city, county, and State officials worked 5 years arranging for the International Lions Club convention to have this year's annual meeting in Phoenix, rather than the French Riviera, which had also been considered.

Due to this threat of strike blackmail, an estimated 25,000 of the 26,000 Lions Club visitors who were in Phoenix this last weekend left town early. This mass exodus cost the city many

millions of dollars and many more millions that would have flowed into Arizona's economy had there been no strike threat.

As public employees, the controllers have an obligation of special duty to the public. The threat of an illegal strike was a gross malfeasance in view of the special bond that exists between the taxpayer-employer and public service employees.

It is one thing to bargain in good faith and with respect for the law. But it will be hard for Americans to forget the insensitivity and unconscionable actions of the air traffic controllers union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the following article from the Arizona Republic with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD.

(From the Arizona Republic, June 21, 1981)

STRIKE THREAT FORCES LIONS TO TRIM PHOENIX VISITS

The threat of an air-traffic-controllers strike Monday has caused many Lions-Clubs International members to cut short their visits to Phoenix and Lions officials to cancel a board-of-directors meeting scheduled for today.

One Lion said he had planned to fly home to California on Monday after spending an extra day in Arizona but couldn't risk additional time or money in case his flight were cancelled and he were forced to remain here for several days.

Lions spokesman Pat Cannon said an informal board meeting scheduled for today was cancelled so board members who wanted to be assured of a flight home could leave.

The Lions wrapped up their four-day international convention Saturday.

If the walkouts of controllers were widespread, leaving a reduced work force of supervisory personnel, flights would be curtailed severely.

Short-haul trips would be most affected by the strike because priority would be given to routes of more than 500 miles, airline officials say.

Matthew Dudish of Pottsville, Pa., said Saturday he planned to fly home Monday. If his flight were cancelled, he said, he would "just extend" his vacation.

"I'll just call work and tell them I'll be home later," he said.

Bill Swartz, of Clewiston, Fla. said he, too, planned to fly home Monday.

"But I still have three weeks of vacation," he said.

If unable to fly home, Swartz said he "would probably rent a car and go to the Grand Canyon" and wait for a flight.

Alternate transportation, such as train or bus, would be too boring to take all the way to Florida, he said.

Lief Bylund of Sundsvall, Sweden, said he planned to drive to San Diego and to fly up the California coast from there. He would find alternate transportation if unable to fly, he said.

Phyllis Bargelt of Bellingham, Wash., said she and several others from her group planned to stay until Wednesday.

"If there is a strike, we'll just have to decide then," she said. "We're not worried."

Dene and Brian Speirs of Strathroy, Ontario, Canada, said they were scheduled to fly home Monday.

But Mrs. Speirs said they wouldn't mind if their flight were cancelled.

Sam and Shirlee Milliken, of Waynesburg, Pa., said they are booked to fly home June 30 and hadn't changed their vacation plans in anticipation of a strike.

Asked what they would do if there were a strike, Mrs. Milliken said they would still plan to fly home the 30th.●

**MR. WATT'S UNSEEMLY
REGULATORY STRIP**

HON. JAMES WEAVER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MR. WATT'S UNSEEMLY REGULATORY STRIP

Interior Secretary James Watt, thumbing his nose at Congress, is plunging ahead to reorganize the Federal agency that regulates strip mining. The merits of the reorganization are debatable, but Mr. Watt's tactics are not. By developing the plan without wide consultation and rushing to stay ahead of Congressional doubters, he displays a deplorable arrogance.

Secretary Watt wants to dismantle Federal regulation of strip mining. As a private attorney, he filed a brief supporting state and industry contentions that the Federal strip-mining act was unconstitutional. But the Supreme Court rejected that argument and unanimously upheld the act the other day. Now Mr. Watt aims to use his reorganization scheme to give states the major regulatory role.

The Watt plan would abolish five regional offices of the Federal Office of Surface Mining and substitute lesser state liaison offices and technical centers. The Federal staff would be cut by almost 40 percent, on the assumption that the states would increase their regulatory activities.

That would be all well and good if regulation remains as effective as Congress intended and if there is an orderly transition. But the transition is turning rough. Mr. Watt developed the plan without consulting key state, industry or Federal officials and then proposed it abruptly.

That prompted Representative Patricia Schroeder, Democrat of Colorado, to conduct a hearing that made plain that major coal states rely for support on the threatened Denver regional office. The testimony also suggested that the reorganization, contrary to declarations, would be costly and drive competent employees from Government service.

Believing that these are legitimate questions deserving more discussion, a House appropriations subcommittee barred Mr. Watt from using any money in the fiscal 1982 budget, which starts October 1, to close the Denver office. It wasn't clear that the full committee or the full House and Senate would go along, but Mr. Watt took no chances. Abandoning his promise of an "orderly phase-in," he ordered the Denver and Kansas City offices closed by August 31, before the budgetary restraint could take effect.

Such conduct makes Mr. Watt what he and his President profess to deplore: a Washington princeling who ignores Congress and the public and simply does as he likes.●

TENN-TOM BOONDOGGLE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as Congress becomes more entwined in the budget thicket, we should be mindful of some of those Federal spending programs earmarked to continue with funding, but which seem to be perpetuated by the smallest of constituencies to benefit only a few. Meanwhile, important social programs with vast constituencies—such as social security, trade adjustment assistance, unemployment compensation, and the student loan program—are sent to the dock facing possible execution.

Take the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, for example.

Ever since its authorization in 1946 and the start of its construction in 1971, the Tenn-Tom has been eating our tax dollars, devouring its share of the budget pit.

Now we are asked to sacrifice large sums of money for legitimate human resource programs while the Tenn-Tom awaits even more taxpayer money. But for whom, how many, and for what reason?

I insert for the RECORD an editorial by James J. Kilpatrick, who has earned a reputation for his eloquent defense of the conservative cause. His insightful critique regarding the questionable value of continuing to fund the Tenn-Tom is worth review by all Members of Congress, regardless of their ideology.

BILLIONS SINK IN TENN-TOM WATERWAY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—Of all the political ailments that afflict the Congress, none is more irritating than the condition known as Macbeth's syndrome. We are seeing it today in the matter of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. Those who oppose this costly project may as well concede defeat. My brothers, we have been bamboozled.

For those unfamiliar with the aches and pains of congressional exercises, let it be said that the syndrome develops from this quandary: Shall we throw good money after bad? Is it better to go ahead with a doubtful project or to end the venture and absorb the losses?

This was the problem that troubled the late Lord Macbeth. He and his lady had embarked upon an enterprise that he couldn't get out of. "I am in blood stepp'd in so far," quoth he, "that should I wade no more, returning were as tedious as go o'er." Macbeth kept going; and he came, as they say, to a bad end.

So it goes with the Tenn-Tom. This is the 232-mile waterway—the largest project currently under construction by the Corps of Engineers—intended to connect the Tennessee River with the existing Black Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway down in Alabama.

From the beginning, the justification for this project has been doubtful. Strong opposition developed when the Tenn-Tom was authorized in 1946. More opposition mobi-

lized before construction began in 1971. Two or three times since then, the project has barely survived attempts to kill it.

But we are now in this intractable situation. The waterway is 53 to 55 percent complete. More than \$1 billion has been spent on this colossal ditch. If construction were stopped dead in its tracks tomorrow, perhaps \$600 million in further outlays might be prevented—but the billion dollars already invested would be lost. What to do?

Such a question is not unknown on Capitol Hill. A few years back, Macbeth's syndrome affected a plan to subsidize construction of a prototype supersonic transport plane. There the decision was to stop the loss and get out. The situation rose again in the matter of another palatial Senate office building; in this case the decision was to plunge ahead. Opposing forces still are battling over the proposed breeder reactor at Clinch River: Do we kiss that investment goodbye, or do we keep going?

My own view, for whatever it may be worth, is that the Tenn-Tom never should have been started. The principal justification was that vast amounts of money could be saved in shipping costs if mid-America could be linked to the Deep South by a waterway winding up in Mobile and the Gulf. The Tenn-Tom, it was said, would provide an alternate water route for use at times of low waters in the Mississippi. Other justifications were thrown in as makeweights—recreational opportunities, increased employment, social uplift, picnic tables, water-skiing, you name it.

A new study from the General Accounting Office, just released, once again casts doubts upon the rosy visions of the Tenn-Tom sponsors. The projected savings in freight costs are still ephemeral. Whatever is gained by the barge operators will be lost by the railways. If the Tenn-Tom ever is to pay its way, in terms of a benefit-to-cost ratio, still more money must be spent between Demopolis and Mobile—perhaps as much as another \$960 million over the next 16 years. Before the turn of the century, the taxpayers could be dragged step by step into a \$3 billion venture.

Things have gone too far to quit now. The waterway will have to be completed at least to Demopolis, and a sinking feeling tells me that, three or four years hence, Congress will have to yield to irresistible arguments that the Demopolis-Mobile improvements be undertaken also.

Under the circumstances, we may as well accept the situation. Perhaps coal experts will justify the heavy investment by Alabama in new port facilities at Mobile. Other navigational improvements of doubtful justification have turned out well. The Tenn-Tom may yet prove its critics wrong. I've been wrong lots of times before.●

DRUG ABUSE

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, in one of his early press conferences, President Reagan called drug abuse, "one of the gravest problems facing us internally in the United States." He went on to say, "Whatever we can do at the national level to try and launch

a campaign . . . we should do . . . because I think we are running a risk of losing a great part of a whole generation if we don't." However, in spite of this rhetoric, the administration has proposed that the alcohol and drug abuse education program be reduced by 25 percent and that the program should be included in a block grant. The administration must realize that they cannot have it both ways.

I submit that we have an effective nationwide campaign already functioning—the alcohol and drug abuse education program. Rather than prescribing a specific solution or implementing a model program, the alcohol and drug abuse education program offers training and technical assistance to States and local school districts to help them design and implement programs to meet their unique needs. While local school personnel have identified the widespread use of drugs as one of the most severe and complicated problems that schools face today, this is the only Federal prevention program that addresses this problem in schools on a nationwide basis.

To respond to this crisis there is clear justification for a primary role at the Federal level in leadership training, technical assistance, research and development, evaluation dissemination, and development of local capacity. This program is not, like the standard discretionary program, a grants program. It provides training and technical assistance to local school districts across the Nation to design and implement local programs, to build local training capacity, and to develop State and regional support networks.

The alcohol and drug abuse education program is highly cost effective. Currently, it is working with 450 school programs in 36 States, Guam, and Puerto Rico, with an appropriation of \$3 million. This program is funded at a level slightly above metric education and slightly below consumer education. Although we may be inconvenienced at times by forgetting the conversion from gallons to liters, I have yet to hear of a student dying from such a lack of knowledge. However, in every region of our country within this school year, students have committed suicide, students have been assaulted, and a few have been murdered in alcohol and drug related incidents.

It would not be cost effective or feasible to divide \$3 million between 50 States and territories. Such a scattering of resources dissipates and wastes funds resulting in duplication of mistakes, a piecemeal approach to the problems and no opportunity for sharing successes across the Nation.

Probably most crucial is the fact that there is no assurance that consolidated funds would be used at the

State level to address the critical problems of alcohol and drug abuse and associated destructive behaviors in our schools. Consolidation would kill a national school program that has been operating since 1974 and is overwhelmingly popular with school and community personnel across the Nation. In many areas of the country this program is beginning to train State Department personnel and involve the private sector in the financing of alcohol and drug abuse education training. Given a few more years to develop these concepts, the Federal program may have provided the States with the capacity to administer an effective alcohol and drug abuse education program at the State level.

During reauthorization hearing held by the Subcommittee on Select Education in April of this year Gary Wappes, National Association of Prevention Professionals, stated:

The block grant approach to service funding is, in general, consistent with our position on local control and responsibility for program design and service delivery. We don't, however, feel that a blanket approach to this issue is a responsible one . . . those local efforts should be supplemented by cost-effective support systems that provide training and technical assistance on a regional, multi-State basis. This service . . . must remain a federal responsibility and function the act is consistent with . . . local programming supported by Federal support for technical assistance and training.

If we are truly concerned about the future of our country, we must not allow programs that are working well and are cost effective to be included in a block grant. The alcohol and drug abuse education program provides much needed services to those who are our future—our Nation's children. Failure to adequately address their needs will undoubtedly produce much greater costs to the Federal Government in the future. ●

ITALIAN EARTHQUAKE RELIEF EFFORTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues correspondence I have had with the Agency for International Development (AID) regarding the use of earthquake assistance funds for the victims of the earthquake which occurred in southern Italy in November 1980.

As you know, the U.S. Government is providing \$50 million in assistance. In addition, numerous private organizations have raised additional amounts to help the victims.

I wrote to AID subsequent to a report which appeared in the New

York Times of May 31, 1981, which alleged that delays had occurred in providing aid. In its reply, AID says that implementation of the \$50 million program of official U.S. assistance is proceeding according to schedule. That assistance will be used to construct 12 schools in the devastated area. AID, in addition, has no evidence that there have been specific bureaucratic problems affecting the disbursement of private funds.

The article and the correspondence as well as a status report on the AID Southern Italy Earthquake Assistance Program follow:

CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1981.

HON. M. PETER MCPHERSON,
Administrator, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCPHERSON: I am writing requesting your comments on a story published in the New York Times of May 31, 1981 regarding disaster relief funds to assist the victims of the earthquake which occurred in southern Italy in November, 1980.

Specifically, I would like to know whether bureaucratic delays on the part of the Italian authorities have slowed the provision of aid; and, if so why; what is being done to remedy those delays and to speed up the utilization of funds available from both public and private American sources; what is being done to ensure the effective use of funds collected by voluntary agencies here who do not have staff there to distribute funds in Italy; whether there is any evidence the Rome government is deliberately blocking or limiting the disbursement of funds in the region for political reasons; and finally, what the status of the U.S. official aid effort is at the present time.

As you know, there is great interest in Congress in seeing the rapid reconstruction of the devastated area and prompt utilization of all funds collected and available for this purpose. I would appreciate a prompt response to this letter.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Europe and the Middle East.

U.S. EARTHQUAKE AID FOR ITALY IS SLOWED

Last November's earthquake in southern Italy, which killed 3,000 people and demolished 365 villages, has generated \$85 million in relief aid from the United States. But the money is beginning to arrive only after extensive bureaucratic delays.

Congress appropriated \$50 million in December for Italian quake relief but so far has spent only \$4.2 million, most of it for the immediate needs of the eight million victims. The emergency is still far from over; about 250,000 people remain homeless.

The Agency for International Development, an arm of the State Department, still holds \$45 million that "will be provided in projects decided upon jointly with the Italian Government," according to James Phippard, an A.I.D. director.

But expecting a coherent plan from Rome may be unrealistic, suggests Mario Cuomo, Lieutenant Governor of New York, who founded a committee to oversee funds flow-

ing from the United States to Italy. His committee, Italian Disaster Earthquake Assistance, has been frustrated, he says, by governmental bureaucracy.

OFFICIAL GUIDELINES LACKING

Italy has yet to issue official policy guidelines on such fundamental questions as whether and to what extent Italy should rebuild an area that is geologically unstable and economically underdeveloped, Mr. Cuomo said.

The region, south and west of Naples, is one of Italy's poorest, and lack of industry has led to a seasonal exodus of men to jobs in Switzerland and West Germany.

When the remaining \$45 million in Congressional funds is finally spent, it will probably be used to build schools, Mr. Phippard said, since "Italians don't want to lose young families from an area already known for its high emigration."

Mr. Cuomo said that aside from the Italian Government's reluctance to pour money into a depressed area, Rome also holds a longstanding bias against developing the south. But he added that if his committee cannot work with Rome's approval, "we will simply go ahead with the help of the local mayors."

Complicating efforts is the fact that there are two types of relief groups handling American contributions: operating agencies that do their own field work and voluntary agencies that lack overseas personnel and must hand over their funds to the operating agencies. Two international operating agencies, the Red Cross and Catholic Relief Services, have each collected \$10 million on this side of the Atlantic and have been distributing it in various forms in Italy. The Salvation Army is also dispensing \$9 million that it collected.

Voluntary agencies, with no staff to distribute funds, have been "shopping around" for worthwhile projects, a spokesman for the American Council of Voluntary Agencies said. Some Italian-American civic leaders argue that huge capital investments require patience, while others complain about months of what seems like indecision.

The Sons of Italy, for example, raised \$2 million and spent half of it for vaccines, but it is having difficulty using the remainder. Dozens of smaller civic groups, including Save the Children, which raised \$187,000, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, which raised \$145,000, have collected \$4 million that still awaits distribution.

"All roads lead to Rome," says Keith Drake, director of Adottare, or Adopt, which circumvents the Italian bureaucracy by asking American towns to send funds directly to sister cities. Adottare was developed by Alfred DelBello, the Westchester County Executive, and has already given a quarter of a million dollars in direct aid.

POTENTIAL FOR INVESTORS SEEN

Using this individualized strategy, American companies can provide long-range support by establishing industrial links with southern Italy. Richard N. Gardner, the former Ambassador to Italy, who visited the stricken area, stresses the potential for "American investors in joint ventures to stimulate growth of industry, agriculture and tourism in the south." Relief projects are expected to produce business for American drug and housing companies.

Mr. Gardner also advises that United States Government money finance "projects visible to the average Italian, such as community facilities."

Congressman Mario Biaggi, the Bronx Democrat who spearheaded the legislation for the \$50 million relief package, says he is "monitoring very closely the dispensation of funds for sensible projects such as schools and health facilities."

While United States officials plan to restore public structures to help entire villages, the passage of time undercuts the impact of the aid. Most of the earthquake victims now live at best in prefabricated shelters, called containers, and at worst in trailers, tents and railway cars. They fear ending up like those victims of an earthquake near Agrigento in Sicily who, nearly a decade later, still live in tents.

SUCCESS IN FRIULI CITED

Many officials praise A.I.D.'s recent success in rehabilitating Friuli, in northeastern Italy, where an earthquake in 1976 killed 1,000 people. "Friuli had a poor economy, but with careful planning after its earthquake, it has been booming," Mr. Biaggi said.

The Italian Government appropriated \$600 million outright for the area of the November quake. Yet A.I.D.'s estimates set the total cost of recovery at \$13 billion.

Certain towns may be redesigned, according to Mr. Biaggi, "possibly with satellite communities, as in Friuli, to provide an alternative industrial economy" to the traditionally insufficient agricultural one.

The Italian Government is expected to relocate some villages to avoid future quake vulnerability, though this program may be delayed because of its unpopularity among the victims.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, Washington, D.C., June 18, 1981.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of June 3, 1981, in which you asked about the New York Times story of May 31, 1981, regarding earthquake assistance activities in Southern Italy.

In stating that bureaucratic delays laid to Rome have blocked use of much of the funds raised in the U.S. for earthquake relief, the article seemed to lump together both the U.S. Government program and those of private U.S. groups. However, the discussion of delays in the text of the article seemed only to relate to private assistance—not to the \$50 million program appropriated by Congress.

The U.S. Government reconstruction assistance to Italy is proceeding on schedule and has not been subjected to any bureaucratic delays by the Government of Italy. To the contrary, all levels of government have been cooperative and helpful. When the A.I.D. reconstruction survey team went to Italy immediately after the earthquake, the Italian Government's Special Commissioner for the Earthquake, Giuseppe Zamberletti, provided transportation assistance, including a helicopter, as well as access to those on his staff who could provide necessary information and contacts and otherwise facilitate the team's effort. In the immediate aftermath of the earthquake when the overriding concern was the relief effort, the team was nevertheless able to consult extensively with Italian officials throughout the earthquake zone. Based on these consultations, A.I.D. recommended a program of reconstruction of destroyed schools. The team returned to Italy in February with this proposal, which received enthusiastic concurrence from Commissioner Zamberletti and local officials. Again, the team's

effort to travel extensively throughout the affected area and to consult with Mayors and Regional and Provincial officials received full government support.

In March a resident A.I.D. Representative went to Italy to begin selecting the sites for the twelve planned schools. This effort has been undertaken in conjunction with all levels of government in Italy, and the sites were announced in a joint press release on June 10. To reiterate, the program is on schedule and has not been subjected to any delays by the Italian Government.

We are in close contact with U.S. private organizations through our participation in the Italian Disaster Earthquake Assistance organization (I.D.E.A.). We are not aware of any specific bureaucratic problems which may be affecting their activities.

With respect to ensuring the effective use of funds collected by fundraising groups with no operating capacity or with no on-site staff, we have urged—particularly through the I.D.E.A. Forum—that these funds be funneled through those private voluntary agencies who do have operating staff in Italy. Given our experience with these operating agencies over the years, we believe this is an appropriate way to proceed.

We have no evidence that the Government of Italy is blocking or limiting the disbursement of funds for political (or any other) reasons. In May, the Government passed a measure providing for \$7.5 billion of assistance to the affected area.

In brief, the status of our program to reconstruct destroyed schools is that design contractors have been selected and sites for 12 schools have been selected and were announced on June 10. The design contractors will now begin the school design process, upon completion of which construction will begin under a competitive bidding process. We expect that construction will begin on the first school by August 1982 and be completed by February 1984. Construction of all schools is expected to be completed by April 1985. I am attaching a briefing paper which will provide you with additional information on our program.

If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

M. PETER MCPHERSON.

Attachment: Briefing paper.

A.I.D. SOUTHERN ITALY EARTHQUAKE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

On November 23, 1980, at 7:30 p.m., a severe earthquake struck southern Italy. The quake with its epicenter at Eboli, registered 6.8 on the Richter Scale. It was considered the most devastating disaster to strike Western Europe since World War II. The affected area (approximately 10,000 square miles—an area the size of Maryland) covered an area north and south of a line running east from the city of Naples to Potenza. This includes the Provinces of Naples, Salerno, Avellino, Benevento, Potenza and Caserta in the two Regions of Campania and Basilicata. The city of Naples and the provincial cities of Salerno, Potenza and Avellino were damaged, and outside these urban centers over 350 towns and villages, out of a total of 570, were damaged by the initial shock and its numerous aftershocks. Some towns and villages, in whole or in part, were simply flattened. The total population of the affected area is estimated at 4.5 million (or about 10% of the country's population) including the 1.3 million inhab-

itants of Naples. Major damage, however, was centered in Avellino, Salerno and Potenza Provinces, and it is in these provinces that A.I.D. plans to have its reconstruction assistance program. The Government of Italy considers these Provinces to be the ones most in need of assistance—the operational centers of the Government's relief and post-relief program were limited to these Provinces.

The quake killed approximately 2,700 people and injured 7,700. It is estimated that living quarters for 250-300,000 people were also destroyed. Surveys indicate that roughly 100,000 structures such as schools, houses and public buildings were damaged or demolished. By the end of January 1981, the Italian Government estimated the cost of recovery (repair and reconstruction) would run to some \$18.5 billion.

While there was criticism of the Italian relief effort immediately following the earthquake, when A.I.D. personnel arrived they found a very dedicated and effective effort. Food and medical care were being provided to those who needed it, numerous types of temporary shelter were being sent from all over Italy and elsewhere, utilities were being rapidly restored, roads were opened, and rubble clearing and demolition of dangerous buildings was well underway. The Government appointed a Special Commissioner, Giuseppe Zamberletti, to direct the relief and immediate post-relief efforts. He divided his organization into three Provincial Operations Centers (COP) in the towns of Avellino, Potenza and Salerno. Each COP had representatives from the military, the national firefighting organization, various police organizations, the utilities, the Automobile Club of Italy (responsible for caravans) and trade union representatives. Each COP was divided into several Sector Operations Centers (COS) with similar representation.

The U.S. Government's relief assistance to Southern Italy directly following the November 23, 1980, earthquake consisted of:

Airlift of 2,000 tents and 20,000 blankets.
Use of six helicopters for survey and relief operations.

Provision of portable communications sets in remote villages.

Assistance of a three-member team of electrical power generation technicians and a water supply expert to help assess needs in those areas.

The total cost of this emergency relief assistance was \$4,235,000. U.S. relief efforts were directed by A.I.D.'s Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance. With respect to the U.S. servicemen who participated in disaster relief the U.S. Ambassador reported "Few things have been so uplifting in the midst of the tragic disaster which struck Italy than the splendid assistance which so many members of the U.S. armed forces gave to the U.S. relief operations and gave in aid to the survivors. . . . They have been deeply appreciated by the Italian people and by the Government of Italy."

Immediately after the earthquake the Congress appropriated \$50 million for relief and reconstruction for the victims of the earthquake. A Presidential Delegation consisting of Mr. Jeno F. Paulucci, Chairman, and Congressmen Silvio O. Conte and Mario Biaggi, Congresswoman Geraldine A. Ferraro, Mario M. Cuomo, Lt. Governor, New York State, and persons from the private sector, visited the Italian earthquake area December 13-17. The delegation recommended that the funds available for reconstruction be invested in permanent visible

structures such as were built by the U.S. after the 1976 earthquake in the Friuli area of Italy. The delegation also urged the coordination of the very substantial U.S. private relief efforts. Subsequently there was formed a coordinating organization called "IDEA" (Italian Disaster Earthquake Assistance) with Mr. Paulucci, International Chairman and Liaison, Gov. John Volpe, National Chairman, Lt. Gov. Cuomo, Executive Coordinator and Vice President George Bush and former Vice President Walter Mondale, Honorary Chairmen.

In early December A.I.D. appointed a Coordinator for the Southern Italy reconstruction program, James R. Phippard, who led a team to Italy at that time and again in February to survey reconstruction needs. The team visited the earthquake zone and had intensive discussions with GOI officials on the scene, including Commissioner Zamberletti, Regional and Provincial officials and a number of mayors. The team observed that, of various types of social infrastructure, school buildings had received the most damage. They also found considerable concern in the area that lack of school facilities would stimulate emigration, further weakening the economic base of the area. Because schools would have an impact on a large portion of the affected population and would also be a permanent and visible symbol of American friendship for the Italian people, A.I.D. decided to focus U.S. assistance on this reconstruction need, subject to consultations in Italy. When A.I.D.'s proposal to concentrate U.S. funds on a school reconstruction program was conveyed to Italian officials all expressed concurrence with it.

On April 2, 1981 the Italian Government signed an "umbrella agreement" providing overall approval for the program. Since March 21 the A.I.D. Representative in the earthquake area, Blaine Richardson, has been working on site identification, and the site locations are expected to be announced by mid-June. Approximately twelve medium to large sized schools are planned.

After specific project locations have been confirmed, individual project agreements will be signed with provincial and municipal authorities (as was done in the Friuli) which will be obligating documents. An amount for contingencies will be estimated for each project, but will not be obligated until actually required, thereby providing the flexibility to use contingency funds when and where they are most needed. A.I.D. has selected two firms, Blue Rock Partnership and Pasantino/JRB/Castore Associates, to negotiate contracts for the design of the schools. Design will begin immediately after the sites have been selected in mid-June, with construction of the first project beginning about 13 months later. Construction of the first school should be completed by February 1984 and all schools are expected to be finished by April 1985. ●

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS ON THE CHURCH

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a most eloquent statement by Mr. Norman Bie of Largo, Fla., regarding

the impact of congressional actions on the church.

I have known Norman Bie personally for a number of years. I consider him to be a close friend and I have always been impressed with the thoughtfulness of his words. In this instance, I believe his words on a divided church bear consideration by all of our colleagues. Therefore, it is an honor for me to insert Norman Bie's statement in the RECORD at this point:

A DIVIDED CHURCH

At a time when the whole church is striving to come together, a legal move has been taken which threatens to split Christianity apart. This is the result of a law which treats religion as something which takes place within the four walls of a building or at a place of religious assembly and which treats any religious communication beyond the course of services at the place of assembly as a business.

This is precisely the result of the copyright law of the United States which became effective January 1, 1978—Public Law 94-553 of the 94th Congress. The change in the law is subtle and passed without wide knowledge in the Christian community.

Those of us who have provided the media by which ministers of the gospel reach their congregations in their homes each day, in distant as well as nearby communities, can see the destructive effect of a law which declares that religion is something that is practiced at a "place of assembly."

Many Christians throughout the World cannot go to a place of religious assembly out of fear for their lives or their livelihood, yet they practice their faith each day, sometimes in a closet or in an attic, with only a radio receiver to bring them instruction on the Gospel of Jesus Christ. If that practice can be defined as something other than the practice of religion because it does not take place in a place of religious assembly, then it can be regulated, limited, circumscribed or prohibited.

The Committee which reported this proposed law to the Congress, recommending its passage, stated that this law "removed the old exemption" dealing with non-profit activities and "substituted in its place certain specific exemptions. Those "specific exemptions" divide religion into two categories and grant full religious exemption only to that part which is practiced in a place of religious assembly.

The "non-profit" label has been used as a convenient means to distinguish between business activities which government could regulate and non-business activities which government could not regulate. If the law may now make a distinction between religion practiced at a place of assembly and religion practiced elsewhere, or by other means, it will necessarily follow that the part which is not deemed "religion" may be regulated. If this distinction is valid for the copyright law so that religion practiced through the use of this media is not religion but "business," it will also be valid for other laws relating to "business" including taxation, licensing, administrative and other reporting requirements (such as the proposed HR-41) and any other regulation which can lawfully be applied to business.

While we have initiated steps to defend religious freedom against this latest threat, it is our duty to bring this danger to the attention of the entire religious community. I

am confident that once informed, the religious community will unite in support of our efforts. I am equally confident that with the support of the religious community, the practice of religion can be restored to the full freedom it possessed as an inalienable right prior to January 1, 1978.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN BIE, JR.

Mr. Speaker, I have sponsored legislation to correct this problem. My bill, H.R. 3392, provides copyright exemption to nonprofit religious broadcasters from certain performances and displays of copyrighted works. Many nonprofit religious radio and television stations are chartered for worship purposes and are devoted strictly to the exercise of religion—not for their own commercial advantage. H.R. 3392 proposes to allow them to exercise religious beliefs without subjecting themselves to Federal prosecution. I hope my colleagues will heed the advice of Norman Bie and join me in cosponsoring H.R. 3392. ●

TRIBUTE TO SYLVIA MIEDEMA

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Sylvia Miedema, was recently the subject of a short profile piece in the West Cook County Suburban Trib.

I have known Mrs. Miedema for a number of years and I think I can attest to the fact that she is one of the most successful businesswomen in the Chicagoland area because of her honesty, integrity and high regard for the savings and loan industry and the customers she serves.

I am very pleased to share the following article about Mrs. Miedema with my colleagues, whom I know join me in wishing her 60 more years of great success.

[From the Suburban Trib, Cook County, Ill., May 27, 1981]

IN CHARGE—AT 77, SHE HOLDS THE REINS ON HER BUSINESS, POLITICS, LIFE

(By Carol Jouzaitis)

In her 60 years at Clyde Federal Savings & Loan Association, the last 30 as president, Sylvia Miedema has been a fighter, an innovator, and, most of all, an example for others in her industry.

It isn't just that in 1951, an era when women executives at financial institutions were as scarce as men wearing ruffled aprons, she took over the reins of Clyde Federal from her father-in-law.

Nor is it simply that in a time when banking and S&L leaders were mute in the political arena Miedema actively supported candidates sympathetic to her industry and urged others to do the same.

At age 77, in addition to her duties as president and chairman of Clyde Federal, she sits on the boards of the West Suburban

Bank of Darien and the Bank for Savings & Loan Associations in Chicago [both of which she helped found], and travels to Springfield and Washington, D.C., several times a year to speak out for legislative changes on behalf of two S&L groups.

"Sylvia is not a shrinking violet," says her longtime friend, Arnold Rauhen, chairman and chief executive of the Bank for Savings & Loans.

Miedema, of Hinsdale, who has overseen Clyde Federal's growth in assets to \$310 million from \$8.4 million over the last 30 years, is sweetly evasive when asked when she will take the retirement she is long past due.

Her desk at Clyde Federal's home office, 7222 W. Cermak Rd., North Riverside, is still out front in the center of the busy office, where she can talk with longtime customers and friends.

The only evidence that she is slowing down is that her winter vacations of several weeks, which she combines with professional conferences and lobbying trips, are getting longer, say those who know her.

Her retirement isn't far off, Miedema says, but she won't say when. The only other family member involved in the business is her son-in-law, Thomas J. Martin, Clyde's executive vice president.

Her addition to her job began in the 1920s, when she joined Clyde Federal as assistant to its president and founder, Charles Klima, her father-in-law. As his helper, her duties "became everything," she said.

"He [Klima] was a sweetheart. He had such confidence in me. It was nice he did trust me," she says. When Klima retired "he felt I was the one to replace him." So Miedema, who had two children, "got myself a housekeeper, and went on by myself."

Competition in the area was stiff at the time, Miedema remembers. "There were 28 savings and loans on 22d Street at one time."

Miedema applied a philosophy of hiring the best staff she could find and training them herself, not just in their duties but in the principles she believes are vital to her institution. "Honesty, integrity counts for everything in this business," she said. "I hired a good staff. They say what they mean and we back up our word."

Still a small S&L in the early 1950s, Clyde Federal began growing quickly after Miedema took over, and she found herself hiring new employees faster than she could keep track. [Today Clyde Federal, ranking about 80th in the Chicago area in assets, has 150 employees, including three supervisors who have been there 30 years, to offices in North Riverside, and one in La Grange Park.]

She also saw a need for an institution other than the Federal Home Loan Bank of Chicago to service S&Ls, and was one of a group who convinced Congress to pass a bill enabling them in 1968 to charter the Bank for Savings and Loan Associations in Chicago.

"She was forceful and aggressive in her positions, and very active in the political domain," Rauhen says.

When it came to getting S&L leaders involved in the political process, "she was the one who led the way. She felt people didn't do enough, and she hit them over the head with it until they noticed," says Warren Pursell, executive vice president of the Illinois Savings and Loan League. "She's also very charming."

Miedema has been an active supporter of U.S. Rep. Henry Hyde [R-6th, Oak Park],

and on her desk she keeps a framed snapshot of her and President Reagan, for whom she campaigned.

In addition to a long list of civic activities, Miedema heads the political liaison committee for the Illinois league and the legislative committee of the U.S. League of Savings Associations.

Miedema is outspoken on the government regulations affecting her business. "It's boondoggling. There are so many rules and regulations and useless paperwork that no one ever looks at. We just have to rely on our own good business sense."

Like other S&Ls, Clyde Federal's earnings have declined because of high interest rates. When its 1980 fiscal year ended in September, Clyde Federal reported a 4 percent increase in assets, but a \$197,000 loss in net income.

The S&L's reserve position has always been strong, Miedema said. The institution has been attractive to smaller S&Ls looking for a merger, and Clyde Federal has moved toward becoming a metropolitan institution.

"You have to have size to operate these days," Miedema says. Within 10 years, she believes Clyde Federal will reach \$500 million in assets.

Suburban Savings & Loan Association in Berwyn, with assets of about \$7 million, merged with Clyde Federal in the spring and now operates as a division of the larger S&L.

Clyde Federal is currently seeking federal approval, expected shortly, to merge with Public Savings & Loan Association, a one-office S&L on Chicago's Southwest Side with about \$45 million in assets. Other mergers are being considered, but she declined to elaborate on them.

Besides the mergers, Clyde Federal's future expansion will include new branches in the western suburbs. A 2,000-square-foot office will open at the end of June in a shopping center storefront at Barrington and Irving Park roads in Hanover Park.

Clyde Federal also owns sites in Naperville and Wheaton, but Miedema said she doesn't foresee any building projects there until at least 1982 because of the economy. ●

NEW JERSEY INITIATES SISTER STATE-PROVINCE RELATIONSHIP WITH ZHEJIANG PROVINCE OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of announcing that the Province of Zhejiang in mainland China has entered into a "sister state-province" relationship with my home State of New Jersey.

Perhaps better known in this country as "Chekiang," Zhejiang is an apt partner for the Garden State, for although it is one of the smaller provinces of China geographically, it is a crossroads for trade which boasts large and still-growing industrial plants. Its farms account for large proportions of China's agricultural production, particularly in tea, rice, and fish. Many

ports and harbors serve the coastal areas, and energy production is of major importance in its economy.

New Jersey has been a leader in pursuing the new commercial contracts which have opened with the People's Republic of China in recent years. Last year, Gov. Brendan Byrne led a highly productive trade mission to that country which discovered many new economic opportunities for New Jersey industry. The Chinese have reciprocated our attention in many ways, and during his recent tour of New Jersey, Governor Li of Zhejiang Province met with Governor Byrne to conclude a historic cultural and economic exchange. Through the good offices of Governor Byrne's adviser in these matters, Winston L. Y. Yang, director of the Chinese Studies program at Seton Hall University, an ambitious agenda for cooperation between Zhejiang and New Jersey has been undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased and honored to have had an opportunity to meet with the Honorable Li Fungping in connection with promising relationship between our States. Governor Li has been so gracious as to extend to me the hope that I might visit New Jersey's "Chinese Sister" soon, and I certainly hope that some day I shall be able to do so.

Allow me to insert into the RECORD here the agreement which these two great sister States have concluded:

AGREEMENT FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVINCE-STATE RELATIONS OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE PROVINCE OF ZHEJIANG OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas, In accordance with the basic principles laid down by the Sino-U.S. Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations and with a view to enhancing the understanding and friendship between the people of the Province of Zhejiang and the people of the State of New Jersey and between the Chinese and American peoples, the Province of Zhejiang of the People's Republic of China and the State of New Jersey of the United States of America have decided to establish Province-State relations of friendship; and,

Whereas, On the basis of the principles of equality and mutual benefit, the two parties will develop friendly cooperation and exchanges in order to promote the prosperity of the Province of Zhejiang and the State of New Jersey. Through friendly consultations, the two parties have reached agreement on the following:

1. The two parties agree to develop exchanges in the fields of culture, education, health, sports, science, and technology.
2. The two parties agree to encourage and promote trade between the Province of Zhejiang and the State of New Jersey.
3. Acting on the principle of mutual benefit, the State Government of New Jersey shall, at the desire of the Province of Zhejiang, encourage and urge industrial and business companies and firms of New Jersey to help develop the economy and natural resources of the Province of Zhejiang with the newest technology, and encourage them to

make capital investment in certain projects wherever possible. The Government of the Province of Zhejiang shall welcome companies and firms from the State of New Jersey to engage in joint venture enterprises in the Province of Zhejiang together with Chinese economic institutions in accordance with the law of the People's Republic of China on Joint Ventures Using Chinese and Foreign Investment and with the approval of appropriate Chinese government authorities, and shall protect, according to law, the investments, reasonable profits, and other legitimate rights and interests of such foreign partners.

4. The items of exchanges and cooperation carried out according to the present Agreement shall be subject to the applicable laws and decrees of the People's Republic of China and the United States of America, as well as those of the Province of Zhejiang and the State of New Jersey.

5. The leaders of the Province of Zhejiang and the State of New Jersey shall according to the needs of the work keep in touch with each other through appropriate methods agreed upon by the two parties in order to carry on consultations on the exchanges and cooperation between the Province of Zhejiang and the State of New Jersey.

6. The establishment and strengthening of the friendly relations between the Province of Zhejiang and the State of New Jersey shall not prejudice either party's trade, cultural, scientific and technological exchanges with other countries or with other regions of the other party.

The present Agreement is signed in the Township of South Orange Village of the State of New Jersey, on May 11, 1981, and shall come into effect on the day of signature. It is done in duplicate in the Chinese and English languages, both texts being equally authentic.

LI FUNGPING,
Governor of the Province of Zhejiang.
BRENDAN T. BYRNE,
Governor of the State of New Jersey. ●

THE 97TH CONGRESS SCOUTING SURVEY

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during each of the past seven Congresses, I have surveyed the Members of the House and Senate for the Boy Scouts of America to determine the participation of Members of Congress in Scouting, either as Scouts during their youth or as leaders.

The survey for the current Congress is now complete. I thank my colleagues for their participation and cooperation.

As I have done in the past, I am placing the results of the survey in the RECORD so that they will be available to Members and others with an interest in Scouting.

I am happy to report that the percentage of Members who have participated in Scouting has increased by 4 percent since the 96th Congress, continuing a welcome increasing trend.

The percentage of Members who have participated in Scouting stands at 65 percent for the 97th Congress. The 348 Members who have participated is an increase over the 326 Members of the 96th Congress. Totals include 276 Members of the House and 72 Members of the Senate.

There are eight more Eagle Scouts in the 97th Congress than in the 96th. The House lost four Eagle Scouts from the 96th Congress—one of whom went to the Senate—but gained 12 new Eagle Scouts. The Senate lost two Eagle Scouts from the 96th Congress, but gained two new Eagle Scouts, including the former House Member.

A summary of the results and a list of the participating Members follow:

SUMMARY—Breakdown of the 97th Congress scouting survey

	Representatives	Senators	Total
Scout.....	202	51	253
Scout and leader.....	63	16	79
Leader (only).....	11	5	16
Total.....	276	72	348

Total who were Leaders: 96.

Percentage of Members who participated in Scouting: 65 percent.

EAGLE SCOUTS

SENATORS

Mark Andrews, N. Dak. (R), Lloyd Bentsen, Tex. (D), Bill Bradley, N.J. (D), Thad Cochran, Miss. (R), Richard Lugar, Ind. (R), Sam Nunn, Ga. (D), and Warren Rudman, N.H. (R).

REPRESENTATIVES

Bill Alexander, Ark. (D), Ike Andrews, N.C. (D), Doug Barnard, Jr., Ga. (D), Charles Bennett, Fla. (D), Jack Brinkley, Ga. (D), Clarence J. Brown, Ohio (R), M. Caldwell Butler, Va. (R), Barber Conable, Jr., N.Y. (R), William Dannemeyer, Calif. (R), Hal Daub, Nebr. (R), Charles Dougherty, Pa. (R), John Duncan, Tenn. (R), Don Fuqua, Fla. (D), Richard Gephardt, Mo. (D), and Dennis Hertel, Mich. (D).

Dan Marriott, Utah (R), John Murtha, Pa. (D), Charles Pashayan, Jr., Calif. (R), William Patman, Tex. (D), Donald Pease, Ohio (D), Claude Pepper, Fla. (D), J. J. (Jake) Pickle, Tex. (D), Henry Reuss, Wisc. (D), Eldon Rudd, Ariz. (R), Richard Schulze, Pa. (R), Philip Sharp, Ind. (D), Bob Shamansky, Ohio (D), Ike Skelton, Mo. (D), Christopher Smith, N.J. (R), J. William Stanton, Ohio (R), Larry Winn, Jr., Kans. (R), and Gus Yatron, Pa. (D).

SILVER BUFFALO

Senators William Cohen, Maine (R), John Glenn, Ohio (D), Sam Nunn, Ga. (D), and Malcolm Wallop, Wyo. (R).

SILVER BEAVER

Senators Mark Hatfield, Ore. (R), Sam Nunn, Ga. (D), and Malcolm Wallop, Wyo. (R).

Representatives Clarence J. Brown, Ohio (R), Ed Weber, Ohio (R), Larry Winn, Jr., Kans. (R), and George Wortley, N.Y. (R).

SILVER ANTELOPE

Senators Wendell Ford, Ky. (D), Mark Hatfield, Ore. (R), Sam Nunn, Ga. (D), and Malcolm Wallop, Wyo. (R).

Representative Duncan Hunter, Calif. (R).
MEMBER: SCOUTING PARTICIPATION BY STATE
(Scout Denoted by "S"; Leader or Adult
Volunteer by "L"; Scout and Leader De-
noted by S & L)

ALABAMA

Sen. Howell T. Heflin (D) S, Rep. William
Dickinson (R) S, Rep. Ronnie Flippo (D) S
& L, Rep. Richard Shelby (D) S, Rep.
Albert Smith, Jr. (R) S.

ALASKA

Sen. Frank Murkowski (R) S and Sen.
Theodore Stevens (R) S & L.

ARIZONA

Sen. Barry Goldwater (R) S, Rep. John
Rhodes (R) S, Rep. Eldon Rudd (R) S, and
Rep. Morris Udall (D) S & L.

ARKANSAS

Sen. Dale Bumpers (D) S, Sen. David
Pryor (D) S, Rep. Bill Alexander (D) S, Rep.
Beryl Anthony, Jr. (D) S, Rep. Ed Bethune
(R) S, and Rep. John Hammerschmidt (R) S
& L.

CALIFORNIA

Sen. Alan Cranston (D) S, Sen. S. I. Haya-
kawa (R) S, Rep. Robert Badham (R) S & L,
Rep. Anthony Beilenson (D) S, Rep. Clair
Burgener (R) S, Rep. John Burton (D) S,
Rep. George Danielson (D) S, Rep. William
Dannemeyer (R) S & L, Rep. Ronald Del-
lums (D) S, Rep. Robert Dornan (R) S, Rep.
Dave Dreier (R) S, Rep. Don Edwards (D) S,
Rep. Vic Fazio (D) S, Rep. Barry Goldwater,
Jr. (R) S, and Rep. Duncan Hunter (R) S.

Rep. Robert Lagomarsino (R) S, Rep.
Tom Lantos (D) S, Rep. Jerry Lewis (R) S,
Rep. Daniel Lungren (R) S, Rep. Paul
McCloskey, Jr. (R) L, Rep. Robert Matsui
(D) S, Rep. Norman Mineta (D) S & L, Rep.
George Miller (D) S, Rep. Leon Panetta (D)
S, Rep. Charles Pashayan, Jr. (R) S, Rep.
Jerry Patterson (D) S, Rep. John Rousselot
(R) S & L, Rep. Edward Roybal (D) S, Rep.
Norman Shumway (R) S & L, Rep. Fortney
(Pete) Stark (D) S, and Rep. William
Thomas (R) S.

COLORADO

Sen. William Armstrong (R) S, Rep. Hank
Brown (R) S, Rep. Raymond Kogovsek (D)
S, Rep. Kenneth Kramer (R) S, Rep. Patricia
Schroeder (D) S, and Rep. Timothy
Wirth (D) S.

CONNECTICUT

Sen. Christopher Dodd (D) S, Sen. Lowell
Weicker, Jr. (R) S, Rep. William Cotter (D)
S, Rep. Lawrence DeNardis (R) S, Rep.
Stewart McKinney (R) S, and Rep. Toby
Moffett (D) S.

DELAWARE

Sen. Joseph Biden, Jr. (D) S & L, Sen.
William Roth, Jr. (R) L, and Rep. Thomas
Evans, Jr. (R) S & L.

FLORIDA

Sen. Lawton Chiles (D) S & L, Rep. L. A.
(Skip) Bafalis (R) S, Rep. Charles Bennett
(D) S & L, Rep. Bill Chappell, Jr. (D) S,
Rep. Dante Fascell (D) S, Rep. Don Fuqua
(D) S & L, Rep. Sam Gibbons (D) S, Rep.
Earl Hutto (D) L, Rep. Andy Ireland (D) S,
Rep. Claude Pepper (D) S & L, Rep. Clay
Shaw (R) S, and Rep. C. W. Bill Young (R)
S.

GEORGIA

Sen. Sam Nunn (D) S, Sen. Mack Matting-
ly (R) L, Rep. Jack Brinkley (D) S, Rep.
Douglas Barnard, Jr. (D) S, Rep. Newt
Gingrich (R) S, Rep. Bo Ginn (D) S, Rep.
Charles Hatcher (D) S, Rep. Edgard Jenkins
(D) S, Rep. Elliott Levitas (D) S, and Rep.
Larry McDonald (D) S.

HAWAII

Sen. Spark Matsunaga (D) S and Rep.
Cecil Heftel (D) S.

IDAHO

Sen. James McClure (R) S and Rep.
George Hansen (R) S & L.

ILLINOIS

Sen. Alan Dixon (D) S, Sen. Charles Percy
(R) S, Rep. Frank Annunzio (D) L, Rep.
Daniel Crane (R) S, Rep. Phillip Crane (R)
S, Rep. Edward Derwinski (R) S & L, Rep.
John Erlenborn (R) S, Rep. Robert McClory
(R) S, Rep. Edward Madigan (R) S, Rep.
Lynn Martin (R) S, Rep. John Porter (R) S,
Rep. Paul Simon (D) S, and Rep. Sidney
Yates (D) S.

INDIANA

Sen. Richard Lugar (R) S, Sen. Dan
Quayle (R) S, Rep. Dan Coats (R) S, Rep.
Joel Deckard (R) S, Rep. Elwood Hillis (R)
S, Rep. Lee Hamilton (D) S, Rep. Andrew
Jacobs, Jr. (D) S & L, and Rep. Philip Sharp
(D) S.

IOWA

Sen. Charles Grassley (R) S, Rep. Berkley
Bedell (D) S, Rep. Cooper Evans (R) S, Rep.
James Leach (R) S, and Rep. Neal Smith
(D) L.

KANSAS

Sen. Bob Dole (R) S, Rep. Daniel Glick-
man (D) S, Rep. James Jeffries (R) S, Rep.
Pat Roberts (R) S, Rep. Robert Whittaker
(R) S & L, and Rep. Larry Winn, Jr. (R) S &
L.

KENTUCKY

Sen. Wendell Ford (D) L, Sen. Walter
(Dee) Huddleston (D) S, Rep. William
Natcher (D) S, Rep. Harold (Hal) Rogers
(R) S & L, Rep. M. G. (Gene) Snyder (R) S.

LOUISIANA

Sen. J. Bennett Johnston (D) S, Rep. Cor-
rine (Lindy) Boggs (D) S, Rep. John Breaux
(D) S, Rep. Thomas Huckabee (D) S & L,
Rep. Robert Livingston (R) S & L, and Rep.
W. Henson Moore (R) S & L.

MAINE

Sen. William Cohen (R) S and, Rep. David
Emery (R) S.

MARYLAND

Sen. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. (R) S, Sen.
Paul Sarbanes (D) S, Rep. Michael Barnes
(D) S, Rep. Marjorie Holt (R) S & L, and
Rep. Clarence Long (D) S.

MASSACHUSETTS

Sen. Paul Tsongas (D) S, Rep. Brian Don-
nelly (D) S, Rep. Barney Frank (D) S, Rep.
Edward Markey (D) S, Rep. John Moakley
(D) S, Rep. Thomas O'Neill, Jr. (D) S & L,
and Rep. James Shannon (D) S.

MICHIGAN

Sen. Donald Riegle, Jr. (D) S & L, Rep.
James Blanchard (D) S, Rep. David Bonior
(D) S, Rep. William Broomfield (R) S & L,
Rep. Robert Davis (R) S, Rep. John Dingell
(D) S & L, Rep. William Ford (D) S, Rep.
Dennis Hertel (D) S, Rep. Carl Pursell (R) S
& L, Rep. Harold Sawyer (R) S, Rep. Mark
Siljander (R) S, and Rep. Howard Wolpe
(D) S.

MINNESOTA

Sen. Rudy Boschwitz (R) S, Sen. David
Durenberger (R) S & L, Rep. Arlen Erdahl
(R) L, Rep. Bill Frenzel (R) S, Rep. James
Oberstar (D) S, Rep. Bruce Vento (D) L, and
Rep. Vin Weber (R) S.

MISSISSIPPI

Sen. Thad Cochran (R) S & L, Rep. David
Bowen (D) S, Rep. Trent Lott (R) S, and
Rep. G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (D) S.

MISSOURI

Rep. William Clay (D) S, Rep. Richard
Gephardt (D) S & L, Rep. Ike Skelton (D) S
& L, Rep. Harold Volkmer (D) S & L, and
Rep. Robert Young (D) S.

MONTANA

Sen. Max Baucus (D) S and Rep. Pat Wil-
liams (D) S.

NEBRASKA

Sen. J. James Exon (D) S & L, Rep. Dou-
glas Bereuter (R) S, and Rep. Hal Daub (R)
S & L.

NEVADA

Sen. Howard Cannon (D) S, Sen. Paul
Lazart (R) S, and Rep. Jim Santini (D) S.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Sen. Gordon Humphrey (R) S, Sen.
Warren Rudman (R) S, Rep. Norman
D'Amours (D) S & L, and Rep. Judd Gregg
(R) S.

NEW JERSEY

Sen. Bill Bradley (D) S, Rep. James Cour-
ter (R) S, Rep. Millie Fenwick (R) S,
Rep. James Florio (D) S, Rep. Frank Guar-
ini (D) S, Rep. Harold Hollenbeck (R) S,
Rep. James Howard (D) S, Rep. William
Hughes (D) S & L, and Rep. Christopher
Smith (R) S.

NEW MEXICO

Sen. Harrison Schmidt (R) S, Rep.
Manuel Lujan, Jr. (R) S & L, and Rep. Joe
Skeen (R) S.

NEW YORK

Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D) S, Rep. Greg-
ory Carman (R) S & L, Rep. William Carney
(R) S & L, Rep. Barber Conable, Jr. (R) S &
L, Rep. Thomas Downey (D) S, Rep. Hamil-
ton Fish, Jr. (R) L, Rep. Geraldine Ferraro
(D) S, Rep. Benjamin Gilman (R) S, Rep.
Frank Horton (R) S & L, Rep. Frank
Horton (R) S & L, Rep. Jack Kemp (R) S,
Rep. Gary Lee (R) S & L, Rep. Matthew
McHugh (D) S, Rep. Donald Mitchell (R) S,
Rep. Peter Peyster (D) S, Rep. Frederick
Richmond (D) S, Rep. Charles Schumer (D)
S, Rep. Gerald Solomon (R) L, Rep. Samuel
Stratton (D) S, Rep. Theodore Weiss (D) S,
and Rep. George Wortley (R) S & L.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sen. John East (R) S, Sen. Jesse Helms
(R) S, Rep. Ike Andrews (D) L, Rep. William
Hendon (R) S, Rep. L. H. Fountain (D) S,
Rep. James Broyhill (R) S, Rep. Eugene
Johnston (R) S, Rep. James Martin (R) S,
and Rep. Stephen Neal (D) S.

NORTH DAKOTA

Sen. Mark Andrews (R) S, Sen. Quentin
Burdick (D) S & L, and Rep. Byron Dorgan
(D) S.

OHIO

Sen. John Glenn (D) L, Rep. John Ash-
brook (R) L, Rep. Clarence J. Brown (R)
S & L, Rep. Tony Hall (D) S, Rep. Thomas
Kindness (R) L, Rep. Delbert Latta (R) S,
Rep. Bob McEwen (R) S, Rep. Clarence
Miller (R) S, Rep. Ronald Mottl (D) S, Rep.
Donald Pease (D) S, Rep. J. William Stan-
ton (R) S, Rep. Bob Shamansky (D) S, Rep.
Louis Stokes (D) S & L, Rep. Ed Weber (R)
S & L, Rep. Lyle Williams (R) S, and Rep.
Chalmers Wylie (R) S & L.

OKLAHOMA

Sen. David Boren (D) S, Sen. Don Nickles
(R) S, Rep. Mickey Edwards (R) S, and Rep.
Wesley Watkins (D) S.

OREGON

Sen. Mark Hatfield (R) S & L, Sen. Bob Packwood (R) S, Rep. Les AuCoin (D) S, and Rep. Denny Smith (R) S.

PENNSYLVANIA

Rep. Eugene Atkinson (D) S, Rep. James Coyne (R) S, Rep. William Clinger, Jr. (R) S, Rep. Lawrence Coughlin (R) S, Rep. Allen Ertel (D) S, Rep. Charles Dougherty (R) S, Rep. William Goodling (R) S & L, Rep. Joseph McDade (R) S, Rep. Marc Marks (R) S, Rep. Austin Murphy (D) S & L, Rep. John Murtha (D) S & L, Rep. Donald Ritter (R) S, Rep. Richard Schulze (R) S & L, Rep. E. G. (Bud) Shuster (R) S, Rep. Doug Walgren (D) S, Rep. Doug Walgren (D) S, Rep. Robert Walker (R) S, and Rep. Gus Yatron (D) S.

RHODE ISLAND

Sen. Claiborne Pell (D) S, Sen. John Chafee (R) S & L, and Rep. Claudine Schneider (R) S.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sen. Ernest Hollings (D) S, Sen. Strom Thurmond (R) S & L, Rep. Carroll Campbell, Jr. (R) S, Rep. Butler Derrick (D) S & L, Rep. Kenneth Holland (D) S & L, Rep. Thomas Hartnett (R) S & L, Rep. John Napier (R) S & L, and Rep. Floyd Spence (R) S & L.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Sen. James Abner (R) S, Rep. Thomas Daschle (D) S, and Rep. Clint Roberts (R) S.

TENNESSEE

Sen. Howard Baker, Jr. (R) S, Rep. Robin Beard (R) S & L, Rep. William Boner (D) S, Rep. Marilyn Lloyd Bouquard (D) S, Rep. John Duncan (R) S & L, Rep. Harold Ford (D) S, and Rep. Ed Jones (D) S.

TEXAS

Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D) S & L, Sen. John Tower (R) S, Rep. W. R. Archer (R) S, Rep. James Collins (R) S, Rep. E. de la Garza (D) S & L, Rep. Henry Gonzalez (D) S & L, Rep. Phil Gramm (D) S, Rep. Kent Hance (D) S, Rep. Jack Hightower (D) S & L, Rep. Abraham Kazen, Jr. (D) S, Rep. Martin Frost (D) S, Rep. J. Martin Leath (D) S, Rep. Mickey Leland (D) S, Rep. Thomas Loeffler (R) S, Rep. James Mattox (D) S, Rep. Ronald Paul (R) S, Rep. J. J. (Jake) Pickle (D) S, Rep. William Patman (D) S, Rep. Charles Stenholm (D) S, Rep. Richard White (D) S, Rep. Charles Wilson (D) S, and Rep. James Wright, Jr. (D) S & L.

UTAH

Sen. Jake Garn (R) S & L, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R) S & L, Rep. James Hansen (R) S & L, and Rep. Dan Marriott (R) S & L.

VERMONT

Sen. Patrick Leahy (D) S & L, Sen. Robert Stafford (R) S, and Rep. James Jeffords (R) S.

VIRGINIA

Sen. James Warner (R) S, Rep. Thomas Bliley, Jr. (R) S, Rep. M. Caldwell Butler (R) S, Rep. Stan Parris (R) S, Rep. J. Kenneth Robinson (R) S & L, Rep. Paul Trible, Jr. (R) S, and Rep. William Wampler (R) S & L.

WASHINGTON

Sen. Harry Jackson (D) S, Sen. Slade Gorton (R) S, Rep. Norman Dicks (D) S, Rep. Thomas Foley (D) S, Rep. Mike Lowry (D) S, Rep. Don Bonker (D) S, and Rep. Al Swift (D) S.

WEST VIRGINIA

Sen. Robert Byrd (D) S, Sen. Jennings Randolph (D) S & L, Rep. Robert Mollohan

(D) S, Rep. Nick Rahall 2d (D) S, and Rep. Mick Staton (R) S & L.

WISCONSIN

Sen. William Proxmire (D) S, Rep. Robert Kastnermeier (D) S, Rep. Thomas Petri (R) S, and Rep. Henry Reuss (D) S & L.

WYOMING

Sen. Malcolm Wallop (R) S, Sen. Alan Simpson (R) L, and Rep. Richard Cheney (R) S.

NAVAL RESERVE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Navy's Selected Reserve, 87,000 strong, provides approximately 12 percent of the Navy's trained military manpower. In the event of mobilization, the Navy must rely heavily upon its Selected Reserve in a number of mission areas. For example, the Naval Reserve provides the following:

	Percent
Of naval U.S. based logistic airlift (VR).....	100
Of light attack helicopter squadrons (HAL).....	100
Of Navy combat SAR capability (HC-9).....	100
Of naval mobile inshore undersea warfare units.....	100
Of naval control of shipping organization.....	99
Of naval ocean minesweepers.....	88
Of Navy cargo handling battalions	84
Of Navy mobile construction battalions.....	68
Of naval special boat forces.....	66
Of Military Sealift Command military personnel.....	60
Of naval intelligence personnel.....	32

Despite the important role of the Selected Reserve in the total Navy, the Office of the Secretary of Defense has made repeated efforts in recent years to decimate the ranks of the Naval Reserve. Congress has wisely intervened on each occasion to prevent ill-advised reductions.

As a result of the ongoing battle with Defense, the Navy in 1979 established the Navy Manpower Mobilization System (NAMMOS) to validate and document mobilization requirements. NAMMOS begins at the operations level where requirements are developed, and builds from the ground up. It sets the Navy's total manpower needs—active, reserve, and civilian. Since the inception of NAMMOS, the Navy has undertaken the process of revitalizing the entire Naval Selected Reserve structure. The final iteration of this revitalization, encompassing 30,000 to 40,000 billets, is underway, and results and analysis should be available in approximately 6 months. Although the budget request for the Naval Reserve strength for fiscal year 1982 is 87,600, NAMMOS indicates a requirement in excess of 110,000.

The active Navy is plagued by personnel shortages in certain grades and critical specialties, particularly mid-career petty officers. Similar skill shortages beset the Selected Reserve. Thus, while the Naval Reserve has no difficulty in meeting its overall manning requirements, its readiness is impaired by the skill and grade mismatch.

In addition to manpower uncertainties, the Naval Reserve has encountered substantial difficulty in providing training for all drilling Reservists. Training—at least meaningful training with a discernible purpose—is essential to both maintaining unit readiness and to personnel job satisfaction. Unfortunately, congressional restrictions on travel moneys have proven counterproductive to this goal. In fiscal year 1980, funds were insufficient for active duty for training and weekend-away training for the Naval Reserve. As a result, the Navy canceled regular paid drills during June or July for all members of the Naval Reserve in order to provide funds for transportation and per diem for the remainder of the year. The net effect on the Naval Reserve was detrimental to training and readiness and severely impacted morale.

The Naval Air Reserve TACAIR test conducted in fiscal year 1977 demonstrated an exceptionally high degree of combat readiness. Naval Reserve Tactical Air Wings are successfully completing transition into some of the more complex aircraft, the F-4N, E-2B, and EA-6A; they have done quite well with equipment comparable to that used by fleet frontline fighter, attack, airborne early warning, photographic reconnaissance, aerial refueling, and tactical electronic warfare squadrons. Nonetheless, current planning does not envision such newer fleet models as the A-7E, A-6E, and the F/A-18. Further, as the degree of specialization in aircraft carrier maintenance grows, the lack of aircraft compatible to carrier crew capabilities and spare parts inventories will pose an increasing dilemma. The prospects for the surface forces are even less promising. Naval reserve ships and helicopter squadrons are programmed for retirement, with few replacements in the pipeline.

Even with its difficulties in equipping, training, and manning its forces, the Naval Reserve has performed admirably when called upon. Recently, for example, VAW-78 and VAW-88, the two Naval Reserve Carrier Airborne Early Warning Squadrons, completed their annual active-duty-for-training at Keflavik, Iceland. The combined effort covered a 30-day period and provided realistic mobilization training in the airborne-early-warning mission, while filling an essential operational requirement by re-

lieving U.S. Air Force AWACS aircraft that had been forward-deployed in Germany. Without the necessary money for equipment and training and the skilled personnel for manning, however, readiness will continue to be adversely impacted.●

AIRCRAFT SALES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the administration's recent decision to sell high technology arms to Pakistan and Venezuela should cause serious concern to all Americans who worry about the state of our national defense.

The proposed sale of advanced F-16 fighter aircraft to these countries will mean a delay in deliveries of the plane to our own Air Force which are awaiting F-16's.

In addition, this proposed sale will encourage the further drain of highly skilled maintenance personnel from our own Armed Forces.

The New York Times recently reported that an internal Defense Department document warned that additional sales of F-16's abroad will severely jeopardize our own aircraft support capability.

Aerospace companies which sell and service these planes abroad will continue to raid our own military of the trained service and support personnel needed to maintain these planes in other countries.

The chief policymakers in this administration have been telling the American people that our Armed Forces are short of sophisticated weapons and depleted of skilled personnel.

Yet here they are endorsing the sale of a sophisticated fighter plane which will exacerbate both of these problems.

Congress has demonstrated its concern about the loss of trained men and women, the people we have spent 6 to 10 years and millions of dollars to train. We passed legislation to provide substantial pay raises and other incentives to encourage these people to stay in the military because we thought it necessary for our national defense.

Now, it appears, we are more interested in upgrading the Air Forces of Pakistan and Venezuela than in improving the combat readiness and support capabilities of the U.S. Air Force. I think the Congress ought to recognize that, along with the billions of dollars these sales bring into the United States, there is a very substantial loss to our own military program.

I would hope that the Armed Services Committee would give its immedi-

ate attention to the impact of these announced sales on the readiness and manpower problems in our Armed Forces.

These issues are well addressed in two articles, one by Judith Miller of the New York Times, and another by Walter S. Mossberg in the Wall Street Journal, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

THE HARDWARE STORE IS OPEN AND CUSTOMERS COME RUNNING (By Judith Miller)

WASHINGTON.—The Reagan Administration has still not announced a policy on weapons sales, but last week it demonstrated that deeds can speak louder than words. Laying aside the policy of restraint preached by President Carter, within 24 hours it announced new arms-supply arrangements with China and Pakistan. A week before, plans were disclosed to sell F-16 jet fighters to Venezuela.

Under Secretary of State James L. Buckley, providing an advance glimpse of the new policy, told aerospace company representatives last month that sales of American weapons abroad "complement and supplement our own defense efforts and serve as a vital and constructive instrument of American foreign policy." In contrast to the Carter Administration's putdown of arms sales as "inherently evil or morally reprehensible," Mr. Buckley said, the new Administration would use arms transfers as an instrument of "facing up to the realities of Soviet aggrandizement." He said the goals of the new policy included enhancing the "state of preparedness of our friends and allies," revitalizing American alliances, fashioning "more coherent" policies affecting East-West relations and "buttressing our own defense production capabilities."

ADMINISTRATION GOALS MAY CONFLICT

The Buckley speech, though short on detail, outlined general standards for evaluating foreign requests for weapons. In assessing such requests, Mr. Buckley said, the Administration would consider the military threat facing the recipient, how the weapons would affect stability in tense regions and how effectively the recipient could use the arms.

Critics of the Carter policy, which ultimately came to be honored in the breach as much as in the observance, praised the new approach. But the sales of F-16's to Venezuela and Pakistan stirred concern and debate in foreign policy circles. Some analysts argued that the sales were questionable precisely because they appeared inconsistent with the Administration's goals as stated by Mr. Buckley. Pakistan and Venezuela had not previously had jet aircraft as advanced as the F-16's; officials privately wondered whether the planes could be quickly or effectively absorbed by either nation's military forces. Moreover, the officials added, the sales risked fueling regional tensions, in direct conflict with another of the Administration's stated goals.

The Air Force, in particular, objected that the F-16's were not an appropriate response to the military threats facing Pakistan, and certainly were not appropriate for Venezuela, which had sought 16 to 24 planes. The sales, the Air Force and the Office of Management and Budget also argued might increase the cost of the planes and delay deliveries to American forces. Concern about the impact of the sales were expressed in an internal document prepared in April by the

Defense Department's Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation. According to the memorandum, foreign sales of F-16's were having "an adverse effect on the readiness of U.S.A.F. [Air Force] units." Aerospace companies, the document said, were raiding United States military forces "for officers able to provide the training and support commitments that accompany such sales."

"This may be very good for G.D.," the document stated, referring to General Dynamics, builder of the planes, "but it seriously threatens U.S.A.F. F-16 support ability." The Pentagon memo also warned that the sale of the F-16's to Venezuela—Peace Delta, as the project is called—might "generate demands from other countries in the region that they also must have F-16's as a symbol of U.S. esteem and trust."

As the document had forecast, proponents of the sale of F-16's to Pakistan argued that the Administration could not offer smaller, less costly F-5 fighters, although many officials believed they were better suited to Pakistan's military requirements, because it had just approved the sale of F-16's to Venezuela.

Even more serious concerns were generated by President Reagan's decision to supply "lethal" arms to China. Senior officials argued privately that the announcement would "confirm the worst fears" of hardliners in the Kremlin, thereby intensifying the chill in Soviet-American relations and possibly reducing the Administration's ability to deter Soviet military intervention in Poland.

PEKING OPPOSES JETS FOR TAIWAN

Other controversial arms sales under consideration include proposals to sell advanced jets to South Korea, Taiwan and Austria. Resistance in Congress to at least some of the sales is expected. Last week, for example, the entire House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on East Asia, headed by Representative Stephen J. Solarz, Democrat of New York, signed a letter to President Reagan urging him, "in the light of our national interest," not to sell the FX fighter plane to Taiwan. Peking has adamantly opposed the deal. The Administration also faces stiff opposition to plans to sell to Saudi Arabia AWACS electronic surveillance planes and equipment that would expand the capabilities of its American-supplied F-15 fighter planes. Many Congressmen fear that the Saudi sales would damage Israel's security.

Administration officials respond that many of these sales were initiated by the Carter Administration, which they argue was ultimately forced to abandon the substance, if not the rhetoric, of restraint. The Carter policy, which portrayed arms sales as an "exceptional" foreign policy instrument, was widely criticized. Opponents on the left complained that the policy was hypocritical. The Administration countered that some sales were required to support allies and friends as well as to reduce trade deficits and to pay for oil imports. Conservative critics saw the restraints as naive and detrimental to American weapons producers.

Indeed, when the Carter Administration at first exercised restraint, other countries did not follow its lead. Negotiations to make the restraints multilateral stalled in 1978 and weapons sales to the third world by the Europeans and the Soviet Union soared. In a 1980 report, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concluded that, while the Carter Administration had effected modest reductions in United States arms exports, the

policy had been "oversold." The committee advocated a "balanced policy," which would combine "elements of restraint with an understanding that prudent arms transfers can serve important foreign policy and national security functions." Administration actions last week left some officials asking whether the pendulum had swung too far.

ADMINISTRATION SPLIT OVER WHO GETS F-16 FIRST

(By Walter S. Mossberg)

The Reagan administration is having trouble reconciling two of its goals: improving American military readiness and arming U.S. allies.

An argument has been touched off by administration plans to sell Pakistan and Venezuela one of the most advanced American fighter planes, the F-16. Delivery normally would take about 42 months, a timetable assuring that their production doesn't interfere with Pentagon requirements.

But State and Defense Department officials say U.S. foreign-policy interests require that the F-16s, particularly the one for Pakistan, be delivered in 24 to 30 months.

Publicly, the Air Force hasn't taken a position on the debate. But privately, it has warned that a production speedup would divert jet engines and spare parts badly needed to improve its own combat readiness.

An administration official concedes, "We're in a bind. We're trying to juggle several balls at once. We need better readiness. But on the other hand, in some ways allies like Pakistan are our first line of defense."

But this official and others, all of whom insist on anonymity, support the quick sales, especially to Pakistan, which they say faces the threat of Soviet invasion from Afghanistan.

Pentagon and State Department aides say top Air Force officials don't oppose the fighter sales if the timing can be worked out, and they insist a compromise will be reached before the deals are set. "In the end, there will be some strain on the Air Force," says one of these aides. "You can't avoid it. But I think it wouldn't be substantial."

Though both countries are expected to urge quick delivery of the planes, formal agreements haven't been worked out. Last week's announcement of the proposed sale to Pakistan specifically says that "terms, timing and numbers" are yet to be set.

TWO-YEAR SCHEDULE

A two-year delivery schedule has been proposed by General Dynamics Corp., the F-16's builder, for a limited number of planes and countries. But in the sales to Pakistan and Venezuela, the Air Force will press for the standard 42-month lead time.

According to an internal Air Force document, the aircraft bodies can be built in 24 to 30 months. But it says the General Dynamics schedule doesn't give "sufficient lead time to acquire (certain) equipment for the production lines, or to identify, order, and produce spare parts and support equipment."

The Air Force estimates minimum lead times for the plane's engine at 37 to 42 months; for ejection seats, 42 months; for engine accessories, 30 months; and for special runway equipment needed to service the planes, 37 to 42 months.

SPARE-PARTS SHORTAGE?

The Air Force says its own spare parts would have to be diverted to replace those that can't be obtained quickly enough. Any such diversion, its internal paper argues,

"will have a particularly dramatic impact on our F-16 support posture," because low funding for spare parts in recent years "has left us critically short of spare parts to support our own peacetime and wartime commitments."

Company and civilian government officials argue that the process can be speeded up. For instance, Air Force logistics experts are given 12 to 15 months to work out details of the sale and let contracts; advocates of rapid sales believe this period can be shortened.

But the Air Force fears a repetition of the problems it faced when Egypt got F-16s in less than two years. The Egyptian sale meant 30 new planes, seven spare engines and a computerized repair shop were diverted from the U.S. Air Force. Those items are due to be "paid back" from Egyptian-ordered gear, but not until 1983 and 1984.

More such delays, the Air Force argues, can't be sustained in a period when most U.S. squadrons designated to fly the F-16s have yet to be equipped with them, when parts inventories are low, and when the Reagan defense policy places heavy emphasis on readiness.

Even if Air Force fears can be eased in the case of the sales to Pakistan and Venezuela, the problems already raised are likely to recur as similar deals multiply.

American arms makers already are straining to keep up with current and projected U.S. demands for sophisticated weapons. Some officials fear that increased sales to foreign forces, including the 4.5-million-member Chinese military, could impede the U.S. buildup.

Yet, with the blessing of the administration, top U.S. aircraft makers are seeking more overseas customers. General Dynamics already sells F-16s to Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Egypt and Israel. (Israel recently used the planes to bomb Iraq's nuclear reactor.)

McDonnell Douglas Corp. has sold its even more costly and sophisticated F-15 fighter to Japan, Israel and Saudi Arabia. It hopes for more sales to each of the three nations, and to others as well. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1981, I unavoidably missed the last two votes to the Legal Services Corporation Act Amendments of 1981—H.R. 3480. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

"Yes" on rollcall No. 90, an amendment to recommit the bill jointly to the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to consider said bill in relation to the President's Legal Services proposals and to promptly hold hearings thereon.

"No" on rollcall No. 91, passage of the Legal Services Corporation Act Amendments of 1981.

A live pair was received on both votes. ●

SAVINGS AND LOANS' PROBLEMS

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss a problem which is very much on my mind—the plight of the savings and loan industry. Although no immediate liquidity crisis is foreseen, the industry continues to encounter severe earnings problems. Roughly 90 percent are losing money, and the reserves of the industry are being eaten into at a record rate. The principal cause of the savings and loans problems is sustained inflation resulting in high interest rates. No doubt, cumulative irresponsible monetary, fiscal, and regulatory Federal policies underpin the situation today.

These conditions make it difficult for savings and loans to borrow funds in the short- and intermediate-term money markets to invest in long-term mortgages. Put simply, most thrifts are paying more for their money than they are earning. One expert says they are losing \$6 to \$7 billion a year under present interest rate conditions.

In the last few months my colleagues and I on the Banking Committee have discussed and examined the issue at length. A wide variety of proposals to improve the ability of the industry to compete and to bring in the considerable resources of the regulatory agencies have been pondered. Inasmuch as we continue to deal with these approaches, and particularly since hearings in the Domestic Monetary Policy Subcommittee will resume shortly, there is a message that I believe needs to be expressed. That is, that we must not lose sight of the fundamental relationship between the condition of the thrift industry and high interest rates caused by inflation.

A 1-percent decline in the interest rate can bring about a \$3 to \$4 billion increase in the profit margin of the industry. According to Federal Home Loan Bank Board Chairman Richard Pratt, a 2-percent reduction in interest rates could bring the industry back into the black.

The success of the industry, like the success of any ameliorative proposals this Congress might dream for the short term, depends on a real decline in interest rates and inflation. All of us in this body are painfully aware of the insidious effects of inflation, but we rarely see the challenge expressed in hard figures. Knowing that a 2-percent drop in interest rates may mean the crucial difference to the savings and loan industry, to homebuilders, and many others gives added meaning to the many small, but necessary, actions we simply must take each day.

A drop of 2 percent is only the beginning. However, once that goal is achieved, I believe it will be possible for the natural momentum in the market to continue a downward trend in interest rates and restore a healthy faith in our economy at home and abroad.●

NEW YORK CITY'S FIFTH PRECINCT POLICE STATIONHOUSE CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, today the oldest police stationhouse in the city of New York celebrates its 100th anniversary of service to the citizens of Little Italy and Chinatown.

The fifth precinct stationhouse has played an important role in serving the many tens of thousands of immigrants arriving in this country since the 1880's. Over the years, a strong and active community council has developed whose members live and work within the boundaries of the fifth precinct.

In a great "melting-pot" city like New York, the fifth has been able to respond to problems within the community in a personal way. It is the only precinct in New York which has a Chinese-speaking police officer. The service provided by this stationhouse over the past 100 years to the citizens of Little Italy and Chinatown is truly unique. This community-oriented service has done much to foster and preserve the strong feelings that we all have for this wonderful part of the city of New York.

I salute all those who are a part of this historic celebration and want to extend my best wishes as the fifth precinct enters its second century of community service.●

CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR CRUCIAL RECONCILIATION VOTE TO REINSTATE

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon decide the future of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor project (CRBR) and, consequently, the future of nuclear power in this country. For the last 4 years the Congress has supported the continued development of breeder technology and CRBRP in particular in spite of extensive efforts by the previous administration to cancel it.

In its wisdom, the Congress has seen CRBR as a key to long-term fuel availability for nuclear energy and as a symbol of its intent to support the development of nuclear power as an essential element of U.S. energy security. We now have an administration which openly supports nuclear power and the completion of CRBR. Unfortunately, CRBR was narrowly defeated in committee by a coalition which is not representative of the energy views of the Congress. The support for CRBR is broadly based and I believe the dissenting view of 17 members of the Committee on Science and Technology fairly characterized this support.

The arguments against the CRBR have been addressed and it is now clear that the primary motive for attacking the project is founded in anti-nuclear bias and not on the merits or true economics of the program. Some past supporters of CRBR are under the false impression that the project was only a symbol and now, under a pronuclear administration it is not needed. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Each Member of the House has been provided with a wealth of information which clearly demonstrates the need to move ahead now with a breeder demonstration in order to be in a position to commercially deploy breeders by the end of this century. If a commercial deployment decision is made at that time, operating breeder reactors will begin to influence the availability of nuclear fuels by the 2020 to 2030 time frame. We cannot afford to wait any longer. The CRBR is the right plant at the right time, and its design is the most advanced in the world (See Mr. EVANS of Iowa in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 18, 1981, page 13026).

These points on timing of the project are supported by the previously mentioned committee dissenting view, which I have included for the benefit of my colleagues. This view reemphasizes the importance of your vote in support of restoring CRBR through amendment to the reconciliation bill H.R. 3982.

DISSENTING VIEW ON CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR PLANT PROJECT

These views are presented to underscore our strong support of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant Project as a key element in our nation's breeder reactor development program.

The action of the Committee on Science and Technology to terminate the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant (CRBRP) is in direct opposition to the will of Congress as expressed over the last four years and to the intent of the new Administration. This action comes just at the time when we can move ahead with construction of CRBR and revitalize our national and international commitment to the development of nuclear energy. Our support for this project is based on a broad consensus in the scientific and technical community as well as the federal

governments of the U.S. and the major developed countries that breeder technology is important to future energy security. In pursuing this goal, we believe, for a number of reasons, that CRBRP is the next step that the U.S. should take in its breeder development program.

Clinch River is the best plant to accomplish the goals of the U.S. breeder program. No alternative can offer more than this plant without greater cost or a serious loss of time. The design has been favorably reviewed at least 20 times by independent government and industry organizations with the objective of insuring that it was sound and at the forefront of technology. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor is the most advanced design in the world today in all aspects except size, and the size of CRBR was properly selected so that it would not be too large a scale-up from the predecessor plant, the Fast Flux Test facility.

CRBRP is ready to go now. Project design is about 86 percent complete and engineering research and development is about 96 percent complete. By the end of fiscal year 1981, about \$218 million worth of completed hardware will have been delivered and more than \$540 million worth will be in fabrication. We could complete the plant about seven years after receiving regulatory consent to begin construction.

Every other major industrialized nation in the world is building breeder reactors. The Soviet Union, France, the United Kingdom, Japan, Italy, and West Germany are actively developing breeder reactors with four fast breeder reactors larger than 250 MWe already operating and nine under construction or planned. All these nations realize that without breeder reactors to assure long-term fuel supplies, nuclear power will be a relatively short-term energy resource.

The U.S. must have a high-confidence energy strategy. We must assure ourselves and future generations of a secure supply of energy. The prudent course is to preserve the breeder option by proceeding with CRBRP. The General Accounting Office in its 1979 report, "The Clinch River Breeder Reactor—Should the Congress Continue to Fund It?", said flatly that if this nation wants a strong breeder program the Clinch River Breeder Reactor should be built. The GAO said further that a decision not to develop breeders implies the phasing-out of nuclear fission as an energy source. GAO support of CRBRP has been consistent and is included in subsequent GAO reports dated July 10, 1979 and September 22, 1980.

The proper stewardship of our indigenous resources requires that we utilize the breeder reactor to assure adequate supplies of nuclear fuel for centuries to come. The breeder promises to use uranium at least 50 times more efficiently than today's light water reactors. The prestigious National Academy of Sciences in its report, "Energy in Transition", came to the conclusion that we need all our resources—but we especially need coal and nuclear. The Academy said that the breeder would essentially make uranium a potential source of energy for hundreds of thousands of years. While current nuclear fuel resource projections indicate that breeders may not be needed until after the year 2020, significant uncertainties surround the long-term production capacity for this fuel.

The United States last year sent an estimated \$100 billion overseas for oil. We are exporting our money and jobs for a resource that we burn rendering it unavailable for satisfying a wide range of human needs

such as plastics, medicine, and fertilizer. Nuclear power cannot replace all that oil or its substitute fuel—natural gas—but it can make a substantial contribution in modifying the energy mix so as to lessen our dangerous dependence on a foreign and depletable oil resource. A typical 1000 megawatt nuclear plant can replace 10 million barrels of oil per year if it is used to displace some of the more than 420 million barrels of oil consumed each year for generating electricity.

Those who say we could abandon our development effort and buy foreign breeder technology are wrong because of the licensing and economic aspects attendant to such an action. The U.S. has been a leader in technology, especially nuclear technology, until the present. Whether we retain this lead and build our own advanced fission plants according to our own safety standards and economics will be decided this year. The delays encountered in adopting foreign technology to our needs as well as the direct costs of design modifications would significantly add to the cost of breeder reactors in the U.S. On the other hand developing the breeder for the U.S. market will assure us the safest and most efficient machine possible.

Nuclear power is needed to meet our growing electric energy demand. Even doubling our present coal consumption for electric energy production—a prodigious task—we still will not be able to meet our projected electricity needs in the year 2000 without significantly expanding our nuclear generating capacity even assuming an electricity growth rate that's only one-half our historical growth rate during healthy economic times. Furthermore, nuclear is economical! For example, the Commonwealth Edison Company uses coal, oil and nuclear fuel to generate electricity. Because of its heavy reliance on nuclear power, its ratepayers save \$460 million in 1980 alone over what costs would have been if these nuclear plants had been constructed as coal-fired units. Projections for their system indicate that electricity from new nuclear plants will continue to be about 20 percent cheaper than from new coal plants.

Opponents of CRBR have argued that it is uneconomic and too expensive. A first-of-a-kind technology demonstration is never judged on economically competitive grounds. Arguments about the costs of breeder reactors 20 or 30 years into the future have to be based on assumptions that cannot be verified. The market conditions of the future will dictate the rate of breeder deployment. Furthermore, the return on the Federal dollar for developing CRBRP includes more than that gained from the advancement of breeder technology. The economic arguments against CRBRP ignore the tremendous revenues from the sale of generated electricity that will be realized over the plant lifetime. These net revenues are estimated at \$3.2¹ billion at today's wholesale cost of electricity for TVA (almost \$20 billion at projected costs). The present value of this future revenue is \$854¹ million.

The Clinch River Plant will cost less, can achieve critical program objectives sooner, and will entail less technical risk than any alternative yet proposed. Any other plant would add at least eight to ten years more to the demonstration project schedule and increase costs by several billion dollars. Ad-

ditionally, to increase the plant size would also increase the risk of failure. In order for breeder reactors to have any impact on nuclear fuel supplies before the year 2030, we must move ahead now with a demonstration plant. That plant can only be the CRBR.

Some support for CRBR has been lost because of a desire to shift the financial burden for costly demonstration projects to the private sector. While we support this approach in concept, it cannot be implemented independent of the realities of the marketplace. Private industry has previously demonstrated its willingness to take risks in the development of nuclear power as shown by the utility contribution to CRBR as well as other private nuclear ventures such as the Barnwell nuclear facility. Current conditions, however, make it nearly impossible for the highly regulated utility industry to purchase new generating capacity needed to displace oil-fired units, much less finance expensive R&D plants. If nuclear energy is to continue to provide power for America in the 21st century, the government must make a comparatively minor investment now.

A severe critic of the CRBR in the past is Mr. David Stockman. He recently sent to the Committee, through the Ranking Republican Larry Winn, a letter dated May 11, 1981. Mr. Stockman noted that "republicans over the years have seen the development of the breeder reactor as . . . a logical part of a complete and efficient total nuclear fuel cycle. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor is the first material evidence that the United States is willing to move toward such a goal." In addition, he stated that "The Reagan Administration favors the economical and safe development of nuclear energy. And, in particular, this Administration supports construction and operation of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor. This Administration intends to reinvigorate the effort on this project by joining the long struggle by the Congress to complete this project."

The CRBR project is important in the near term to the future of nuclear power. If Congress acts to terminate CRBR, this will be one more in a series of policy reversals (including closing the enrichment order books, prohibition against domestic and foreign reprocessing, and the Carter Administration's identification of nuclear power as an energy source of last resort) which, in conjunction with regulatory uncertainty and private financing constraints, make additional investment in nuclear power difficult at best. If we are to meet our growing electric energy needs, these uncertainties must be removed. The focus of attention today is on the government's willingness to continue with the CRBR project.

We strongly support the completion of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor Plant and believe it is one of the most important energy technology development decisions facing the Congress this session. Moving ahead with CRBR will not only move us once again toward world leadership and influence in breeder technology but permit the much needed domestic development of nuclear power.

Robert A. Roe, Marilyn L. Bouquard, Ronnie G. Flippo, Albert Gore, Jr., Robert A. Young, Richard C. White, Harold L. Volkmer, Ralph M. Hall, Larry Winn, Jr., Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., Manuel Lujan, Jr., Harold C. Hollenbeck, Robert S. Walker, Edwin B. Forsythe, William Carney, Joe Skeen, Bill Lowery.●

EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would establish an educational program for members of the Selected Reserve and National Guard who agree to serve at least 6 years in such programs. My bill would become effective October 1, 1981. On May 19, 1981, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported H.R. 1400, an education program for the All Volunteer Force. The bill was ordered reported by the committee by voice vote and now has 120 cosponsors. Since the bill was jointly referred to the Armed Services Committee, Hon. BILL NICHOLS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation of the Committee on Armed Services, has graciously consented to hold hearings on this bill and they begin tomorrow at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama for the prompt action he has taken to begin hearings on this major education bill. Following these hearings should the committee meet to markup H.R. 1400, as amended, I plan to offer an amendment that would encompass the provisions of the bill I am introducing today, because I feel we must do everything possible to strengthen our Selected Reserve program. This bill will do the job and I am hopeful we can enact this legislation before the beginning of the new fiscal year.●

INFLATION-PROOF SAVINGS CERTIFICATE ACT

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced the Inflation-Proof Savings Certificate Act, H.R. 3960, which I believe will significantly promote long-term savings.

The United States now has one of the lowest rates of saving of any industrialized country. There are many reasons for this low level of saving. However, the one which stands out most clearly is the belief that those who save end up with less than they started with in real dollars. Inflation and taxes ordinarily take away considerably more than the interest earned.

Even with the new instruments which have become available recently,

¹ Figures revised based on more recent and detailed analysis.

such as the \$10,000 6-month certificate and the money market funds, the after-tax reality is often a loss of value in real spending power.

At the same time, savings and loans and, to a lesser extent, banks have been having considerable difficulty making ends meet because of the high level of interest they are paying. Savings and loans which hold long-term mortgages in the 7 to 11 percent range are quickly becoming endangered. Many are already being merged because they have lost all of their net worth. If the present situation continues, the next year is likely to see the liquidation of major savings and loans.

The lack of savings in local banks and savings and loans and the very high interest rates being paid are causing stagnation in the housing industry and one of the worst periods for small businesses in general. How can a person start or expand a small business while paying 20 percent for the needed capital?

Clearly, we cannot reestablish the "Q" rule, tightly controlling interest rates. However, we can provide a financial instrument which will provide a savings incentive for the moderate- and middle-income family. That incentive must, at a minimum, include a return which insures that the principal is maintained in real after-tax dollars. At the same time, the note must be affordable to banks and savings and loans.

This bill establishes an exemption from income taxes of up to \$2,000 in the case of a joint return (\$1,500 for a single filing) for interest income acquired from an "inflation-proof savings certificate." The certificates could be issued by banks, savings and loans, or credit unions and would have to be held for at least 3 years to acquire the tax exemption. The interest rate would be equal to the increase in the Consumer Price Index plus, perhaps, a small bonus.

Since the savings certificates would be tied to the Consumer Price Index and would not be taxable, the saver would know that the value of his or her funds would be preserved. The certificate would be tax deductible only if issued by a depository institution. We would therefore see all of the savings stimulated by this bill deposited in banks, savings and loans, or credit unions where they would generally be available to assist consumers and local business needs.

The bill further provides that the exemption would double if the note became due after the holder was over 65 years of age. Thus, a 55-year-old could acquire a 10-year certificate to qualify for the longer exemption. This will allow substantial savings for retirement.

The exemption provided would be in addition to other interest income ex-

emptions and would itself be indexed to inflation.

I believe that an exemption of this type would substantially increase the amount of savings and would place those funds where they would do the greatest good for the economy. ●

JAPANESE-MADE PRODUCTS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carl H. Hendrickson, of Route 6, Murray, Ky., a constituent that I represent in Congress, has written a very thoughtful letter on the fact that the influx of Japanese-made products coming into the United States goes far beyond automobiles. I feel that Mr. Hendrickson's letter is one which should be shared with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time. The letter follows:

CARROLL HUBBARD: At a meeting the other day, I heard a man say, "Me and my cousin just got laid off; company don't have any orders."

So I looked around. Everyone was drinking import beer. The man next to me wore a Japanese watch. The color TV in the room was Japanese, also the FM receiver. Looking in the parking lot, seven out of ten cars were imports. An ad on the building across the street urged everyone to buy a Japanese camera.

This could be anywhere in the USA. How can we sell America by pushing imports? Sell America and put people back to work.

Sears, Wards, K Mart, and most large stores, sell nothing but imports. Get them to sell made in USA goods.

CARL H. HENDRICKSON,
Murray, Ky. ●

TELEPHONES FOR HEARING-IMPAIRED PEOPLE: THE 1-PENNY BARGAIN

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, once again I have introduced my bill, H.R. 375, to eliminate the discrimination that hearing-impaired people suffer in the delivery of telephone services.

The critical need for this legislation is cogently expressed by my constituent, David Saks, who first brought this problem to my attention.

I would like to share Mr. Saks' plea with my colleagues:

TELEPHONES FOR HEARING-IMPAIRED PEOPLE: THE 1-PENNY BARGAIN

In 1876, no one could communicate by telephone; 105 years later, more than 2,000,000 Americans still cannot communicate by all telephones.

An 1877 newspaper ad announcing the new invention urged readers to "examine . . . instantaneous communication by direct sound"; 104 years later, television viewers are urged to "reach out and touch someone."

More than 2,000,000 Americans still cannot use over 40,000,000 telephones in their country. They cannot "reach out and touch someone" with the "direct sound" of their voices. These hearing-impaired Americans rely upon hearing aids with built-in telephone pickups in order to hear over telephones.

The forty million "silent" telephones are manufactured without means to create the magnetic field required by hearing aids.

Most of our 170,000,000 telephones work with hearing aids by radiating a magnetic field sufficient to activate the hearing aid telephone pickup. The bulk of these hearing aid-compatible telephones are in service areas of A.T. & T., the Bell System.

The bulk of the "silent" forty million are in service areas of Independent (non-Bell) telephone companies and in the privately-owned systems installed by the Interconnect telephone industry.

The hearing aid industry provides the pickup coil—its share of the telephone hearing aid compatibility equation.

The telephone industry does not provide the magnetic radiation in all phones—its share of the compatibility equation.

Some hearing impairment is sufficiently mild to permit use of telephones in the customary manner of non-impaired people.

For some hearing-impaired people, the increased sound-volume of amplifier handsets is adequate to make telephones usable.

For some profoundly hearing-impaired (deaf) people, communication by voice telephone is not possible at all.

Telephone/hearing aid compatibility involves the severely and profoundly hearing-impaired people who can communicate by voice telephone if there is functional compatibility between their telephones and hearing aids—the two communications devices that set the pattern of their lives.

With compatible (usable) telephones these hearing-impaired people merge into the mainstream of society. They hold jobs, practice professions, operate businesses, gain education, live normal family and social lives, enjoy the mobility of the mainstream.

With incompatible (unusable) telephones they are "phone deaf"—unable to hold many jobs, inhibited in professions, businesses, etc., and they are isolated socially.

This deprivation is unnecessary. Approximately 75 percent of our telephones are made so that they deliver sound to all hearing aids. It is vitally necessary that the remaining 25 percent utilize this same beneficial technology. This can be done now, it does not depend on the development of new technology, nor should it be delayed pending new developments.

All telephones must work with all hearing aids—everywhere, and they must work by direct coupling to hearing aids, without the use of external coupling devices.

While traveling through a GTE service area in Florida, Donnie Schmidt needed to place an emergency phone call. The nearest hearing aid-compatible phone was twenty miles away. She was deprived of full access to the national telephone network.

While traveling from Pennsylvania to Texas, Gibson Gray passed through areas using compatible phones and areas using incompatible phones. In the former, he was a

functionally "normal" telephone user. In the latter he was "phone deaf." He was deprived of full access to the national telephone network.

Traveling salespersons, tourists, conventioners, foreign visitors—as well as employees and others at home and business—all attest to the impracticality of such wide variation in the delivery of telephone service. This situation is intolerable in a public utility industry with exclusive, government-protected monopoly territories. All telephones must be accessible to assure equality of service from the national telephone network.

Industry estimates indicate a 50¢ cost differential between magnetic and non-magnetic telephone receivers. If this estimate is accurate, or nearly so, and if all extra cost is borne by subscribers, then the extra cost to equip all new telephones with magnetic capability will be slightly over one cent per year per telephone. No cost to Government—no cost to industry or stockholders—one penny annually per phone to subscribers. If I have one telephone in my home or business, my share of the additional cost will be slightly over one cent each year. For my penny, I will receive the benefit of adding two million people to my pool of potential "communicators"—I will be able to place calls to, or receive calls from, anyone in the United States who is capable of using a voice phone, including those who are "phone deaf."

Organizations of hearing-impaired people, particularly the Organization for Use of the Telephone, have struggled for years to bring about telephone/hearing aid compatibility. Some expansion in the number and proportion of hearing aid-compatible telephones has been made, largely in coin-operated public phones.

The entire telephone industry is aware of the urgent need for hearing aid compatibility. Federal, State and local government agencies have been made aware of the issue. A bill was sponsored by Congressman Clarence D. Long in the 96th Congress to require that all new telephones be manufactured with magnetic capability. This proposed legislation received an extensive pro and con airing before the Subcommittee on Communications.

The problem still is with us. The "phone deaf" still are among us. Industry has not solved the problem. Government has not solved the problem. Consumers as a group are inhibited by the huge size and power of the telephone industry. Consumers as individuals lack the knowledge of telephone/hearing aid coupling technology to deal with local telephone company officials. The fate of "phone deaf" people is in the hands of Congress.●

SOVIET OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, we cannot pass in silence the anniversary of the forcible occupation of Lithuania by Stalin's Soviet armies. This invasion, which the Soviet dictator was enabled to do as a result of his infamous understanding with Adolf Hitler, continues to have repercussions in the world to this day, particularly for the

people of Lithuania and her sister states. Although those two notorious dictators are dead, their brutal legacy is very alive in the Baltic region, where the basic liberties of proud people continue to be denied today.

Mr. Speaker, the international concern for human rights which has grown in recent years has produced some positive benefits in some parts of the world, but this grim anniversary of the invasion, persecution, and deportation of thousands upon thousands of Lithuanians testifies what a long way we have to go.

In America, where liberties unknown in many places can be taken for granted, we must not break faith with the Lithuanians and the other captive peoples of the Soviet Union by allowing ourselves to forget what they are undergoing. The anniversary of the Soviet occupation of Lithuania should make us reflect on our own good fortune, even as it reminds us of our bonds with those less fortunate.●

NORTHERN IRELAND AND THE HUNGER STRIKES

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I remain deeply concerned about the ongoing hunger strikes being waged by Irish Republican prisoners in the Long Kesh Prison. These hunger strikes have already claimed the lives of four Irishmen. A fifth, Joe McDonnell is approaching death. His sister Maura has been visiting the United States to drum up American media attention which she hopes will save her brother's life.

I, along with some 53 of my colleagues have introduced House Resolution 158 calling on Great Britain to exercise "greater urgency and flexibility in trying to reach a humanitarian resolution to the hunger strikes." I wish to renew that plea today. The situation is again reaching crisis proportions. I hope the House will see fit to pass my resolution as a demonstration of our concern for the ultimate human right—the right to live.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article from the New York Daily News of June 19 entitled "On Living (Grimly) as Your Brother Starves in an Irish Cell." The author of the article is Beth Fallon.

ON LIVING (GRIMLY) AS YOUR BROTHER STARVES IN AN IRISH CELL

Maura McDonnell had lunch in a real New York restaurant yesterday, and it is possible that today she will actually go shopping—as any woman of 28 would like to do in the world capital of stuff. Maura McDonnell does not have much time to

worry about stuff, or any of the other delights of life. Unless Margaret Thatcher compromises, Maura's brother Joe will be the next to die on hunger strike in Long Kesh Prison. There are others behind him.

Today is his 42d day without food. He succeeded Bobby Sands on hunger strike after Sands died. He was arrested with Sands in 1976 on a weapons violation. "They got 14 years for one unloaded pistol," Maura McDonnell said.

When she leaves for Belfast this weekend, she will have been in America three weeks and seen no monuments. She will have seen only "the likes of yourself and cameras" to talk about her brother. Maura McDonnell is from a Republican family and does not deny that her people fight for an end to British rule in the North. But she denies, dry of throat and calm of manner, her dark head bobbing, that they are criminals for doing it.

"My brother is not a criminal," she said Wednesday night. "No criminal gives up his life this way. My brother is 30 years old and has two small children. He took a visit for the first time in three years and nine months, five days (into) his hunger strike. His two little children hugged and kissed him, but it didn't matter. We felt he was giving up his life so the same thing won't happen to them."

What keeps Maura McDonnell standing by flatbed trucks talking to reporters while demonstrators shriek "murderers" at the admirers of Prince Charles is, she said, only one thing. "Maybe we will be able to save his life. My fiance is also in H-Block. He got no medical treatment for nine months because he would not wear prison clothes. But there was pressure from the United States, and then they gave him medical treatment. We want to show Mrs. Thatcher a sign. It's Mrs. Thatcher who holds the key."

If Maura McDonnell feels the pull for a more ordinary life on the streets of Manhattan, the ordinary joy of a new dress or a trifle for her mother, it is even more schizophrenic at home. "I work with Protestants, and the Protestants don't really talk very much about what is happening. I think they may know that I'm Joe McDonnell's sister, but they don't say. We don't talk very much about the troubles at home," she explained.

To anyone who has not lived in the conspiracy of silence that is an Irish family, this will sound insane. To anyone who has so lived, no explanation is needed. Maura McDonnell works as a secretary with people who know her brother is starving himself to death as a political protest, and nobody talks about it. It is a common defense against the unbearable, and there is, Maura said, very little antagonism in it.

"I don't think anyone thought Margaret Thatcher would let Bobby Sands die. Now there are four dead, and my brother is next. We do not know how many more must die before Mrs. Thatcher gives in. I feel four men have died, and that is enough. The men know that in the end they'll win."

Win or lose, the price will be high.

Another reporter came up to question Maura McDonnell. Was she married? She shot a quick glance at the questioner, and a small smile which was just as quick. But the smile fled somewhere faraway, perhaps to the night when IRA sympathizers say Terry Kirby was caught raiding a Protestant house with weapons and the British charged him with kidnapping the owner.

"My fiance's doin' 26 years," said Maura McDonnell.●

BROOKLYN'S OLDEST RESTAURANT CELEBRATES ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, on July 5, a number of my constituents in Brooklyn will join together in celebration of the 75th anniversary of Brooklyn's oldest restaurant—Monte's Venetian Room. I would like to congratulate the owner of the Venetian Room, Nick Monte, whose family rose from humble origins to a well deserved success that exemplifies the American work ethic.

It was July 2, 1906, that Angelo and Filomena Monte first opened their famous restaurant, where they work and lived in a small apartment upstairs with their seven sons. For 75 years Monte's Venetian Room has been serving some of the best Italian cuisine on this side of the Atlantic and I can personally attest to its excellence.

Mr. Monte has been a longtime champion of the rehabilitation of the Gowanus Canal around the corner from the Venetian Room. It is Mr. Monte's goal to stop the 25-year deterioration of the Gowanus and make it an asset to downtown Brooklyn. As an active member of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, the Brooklyn Tavern Owners Association, and the Build a Better Brooklyn Association, Mr. Monte celebrated the Venetian Room's 74th anniversary last year by leading a neighborhood volunteer work force in a comprehensive cleanup of Carroll Street.

Mr. Speaker, today the Monte success story extends to Montauk, N.Y., where Nick Monte is the owner of the famous Gurney's Inn and Conference Center and the resort's new international health and beauty spa. As a member of the New York State Board of Tourism, I salute Nick Monte's efforts to utilize to the best possible advantage millions of dollars in State funds for advertising and promotion of Long Island's east end. The spa as well as Gurney's itself provide a year round transfusion to that part of Long Island's tourist industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Monte's Venetian Room and Nick Monte, whose dedication, contributions and outstanding record of achievement on behalf of Brooklyn and Long Island's east end are most deserving and worthwhile. We have been extremely fortunate that the Monte family chose to settle in Brooklyn, and I again congratulate Monte's Venetian Room on its 75th anniversary. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CIVIL DEFENSE

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a very timely and provocative letter which appeared in the June 18 edition of the Washington Star by Dr. B. Wayne Blanchard.

Dr. Blanchard's main point is that survivability is a possibility and not a fiction as so many Civil Defense critics have maintained.

I think that during these very crucial times of awakened interest in the Soviet threat, we as legislators, must carefully take Dr. Blanchard's considerations to heart and reexamine the value of preserving the American dream in the wake of a nuclear holocaust, no matter how remote the possibility.

The letter follows:

PREPARING FOR SOME TO SURVIVE.

In his "Casual About the Bomb" column (June 1) Daniel S. Greenberg asserts that survivability in the event of a nuclear attack upon the United States is a "fantasy." Moreover, he implies that this would still be true "even assuming extensive civil defense protection and success in dispersing people to surrounding countryside."

As the basis for his assertion, Mr. Greenberg cites the vulnerability of the Air Force's hardened NORAD headquarters in Cheyenne Mountain, Colo. ("If the Air Force doesn't feel secure in its reinforced mountain den, how can anyone argue that civilization would survive a nuclear war?") as well as the claim that the medical community would not be up to the task of helping the injured and dying (he cites how difficult it is to save just one severe burn case).

Several points need to be made. First, while it is true that any target that sustains a direct hit by a large nuclear weapon can be destroyed, it is also true that the potential risk areas in the United States comprise only about 2 to 3 percent of the nation's land area. Unfortunately, about two-thirds of our population resides in this 2 to 3 percent area.

It is self-evident that if most people stay in our larger cities and seek best-available protection in existing buildings there, survival will be low—in fact, about 40 percent. If, however, most people are moved to surrounding "host areas" by crisis relocation (evacuation) over a period of several days during an acute crisis, survival will be substantially higher—about 80 percent.

Mr. Greenberg states that if, for example, Detroit were hit by a million-ton blast, some 250,000 people would be killed and another 500,000 injured. Most probably this would be true if all that these people did was just stand around and do nothing—no doubt believing that survival was a "fantasy."

If, however, these people were to leave Detroit during an intense international crisis—say after the Soviets are observed evacuating their cities—and then followed instructions to protect themselves against the possibility of radioactive fallout, then most would survive. In addition, the percentage of injured survivors (including physicians) would be decreased significantly and thus the demand upon medical resources. The

June 23, 1981

prospects for eventual national recovery would be substantially improved.

In fact, it is entirely conceivable that civil defense measures could spell the difference between destruction of the nation on the one hand and survival and eventual recovery on the other. Make no mistake that civil defense programs are needed. While nuclear warfare is still improbable, no amount of good intentions, diplomacy or arms control can make nuclear war impossible.

History teaches two very important lessons: (1) there have always been wars, and (2) preparedness has always been safer and cheaper than unpreparedness. As President Kennedy said in May 1961:

"... the history of this planet, and particularly the history of the 20th century, is sufficient to remind us of the possibilities of an irrational attack, a miscalculation, an accidental war or a war of escalation in which the stakes by each side gradually increase to the point of maximum danger which cannot be either foreseen or deterred. It is on this basis that civil defense can be readily justifiable—as insurance for the civilian population in case of an enemy miscalculation. It is insurance we trust will never be needed—but insurance which we could never forgive ourselves for foregoing in the event of catastrophe." ●

RECOGNITION OF MR. ALBERT KOHN

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and express appreciation for the good work of Mr. Albert Kohn, director of clinical laboratories at Haverford Community Hospital.

Words do not adequately express the admiration, esteem, and respect held for Mr. Kohn by the employees of Haverford Community Hospital. He has been at Haverford for 23 years. It is said that he "came with the building" since he was recruited before the hospital was built. Through his efforts the hospital lab and the institution itself has grown. Mr. Kohn's advice has often been sought by the hospital administration, and he has acted as administrator on numerous occasions.

Al Kohn's contributions go beyond just Haverford Community Hospital. He has helped more than one Delaware County physician in his or her education and treatment of patients. It has been known throughout our community that if you need help for anything from headaches to poisoning, "Dr. Kohn" is the person to call.

For his 23 years of dedicated service to his institution and the community at large I recently presented Mr. Kohn with a certificate of appreciation. I am grateful for this chance to call Mr. Kohn's service and achievements to

the attention of the House of Representatives.●

ALABAMA'S GIPPER

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, one thought occurs to me after reading a Time magazine article about Senator JEREMIAH DENTON * * * sometimes the people in a State do win. And what a boon for the Nation. For 6 long years. Praise the Lord.

The article follows:

[From Time, June 8, 1981]

AN ADMIRAL FROM ALABAMA—OLD-FASHION CONVICTIONS DRIVE THE P.O.W. SENATOR

[By William A. Henry III]

Most men come to the Senate to build a career. In the manner of his biblical namesake, Jeremiah Denton came to sound an alarm. A retired admiral who spent more than seven years as a prisoner of war in North Viet Nam, Denton believes that America is being destroyed by sexual immorality and Soviet-sponsored political "disinformation"—and that both are being promoted by dupes, or worse, in the media. By the mid-1980s, he warns, "we will have less national security than we had proportionately when George Washington's troops were walking around barefoot at Valley Forge."

Such apocalyptic talk sometimes puzzles when it does not alarm his colleagues on the Hill. But it goes down just fine with the people of Alabama, who last fall chose Denton, 56, as the first Republican to represent them in the Senate since Reconstruction days. "He's the most popular man in the state right now," says Bobby Davis, a top aid to Democratic Governor Fob James Jr.

Denton has an ideal plinth from which to proclaim his strident anti-Soviet views. He is chairman of a new Judiciary Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism. At recent hearings, Denton depicted a pervasive, secret Soviet influence within the U.S. and suggested that Moscow had stopped short of using terrorism in this country only to leave America "a sleeping giant" until too late. Liberals and civil libertarians are worried about groups that Denton may try to investigate as part of the "disinformation" conspiracy, such as antinuclear organizations and a Washington-based liberal think tank, the Institute for Policy Studies. Some critics have begun to compare Denton to that ultimate American witchhunter, the late Joe McCarthy.

That is unfair. Denton does not use McCarthy's ambush tactics, and unlike McCarthy, he is plainly sincere. He spent more than four of his years as a Vietnamese prisoner in solitary, his feet manacled to the floor for months at a time. Nonetheless, he maintained a chain of command in the P.O.W. camps and endured savage beatings for it. When forced to video-tape a confession, he blinked his eyes in Morse code to send the world a message, "Torture."

In some ways Denton represents the highest ideals of the New Righteousness. After leaving the Navy in 1977, he helped found the Coalition for Decency, which tried to

clean up television by urging boycotts of sponsors. When elected to the Senate last fall, he was relatively unschooled in politics. Denton ran in order to speak his deepest beliefs as a patriot, a Roman Catholic and a father of seven, and he refuses to compromise them now.

He insists, for example, that "sexual jealousy" causes most teen-age suicides and much violent crime, including "90%" of murders and attempted killings. He has deviated from a Reaganesque budget-cutting fervor on just one social issue: a proposed \$30 million program for the Government to advocate teen-age chastity. Like Ronald Reagan, Denton strongly defends the validity of the U.S. effort in Viet Nam. He contends that the war could have been won but the U.S. failed to see and press its advantage. He adds that America must recognize the Viet Nam fighting as "morally just" if it is to regain national spirit. Denton also admires Richard Nixon for understanding "the use of force" and the depth of Communist hostility. Nixon reciprocated with a \$1,000 contribution to Denton's campaign.

Yet Denton is not a predictable, doctrinaire conservative or a prude. He gambles, takes a social drink now and then, and can swear like the sailor he was. He is an intimate of Baptist Preacher Jerry Falwell, and his campaign was backed by Falwell's Moral Majority. A month after the election he complained to Falwell that the group had no blacks or Jews on its board. Said Denton: "I don't see the Moral Majority supporting the commandment 'Love thy neighbor.'" He challenges fellow Southerners who support a vast network of all-white "Christian academies" that rival public school systems to "prove these schools aren't shelters for segregation. Prove it!"

Denton sometimes seems like a man from an earlier era, when people commonly lived by principles. One of his own, since youth: "To believe in the heroic makes heroes." He thought of becoming a journalist, he once said, because they seemed to be "messianic people." Then he was moved to join the Navy—he entered in Jimmy Carter's class at Annapolis, graduating in 1946—by seeing a Lionel Barrymore movie, Navy Blue and Gold.

Denton's youth was rootless. He attended at least 13 grammar schools and lived in hotels where his father was a desk clerk. He came to know a settled family life only when his parents separated. His mother, a devout Roman Catholic, kept the children with her. Denton's father was a womanizer, a real estate speculator, a onetime bookie. Four decades later, Denton acknowledges that he is still preoccupied enough by his father to campaign for family life.

Before he went to war in 1965, he is fond of telling visitors, the raciest thing in the media was Clark Gable telling Vivien Leigh; "Frankly, my dear, I don't give a damn." Returning to America from the P.O.W. camps, he had to ask his wife what a massage parlor was. He still sees explicit sex as an "alien element" in our heritage. He passionately wants "to restore patriotism, especially among opinion formers, the people in the media and education." And he is unfazed by opposition, even mockery of his convictions for being naively overwrought. "I'm going to stand up and take it," he says. "By the time I'm finished, the press will take the lead rather than question my McCarthyite characteristics."●

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF MILFORD, MICH.

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, next week on June 29, the Township of Milford, Mich., which I am honored to represent, will begin a year-long observance of its sesquicentennial. I wish to congratulate the people of Milford on this joyous occasion.

Milford was first settled in 1832 by Elizur and Stanley Ruggles who built their homes and set up a sawmill on the banks of the Huron River. Within 8 years all the surrounding lands had been taken by settlers, and by 1872, Milford could say that it was a permanent, established community with an end to its pioneer period.

Since then, the township and the village of Milford have continued to grow to its present size of about 11,000 people.

But while Milford is celebrating its 150-year history, I believe it could also celebrate the traditions and lifestyle that the area has offered its people over those years.

Milford has superb summer and winter recreational facilities with 25 percent of its area designated for public recreation. It has struck a fine balance in its residential and commercial areas, and it provides its people with a fine school system, library, and many other public facilities.

The village's own description of itself as a "quaint, little, tree-lined village" conjurs up the images that could describe the whole township. It is a place of history and tradition, a solid, friendly community that is a great place to raise a family.

While Milford is only 30 miles from Detroit, its population is stable with its young people moving back into the area because of the lifestyle the area offers.

To kick off its sesquicentennial celebration, arrangements have been made to have the Milford Post Office be the only outlet in the country offering the "First Day Issue" of the commemorative "International Year of the Disabled Person" stamp.

Receiving a special honor for the day will be Mr. David Augustine. Mr. Augustine is a Milford police dispatcher who has been confined to a wheelchair for the past 25 years. He is a lifetime resident of the community, and so it is particularly fitting for him to be honored that day.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to again congratulate Milford and her people. They have helped to provide our area of Michigan with a history and a lifestyle that takes a backseat to no other area.●

PROTECTION OF THE UNBORN

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on the beginning of human life continue unabated, I would like to submit for the record a recent article by the renowned columnist, George Will. Mr. Will presents some very poignant criticisms of the continued denial of rights to the unborn child. The Supreme Court in the Roe against Wade decision of 1973 deemed abortion to be legal under any virtual circumstance. This decision was made with the deliberate disregard of recent medical breakthroughs confirming the existence of life at conception. Further, not only did the Supreme Court strike down the rights of the unborn but did so on a note of feigned humility. By reverting back to a state of ignorance, the Court claimed the question of when life begins too complex for man to comprehend. Hence the Court threw up its hands in ignorant despair, and in so doing condemned the unborn to a premature death.

Mr. Speaker, I venture to say we are not as ignorant as the Supreme Court would have us. Many of us have heeded the reconfirmation of modern medicine that life begins at conception and continue to advocate the protection of the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, it is unconscionable to disregard the existence of life. Rather we must take steps to insure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to the unborn.

I commend Mr. Will for his articulation and submit the following for the RECORD:

[From Newsweek, June 22, 1981]

THE CASE OF THE UNBORN PATIENT

(By George F. Will)

A character in a John Updike novel says, "Life, that's what we seek in one another, even with the DNA molecule cracked and our vitality arrayed before us as a tiny Tinkertoy." But as science explicates the chemistry of life, many people flinch from some facts. They seek not life but reasons to deny that some life exists. They sense, I think, the moral incompatibility between some facts of modern science and some practices of modern society.

Recently a boy underwent brain surgery six times in the nine weeks before he was born. An ultrasound scan in the 24th week of gestation revealed hydrocephalus, a damaging concentration of fluid in the brain. A hollow needle was inserted through the womb, into the fetal skull to the fluid. Nearly a quart of fluid was drained in six operations.

Prenatal medicine can detect and treat various forms of fetal distress and genetic problems, with the help of ultrasound pictures that can show all fingers and heart chambers at eighteen weeks. A fetus's inability to assimilate an essential vitamin has been detected and treated by giving large vi-

tamin doses to the mother. Babies likely to be born prematurely can receive drugs that hasten maturation of the lungs, thereby combating hyaline membrane disease, a killer of premature babies. Drugs such as digitals can be delivered to a fetus through the mother's bloodstream to correct irregular heart rhythms. Excess fluids have been drained from the chests and abdomens of fetuses, and blood transfusions have been given to fetuses.

Rights: Prenatal medicine should raise troubling thoughts in a nation in which abortion is the most frequently performed operation, a nation in which last year 1.5 million abortions ended about one-third of all pregnancies. Science and society are out of sync. The most humane of sciences, medicine, can now treat as patients those who the law says lack an essential human attribute: rights. Mothers can kill any fetus that medicine can treat.

This is not widely understood. Some defenders of the Supreme Court's 1973 abortion decision may have been so busy applauding it that they have not read it. The New Republic recently praised the decision as "fair," explaining it this way: "Abortions are freely available in the first trimester, subject to medical determination in the second trimester, and banned in the third, when the fetus is viable." But the Court actually decreed that there can be no serious impediment to even third-trimester abortions. It said that even in the third trimester states cannot prevent any abortion deemed necessary to protect a mother's health from harm, and that harm can include "distress."

There is, effectively, abortion on demand at every point. So just as prenatal medicine was beginning to produce marvelous life-saving and life enhancing achievements, Supreme Court Justices made it the law of the land that patients for such medicine have no right to life.

Not surprisingly, some pro-abortion forces are increasingly anti-scientific, in the name of "humility." They say: let's all be properly humble and admit that the matter of when human life begins is a mystery beyond our poor power of understanding, so the answer "birth" is no more arbitrary than any other. This argument is too anti-scientific, and too convenient to the pro-abortion position, even to seem ingenious. It has aroused Walker Percy, an M.D. and a novelist of distinction. He notes that it is a commonplace of modern biology that the life of an organism begins "when the chromosomes of the sperm fuse with the chromosomes of the ovum to form a new DNA complex that thenceforth directs the ontogenesis of the organism," producing the undeniable "continuum that exists in the life of every individual from the moment of fertilization of a single cell." Percy adds:

"The onset of individual life is not a dogma of the church but a fact of science. How much more convenient if we lived in the thirteenth century, when no one knew anything about microbiology and arguments about the onset of life were legitimate. . . . Nowadays it is not some misguided ecclesiastics who are trying to suppress an embarrassing scientific fact. It is the secular juridical-journalistic establishment."

Stephen and Amanda, Australian twins, were conceived in vitro. Two eggs were fertilized in a laboratory and implanted in the mother, who wanted twins. Perhaps the status of life begun in vitro is unclear prior to the implantation that is necessary for the continuum. (Necessary today but perhaps

not tomorrow, when there may be artificial wombs.) But little Louise Brown in England is famous because she is the first child whose life began in vitro.

Agenda: In 1947, before Planned Parenthood became a pro-abortion lobby, an officer referred to the being produced by fertilization of an ovum as "the new baby which is created at this exact moment." In 1964 a Planned Parenthood pamphlet said, "Abortion kills the life of a baby, once it has begun." What has changed is not biology but Planned Parenthood's agenda.

In 1973 the Supreme Court, feigning humility as it arrogantly legislated, said it could not "resolve the difficult question of when life begins." Actually, the Court knew what every high-school biology student knows. So it quickly inserted the telltale adjective "meaningful." It defined viability as the point at which the baby can have "meaningful" life outside the womb. Speaking of such life recently at a Phoenix abortion center, a woman in her second trimester was injected with a saline solution and sent home. Three nights later she went into labor and was told to go to the hospital to "deliver the fetus"—dead, of course. Instead, she delivered a live girl.

The argument about abortion cannot be about when human life begins. It must be about the status of life at various early stages—a matter about which decent people can disagree. But denial of elementary biology is the way some pro-abortionists duck the difficult issue of gradation. However, whatever one thinks should be the status of the life that exists at conception, surely any civilized sensibility should be troubled by the status of life later in pregnancy. Then a mother need not treat as human a being that prenatal medicine can treat as a patient, a being that can become, if the attempt to kill it fails, a pediatrician's patient. ●

SAME OLD SCENARIO

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in the last 5 months the dairy price support program has undergone significant criticism from a number of different sources. They have proposed reducing the level of support for this perishable commodity despite the fact that the dairy farmer is facing ever-increasing costs of production.

These critics have universally overlooked the fact that dairy price supports benefit the producer and the consumer alike. If anyone doubts that simple fact, they need only look back to what happened to the supply and price of milk products the last time the dairy price support program was severely curtailed in 1973-74.

Such tampering with the program unleashes a vicious circle that injures both the consumer and the producer. The most succinct and straightforward description of this vicious circle I have ever seen was done by Ira Rutherford in this month's Dairyman's Digest. I

certainly commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SAME OLD SCENARIO
(By Ira Rutherford)

If milk prices lag behind costs, dairymen will be forced to milk more cows in order to meet cash flow requirements, which then . . .

. . . adds to our surplus, making the supply/demand imbalance even worse, and then . . .

. . . as the on-farm financial squeeze continues, voluntary and even involuntary sell-outs and auctions begin, which brings . . .

. . . precipitous drops in U.S. milk production, which causes . . .

. . . government stocks to be sold back to the trade in an effort to keep the lid on prices, but . . .

. . . even the currently "high" level of stocks will be depleted in a relatively short time, and so . . .

. . . prices will "boom" dramatically—well over 100% of parity, which causes . . .

. . . consumers to shy away from dairy products because of the alarming price increases, and . . .

. . . emergency imports to be authorized to try to moderate the prices, which then causes . . .

. . . farm prices to "bust" back to the inadequate support level, which . . .

. . . drives more farmers out of business, and . . .

. . . causes the cycle to start over again, until . . .

. . . reasonable support levels are again established in order to stabilize the entire system. ●

McNAMARA CALLS FOR FULL FUNDING OF FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, Robert S. McNamara will retire after 13 years as President of the World Bank. I would like to take this opportunity to applaud Mr. McNamara's distinguished service to the cause of alleviating world poverty, and to call to the attention of my colleagues his warning about the dangers of reneging on our commitments to the world's poor.

As the Congress considers legislation regarding the U.S. contribution to the World Bank, I hope that the ideas espoused by Mr. McNamara during his tenure at the Bank will not be forgotten. The following article describes Mr. McNamara's contentions that foreign aid promotes our own security objectives, as well as economic growth and development abroad. I hope that Mr. McNamara's articulate defense of U.S. assistance to those peoples less fortunate than ourselves will not fall upon deaf ears.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1981]
McNAMARA WARNS UNITED STATES OF PERILS IN REDUCING AID TO WORLD'S POOR

(By Leonard Silk)

Robert S. McNamara, who will retire this month after 13 years as president of the World Bank, believes the economic and political interests of the United States will be seriously injured if it retreats further from commitments to aid the poor people of the third world.

In an interview in his office in Washington, Mr. McNamara said Congress was "on the verge of repudiating" agreements made by the Carter Administration, and endorsed by the Reagan Administration, to contribute \$658.3 million toward a general increase for the World Bank and \$3.2 billion over three years to the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association, the bank's affiliate, which lends to the poorest countries.

WE ARE BANKRUPT TODAY

"With respect to I.D.A.," he said, "essentially we are bankrupt today. At the end of next week, the end of our fiscal year, we will have about \$1 billion of I.D.A. credits approved by our board, but for which we have no commitment authority, and hence no authority to sign."

And, he added, "those are for projects that are to deal with these very basic problems," of poverty and financial crisis, "the solution to which will benefit not only the developing countries but the United States."

If the United States fails to support the development affiliate, Mr. McNamara said in the interview last week, other countries, acting under a trigger clause tied to the United States contribution will withhold their support, and the affiliate will collapse.

While the Republican-dominated Senate, following the White House endorsement, has voted the full authorization of \$3.2 billion for the development affiliate, the Democratic-led House Banking and Currency Committee has cut the authorization to \$1.9 billion.

But since there is actually little support for even the truncated bill among Republicans or Democrats in either the House of Representatives or the Senate, it may be excluded from the huge reconciliation bill that ultimately emerges from Congress.

Thus, with just over a week to go in his present job, Mr. McNamara is worrying and working down to the wire. At 65, he looks thin and fit; his eyes are bright and restless behind silver-rimmed spectacles. He is deeply tanned, both from his wanderings in the hot countries of the third world and from the tennis courts of Washington; last week, however, he was wearing a surgical harness on his right arm, having just broken his wrist playing tennis.

He still works in shirt-sleeves, donning a jacket only for picture-taking. He seems as passionately involved in his job as he did when President Lyndon B. Johnson accepted his resignation as Secretary of Defense in 1968 during the Vietnam War and backed him for the presidency of the World Bank. This post has always been held by an American, and Mr. McNamara's successor will be A. W. Clausen, former chairman of the Bank of America, with headquarters in San Francisco, which was also Mr. McNamara's hometown.

It was President Carter who named Mr. Clausen to the post, with Mr. Reagan's concurrence, although the extent of the Reagan Administration's commitment to the World Bank's aid program remains in doubt.

ROLLCALL VOTE SHUNNED

So unpopular is foreign aid with voters, at a time when even domestic food stamp and welfare programs are being slashed, that the Democrats in Congress are loath to support foreign aid on a roll-call vote, lest they be attacked by their Republican rivals as "big foreign aid spenders."

The crucial factor that will determine whether the authorization of aid for the World Bank Group dies in Congress or passes is likely to be the pressure exerted by President Reagan and his lobbyists on Capitol Hill on behalf of the bill.

But the White House appears reluctant to fight hard for foreign aid, hoarding its capital for what it regards as more urgent causes. Some high Administration officials, such as David A. Stockman, the director of the Office of Management and Budget, are on record as favoring deep cuts in foreign aid, including funds for the World Bank.

WIDE-RANGING TALK

In last week's interview, Mr. McNamara talked extensively on a wide range of economic, political and technical subjects, rarely consulting notes for data. But the McNamara personality is not computerlike but a blend of precision and emotion. He himself speaks of the need to combine "a soft heart and a hard head."

His uppermost immediate concern is to rescue and strengthen United States support for the World Bank. He said he believed American economic and political interests would be seriously injured if this country retreated further from its earlier commitments to aid the poor people of the third world, which appears likely as Congress wrangles over economic legislation.

"The United States contribution to development assistance," he said, "is disgracefully low; it has declined in relation to national income 90 percent since the Eisenhower Administration at a time when national income in real terms per capita has more than doubled. It is today the 15th lowest among the major industrial nations. There is no other large industrial nation providing as low a proportion of its national income to development assistance; it is disgraceful."

A HARD-HEADED LOOK

Mr. McNamara declined to criticize the Reagan Administration for not lending the bank stronger support. "The Administration," he said, "is a reflection of the views of the American people." But he said: "I think our people have failed to recognize in the last 10 or 20 years what has happened to the world they live in. They do not understand how our nation should respond to these changes in ways that address its national interest. I am not talking about 'dogoodism' now. I am talking about taking a hard-headed look at where the nation's interest lie."

Mr. McNamara said that if the United States slashed its support for poor countries, the country would be penalized in the following areas:

Inflation, because the World Bank finances production of essential commodities, the scarcity of which could raise world prices—foodstuffs and energy, for example.

Economic growth, because third world countries absorb roughly a third of United States exports. If lack of financial support erodes this market, domestic production and employment could be badly hurt.

Strategic interest, because lower rates of economic and social advance in the developing countries are almost certain to bring po-

litical instability damaging to the United States, adding to its military costs and adversely affecting its national security.

Mr. McNamara, who will leave the World Bank on July 1, is in a sense the last of the generation of post-World War II crusaders for a better world order to hold high public office. It was this group who combined a militant anti-Communism with a concern for world economic development.

COMMISSIONED PENTAGON PAPERS

Although Vietnam was for a time called "McNamara's War"—it was he who commissioned the Pentagon Papers, which explored the origins of the war—he declined in the interview to give his present views on the American involvement in Vietnam, saying: "I have not talked about my period in Vietnam, and I am not going to start today. I may some time, but not while I am in this institution. It is inappropriate for an international civil servant to do that."

With both the cold war and the drive for social and economic reform at home and abroad in their background, Mr. McNamara and others like him have been attacked from the left as self-interested capitalists pretending to be socially responsible and from the right as socialists undermining the free-enterprise system.

Mr. McNamara considers such charges to be baseless and ignorant as applied to himself and the institution he has headed. When asked about the assertion made by some on both the right and the left that the World Bank is supported by American commercial bankers as a kind of bailout operation for banks that lent too heavily to the developing countries, Mr. McNamara responded:

"On the contrary, it's supported by individuals in this country who understand that our own economy will suffer, not the banks. The banks are intelligently managed; their loans to developing countries are a relatively small percentage of their total loans outstanding; they have appropriate reserves in relation to them; they are concentrated in some of the stronger developing countries. Brazil, for example, is a very rich country, even if it does at times have liquidity problems. Over the long run the banks aren't going to lose a lot of money on Brazil.

"So the charge that this bank is moving in ways that are designed to bail out U.S. commercial banks is absurd. This bank is, however, moving in ways that are consistent with the broad economic interests of the U.S. And if this bank is prevented from continuing to move in those ways, not only will the developing countries be hurt, and particularly the poorest people in those countries, but the U.S. economy will be hurt, and the American people will be hurt."

CRITICISM REJECTED HARSHLY

Mr. McNamara rejects harshly the criticism, offered by a host of conservatives, including some within the Administration, that the World Bank is undermining private enterprise and promoting socialism. He called the accusation an extreme hindrance to the bank's operation, especially in the United States.

"They are ignorant," Mr. McNamara said of the conservative critics. "They are ignorant of what the bank is doing. The bank in a very real sense is the largest single source of financing of private enterprise in the developing world, without qualification."

Mr. McNamara noted, for instance, that more than 30 percent of the bank's financing went to agriculture, almost all of it for financing individual, private farmers. He

said the bank urges developing countries to increase their efficiency by relying on the price system to direct resources and to stop subsidizing the urban centers at the expenses of the poor rural people. "We consistently urge real interest rates," he added, "that is, avoidance of interest subsidies, in order to stimulate savings and assure a directing of capital investment to situations where there will be a real rate of return. We consistently advise against, and as a matter of fact we'll refuse to loan for investment in utilities, public utilities, electric companies, water companies, railroads where the tariffs, the prices, are not set to yield profits, real rates of return so that they are self-sustaining investments."

He feels that the bank has made great strides in its attack on absolute poverty. The most obvious accomplishment of the bank under his administration, he said, had been to increase its annual commitments of loans from \$1 billion in 1968 to \$13 billion in the fiscal year ending June 30, which has meant, after allowing for inflation, quadrupling or quintupling its real lending. But the most important accomplishment, he feels, was learning to focus resources and technical assistance on the poor, raising their productivity and hence their output and real income.

With the statistical exactness for which he has long been noted, first as a Harvard Business School professor, then as a statistical controller in the United States Air Force during World War II and as president of the Ford Motor Company, Mr. McNamara reeled off the rates of return from investments in antipoverty programs in Bangladesh, Pakistan, Burundi and other poor countries. These rates of return ranged as high as 50 percent and averaged 19 to 20 percent on invested capital.

GREATEST ACCOMPLISHMENT

This, he feels, was his greatest accomplishment: the discovery that the bank could help the poor and society simultaneously.

It is with some regret that Mr. McNamara will leave his post at the World Bank. "I don't want to quit yet, either," Mr. McNamara said. To that end he has already accepted a number of appointments to the boards of nonprofit institutions, including the Brookings Institution, the Ford Foundation, the Urban Institute and the California Institute of Technology, as well as to the boards of such corporations as Royal Dutch/Shell, Corning Glass and The Washington Post.

"I am going to divide my time roughly 50-50 between the public and the private sectors," he added. "I hope to be active in continuing to advise both our own Government and other governments in fields that I may have some competence in. I am not wealthy, but I don't have to choose my activities on the basis of compensation, and I don't care about status or prestige. I am willing to do anything that will be of assistance to either our Government or other governments. I do believe in public service, I am interested in it, excited about it. Foreign governments have asked me to provide advice and I will be doing so. And I am not going to accept compensation. I'm just going to do it when I feel like it, and when it will be helpful."

Has he any disappointments as he looks back over his performance as president of the World Bank?

He said he had, among them "the deferral of certain actions that I had hoped to initiate." One of them would have been a ratio change—a higher proportion of lending rel-

ative to the bank's capital. An other, he added, "would have been an expansion of our research program, a very substantial expansion, because I think that through that we would increase the world's understanding of the development program and how to accelerate it, with advantage to all parties."

He said his greatest disappointment was that "we and others have failed to inform the people of the industrial countries of the nature and magnitude of the changes in the relationships among nations, economically and politically, over the last decade"—especially their greater interdependence.

"For that reason," he said, "we have failed to show them where their own narrow interests lie. We have failed to convince them that there is a plus-sum game as part of which they can move to assist the developing countries to achieve economic and social advance with benefits to both the developing and industrialized countries."

"Now that is my strong belief," he added "It is a belief I think is shared by most of my associates, and by many others outside the institution, and it is that failure which I think is leading to less than rational action by many of the nations, particularly the United States." ●

"OHIO," NATION'S FIRST TRIDENT SUBMARINE COMPLETES SUCCESSFUL SEA TRIAL

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics has received a great deal of attention. It is time that they be recognized once again—this time for a major accomplishment.

The *Ohio*, the Nation's first Trident submarine, successfully completed its first round of sea trials on Saturday, June 20.

With Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the father of the nuclear Navy coordinating the trials, the *Ohio* went through its paces in the North Atlantic, successfully completing test dives and extensive testing of its propulsion system.

The submarine, longer than the Washington Monument, is the largest submarine ever built in this country. Its construction is a major technological achievement, a testimony to the talents and skills of the men and women of Electric Boat and the U.S. Navy.

With its 90,000 horsepower engine, the Trident is the quietest and among the fastest submarines in the world today. As the most modern leg of our strategic triad, it will be an important addition to our nuclear deterrent forces.

I would like at this time to submit for the RECORD a letter I received on the sea trials from Admiral Hayward, Chief of Naval Operations:

DEAR MR. GEJDESON. I want to personally report to you that our first Trident submarine, the OHIO (SSBN 726) has successfully completed her maiden sea trials on 20 June.

We in the Navy are proud of this highly successful milestone which is a major step in upgrading this important and most survivable leg of our nation's strategic TRIAD.

It is fitting that as OHIO went to sea, one of our original 41 ballistic missile submarines, USS *James K. Polk* (SSBN 645), was completing the 2,000th Strategic Deterrent Patrol with over 100,000 submerged days of patrol logged since 1960.

The Secretary of the Navy and I appreciate your continued support for the Navy's Strategic Program and are most pleased to be able to report *Ohio* is on her way to joining the fleet.

Sincerely,

T. B. HAYWARD,
Admiral, U.S. Navy. ●

FREEDOM IS WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Illinois State Representative Diana Nelson has been an active civic leader as well as an outstanding member of the Illinois General Assembly. I am especially proud that Diana Nelson is a constituent of mine and a fellow public official.

I wish to insert the following address, which Representative Nelson delivered at a Memorial Day ceremony in Western Springs, Ill. It was carried by the Suburban Life Citizen of May 30, which serves the west suburban communities of Chicago.

[From Suburban Life Citizen, May 30, 1980]

FREEDOM IS WHAT IT'S ALL ABOUT

(By Diana Nelson)

Memorial Day means memories, means "to remember."

On a spring day like this one, would you want to die? I don't want to, and you don't want to, but some of your aunts and uncles did.

I have seen a military cemetery on the island of Oahu in Hawaii called the Punch-bowl which is the inside of an extinct volcano. It is as large as Western Springs' Spring Rock Park from the water tower to the corner of 47th and Central, and as you look across the crater, for as far as you can see, every ten feet is a white cross or Star of David marking a grave.

A famous war correspondent, Ernie Pyle, is buried there. Everybody knew who he was. But for each cross and each star, a family had a funeral and grieved.

That is why we have Memorial Day, to keep the memory of those who died safe in our minds and in our hearts. Why? Why did they die if they did not want to die?

Today is a beautiful sunny spring day. We appreciate spring days like this because we can remember and contrast a day like today with one in January when the wind howled in the dark at five o'clock and snow drifted onto the front stoop.

Compare America to other countries on our earth like Russia or Cuba or Poland,

and you will appreciate the freedom we enjoy. Freedom is being able to choose. Freedom is indivisible.

If I deny you the right to speak or read because your ideas are different from mine, freedom would no longer exist in America.

Mikhail Baryshnikov, the ballet star who defected from Russia, reports in an interview with a journalist that the hardest thing for him was learning not to lie.

If one is denied the most basic freedoms, to say what you think about legislators who cannot agree on a transportation solution, or if you cannot worship in your church or synagogue, or if you cannot travel from a job to a better job, or if you live in a two-room apartment with another family and the TV set only carries one doctrinaire station of propaganda, then that is the dead of winter that Solzhenitsyn writes about, and that is what the spring and sunshine of freedom in America is in contrast to.

None of the young people who died wanted to die. They died because we as a nation said this idea, this notion of being able to choose our leaders, to choose our place of worship, and to choose our news sources, is more important than living in a dark winter of "know-nothingness."

Right now, you have choices to make. My children have some difficult choices about whether to join the swim team, or play softball or go to basketball camp. Be glad for those choices. When you become an adult, the choices will be much more difficult.

Sometimes I have to vote in Springfield, and I have a hard time choosing. Should I vote my conscience, should I vote my party, or should I vote my constituency? I would not have that choice if a million fellow Americans had not died so that we enjoy the rights of a free people.

Very briefly, to those of us of voting age, don't let your children forget.

Memorial Day is a sad American holiday. It is a day when we slow the normal pace of American life to pay tribute to the men and women who gave their lives that we might live free.

We need to be reminded for it is only human to forget as quickly as possible those things which are unpleasant—and war is not a pleasant experience. The photos from Vietnam are gone from the nightly newscasts.

Remember Gen. John Logan's order issued as commander-in-chief of the Grand Army of the Republic in 1868: "Let no ravages of time testify to coming generations that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and undivided republic."

Let us with pride in our heritage resolve, to keep faith with the spirit of Gen. Logan's order.

Tell your children about a family member who served our country. In our family it's Uncle Melvin Walker, shot down over New Guinea in World War II, whose body was never recovered. Or tell your children about a neighbor who served in Vietnam.

Talk to each other. Talk about choices. Talk about freedom.

Please don't forget. ●

IMPACT AID

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 16, I joined 34 Members of

Congress in testifying before Chairman Natcher's subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare in response to the recent proposals regarding impact aid.

Under the administration's proposal which would eliminate all funds for category B students and restructure the funding formula for category A, the State of Maryland would stand to lose all of the \$20.6 million it received in fiscal year 1981. The elimination of this money would impose a severe hardship on many school districts throughout the country.

As the Representative from Maryland's First District, which would lose more than \$3.8 million in impact aid in fiscal year 1982 under the administration's proposal, I am naturally concerned about the adverse effect that such drastic reductions would have on the local school boards within my district—especially in the heavily impacted areas where military installations are located. One of the most severely impacted school districts is in Harford County, where the Aberdeen Proving Ground is located. This county would lose more than \$1.8 million in impact aid payments in 1982.

To this end, it was encouraging that the House Education and Labor Committee, on June 17, reconsidered its initial proposal to completely eliminate the impact aid program and restored \$414 million of those funds. They have proposed to fund category A students at 65 percent of their 1981 entitlement and category B students at 55 percent of theirs. While this still means a reduction in impact aid payments, more than \$2.5 million would be restored to this program in Maryland's First District. In Harford County, where impact aid payments totaled more than \$1.8 million in fiscal year 1981, funds would be restored at approximately \$1.2 million.

I would hope that my colleagues in the House will act favorably upon this recommendation and that when this measure is considered in the House-Senate conference in July, it will also pass in order to allow local governments to get on with the urgent work of planning their fiscal priorities.

In this manner, I would like to share with my colleagues a very timely article which appeared in the June 18 edition of the *Aegis* in Harford County:

TUITION PLAN EYED FOR APG DEPENDENTS

The county government is considering a tuition charge for military dependents who wish to attend public schools here.

Facing the probable elimination of all Federal Impact Aid, funds which have helped pay for the education of military dependents, the County law department, at the request of the County Executive, has begun research into a tuition system.

Assistant County Attorney Richard Herbig last week began "exploratory" research into the possibility of local enabling legislation which would allow the County to

assess a tuition on the 1213 "A" students currently attending Hartford public schools.

"A" students are defined as children whose parents both live and work on a military installation.

Executive Staff Director Rosemary Logan is apparently responsible for initiating the research into the tuition possibility.

"Other areas have moved in that direction," Mrs. Logan told The Aegis Tuesday. "Fairfax County, Va. has talked about \$3,000 per student. We don't know where we stand on it (tuition). That's why we've asked our law department to look into it.

"I can tell you this, the County Executive would look favorably on such a system if Impact Aid is cut," Mrs. Logan added.

A bill introduced by Anne Arundel Delegate Elizabeth S. Smith (wife of that County's school superintendent), which would have had the State going to a tuition system for military dependents, died in the House Ways and Means Committee of the State Legislature during the recently completed session.

Anne Arundel has also explored the possibility of going it alone on a tuition plan, but has reportedly put those moves on a back burner pending State action.

"What we want to determine is does a Charter County, such as Harford, have the authority to initiate such a (tuition) system," Mr. Herbig told The Aegis Tuesday. "These are basic, preliminary investigations, and, of course, the whole thing would become moot if Impact Aid comes through."

Mr. Herbig said he could not predict a time frame for either his opinion or County action on the tuition plan.

Meanwhile, Harford School Superintendent A. A. Roberty said he knew nothing of the possible tuition system and would be opposed to it "philosophically."

"They (County) haven't told us anything about it," Dr. Roberty told The Aegis Tuesday. "Of course that's nothing new.

"I'd have serious misgivings about it," continued the Superintendent. "I'll take money from anybody if it will help the school system, but I'm not sure that such a system would be fair to the military and especially to the individual parents. APG adds a great deal to this area economically. You might get into a situation where you collect a million or two but chase away 40 (million)."

Dr. Roberty said that putting the County in a collection situation with the individual military families might also create problems.

But, Mrs. Logan asserted that, since the Federal reservations were not technically within the County jurisdiction, and since those families who reside on the military installations pay no local property tax, it would be well within the County's rights to expect some payment for school services rendered, if Impact Aid is eliminated.

Reportedly, a Maryland Attorney General's opinion has said that such a tuition system "may be constitutional," but that it probably could not be implemented without a State Constitutional amendment due to the provision in that document calling for a "free public education" for all Maryland children.●

DEDICATION OF SAVACAN OF MIAMI, INC.

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, when a new business that has environmental and energy saving benefits, and also provides jobs and money for a community, is officially dedicated, that is an event worth noting. Such an event took place in Miami's Liberty City area recently, when Savacan of Miami, Inc., a recycling center, was dedicated. It was the occasion for some inspiring and encouraging remarks by Mr. William B. Renner, president of the Aluminum Company of America. I am introducing here his brief speech, since I believe it will provide encouragement for others seeking to begin small businesses.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY W. B. RENNER, PRESIDENT,
ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA

Thank you, George (Greene).

I know how tough it is to create a new business . . . to turn an idea into bricks and machines and jobs. It takes nerve. It takes effort. It takes money. It takes vision.

You face tremendous problems, most of them not of your own making. You start with one building in an inner city neighborhood. A handful of employees. Perhaps an anxious banker for a partner. You hire people completely unfamiliar with your business and you train them to do jobs that neither of you know much about. At first, everything goes wrong. Equipment breaks down. Suppliers don't deliver materials on time. Cash flow isn't what you estimated. You have problems with zoning or utilities. Somehow, God willing, you manage. You make decisions. Things begin to work out. And then something truly miraculous happens.

You succeed. You prosper. You grow. Pretty soon you're buying another building, hiring more people, contributing to your community's well-being. No, I'm not talking about Savacan of Miami, although they probably recognize the situation I'm describing.

I'm talking about Alcoa, because that's what happened to us when we got started in Pittsburgh in 1888. Our aluminum smelters and rolling mills with their thousands of employees didn't spring out of the ground overnight. When we opened our doors in a building not much bigger than a two-car garage, all of Alcoa's employees could have ridden to work in one of the newly-invented automobiles.

The company's only salesman—a fellow who went on to become president—used to say that with a little maneuvering, the sales force, research, corporate planning, accounting, personnel and advertising departments, production line staff and plant management could all go through the front door at the same time.

That's how it was with Alcoa. It's how any business begins.

Savacan of Miami is the newest of more than 1000 recycling centers in our national recycling program, most of them locally owned and operated . . . businesses that

made it by grabbing their own bootstraps and pulling with particular local vigor.

Savacan pays consumers 26 cents a pound for used aluminum cans, about a penny a can. That may not seem like much. But last year, centers in our recycling activity paid \$90 million to can collectors. They recovered 7.6 billion cans—about 31 cans for every American. The energy saved by recycling the cans was equivalent to 3.3 million barrels of oil.

I believe the recycling activity dedicated here today can point the way to other communities in demonstrating the civic and economic benefits possible through vision, determination, hard work, and perhaps a helping hand here and there.

Alcoa is delighted to have had a part in helping this very worthwhile recycling activity get under way. It's been personally encouraging for me to have seen this community—and the people of Savacan of Miami—pull together to make this business a reality.

Good luck!●

SISTER DAMIAN YOUNG HONORED BY TORRANCE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 26 the Torrance Area Chamber of Commerce will present Sister M. Damian Young with the 1981 Torrance Distinguished Citizen Award at its annual banquet. I am inclined to think that they have made an excellent choice this year, and I think you will agree after you hear a little about what kind of a person Sister Damian is.

As president and chairman of the board of Little Company of Mary, Sister Damian is responsible for overall management of the hospital, with direct responsibility for all administrative and volunteer personnel. Although she has held this demanding position for 9 years, she has also found time to hold several positions in a number of community activities, including chairman for the Boy Scouts of America Medical Explorers Post No. 1041, chairman and treasurer of the Hospital/Home Health Care Agency of California, member of the advisory board of the Torrance Salvation Army, and hospital representative to the Torrance Unified School District. A member of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Sister Damian is serving on the liaison advisory board of the department of health and hospitals, the Medico-Moral Committee, and Area Parish Council No. 20.

My wife, Lee, and I both think it is wonderful that the chamber is honoring Sister Damian, and we would like to add our thanks and congratulations.●

NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK
LAW

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, today being the 34th anniversary of section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act, this seems an appropriate time to comment on the issue of compulsory versus voluntary unionism.

There is a proper balance in all things. In the sphere of labor-management relations, this century has witnessed a tremendous growth in the power of labor vis-a-vis management. The collective bargaining process has produced fundamental gains for the American worker. But in this search toward equity, there must also be concern for the rights of the individual employee.

More than 70 percent of the American people, represented by a large and growing coalition of legislators in both the House and Senate, are calling into question the validity of compulsory unionism. Section 14b of the Taft-Hartley Act empowers individual States to outlaw all forms of compulsory unionism. The wording is clear:

Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

To date, 20 States have enacted right-to-work laws—giving every worker the freedom to choose whether or not to join a labor union.

But in 30 States this is not the case, and more is at stake than a denial of freedom of choice. Between 1969 and 1979, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, compulsory unionism States suffered a net loss of 271,000 manufacturing jobs. Over the same 10-year period, the 20 right-to-work States gained a net total of 1,087,600 manufacturing jobs. In fact, every one of those 20 States enjoyed a net increase in manufacturing jobs.

Currently before the House are two bills containing clear-cut prohibitions against compulsory unionism, H.R. 2301 and H.R. 2300, sponsored by Congressman MICKEY EDWARDS of Oklahoma. H.R. 2301 will extend right-to-work protection nationwide. H.R. 2300 grants this protection to students.

I have advised Congressman EDWARDS of Oklahoma that I wish to be a cosponsor to H.R. 2301 and H.R. 2300. I urge your active support for these bills. Last November, Americans cast an overwhelming vote for freedom in the marketplace. Enactment of national right-to-work legislation is a logical step in responding to this mandate.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMARKS ON SOCIAL SECURITY
CUTS

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received from one of my constituents. This man is a steelworker who like many other laborers has spent a lifetime working under difficult and often dangerous circumstances. Now after all these years of hard work and contributions to the social security system, his much-needed and well-deserved retirement is being threatened by a callous administration that appears to have no regard for the people who are manual laborers in this society—the people for whom early retirement and reduced benefits are a life and death issue, not a luxury. I offer this letter as a reminder to all of us of our contract with the American worker.

NATIONAL AD HOC COMMITTEE,
CONCERNED STEELWORKERS, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., May 12, 1981.

Ms. BARBARA MIKULSKI,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MIKULSKI, One need only contemplate the proposed social security cuts for a minute in order to see the far reaching and devastating effect they will have on millions of American workers.

In the steel industry alone there are many thousands who will be adversely affected by the proposed cutting of benefits received at age 62 years (early retirement) from the present 80 percent to a low 55 percent. Not only will it impose hardship on those workers whose health deteriorated after long years in the mills; those around 58, 59 or 60 years of age, it'll penalize them for living until age 62 when they seek retirement. Many of those who are now struggling to get to age 62, presently plagued by various health problems, hoping to retire with some semblance of dignity are about to be sacrificed into that awful maw of bad business management.

I'm in the mills... see the many co-workers with legs gone bad, encased in Jobst supports, some ulcerated or varicose or phlebotic. Then you see the many different kinds of braces supporting bad backs, shoulders and other unmentionable areas, hearing loss brought on by long years in the mills, standing on hard, cold concrete floors. One doesn't have to be a doctor to appreciate what's happening to me and so many of my co-workers. So many have become grist-for-the-mills... now what's left? Not even the early retirement so eagerly looked forward to by so many of us! We are all being sacrificed!

Up in the morning—off to the job, but not before pulling on the full length support stockings with belt, on with the back brace (herniated disc), on with the elbow brace (osteo arthritis), swallow the medication (two kinds). Then the hour by hour struggle through the day to the end of the shift. Now it's home to the heat pad, propped-up legs and feet (it helps the swelling) a back-rub and one day closer to age 62. Well, my struggle to survive and get-out at 62, with a

degree of independence, is about to go up in smoke. At age 59, with multihealth problems 62 was the survival goal. With the already reduced rates (80 percent) my wife and I could make it. However there's no way we can make it with 55 percent social security benefits. What do I and the many others like me, in many industries across the country, do now? Die-in-the-mills?

The things discussed in my letter are by no means isolated cases. There should be a complete investigation concerning the plight of so many American workers now caught-up in the deadly game being fostered upon us. The amazing thing is that there's no attempt to try something else, rather than taking the easy way out by sacrificing so many American workers!

We need help and hope that you will find it possible to use the power of your high office to help the cause of so many of us out here, who are about to be ripped-off again!

Please let us hear from you and remember we are willing to help out in any way we can.

Thanking you for your cooperation and consideration I remain

Yours truly,

CHARLES R. BROWN, Sr.

P.S.—One needs only read statistics on the average life expectancy of retired steelworkers to fully realize how unconscionable it is to condemn us to extra years of servitude. There must be millions out there, in the unsafe, unhealthy workplaces across America, who face similar bleak futures due to the callous attitude of the present administration concerning the social security problems.

We beseech you and your colleagues to publicly speak-out about the present situation. Thank you.●

IMPORT TARIFFS UNFAIR TO
FISHERMEN

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill designed to help American fishermen compete with those from foreign countries and to alleviate our \$2.6 billion fisheries trade deficit. My bill would accelerate an already scheduled tariff reduction on imported synthetic fiber fish nets and netting, providing almost immediate relief for our domestic fishing industry.

This is not a new issue but one which I attempted to remedy in the 94th and 95th Congresses through legislation similar to the bill I am introducing today. Earlier attempts to reduce the tariff on imported synthetic nets were coolly received by previous administrations because, we were told, while it was generally agreed that the tariffs were unduly protective, the United States wanted certain concessions from other nations before lowering them. In short, our negotiators did not want their position hurt by a premature lowering of the tariffs. These multilateral trade negotiations have

since been concluded and the United States has agreed to a gradual reduction in the tariffs. Unfortunately, this reduction is far too slow to make any significant difference, particularly in view of escalating fuel prices.

It is worth noting that the tariffs on imported cotton or on vegetable fiber nets have already been reduced. In fact, the tariff on cotton nets was established at 40 percent ad valorem by the Trade Act of 1930 and subsequently reduced to its present 17.5 percent. Since 1963, however, our fishermen have been burdened with an import tariff on synthetic fish nets and netting of 32.5 percent ad valorem plus 25 cents per pound. My bill simply brings the tariff on synthetic nets into parity with those made of cotton while at the same time maintaining adequate protection for our own net manufacturers.

Because the United States does not manufacture the quality or variety of nets required by the industry, our commercial fishermen depend on a wide variety of imported fish nets. Today we are importing over one-third of the nets used by our commercial fishing industry. Synthetic nets alone account for over 95 percent of these imports. A typical fisherman from New Bedford, Mass., which lies in my own district, spends almost \$15,000 a year on his nets, meaning that he must pay over \$5,000 in duties. The duty on a single purse seine net used by our commercial tuna industry can cost over \$77,000. I believe these costs are more than the commercial fisherman should be expected to pay.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 185,000 commercial fishermen in this country who need our help. Recent figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that since 1975, diesel fuel prices paid by our fishermen have increased almost 864 percent. While fuel prices skyrocket we continue to increase our imports of edible fishery products. Ironically, while our fishermen are expected to compete with foreign fishermen heavily subsidized by their own governments—and whose catch generally enters this country duty free—they are also expected to pay a high tariff on the nets they use. Our fishermen are not looking for handouts or subsidies. They simply want to earn a decent living through honest hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me and support this legislation to reduce the unnecessary and extremely burdensome costs borne by our commercial fishermen. Reducing the tariff will help alleviate our national trade deficit in fisheries products while helping all segments of our fishing industry, including salmon gillnetters in the Pacific Northwest, tuna purse seiners in the Pacific, Great

Lakes gillnetters, Gulf shrimpers, and North Atlantic trawlers. ●

SECRETARY OF INTERIOR JAMES WATT'S POLICY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have been actively involved in seeking the answers to the many environmental questions that my committee has had to deal with in the last 5 years.

I, like others, was aware that with the coming of a new administration, there would likely be some changes in the direction of Interior Department environmental policy. I can assure you though, that I never expected these changes to be personified in the form of James Watt. As Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Watt has made it a policy of shocking people with his actions. It seems that rarely does a day go by without Members of Congress hearing about another outrageous proposal coming from the Interior Department. California offshore oil leasing and the realignment of the Office of Surface Mining are apparently only a small sample of the actions we can expect from Secretary Watt.

The Interior Committee held many hearings and the members and staff worked long hours in passing legislation that reflects America's conservation ethic. There was much give and take, insuring that balanced legislation was signed into law. I consider these laws much too important to allow them to be gutted by administrative rulemaking. In the upcoming months, the committees, and certainly I, will be watching to insure that congressional intent remains the guiding force behind the Interior Department's interpretation of the law.

I seriously question whether James Watt, as Secretary of the Interior, will provide a balanced administration of national resources or will continue to give way to extreme and tortured interpretations of the law which are resulting in significant degradation of our natural environment.

When Mr. Watt first appeared before the House Interior Committee, I questioned his background and its conflict with his new role as Secretary of the Interior.

Today, only 5 months later, his reassurances of neutrality and impartiality ring hollow, as he has fulfilled the worst expectations in running roughshod over Congress and the carefully crafted policy that serves as the background for orderly use of our most precious resources.

I believe it would do well for my colleagues to read the following first excerpt of the June 29, 1981, Newsweek cover story. The second part of this story will appear in tomorrow's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JAMES WATT'S LAND RUSH

The land was there before James Watt, and it will survive him, but it may never be the same. That is one view of the new Secretary of the Interior, whose strong convictions are making him the most controversial man in the Reagan Cabinet. Watt has deep feelings for the land, but as his environmental critics see it, he also knows what a nuisance it can be when it stands between man and mineral, and he has more than a few ideas about how it can be improved. That is why he is preparing to reverse the government's opposition to mountaintop mining, a procedure in which the top of a mountain is sheared off to get at the coal and dumped into the adjacent valley. In the eyes of the critics, that creates a building site out of nature's unruly topography—a level bed of earth, ready to receive man's improvements; the perfect monument, they would call it, to this public servant of practicality.

In his sense of mission, Watt is as zealous and sincere as any environmentalist who opposes him. One of his first acts as Interior Secretary was to reopen the question of oil drilling near four of northern California's most beautiful beaches—provoking a howl of protest from California Democrats and Republicans alike. He has portrayed himself as the man who will protect his native West from rampaging preservationists, and who believes the national parks should be repaired before they are expanded. His predecessors painstakingly drew up a 575-page book of strip-mining regulations, having to do mostly with restoring the land to its original contours; Watt intends to rewrite many of the rules and cut the Federal regulatory force by 40 per cent. Many of these decisions are popular with some Western governors, who have been agitating for years for more control over the Federal lands in their states, but no one has been as touched by Watt as Carl Bagge, president of the National Coal Association. "He's made my job a pleasure to do again," Bagge says. "I can look myself in the mirror and no longer see myself as evil incarnate."

Watt, too, has often felt like a lone voice in the wilderness, crying out for some of it to be used before all of it was preserved. Now, as Secretary of the Interior, he says he has the opportunity to "swing the pendulum back to center" from what he calls the extreme environmentalist position. Environmentalists fear that Watt, by temperament and conviction, will push it to the other extreme. The Secretary of the Interior is responsible by law for balancing demands that are sometimes irreconcilable. He is not only the nation's chief environmental officer, but also its game warden, dam builder, miner and Indian chief; he is charged with promoting "multiple uses" of public land, although there is no way that a strip mine can coexist with a recreation area. Watt has been called the "fox guarding the chicken coop" so often that he has installed a photograph of a fox over the fireplace in his office. Former Sen. Gaylord Nelson, chairman of the Wilderness Society, calls Watt "unfit to hold public office," one of the milder epithets in what Watt has called a "hysterical" campaign against him, and the Sierra Club is trying to collect a million

signatures on a petition to drive him out of office.

THE PRICE

The pendulum of public opinion has swung somewhat in Watt's direction, but there is certainly no broad mandate for the Administration to do away with environmental protection. A Newsweek poll conducted last week shows that a solid majority of Americans are willing to pay the added price of environmental safeguards—although the percentage expressing that opinion dropped from 69 to 58 over the last year and a half. An overwhelming majority agrees that it is possible to have strong economic growth and still maintain high environmental standards. But there are large majorities for most of the steps Watt has proposed to increase energy production: by a 70-to-22 margin, Americans approve of expanded offshore oil drilling and, by 76 to 19, they favor increasing oil exploration on Federal lands. A plurality would ease strip-mining regulations to allow more coal to be mined and a majority would relax air-pollution standards to permit more coal to be burned.

A Secretary of the Interior holds what is usually viewed as one of the more humdrum posts in Washington, and Easterners find it hard to comprehend the enormous power the Interior Department wields over the West. What monetary policy is to Wall Street, what agriculture policy is to the Chicago Board of Trade, land and water policy are to the West. The Interior Secretary administers about one-third of all the land in the United States. He runs all the National Parks, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas; he runs the Bureau of Reclamation, which builds the dams and aqueducts that water the West. He enforces the strip-mining law, leases oil fields on the outer continental shelf and controls the mineral rights on hundreds of millions of acres of national forest.

And Watt has an influence on national environmental policy that far exceeds his nominal role. He is one of the most forceful Cabinet officers, is held in high regard by the White House and frequently boasts of how closely his views match President Reagan's. His role has become magnified because he is chairman of a Cabinet subcommittee, the Council on Natural Resources and Environment, which gives him some authority over Energy Secretary James Edwards and Environmental Protection Administrator Anne Gorsuch. As a result, Watt is playing a dominant role in writing the amendments to the Clean Air Act. A draft version leaked last week indicates that the Administration plans to weaken key enforcement provisions of the law and allow the states to control pollution at their own pace.

Watt's other strength is his ability to make his department carry out his views. A sign on his office wall serves as his motto: "Nothing in the world can take the place of persistence." Into the thicket of bureaucracy he charged, clear-cutting every appointed official except the National Park Service director, and replacing them with conservatives who share his pro-development values. Those he couldn't uproot he beat back: he described the process of taking charge of Interior as making the bureaucrats "yield to my blows." The conservationists who had romped happily for years fled like rabbits. "People in the department are scared to death," claims Dr. John Grandy IV, vice president of Defenders of Wildlife. "They don't even want to have a conserva-

tionist's phone number on their desk. I call people who've been friends for years and their voices get low and I have a different name."

PRINCIPLES

What environmentalists find so infuriating about Watt is not just that he disagrees with them, but that he challenges their most deeply held convictions. They are used to dealing with people who oppose them out of economic self-interest—miners, developers, oilmen—rather than as a matter of principle. But Watt has never had a financial stake in the exploitation of the outdoors; in fact, he is one of the least prosperous of Reagan's Cabinet members, with a declared net worth of only \$65,000. He opposes them on their own terms, matching his idealism with theirs. He undercuts their basic claim to legitimacy, which is that they alone are disinterested champions of the commonwealth. It is self-evident to them that they have nothing to gain by championing the right of an obscure threatened fish over the need for a dam; it is not so clear to Watt. In his public statements and speeches, he refers to environmental "pursuits" as a "narrow special-interest group" that deserves no special consideration. "I listen to the miners and timber cutters and drillers as well as the preservationists," he boasts. "They realize they've lost the keys to the front door. I opened up the door to everyone."

Both Watt and his opponents talk frequently of the sacred responsibility of "stewardship" over the lands, but they mean two different things. To environmentalists, this means saving what shreds of wilderness they can from the encroaching bulldozers, to set aside as a perpetual reminder of the natural world in which man lived for all but the last few centuries of his existence on earth. Watt calls this "a greedy land-grab by the preservationists." He sees his responsibility as maintaining the land for people to use. One way to use it is recreation, of course; and it is simply false to suggest, as some of his critics have, that Watt would favor mining or timbering in the national parks. Parks are inviolate, by decree of Congress, and he has no quarrel with that.

FIXER

He does believe in making them more accessible. "My concept of stewardship is to invest in it," he says. "Build a road, build a latrine, pump in running water so you can wash dishes. Most people think that if you can drive in, walk 20 yards and pitch a tent by a stream you've had a wilderness experience. Do we have to buy enough land so that you can go backpacking and never see anyone else?" For that reason, and because the parks are deteriorating, he is trying to delay buying any more park land; he believes it's more important to maintain facilities in the existing parks. "I won't mind being remembered as the guy who fixed the plumbing," he says.

It is that side of Watt that his opponents find so provocative; he seems to regard the outdoors as a kind of wide-screen nature documentary with insects. A few hours of it is enough. Addressing a meeting of national park concessionaires last spring, he described a recent raft trip down the Grand Canyon, which he found thrilling the first day, but increasingly tedious for the next three, until he was helicoptered out. Watt opposes environmentalists who would ban motorized rafts in the Grand Canyon on noise-pollution grounds. He wants people to

be able to get down the river in four or five days, instead of ten, which he believes will make the Grand Canyon more accessible to middle-income people. Responding to a question about horseback riding in parks, he made what he now calls an ill-advised joke, assuring the audience that he favored it: "I don't like to paddle and I don't like to walk."

Statements like that convince environmentalists that Watt is hostile to ecological values—that he sees man's role as taming the natural world, rather than living in harmony with it. Watt's view is decidedly anthropomorphic, and he seems to suspect his critics of a skulking bias against humanity; informed of a thunderous denunciation of his policies by nature photographer Ansel Adams, Watt replied with a shrug: "Ansel Adams never took a picture with a human being in it in his life."

DISORDER

Watt also takes seriously his role as the steward of that huge portion of the nation's resources he controls—half the coal, virtually all the oil shale—and he believes in managing them "so the public realizes the multiple benefits that can come from them." He is increasing offshore oil drilling, making more coal available for leasing, and offering the first onshore Alaskan oil and gas leases since the mid-1960s. Some of this development would have occurred anyway because environmental disputes that had delayed oil and coal leasing have been settled. But Watt is moving so quickly on all these fronts that even some oilmen privately fear that development could become disorderly. Watt agrees that a careful plan is needed, but he insists that development start now. If not, he predicts "the Eastern industrial states will turn on the West and say 'We shouldn't have to pay these high OPEC prices, we shouldn't have to lose our jobs to the Sun Belt . . . when in fact this energy is available.' Then our way of life in the West will be destroyed by a crash program."

The most controversial action Watt has taken is to suggest adding four Pacific Ocean basins to a California offshore-lease sale—tracts that had been deleted by President Carter's Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus a week before the 1980 election. The basins lie in valuable fishing areas and not far from some of California's most treasured beaches—and they contain, according to U.S. Geologic Survey estimates, less than twelve days' worth of oil. Although Watt often talks of the West's justifiable resentment of heavy-handed Washington bureaucrats, he failed to consult Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr., before proposing the leases. Watt's move is so unpopular that the California State Republican chairman has warned it could hurt his party's chances of taking back the governorship next year. Even Alaska's development-minded Gov. Jay Hammond was upset. "It appears industry is playing a more influential role than it should when it is in conflict with a state's position," Hammond complained. He added that Watt was "a very straight arrow . . . with the mission of a zealot in the exploitation of resources." Watt says the final decision on the lease sale will be made in the White House "on political grounds" and he will support whatever Reagan decides: "I told them I can preach it round or I can preach it flat."

EARTHLY TIME

There is one other area in which Watt's concept of stewardship departs from that of most environmentalists: he believes it will

end with the Second Coming. As he testified to the House Interior Committee shortly after taking office, he believes in setting aside some resources for future generations, but "I do not know how many future generations we can count on before the Lord returns." That quote has been unfairly interpreted as a justification for using up our resources willy-nilly; Watt says it means nothing of the sort. Says his former minister, the Rev. Howard Cummings: "As Christians we have a duty to see that the quality of life is better on earth for our having been here. We are not escapists."

But some environmentalists are uncomfortable with the idea that earthly time is limited; they are fighting to save the world for all time. Watt is deeply offended by suggestions that his religion could somehow interfere with his judgment on his job, and he refuses to discuss his beliefs in detail. He is, however, a fundamentalist Christian who attends an Assembly of God church; Rev. Cummings, who was his pastor in Denver, where Watt lived until January, calls him "a deeply Christian man" who has experienced the "gifts of the Holy Spirit," including talking in tongues. When Watt took office, he called Cummings, and the two men prayed together over the phone for guidance in Watt's new job.

Among environmentalists, stories circulate that Watt got into an argument with a geologist over the age of rocks in the Grand Canyon; Watt denies it. "If you believe as Watt does," one environmental activist said, "then there's never a resource problem because the Creator can replenish what he created." Asked how old he thinks the Grand Canyon is, Watt replies, "zillions of years." Asked if he believes in evolution, he refuses to give a direct answer: "you can speculate. I'm a fundamentalist." ●

WILLIAM FRANCIS PIKE HONORED BY SAN PEDRO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, William Francis "Bill" Pike, is retiring as president of the San Pedro Chamber of Community Development and Commerce. He will be honored at the chamber's annual installation banquet at the end of this month, but I would like to take a few moments now to discuss his remarkable career.

Born in Gloucester City, N.J., in 1915, Bill encountered tragedy early in life, when his mother, brother, and three sisters died in the terrible 1917 influenza epidemic. He spent a couple of years in an orphanage while his father recovered from a shipyard accident, and then the two of them moved to Phoenix, Ariz. Bill's father passed away 10 years later, and Bill went to live with friends in Inglewood, Calif.

Bill has had a varied career history: He began working for Northrop Aircraft's electrical maintenance department in 1941, and worked his way up to supervisor of purchasing industrial

supplies and equipment. Working at Northrop provided Bill with valuable professional experience, and also much personal happiness as his secretary of 3½ years, Jacqueline La Mere, became his wife in 1954.

The two of them moved to San Pedro in 1958 and opened a stationery store a year later. In 1963, Bill and Jackie opened Pike's Stationery in Ports O' Call, and Bill helped organize the Merchants Association. In 1966, they opened a gift and card shop on the Princess Louise, and, in 1971, yet another shop in Dana Point. Bill had studied real estate in the 1960's—obtaining his salesman's license in 1965 and his broker's license in 1967—and applied this training in 1976 by opening Century 21-Bill Pike Realty.

Besides an obviously successful professional life, Bill has been an active participant in community affairs over the years. From 1967 until 1973, he was a member of Mayor Yorty's Citizen Advisory Committee, for which he received a Meritorious Community Service to City of Los Angeles Resolution. He has been a member of the Ports O' Call Merchants Association for 16 years, serving twice as president, 2 years as secretary, and 4 years as treasurer. He has been on the board of directors of the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce since 1976, and a member of the San Pedro Elks since 1967.

My wife Lee and I congratulate Bill and Jackie for their success and wish them the best in the years ahead. ●

MOUNT HOLLY AMERICAN LEGION COMMEMORATION OF CARRANZA FLIGHT

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, July 12, 1981, will mark the 53d anniversary of the death of Emilio Carranza, a young captain in the Air Corps of the Army of Mexico, whose plane crashed in New Jersey while the aviator was on a goodwill tour of the United States.

Each year since that tragedy, American Legion Post No. 11 of Mount Holly, N.J., has conducted a memorial service at the crash site, now designated as Carranza Memorial Park.

This display of intercontinental friendship and goodwill has served to draw our respective nations and peoples closer together.

I am pleased to submit for the RECORD a copy of an official resolution approved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, recognizing the Carranza Memorial and honoring the tradition begun and maintained by American Legion Post No. 11 of Mount Holly.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW JERSEY GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Introduced by Assemblyman H. James Saxton)

Whereas Emilio Carranza, Captain in the Air Corps of the Army of Mexico, did in 1928 upon the commission of his government undertake a goodwill tour of various cities in the United States, in all of which he met with enthusiastic expressions of friendship from the thousands of Americans to whom he directly carried his embassy; and,

Whereas shortly after commencing his solo return flight to Mexico City, the gallant aviator encountered a violent storm which, downing his craft, hurled him to a fiery death in the deepest solitude of the pine barrens; and,

Whereas the members of American Legion Post No. 11, of the township of Mount Holly in the County of Burlington, learning of the disappearance of the brave captain, dispatched a search party which, after making its way 25 miles through trackless wilds, sighted the wreckage of the airplane, extricated the body of the young airman and returned it to the Post, there establishing a Guard of Honor about it; and,

Whereas on July 12, 1929, one year after the Mexican flier's untimely death, the members of Post No. 11 conducted a memorial service at the site of the catastrophe, thenceforward designated as Carranza Memorial Park, at which service they pledged themselves as one man to conduct each year a like observance, and did moreover resolve to promote at large the ends of peace, goodwill and improved understanding between the United Mexican States and the United States of America; and,

Whereas the ceremonies since held have each year enjoyed the participation of representatives from the Mexican Embassy, placing the indelible stamp of international amity upon the event and thereby uniting the hearts of the peoples of two great neighboring republics; and,

Whereas this year, the 53d anniversary of that lamentable tragedy the standing pledge of Post No. 11 of the American Legion is redeemed this July 11, 1981, which is a fitting occasion on which, not only to memorialize that tragedy and mourn again the loss of Captain Carranza, but also to celebrate the profound sentiment of affinity which flourishes between the two countries; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, That this House hereby honors the memory of the emissary from the south, commends the Mount Holly Post of the American Legion for its half-century of devotion to perpetuating the cause of international cordiality in the service of which he perished, and joins with Post No. 11 in urging the citizens of this State and this Nation to rededicate themselves to that cause as it may figure in their own lives. ●

CONGRATULATIONS TO REVERE
JOURNAL ON 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere pleasure to offer my congratulations to the Revere Journal of Revere, Mass., on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

For the past century, the Journal has remained an important part of this city. More than simply a newspaper, the Journal has proven to be an illustrated diary of the lives of Revere residents. It has captured all the milestones—the tragedies and the triumphs—of this seaside community.

When the Journal was first published on February 5, 1881, it was only four pages long; a small paper, but large enough to serve Revere's 2,500 residents. Over the 100 years, the Journal has mirrored this city's growth and development.

Mr. Speaker, the Journal can be proud of the important part it has played in Revere's history. The need for an informed and enlightened people cannot be overstated, and the Journal has consistently provided this vital service for 100 years. I am certain that in the future, it will continue its tradition of excellence.●

SENATOR SYMMS VINDICATED
ON VMI STAND

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, only recently President Reagan awarded his first Congressional Medal of Honor to Green Beret M. Sgt. Roy P. Benavidez. Part of President Reagan's remarks on that occasion over at the Pentagon are in keeping with the true meaning of the Vietnam veteran:

They came home without a victory, not because they'd been defeated but because they'd been denied permission to win. They were greeted by no parades, no bands, no waving of the flag they had so nobly served. There's been no effort to honor and, thus, give pride to the families of more than 57,000 young men who gave their lives in that faraway war.

President Reagan spoke highly of those Vietnam veterans who did not shirk their duty and served as well in combat as Americans had in all its wars. It was Senator STEVE SYMMS who recently took the lead in the Senate to oppose one of those "other" Vietnam veterans who stood an excellent chance to head Virginia Military Institute (VMI). That individual was Josiah Bunting, and Senator SYMMS

led the fight in the Senate by placing the full background of Josiah Bunting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 24, 1981 (S2618).

One of the most degrading books of dishonor to the Vietnam veteran was "Self-Destruction: The Disintegration and Decay of the United States Army during the Vietnam Era," authored by "Cincinnatus," heralded by the media as a much decorated Vietnam veteran. The book was extended more credibility by the endorsement of Josiah Bunting.

Finally, on May 2, 1981, the true identity of "Cincinnatus" was published in the Washington Post. I would like to share the full story of "Cincinnatus" with my colleagues. After reading this exposé, one cannot help but admire Senator SYMMS for his stand on Josiah Bunting when the ebb and flow of the tide was in favor of Bunting. To some it was intestinal fortitude, to others it was just plain guts; that was the true Vietnam veteran who did the job, came home, and did not degrade his military service. It is this kind of individual we need more of today. We should salute Senator SYMMS for taking the stand needed—when it was needed. He too had guts. The Washington Post article of May 2, 1981 follows:

ARMY CRITIC UNMASKED

(By Michael Getler)

A major new book sharply critical of Army leadership in Vietnam and supposedly written by a "senior field-grade officer . . . currently assigned to the Pentagon" using the pen-name "Cincinnatus" was actually written by a professor who was never in Vietnam and whose affiliation with the military since 1965 has been as a chaplain in the National Guard.

In a lengthy telephone interview yesterday, Dr. Cecil B. Currey, 48, a history professor at the University of South Florida in Tampa, acknowledged that he is "Cincinnatus," author of "Self-Destruction: The Disintegration and Decay of the United States Army During the Vietnam Era," published by W. W. Norton & Co. in New York early this year.

The book has received widespread national attention. It has been reviewed by major newspapers around this country and abroad. Numerous anonymous telephone interviews were arranged by the publisher in which reporters did not know the identity of the author. "Cincinnatus" also appeared on the NBC-TV "Today" show with his face hidden by shadow and his voice electronically disguised.

Despite this author's anonymity, the book has received widespread acclaim in most reviews.

But in many cases the reviewers or interviewers apparently assumed too much about the author's credentials or possibly were misled by the way the publisher described "Cincinnatus" on the book jacket or by other factors, including previous interviews.

"Today" show reporter Jessica Savitch, for example, introduced him on Feb. 2 as a "career military man . . . a Vietnam veteran . . . right now assigned to the Pentagon." There was no attempt by "Cincinnatus" to refine that description on the air.

Herbert Mitgang, a New York Times reporter who covers publishing, wrote Dec. 30 about the book's impending appearance. He had a telephone interview with "Cincinnatus."

The author, Mitgang reported, said he had served as a private and corporal in Korea, was commissioned in 1962, graduated from the Command and General Staff School and Army War College, and served as a captain during the 1968 Tet offensive.

His editor at Norton, Eric P. Swenson, told Mitgang at the time that he had checked the colonel's credentials, had spoken to him many times but had never seen him in person.

The book jacket describes "Cincinnatus" as "the pen name of a military man who entered service as a private in Korea and rose through the ranks to become a senior field-grade officer. A graduate of Command and General Staff College, he is the author of one book on military history as well as papers and monographs. He holds A.B., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees. He is currently assigned to the Pentagon."

According to Army records and yesterday's interview with Currey, the professor joined the Army as a private June 30, 1953, just days before the Korean War cease-fire. He did not serve in Korea. He left the Army in 1955, staying in the inactive reserves, then completed a master's degree and entered the ministry.

He left the ministry in 1962, got a doctorate in history at the University of Kansas, then joined the Nebraska National Guard in 1965 and applied for a commission as a first lieutenant in the chaplain corps in an effort to retain links to his twin interests; the ministry and the military.

Currey transferred to the Florida National Guard, where he stayed from 1967 to 1978, doing weekend and two-week-a-year stints of active duty as a chaplain while teaching at the University of South Florida.

In 1975, he spent a term as a resident student for the Army's Command and General Staff College, which he says was an unusual compliment for a reserve officer, and eventually became a faculty consultant. In 1978, as a major, he transferred from the guard to become a lieutenant colonel in the Army reserves to qualify for a reserve post in the Chief of Chaplains Office in the Pentagon.

Currey, who still lives in Florida and teaches at the university, acknowledges that his duties in the Pentagon are like those of reserve or guardsmen elsewhere, namely two weeks a year of active duty, though he has taken on some special projects which have kept him at the Pentagon a few weeks longer on occasion.

In the event of a full reserve mobilization, he would be assigned to the Pentagon. This may account for the "currently assigned to the Pentagon" line on the book jacket.

Currey did not go to the Army War College, and while he was a captain during the Tet offensive in Vietnam in 1968, he was in Florida at the time.

Currey says those items in The New York Times interview caused him great personal grief, and he said he thinks they were basically a misunderstanding because he and the reporter were talking about Tet and the reporter asked what his rank was at the time. Currey claims he has tried to be as careful as possible in interviews.

Currey's book received considerable praise in the lead review in The Washington Post's Feb. 15 "Book World." The review was written by Josiah Bunting III, a former Army

officer in Vietnam, college president and author of *The Lionheads*.

In that same edition, a separate interview with "Cincinnatus" by reporter Marc Leeson and arranged by the publisher referred to the anonymous officer as an Army colonel stationed at the Pentagon who had served a tour of duty in Vietnam.

The book is an April selection of "The Military Book Club," and the brochure that went out to thousands of members carried the headline: "Why We Lost in Vietnam" and talked about "a scathing critique of the U.S. military by an officer who was there."

It said the book was "written by a career officer who served in Vietnam and is now assigned to the Pentagon" and is based on "his own 30 years of military experience."

Currey said he and Swenson were very upset by this and wrote a letter to book club officials asking where they got their facts and referring them to the book jacket as the only authorized description. Nowhere in the book, Currey said yesterday, is the claim made that the author was in Vietnam.

The central theme of Currey's book is very blunt: "The old, old refrain that the Army failed because of political and social unrest at home is still the theme song of the upper ranks. The fact is that the military disaster in Vietnam grew out of ineptitude at the top.

"Stated simply," Currey wrote, "the Army made too many mistakes in its years in Vietnam. If those same errors are not to be repeated in some future conflict, their sources must be identified, understood and corrected. At some point, for reasons then believed good, America's Army will once again be sent into battle. It will be unfortunate if it has closed its eyes to the lessons of Vietnam and again faces a debacle."

The reviewer for *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, echoing a feeling that was evident in a number of media reviews, said: "This book should be urgently and widely studied in Washington with immediate steps taken to eliminate the weaknesses it reveals. The author deserves a medal for what he has written."

Military reviewers were far more skeptical. While admitting that there were many lessons to be learned, they challenged the book's tone, scholarship, authenticity and the idea that the Army rather than the political leaders, deserved all of the blame.

Col. Harry G. Summers, Jr., an infantry colonel on the staff of the Army War College, wrote in "Army" magazine that it was the ultimate in "chutzpah" for "a self-proclaimed Army officer who supposedly rose from the ranks" to condemn officers for not resigning over their disagreement on Vietnam policy and then publish his attack on the Army anonymously.

In his book, "Cincinnatus" wrote "In certain churches, ministers wear dark clerical garb to obscure as much as possible of themselves in order to allow their listeners to concentrate exclusively upon what is being said rather than upon who is saying it. That is my hope here as well."

In the interview, Currey said the dilemma he and his editor faced was how to get an important message across to an institution, meaning the Army, that is by its nature suspicious of criticism whether it comes from within or without.

If he were identified as a civilian, he said, the question would be asked what he knows about the Army. If his military credentials were used, he would be dismissed also because critics would focus on his rank, his lack of Vietnam service and, most of all, on being a chaplain.

"No matter how we presented the biography," Currey explained, it was felt that the authority of the credentials, "would stand in the way of getting a serious hearing for an important message." So a pseudonym was used in the hopes that readers would not get hung up on who wrote it, he said.

Cincinnatus, according to legend, was the 5th Century Roman citizen-soldier-patriot who left his farm, was made dictator long enough to save Rome, and then renounced his title and returned to the farm.

Currey says he, in person or as the fictional "Cincinnatus," is also "dedicated to this Army" of today.

Initial information concerning the identity of "Cincinnatus" came from Army officers who had received anonymous letters alleging that Currey was the author. This information was passed on to *The Washington Post*.

Additional inquiries in many other places, including the University of South Florida, made it clear that Currey was the author. Attempts to reach Currey for several days were unsuccessful, but were finally arranged by the publishers.●

TORRANCE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HONORS GERALD L. REYNOLDS, A NEWSPAPERMAN'S NEWSPAPERMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the end of Gerald "Jerry" Reynolds' term as president of the Torrance Chamber of Commerce. The chamber will honor him at its annual installation and awards banquet later this month, but I would like to say a few things about Jerry today.

Jerry is a member of that fascinating profession, journalism. He has been a newspaperman since his days as a student at Torrance's North High School when he worked part time at the Torrance (California) Press-Herald. After graduating from high school in 1959, Jerry continued to work part time for the paper while studying history at the University of California at Berkeley. He graduated with honors in 1963 and began work as a full-time reporter at the Press-Herald, a position he held until 1966 when he was promoted to city editor. Three years later Jerry changed newspapers to become a general assignment reporter on the staff of the South Bay (California) Daily Breeze. Once again he advanced rapidly, becoming city editor of the Breeze in 1971, and managing editor in 1974.

Without question, Jerry Reynolds is a very capable writer and editor, but, besides displaying a strong dedication toward his job, he also exhibits a concern for the entire field of journalism. He is currently serving as chairman of the California Newspaper Publishers Association Editors Conference, and has served two terms as chairman of

the California/Nevada United Press International Editors. He also is a member of both the Associated Press Managing Editors Association and the Superintendent's Advisory Committee for the Southern California Regional Occupational Center.

Mr. Speaker, the South Bay Daily Breeze may not be the Washington Post, and Jerry Reynolds may not be Benjamin Bradlee; but he is one of the best examples I have come across of the talented, hard-working, and conscientious group of newspapermen who do so much for communities all across the United States. My wife, Lee, and I offer a heartfelt thanks for his good work on both the professional and the private level.●

INHERENT SAFETY OF BREEDER REACTORS

HON. MARILYN LLOYD BOUQUARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mrs. BOUQUARD. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter, which was sent to the Honorable DON FUQUA (D-Fla.), from the Department of Energy reporting on the completion of a milestone test at the Fast Flux Test Facility located in Hanford, Wash. As you know, this facility is a liquid metal fast breeder test reactor which is being operated for the purposes of providing engineering data on potential breeder reactor materials and components.

Recently, a deliberate and very severe test was applied to this reactor. The reactor was shut down from full power and simultaneously the main pumps circulating coolant through the reactor were turned off. Mr. Speaker, the result of this test showed that by natural circulation alone, the reactor could maintain itself in a completely safe manner. This is another instance where the inherent safety of breeder reactors is demonstrated.

Because I know many of my colleagues and their constituents are interested in more of the details of the test at the Fast Flux Test Facility, I would like to share the Department's letter with you by inserting it in the RECORD as part of these remarks.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,

Washington, D.C., June 12, 1981.

HON. DON FUQUA,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed for your information is a report summarizing the status, progress, and expenditures for the Fast Flux Test Facility for the quarter ending March 31, 1981.

A major project milestone was achieved this quarter with the successful completion of the natural circulation decay heat removal verification testing. Following tests at

lower power levels, the reactor was scrambled from the full power design rating of 400 megawatts-thermal with electric power to the main heat transport system pumps purposely interrupted. Loss of electrical power to the pumps in a real event would require failure of two electrical transmission lines from independent sources and failure of two onsite backup emergency power diesel generators. Peak temperatures measured from instrumented fuel assemblies were within 1 percent of pretest predictions. These natural circulation test results demonstrate the inherent safety feature of a properly designed sodium-cooled reactor and assure emergency core cooling capability in the Fast Flux Test Facility without any electrical power or means of forced pumping. In addition, verification of the analytical models provides a substantial technical basis for designing similar decay heat removal characteristics in subsequent breeder reactor plants.

Work progressed this quarter in preparation for the second integrated leak rate test of the reactor containment building. The initial test was performed at the completion of construction with the results well within acceptable design limits. Now that all equipment and building penetrations are in place,

the second test is being performed to again verify that containment integrity is within design limits.

Good progress also continued this quarter in preparing for initiation of fuels and materials irradiation tests. Specially designed test assemblies were received at the site and are ready for placement in selected locations of the core.

With the successful completion of the full power demonstration test last December and the natural circulation tests this March, all required preoperational tests to permit routine reactor operations have been completed. Test results agreed closely with predictions, operating procedures have been verified, and plant performance has been demonstrated within the specified operating envelope.

Current cost and status data continues to assure that the project will be completed within the present \$647 million authorization.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. CRAWFORD, JR.,
Acting Assistant Secretary
for Nuclear Energy.

Enclosure.

REPORT ON THE FAST FLUX TEST FACILITY FOR QUARTER ENDING MAR. 31, 1981

(In millions of dollars)

	Congressional authorization total estimated cost	Costs spent to Dec. 31, 1980	Costs spent second quarter fiscal year 1981	Costs through Mar. 31, 1981	Cost and commitment through Mar. 31, 1981
Construction.....	540.0	532.6	1.1	533.7	535.3
Expense-funded components.....	107.0	99.4	.0	99.4	99.4
Total.....	647.0	632.0	1.1	633.1	634.7

Significant progress during the second quarter fiscal year 1981 included the following:

Mar. 9, 1981, commence reactor startup, performed startup physics tests.

Mar. 12, 1981, reactor power at 75 percent scram to natural circulation

Mar. 13, 1981, reactor critical, performed startup physics test.

Mar. 14, 1981, 35 percent power physics test.

Mar. 16, 1981, reactor at 100 percent power.

Mar. 18, 1981, 100 percent scram to natural circulation.●

RESULTS OF BLOCK GRANTS ON THE NEEDY

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the devastating consequences that the administration's proposed block grant program will have, should it be enacted. Standards previously upheld by the Federal Government will disintegrate as the States are given Federal funds carte blanche. There are no requirements that these funds supplement, and not supplant, the States' own funds, which are targeted for purposes different from Federal funds.

The new system would only require that the States submit a request to the Federal Government for funding, and then another explaining how the money was spent. There is no evaluation performed by the State legislature and the money received by the States will be almost impossible to trace. This delegation of responsibility to the States is an abandonment of Federal responsibility to the Union. In fact, by relinquishing the protection of Federal standards, we are steering ourselves toward an organization resembling that under the Articles of Confederation; and away from the cohesive Union which we have worked so hard to achieve.

Programs which were established to fill a specific need and received targeted funds from the Federal Government will be severely hurt by the 25 percent cuts proposed by the administration. Other programs were rescued by the Federal Government after neglect and abuse at the State level. Programs which were established for the sole purpose of filling an existing void were not established only to meet a typewritten list of "needs" but to aid human beings who have serious problems which many of us can scarcely comprehend.

Retarded people will find that education and special services, which are important to help them grow, func-

tion, and contribute to society, have been reduced.

Many elderly who rely on senior citizens centers as their only link with friends and outside contact will be forced to remain in tenement homes, alone and lonely. Those wholly on low-income energy assistance and already spend up to 30 percent of their fixed incomes to pay for oil will literally die of exposure to the cold because of escalating oil costs and the 25-percent cut. The cuts will also affect the elderly who are able to remain at home because homemaker services are provided for them. Without help from visiting aides, these elderly people will be institutionalized, where they will lose much of their remaining dignity.

The more than half million homeless children in this country will be set adrift if funding to States is decreased and decontrolled. Without incentives to develop programs to reunite families, and without case review systems performed by the Federal Government, the States will continue to spend funds on costly out-of-home care, which does not benefit our country's most vulnerable children, who have already suffered through an assembly line of foster homes and institutions.

The handicapped will find themselves virtual prisoners in their own homes because simple services and organizations established to help them function as normal members of society have been denied sufficient funds.

Not only will services and organizations be weakened by a lack of funds; the groups of underprivileged people who they serve will be weakened in political strength. Currently, activists in these groups can coalesce to fight for funds. The new regulations will cause these groups to form factions against each other. Instead of banding together to fight for the aid of all, groups will be pitted against each other in an attempt to gain as large a share of the block grant as possible.

A large number of these underprivileged members of our society live in urban areas. Historically, States have not been generous in helping their cities meet the severe financial needs of these citizens. The very structure of the block grant system almost insures abuse and mishandling. I would like to bring to your attention a paper prepared by the ad hoc coalition on block grants.

As a part of the block grant process, the administration proposes to repeal the Child Welfare Act, the Child Abuse and Neglect Act, the Right to an Education for all Handicapped Children Act, major portions of the Equal Opportunity Act, and dozens of other major laws. Those bipartisan and hard fought laws provide for more than money for programs, they establish standards and models for States and local government. Far more is at stake in this battle than budget cuts.

Many of these programs were established after documented neglect and abuse at the State level. In many cases, States have been unwilling or unable to meet the needs of the disadvantaged * * * It is unlikely that their needs will be met by turning over less money to States with no accountability, priorities, or direction. There is a growing discussion over the ability of States to take on the administrative responsibilities for these services, given to lack of time for planning and start up. Some fear that much of the block grants could be eaten up in new and duplicative administrative structures.

Giving aid to States in the form of unstructured, untargeted block grants will not serve to accomplish the administrations purpose of saving the taxpayers money. They have argued that the Federal Government will greatly reduce its spending, but they have not taken into account the fact that 50 new State bureaucracies will have to be established in order to apportion the block grants. This, of course, will be at the same taxpayers expense.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of underprivileged humans who desperately require special help, I urge my colleagues to consider the loss of control and standards which will occur if the Federal Government abandons its re-

sponsibility to the people by implementing this block grant program.●

ANNA CANTU, AN EXCEPTIONAL WOMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 23, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th of this month the San Pedro Chamber of Community Development and Commerce will hold a banquet to honor, among others, Anna Cantu, the outgoing president of their women's division. Anna is an exceptional woman, and I'd like to share with my colleagues some of her achievements.

Anna was born in Mexico, and lived in Arizona until she was 12 when she moved to San Pedro, Calif., her home ever since. In 1946 she married Caesar Cantu, and kept herself busy in succeeding years raising six children. Mr. Speaker, I think most of us know from personal experience the work required to raise children, especially when there are six of them, but Anna has a long list of additional activities to her credit. In 1980-81 she served on Coun-

cilman Gibson's 15th District Citizens Advisory Council. She was president of the Holy Trinity Altar Society in 1977-78 and 1978-79. She has, of course, been very involved in the chamber, serving two terms as president of the women's division, and as director of the southern region of the California Women in Chambers of Commerce. She has also been a member of the harbor area police-community council, the precinct election board, Mayor Bradley's volunteer corps for city government, the San Pedro Bay historical society, the Holy Trinity Choir, and the St. Peter's Choir. Her dedication to these organizations has won her several well-deserved honors including the Women's Division Certificate of Achievement Award, the Holy Trinity Altar Society Honorary President Award, and the Certificate of Award for Outstanding Community Contributions from Women's Division of San Pedro Chamber.

Anna is truly a person to admire. My wife, Lee, and I, on behalf of the whole San Pedro area, thank Anna and wish her along with her husband, Caesar, and their children, Gloria, John, Nancy, Michael, Steve, and Jean, the best in the years ahead.●