EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LESSONS OF IRAN

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent speech delivered by former Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher on the lessons of Iran.

Mr. Christopher, who was intimately involved in the negotiations through Algeria to end the hostage crisis, discusses the downfall of the Shah, the Iranian revolution, the hostage crisis, and the lesson of the experience for our dealing with developing countries, our international strategy, the role of our diplomats, our stake in international law, and the role of American values in relations with other countries.

The speech follows:

LESSONS OF IRAN

(By Warren Christopher)

"Bad times have scientific value," Emerson wrote. "These are occasions a good learner would not miss."

All of us, especially the people directly affected, would have preferred to miss the hostage ordeal in Iran. But it is there, sitting squarely astride our collective memory. We had best learn from it what we can.

Perhaps we are now ready to begin that process. The hostages have been home for some four months. The national sense of relief is dispersing; the celebrations have ended. Possibly even our sense of outrage toward the Iranians is beginning to abate. We may be approaching the level of detachment necessary to comprehend the crisis more fully.

There are five broad areas in which I think the Iran crisis holds valuable lessons.

First, the Iran experience should encourage a sense of realism in our dealings with developing countries. For their internal politics are shaped almost wholly by internal forces, and very little by external pressures. A wise nation, however powerful, understands the peril it invites in confronting the will of another people. Outside powers have an effect, if any, only at the margins.

The reasons the late Shah's regime shattered so swiftly are complex and cumulative. While there were impressive economic achievements, deep inequities remained and corruption was rampant. Too little attention was paid to religion and tradition. Political rights were limited so rigidly for so long that people throughout the country—directly or through family or friends—had been personally touched by official repression the Shah was seen to have sponsored. And the gap between the governing group and those governed remained awesome.

Whatever the cause, by 1978 the Shah's collapse had become inexorable. By then there was probably nothing that he or we could do to prevent it.

Some argue that the hostage crisis would never have happened if we had, in the first place, "stood by our friend," the Shah. But there was no way to do that, short of shooting our way in and occupying the country with full military force.

Alternatively, there were suggestions that we should have encouraged repressive action by the Iranian military, in the context of a military coup against the Shah.

Either course would have caused widespread bloodshed. And neither would have worked. For such policies would have meant siding against most of the Iranian people, who then had the idyllic expectation, and not the subsequent reality, of Khomeini's rule.

We should be thankful President Carter had the wisdom to reject such options. They retain some adherents only because they were not selected and we were spared their consequences.

There is also a lesson here for our broader approach in the developing world. We must take care to recall that our relations are with countries, not just with leaders. We need to broaden our contacts, to make sure that all elements of the population understand our purposes. We must guard against the tendency to identify so narrowly with the personalities in power that we neglect cross-currents of opinion taking sway among the people they rule. Unfortunately, there are too many examples of that tendency in U.S. policy around the world today.

In a second broad area, the Iran crisis offers lessons for our international strategy, in similar conditions and also more generally.

I take sharp issue with those who claim our country lost face because we did not somehow "force" Iran to surrender the hostages. The most common formulation is that we should have issued an ultimatum: if the hostages were not released by a certain date, Iran would have been bombed or invaded.

But consider the probable effects:

The murder of the hostages;

Greater internal and international sympathy, even prestige, for Khomeini;

An end to the international condemnation of Iran, and perhaps a shift of international opinion in Iran's favor;

Disruption of petroleum exports from the Middle East;

And to crown all of these, a probable American entanglement in an Iranian civil war.

However satisfying it might have felt to follow our stormier impulses, I fail to see how such results would have served American interests.

Speaking more broadly, I have yet to see a coherent alternative plan or proposal that would have been likely to force the Iranians to release the hostages.

I also take issue with those who contend we should never negotiate over hostages.

It is a mistake to equate talking with making concessions. On the contrary, we can and should refuse, as we did in this case, to make concessions that imply any form of victory for the kidnappers. We must resolutely resist the kind of outcome that could invite similar acts in the future.

But a presentation that shows our resolve can produce an agreement that withholds concessions and still saves lives.

Circumstances will differ from case to case. Sometimes a bold and skillful strike can be successful, as at Entebbe. But there will be other less propitious times as well. We must be prepared to adapt our strategy to suit the circumstances. A rigid "never negotiate" posture limits the government's ability to find an acceptable outcome. Any predetermined strategy, slavishly followed, could draw us to nightmarish results.

I believe we should grasp, as a central lesson of the crisis, the wisdom in seeking negotiated settlements to international disputes.

That principle was sorely tested in Iran. Khomeini had called the United States the "Great Satan" and had forbidden any diplomatic contact with us. We had enormously complex and painful issues, and no one with whom to raise them.

Nevertheless, in the end it was not the force of our arms, but the force of our arguments—and our economic and diplomatic leverage—that ultimately prevailed.

I recall this not to credit any person, least of all myself, but to celebrate the importance of negotiation. To be sure, the Algerian willingness to mediate, the continuing internal turmoil in Iran, the political evolution there, the Iran-Iraq war—these and other factors had a bearing. But the policy of steady, methodical probing for a negotiated result is what brought this crisis to an end.

This is a fact worth recalling when we weigh our national budgets. Most diplomacy is conducted out of the public eye, and is neither glamorous nor sensational. As we build our defenses, we must also maintain the strength of the American Foreign Service where our national policies are designed and placed in effect. In a world where most things are done by persuasion, even the strongest arms cannot substitute for a clear, convincing voice.

Unfortunately, our budgets do not now reflect this truth. As the military threat grows, our defense budget rises accordingly. But as diplomatic challenges multiply, our professional Foreign Service remains the same or declines. In 1960, we had diplomatic relations with 81 countries; now we deal with 53 more—but with the same number of professional diplomats in the State Department that we had two decades ago. And they must deal not only with 53 more countries, but on a wider range of harder issues than ever before.

We also must take care to retain the people—the men and women of the Foreign Service—whose wisdom and experience have been at the heart of our foreign policy successes, including the resolution of the hostage issue. I have never worked with a more capable, devoted and imaginative group of professionals. Therefore, I am concerned by reports that some of our best career officers, who served prominently during the last Administration, have yet to be assigned to new posts commensurate with their abilities and stature. This trend may lead to the early retirement of many of the ablest professionals in the Foreign Service, depriving

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

the country of incomparable experience and intellectual talent.

In short, it is foolish policy and false economy to fail to give strong support to this indispensable national asset.

Along with the worth of diplomacy, the Iran negotiations underscored the importance of persistence and steadiness in foreign policy—of being prepared to wait, if necessary, until an issue is ripe for resolution.

Over the early months of the crisis it became clear that the hostage timetable would depend, in large part, upon the march of events in Iran that were wholly beyond our control. The most important was the emergence of authoritative leaders who could speak for Iran. It was not until August 1980, 10 months after the hostages were seized, that Iran had a Parliament with power to act on the issue, and it was many weeks more before the lines of authority were clear enough for serious talks. During those long, painful months it was crucial not to be goaded by frustration into an unwise course of action.

There are a number of lessons here:

In a turbulent world, there will inevitably be other instances where problems urgently need solving but we can only see the faintest glimmer of how it might be done. It is right to be impatient over such things as human suffering, war, and injustice. But we need to develop a capacity for steadiness, not in the sense that we accept things as they are, but to bring a constancy to the effort to change them.

In difficult specific circumstances, like those in Iran, government should avoid building up expectations of early success—lest the pressure to act quickly, even if improvidently, become irresistible. We must not let the calendar be an ally of the opposite camp.

At the same time the press and public need to understand that a shortage of news does not necessarily signify an absence of progress. The economic and diplomatic sanctions we and others applied on Iran had a cumulative effect. They played a vital role in the growth of a consensus in Iran that a settlement would serve Iran's interests. So on that score we were making headway even when we appeared to be dead in the water.

A wide understanding of such a phenomenon could lead to greater national steadiness, and thus to more realistic and effective diplomacy.

In a third area, the Iran crisis reminded us of the perilous circumstances in which our diplomats often must perform. Are there better ways to protect them, to prevent takeovers like that in Iran?

Certainly there are ways to improve our posture:

Structural improvements and tightened procedures can make embassies more defensible, and a program of that kind is underway.

Marine guard contingents can be reinforced.

We can thin down embassy staffs, or evacuate, in times of crisis. In Iran, our official staff was cut from over 1400 personnel before the revolution to about 70 in November of 1979.

We can work through international institutions for rules that make sanctions automatic when governments either condone terrorism or engage in such conduct themselves.

But we cannot reduce the risks to zero. Under international law, the ultimate responsibility for the security of diplomatic missions rests with the host country. That is the only practical course. Transforming our embassies into fortresses, or attempting to ring them with massive defenses of our own, would defeat much of their purpose.

So as we do what we can to improve security, we should also pay special tribute to the gallantry of our Marine guards around the world. And we should recognize that it takes courage—as well as skill—to be a diplomat in today's world.

Fourth, the Iran hostage crisis also brought home—in a very tangible and immediate way—our stake in global institutions and in the structure of international law.

It has become the fashion to belittle the United Nations as a constructive force in world affairs. Indeed, the shortcomings of the U.N. system were all too apparent in the hostage ordeal. U.N. sanctions against Iran were thwarted by an opportunistic Soviet veto. There was no effective way to enforce the orders of the World Court that the hostages had been seized illegally and should be released immediately. Missions to Iran by Secretary General Waldheim and by a special five-member U.N. commission also proved futile.

Yet for all of these failings, the international community still played an indispensable role.

At the practical level, the solutions to complex aspects of the negotiations were found in established international practice, such as the rules of the U.N. Commission on International Trade Law. The existence of settled, neutral procedures was a great help in expediting the negotiations.

Even more fundamentally, the political influence of the United Nations was felt at crucial times. From the outset, the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions and the International Court of Justice rulings deprived Iran of any pretense that it was pursuing just claims in a legitimate way against the United States. The resulting isolation contributed to the pressure on the Iranian government.

By the same token, our pursuit of the issue through the United Nations legal machinery stirred international sympathy for our cause. Our course strengthened the inclination of scores of countries—some in public, some very quietly—to help us with diplomacy of their own. In addition, when we imposed sanctions in April of 1980, most countries treated those as legitimate steps. By pursuing all lawful means, we built increased respect both for the law and for ourselves.

The United Nations environment ultimately produced a crucial turning point. In mid-October, Prime Minister Rajai visited the United Nations and sought to focus world attention on Iran's grievances in its conflict with Iraq. But he played to a cold house at the U.N. He was told repeatedly that Iran could expect no support from the world community as long as the American hostages remained in confinement. Impressed by the U.N. experience, he took back to Iran a new appreciation of Iran's isolation and its stake in ending the crisis.

These are events to keep in mind as we contemplate the worth of the United Nations and our participation in it. I do not suggest by any means that criticism ought to be silenced. But we also ought to see beyond the dreary sameness of General Assembly debates. We ought to recognize that the United Nations and its affiliated institutions do far more than vent the anger of the developing world. Indeed, they serve our interest in world stability, grounded on the rule of law.

Finally, I believe the crisis in Iran demonstrated the continuing role of our values in our relations with the rest of the world.

It was our system's inherent concern for human life that caused the government to undertake a massive effort in 1979 to evacuate tens of thousands of private Americans from Iran, and to reduce sharply the diplomatic contingent there.

From the beginning, our values at home also helped define the boundaries of the negotiations. For example, our government could not agree simply to seize any of the Shah's assets we could find and turn them over to Iran. On that issue our bottom line was due process of law. It was immovable.

Indeed, it was largely our respect for individual lives that made this a crisis.

Had we cared less about individual human lives, the holding of fifty-three hostages would not have held the entire nation's attention. Had we cared less, we might simply have written off the people and looked for ways to punish their captors. But our concern about the hostages made it unthinkable for us to deal with the crisis in a callous or cynical manner.

Our respect for human life also provides the essential context for any dealing with terrorists in the future.

We must never be overanxious. The hand of terrorists should not be strengthened. We must be prepared to wait for a settlement as long as it takes—making it clear all the while where the responsibility lies for the safety of people held captive.

But beyond that, I do not believe we can, or should, pretend complacency about the lives involved. For such a choice would trade a principle—and a sacred one—for a tactic.

This can be an excruciating issue. Our values make it harder to operate in situations where others are not so constrained, where the adversary is often cruel and inhumane.

But our values also define us. For our own sake, and also to foster the kind of understanding we want among the people of the world, I think we want to keep and protect our unique definition.

There are compensations as well as costs to a foreign policy built on ideals. In Southwest Asia, the world had been presented a striking contrast between our approach and that of the Soviet Union, whose forces continue still to spill the blood of nationalists in Afghanistan. While we have been restrained, the Soviets have inflicted their bloody preference in dictators on a nonaligned neighbor. Where we have abided by the rule of law, the Soviets have attempted to impose the rule of raw power on a weaker state.

That message has not been lost on other countries and peoples. The Soviet star in the Third World plummeted in the months following the invasion, and ours, correspondingly, has risen. Again, the message for us in this surely is not that we should copy the tactics and standards of our rivals, but that we should spotlight and celebrate the difference. From such a comparison, we can only emerge the stronger and more respected.

Using the sharpened vision of hindsight—and the cooling influence of time—I offer these few thoughts as a tentative assessment of the hostage crisis. What is their sum?

The crisis gave us the chance to grow wiser in our dealings with the developing world.

It underscored for us the importance of steady diplomacy in pursuit of our interests, in contrast to the impetuous resort to force where its use would damage our interests.

It drew our attention to the great contributions, and the legitimate needs, of our diplomatic service.

It brought back to us a tangible return from the international community we have supported.

And in more ways than one, for us and others, the hostage crisis displayed and tested American ideals—and they were found worthy.

As I have reflected on that last night in Algiers, remembering the relief and exhilaration as the hostages came down the ramp alive and remarkably healthy, I have been reinforced in the conviction that the long, difficult, and often frustrating course we followed was the right course for America.

Now I hope we will examine that experience, honestly and carefully, neither to claim credit nor to cast blame. For it holds lessons that will make our society stronger and our foreign policy more successful.

That is the right course for America, too. And there could be no better tribute to those who suffered long months of torment in the service of their country than to learn the lessons of Iran.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday during two votes on the Public Broadcasting Act amendments, H.R. 3238. On rollcall No. 101, the amendment offered by Mr. BLILEY of Virginia, I would have voted "nay." On rollcall No. 102, final passage of the bill, I would have voted "aye."●

SILVER RATES A HOLD—THE UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT SELL AN OUNCE FROM THE STOCKPILE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if present plans hold, the United States must sell most if not all the silver it presently has in our national stockpile. The silver will be sold in the name of budget reconciliation, directly contrary to Public Law 96-41, the Strategic and Critical Material Stockpiling Revision Act of 1979, which states:

The purpose of the stockpile is to serve the interest of national defense only and is not to be used for economic or budgetary purposes.

We are not only moving to violate the law of the land, but we are going against the decision of the responsible subcommittee—Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, which voted unanimously not to sell silver prior to this action.

Barron's Financial Weekly in its June 22, 1981, issue ran an excellent editorial on this subject. I strongly commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

SILVER RATES A HOLD—THE UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT SELL AN OUNCE FROM THE STOCKPILE

Long before the Hunt brothers surfaced, silver, so a top executive of the American Smelting & Refining Co. (now Asarco) once observed, perennially suffered from a bad press. During the heyday of William Jennings Bryan, it became not only the standard of bimetallism but also the symbol of demagoguery and currency debasement. Several decades later, the spiritual heirs of the Populist movement further tarnished its lustre by making it the object of an unabashed, and oft-criticized, subsidy to Western mining interests. Since January 1980, when the precious metal confounded foe and friend alike by soaring to nearly $50 an ounce, silver, of course, has come down to earth with a crash. Early this month, it briefly broke below $10 an ounce, at which point it was off a shocking 75 percent from the peak. The Hunts have plunged heavily into hock, and sterling silver flatware, once worth a king's ransom, is going begging.

Lately, however, silver also has had its share of ups as well as downs. In particular, after more than a year of investigation, an official inquiry into the Hunt fiasco, including representatives of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Federal Reserve Board, SEC and Treasury, has pointed the finger of blame at no one. Instead of trying to engineer a squeeze on the shorts, let alone to corner the market, as had been widely rumored, the Hunts and their associates, so the study found, time and again did the opposite. By the same token, the powers-that-be at the Commodity Exchange and Chicago Board of Trade, under attack for taking steps that seemed designed to further private financial interests rather than the public weal, also received relatively high grades. True, such findings by no means constitute the last word: both CFTC and SEC continue to pursue probes of their own, and charges may still be brought. Nonetheless, for the present at least, the Hunts et al. stand accused of nothing worse than seeking, perhaps over-zealously, to protect their fortunes against the ravages of inflation. Miscalculation, but no crime.

Even on that score, the outlook strikes those in the trade as no longer wholly bleak. Since hitting the low a few weeks ago, silver has failed to show further weakness. Moreover, at least one astute observer, Charles Stahl of *Green's Commodity Market Comments,* has turned unabashedly bullish. True, unlike its glittering record in gold, where for more than a year it succeeded in calling all the turns, *Greens'* has been prematurely positive on silver: for some weeks its readers have been long on the metal, at an average price of $11.49, somewhat above the current market. Nonetheless, it makes a plausible case for the upside, including the steady climb in consumption during the past 81 months, the likelihood that millions of silver coins will be turned out next year to commemorate the 1984 Olympic Games, and the plans of Sunshine Mining Co. to mint one-ounce silver medallions known as "sunshines." Weighing the prospects, *Green's* last week flatly advised its followers: "On June 5, spot silver on Comex closed at . . . $9,8950. In our opinion, that will be the low for the year. . . ."

That's what makes markets. As to the politics of silver, an element that assays as high today as a century ago, we hold stronger views. The issue currently before Congress is whether or not to dispose of 139.5 million ounces of the metal, the total board now held in the U.S. stockpile. On June 4, the Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, by unanimous vote, rejected the proposed sale. A week later, the full Committee approved it. Further hearings were held by the Senate last week.

What will finally emerge from the legislative mill remains to be seen, but a few points are clear. The purported aim of the transaction is to help finance the purchase of other raw materials deemed more strategic, a goal which seems laudable enough. Yet over the years, bureaucracy repeatedly has changed its views on this critical issue, a perennial uncertainty that has tended to result in a series of badly timed purchases and sales. In silver—where the Treasury in the Sixties liquidated millions of ounces at bargain-basement prices—official judgment and timing have proven notoriously bad. In mid-1981, at around $10 an ounce, silver may or may not be a buy, but it's surely not a sale.

By the same token, whatever the future may hold in store price-wise can scarcely begin to rival the incredible past. As the CFTC report to Congress points out, silver took six years, or from 1973 to early 1979, to go from $3 an ounce to $6. It proceeded to triple by August 1979, sextuple by November. Then, triggered by such powerful forces as the revolution in Iran, the seizure of the Grand Mosque in Saudi Arabia and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, quotations exploded, topping $30 by year-end and surging in mid-January 1980 to a peak settlement price (on the CBOT and Comex) of $48.70.

Thereupon, the market abruptly reversed, falling more than 30 percent in the following week and continuing to plunge until the end of March, when the metal changed hands at $10.80 an ounce, barely 25 percent of the peak price. The Hunts missed a $100 million-plus margin call, and for a day or so, the financial community stood poised on the brink of disaster. Today, of course, all that seems like ancient history. Bache & Co. (which sent out the margin call and looked to be in deep trouble at the time) has seen its shares recover from a low of $7⅜ to the $32 recently offered by Prudential Insurance Co. The stock market has staged a robust advance across-the-board. Apart from the Hunts, who dropped billions of dollars and wound up in hock, silver rates was the major casualty of the whole affair.

Here, too, recovery may be shaping up. Back in January, in the pages of *Barron's,* Dennis A. Suskind and Irwin Shishko, vice presidents of J. Aron & Co. Inc., dealers in precious metals, took a hard look at the long-range prospects. According to their statistical work, throughout 1979, production persistently fell short of industrial demand at $7-$9 an ounce. "If silver ever drops below $10 again," the two concluded, "[it] is likely to shift back to chronic shortage." *Green's Commodity Market Comments* as noted, has turned short-term bullish. Observing that the Bureau of Mines recently revised upward its estimate of 1980 domestic consumption, from 117.7 million ounces to 125.2 million, the firm went on to say that in the first quarter of 1981, usage stood at the highest level in 18 months. "It is our expectation," it added, "that consumption of silver this year will be 10-15 percent higher than in 1980, and that in 1982, consumption will increase drastically because of the proposed Olympic coins, the minting of which should start by the end of this year or beginning of next. . . . We expect a sustained move which should carry the price of silver to the $16 level within a reasonable time."

Such a rise, of course, would undoubtedly delight the Hunts, who still hold a minimum of 63 million ounces. Win or lose, however, they should be pleased with what the CFTC report had to say about their controversial dealings. By taking delivery of the physical metal, the buyers probably accelerated the upswing in prices. However, add the investigators: "From a surveillance perspective, the actions of the Hunts and other major long position holders were in several respects inconsistent with conduct normally attributable to a market squeeze on a maturing futures contract." Specifically, "the largest position concentrations were in deferred rather than nearby delivery months. Also, the major buyers—the Hunts and several foreign interests—appeared to want to acquire physical silver bullion. To this end, [they] were willing to accept non-certificated silver in other locations and forms, rather than insist that the shorts fully meet their contractual obligations to make delivery in accordance with the terms of the futures market. They also exchanged warehouse receipts covering deliverable silver for silver located outside the U.S. In addition, the CFTC and the exchanges had also received assurances that, consistent with their historical trading practices, the Hunts and other major longs would liquidate or roll forward at least part of their positions in the maturing futures contracts." So far, so good.

As to the proposed liquidation of the stockpiled silver, Barron's takes a dim view. For one thing, as Simon D. Strauss (formerly vice chairman of Asarco and now a consultant to the company) told the Senate Armed Services Committee on Friday, over the years stockpile targets have gyrated wildly. Thus, from 3½ million tons early on, the goal for copper was whittled in stages to zero, before restored to one million tons. Aluminum, nickel, lead and zinc have shown comparable swings. As to cobalt, most of it was sold at $2-$4 per pound, compared to a current quotation of $20. The same, of course, holds true of silver, which the U.S. Treasury, with its customary sagacity in this realm, largely disposed of in the Fifties and Sixties, at prices ranging from 91 cents per pound to $1.29. To judge by the record, in short, official judgment on whether or when to buy and sell inspires scant confidence. Let's rate silver a hold.●

COMMENDING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND PARAMEDICS

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 13, a grave tragedy fell upon the community of Lancaster, Pa., in my district. A young boy, 8-year-old Benjamin Walker, crawled into and became trapped in an abandoned septic tank in his front yard.

Responding to what was thought to be a routine call—a boy trapped in a sewer; no serious injuries—paramedics from St. Joseph Hospital in Lancaster and volunteer firefighters from the Bausman Fire Co. were immediately dispatched to the scene. "Jamie," as he is fondly addressed by his family, was rescued through the heroic efforts of these rescue squads. But in their attempts to retrieve the boy from the 8-foot hole, three brave, selfless, young men lost their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to these self-sacrificing men, 24-year-old Bruce Ditlow of Lancaster, 22-year-old Kevin Weatherlow of Willow Street, and 18-year-old Jeffrey Jones of Lancaster.

Bruce Ditlow and Kevin Weatherlow were best friends as well as partners on the St. Joseph Hospital rescue squad. They attended Penn Manor High School together. They trained to become paramedics together. Bruce served as best man at Kevin's wedding.

When Bruce descended into the hole, to bring Jamie Walker to safety, neither he nor anyone else at the scene knew that the pit was completely absent of oxygen. Bruce was immediately overcome by what was thought to be highly combustible methane gas, but was later determined to be a deadly concentration of carbon dioxide. Kevin, recognizing that his friend was in trouble, equipped himself with breathing apparatus and life lines and entered the small opening. Finding Bruce unconscious, Kevin removed his oxygen mask to revive his friend; and he too was felled by the gases, but not before he had tied a lifeline around Jamie, who was then pulled to safety.

A third volunteer, fireman Jeff Jones crawled into the tank opening in an effort to rescue the two paramedics. The three were pulled out after firemen, police, and volunteers smashed through a foot-thick-wall of the tank with sledgehammers. Each man was pronounced dead from cardiac arrest, due to a lack of oxygen.

This kind of heart-rending tragedy could have occurred anywhere in this country, at any time. But only when this kind of routine call does turn into such a devastating calamity are we reminded of the courage and dedication of these men and women who face danger and life threatening situations daily in the performance of their jobs.

We need not look further than our own communities to find heroes. They are the men and women who commit themselves to learning lifesaving and firefighting techniques, who volunteer to train others and who fearlessly risk their lives attempting to save the lives of others.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that volunteer firefighters, paramedics, and rescue team members be commended for their service. I hope that each of us will reflect upon the dangerous duties performed by these men and women in communities throughout this great nation and will approve this resolution.●

FLOOR STATEMENT ON SBA PHYSICAL DISASTER LOANS

HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year much of the Midwest suffered recordbreaking temperatures and drought. In midwestern cities, people died of the heat. In the rural areas, folks were more fortunate, but agriculture was devastated as crops literally burned up in the fields. Corn and soybean yields were cut to fractions of normal harvest.

Appropriately, the Federal Government provided relief to those in our cities suffering from the heat wave. The Government was committed to this effort and carried out its obligation to city dwellers. But the Federal Government did not meet all of last summer's crises so well. In fact, the Government shirked its duties in one vital area. I speak of the Small Business Administration's physical disaster loans. Let me explain what occurred:

Until mid-March of this year, SBA was making loans to farmers who lost crops and livestock to the drought and intense heat. But, it is apparent now that while SBA was telling rural bankers it had money for this program, it also was deciding to stop making any more loans. The devastation created a large demand, but SBA was not prepared for it. Farmers were making decisions based on information received in good faith from their friend, the local banker, who obviously had not conjured up this loan program. Bankers in my district had not imagined such a loan program. SBA was telling them about the program.

The fact is SBA decided without warning not to meet the financial needs of farmers who were hurt by the disastrous weather. First, SBA said that demand was too great, so the loans should not be fully funded; then, SBA said these farmers did not really need the assistance and could get their credit needs met elsewhere.

But, in the meantime, some farmers in no greater need than those denied loans were loaned money under this program. This is an incredible state of affairs in which some receive a government benefit and others do not based on a set of rules and regulations that contradict definition. The application procedure and deadline were clearly set forth and then suddenly they were different.

I certainly support the President's economic recovery program, and I have advocated and worked for it. But I must condemn SBA's action. We must meet our commitments. We must carry out our obligations. If we do not, we undermine faith in our Government, and through arbitrary decisions like these, in the middle of the game we sort out winners and losers. Let us finish the game; then change the rules.

American agriculture, the prime mover in our economy, has suffered because of this. I am outraged, as many of the farmers and bankers in my district are outraged, at this situation. Many, indeed most, of these producers will continue providing food for us and the world, but an irreversible breach of faith has been committed. Farmers in my district now feel the Government's rules and regulations can be changed at any moment to satisfy the whims of policymakers. This kind of action is not good government any longer. It supersedes the Congress and through such opinions written by the Attorney General of this Nation regarding this situation intentionally seeks to supervene the Constitution.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

HON. GLENN ENGLISH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, June 10, marked the 75th anniversary of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. This law, enacted in 1906, instituted a system of Federal inspection that assures consumers the meat products produced in this country come from healthy animals prepared under sanitary conditions. This legislation marked the beginning of an era in which the U.S. Government and the meat industry would work cooperatively to provide safe, wholesome, and properly labeled meat products.

I would like to enter in the RECORD a speech presented at the U.S. Department of Agriculture's 75th anniversary celebration for the Federal Meat Inspection Act by Mr. Hugo Slotkin, chairman of the board, John Morrell & Co., Chicago, Ill.

REMARKS BY HUGO SLOTKIN OF JOHN MORRELL & CO.

Mr. Secretary, Congressman Foley, distinguished speakers, ladies and gentlemen.

It is an honor for me to represent the American meat industry on this historic occasion. Since 1906, the Department of Agriculture and the American meat industry have been engaged in one of the most effective partnerships ever put together between Government and the private sector—the American system of meat inspection.

While the regulatory system has hundreds of requirements, rules and regulations, it depends fundamentally on each party having a mutual respect for the obligations of the other. While we have had some disagreements over the years, the industry and the Government have made the system work.

Today we celebrate 75 years of a joint venture between the meat industry and the Federal Inspection Service in working together to make the American meat supply the most wholesome in the world. They say the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Well, Americans last year consumed $65 billion worth of red meat products—all that was produced. How well the industry has performed is made clear when we recognize that 85 percent of the audited plants were graded good to excellent and that less than ½ of 1 percent of 37 billion pounds of federally inspected meat produced was subject to any regulatory action. We can readily conclude that industry and Government have made a sometimes cumbersome and sometimes onerous system work for the public good.

When the meat industry and the meat inspection services began this long association back in 1906, the American consumer went to the corner grocery and chose from a very limited selection of fresh meat cuts and a few sausages. Today, through 75 years of research and innovation, the meat industry provides the modern American supermarket with over 1,000 different types of processed meat products, each neatly packaged and attractively displayed in a refrigerated showcase.

The consumer of 1906 would be amazed at our 1981 variety, and he or she might be even more amazed to know that every one of those products was prepared under Government inspection and that diseases prevelent in 1906 are virtually unknown today.

We have met the challenges together, but today, when the consumer demands even greater variety and quality, and with control of the Federal budget presenting us with even greater challenges, our ingenuity and our management ability will be put to a new test.

We in the industry are anxious to work with the Department in exploring new methods and new ways to accomplish our work more efficiently, more effectively, while, at the same time, assuring the consumer of high standards of wholesomeness, we recognize that we are entering a period of change in the way our industry will be regulated. We stand ready to act as a constructive partner with the Department in bringing about these changes. The environment today—one of teamwork rather than as adversaries—will help insure that both the needs of Government and industry can be met while meeting our responsibility to the public interest.

For 75 years our joint efforts have assured the American public of the safest food supply on the face of the earth. Let us today renew our determination to continue to pursue our mutual goal of a wholesome meat supply in a spirit of partnership and cooperation.●

CONGRESS SHOULD IMPROVE ECONOMIC CLIMATE FOR HEAVY OIL PRODUCTION

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation that will aid our Nation's efforts to reduce our reliance upon costly and politically unreliable foreign oil. My legislation, H.R. 3912 and H.R. 3913, would expand the definition of heavy oil under the windfall profit tax, and it would exempt heavy oil from the windfall profit tax.

Perhaps the greatest promise in the immediate future for cutting down on imported oil lies in producing more of our own oil. Much of that new U.S. oil production will be so-called heavy oil. Heavy oil is present in untold billions of barrels in estimated reserves in California, but it is extremely difficult and expensive to produce. Heavy oil can mean anything from molasses-like crude to solid tar, and getting it out of the ground and into pipelines requires expensive heating techniques, including costly pollution controls on steam generators used to produce the heat.

Heavy oil costs a great deal to produce, yet it commands a much lower price than lighter crude. When the costs are coupled with the added burden of the windfall profit tax, the incentive to produce this oil is further dampened.

Current domestic heavy oil production recovered by thermal techniques is about 300,000 barrels per day. It has been estimated by the Congressional Budget Office and the National Petroleum Council that heavy oil production should at least double by 1990 if it were not burdened by the windfall profit tax. Loss of tax revenues from the exemption of heavy oil would total only $3.3 billion over the decade from 1981-1990, yet the value of lifting the windfall profit tax from producers of heavy oil would be far greater for our national energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to achieve self-reliance in energy production, it clearly makes little sense to tax away the incentive for that production. Our Nation's energy producers have shown ingenuity and perseverance in developing new ways to recover oil in difficult-to-exploit reservoirs. Congress should help improve the economic climate for heavy oil production, because heavy oil will play an increasingly important role in solving our oil supply problems.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 3912 and H.R. 3913, and I also urge early action by the Congress in this important energy concern.●

WALTER EICHINGER: A MAN DEDICATED TO EQUALITY

HON. ROBERT W. DAVIS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following statement by one of my constituents, Mr. Walter Eichinger of Ontonagon, Mich., concerning his view on the administration of the medicare program.

Anyone having a business today has a responsibility to themselves and also the employee. In the event the employee does not perform efficiently and effectively, it becomes the responsibility of the employer to replace the negligent individual.

We Senior Citizens, and those of you who will be someday, plus all of you involved in the big Medical spectrum, are, indeed, a very potent group. All we need do is collectively recognize it by team play, dedication and sticking together. We will be able to send a message to our employees, the Politicians and the bureaucrats he employs, with teeth in it.

We, the aging group, are still capable in solving our own problems and do not need a host of outsiders telling us what they think is right for us. We know what is right . . . and also what is wrong and we believe we know of those intending to do wrong.

Medicare should not be entered into the Political Arena because this has been where it has laid dormant for years. Nothing . . . absolutely nothing has been done to help solve the problems of the Medicare "Monster" until the introduction of the Michigan White House Conference on Aging Resolution at Dearborn, Michigan, April 29 and 30, 1981.

If the Congressman would be generous enough to admit in his press releases his willingness to get behind the White House Conference on Aging "wagon of equality", it would relieve a great deal of indecision.

We cannot settle for less than what the resolution states and here is why:

People who have not reached the age of retirement or who are not in the field of geriatrics cannot provide themselves enough time away from their way of life to help research the results of the study being conducted, nor do they realize the impact the problems that Medicare has caused the participating recipient as well as the entire medical field. Most people are just too busy earning a living to make these necessary studies. Here is one important observation: irrespective of who it may be, nobody has presented anything effective toward solving the problems of Medicare, the recipient, the doctors, hospitals and others in the field, prior to the action enforced by the Michigan White House Conference on Aging.

Any attempt now to change the package the White House Conference is submitting will be ineffective, complicated, bureaucratically controlled and very costly. The Medicare program was designed to take care of the sick, the elderly, and those unable to provide for themselves; certainly, not to create jobs for the ones involved in paper shuffling, the talented, and those having sufficient ability or resources to provide for themselves.

The White House Conference on Aging should stress this: Anyone challenging the intent of the Resolution is most likely being paid in salary or supported in some way by tax dollars and by doing so delays making Medicare work for what it was originally designed to do.

Here is the Resolution: We respectfully request action either administratively or legislatively to determine the proper, equal and reasonable charges used by Medicare in the State of Michigan. We believe that the "approved amount" should be equal statewide as is the premium and that the geographical locality should not determine the quality of medical expertise rendered nor should it regulate the changeable values of professional diagnosis and treatment.

Remember that five of the National Delegates, those going to Washington in November and December signed the petition for presentation of the Resolution and that more that 20 required signers willfully signed . . . most importantly, the 480-member general assembly passed it without one opposing vote. That is quite a record. This is no time to make changes.

Medicare must be equalized straight across the board, totally, without reservation; here is why:

(1) If Medicare is equal, all printed forms could be uniform; all claims be standardized; no need to have the human element of greed enter into the dilemma nor have anyone make an adjusted decision based on geographical qualifications.

(2) With time, bureaucratic graft, bureaucratic decision-making would be cut, hopefully eliminated; and now comes a new light in making Medicare work . . . the American tradition of an award for making it work.

(3) Give Medicare a chance to cut billions of dollars of waste and mishandling and add to the beneficiary a renewed confidence as well as the provisions to provide the services intended. This will automatically permit a higher level of professionalism to each medical facility, to each person holding the highest academic degree awarded to any practice, and it will give the confused medical field the opportunity to seek its own level. This is the history of our great nation . . . it isn't new. Let's go back and do it right.

(4) The same Medicare premium deserves the same privileges, status or rights.

(5) Privileged areas, and the Resolutions states, "changeable values" tends to produce a bleeding of medical expertise, one locale to another affecting the medical facilities and the desire for some doctors to move to areas where "approved amounts" are more liberal; also a sequel effect, a chain reaction, a linkage effect involving suppliers, transportation, energy, motel-hotels, restaurants, garages, gift shops . . . others.

(6) The "approved amount" is the standard for whatever the charge may be. The supplemental insurance, Medigap Insurance, carried as a separate policy, in most cases, yields the sum based on the "approved amount"; the geographical difference, at times, amounts to a considerable sum.

(7) We would be derelict of our obligation and guilty of abandonment to those who trusted us; the White House Conference on Aging cannot change its course; if given the facts, the people will understand that the Washington White House Conference on Aging is the most effective group to assure fulfillment of the needs of the aging and restore the dignity and security of Medicare.●

A TRIBUTE TO LILLIAN KATZ

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to one of my constituents, Lillian Katz, founder and president of the Lillian Vernon Corp. of Mount Vernon, N.Y. Lillian Vernon is celebrating its 30th anniversary this year.

Lillian Katz was born in Leipzig, Germany. She lived in Holland for 4 years and emigrated to the United States in 1937 to escape from the impending Nazi invasion. She began her business in 1951 with $2,000. Today, her company is a major employer in my district.

Lillian Katz has long been active in her community. Her company has donated a room to Mount Vernon Hospital and sponsored programs for the benefit of various local and national charities.

I am pleased to add my voice to those commending Lillian Katz on the 30th anniversary of her company's operation in Westchester.●

CANADIAN ATTEMPT TO TAKE OVER CONOCO OIL CO.

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I have in recent months expressed my concern about a deterioration in the reciprocity between Canada and the United States in the energy investment field. Yesterday I expressed my concern about the most recent Canadian attempt to take over Conoco Oil Co. Last week I placed the State Department's response to my concerns in the RECORD. Today I am placing in the RECORD the response from the Department of the Interior:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1981.

Hon. MANUEL LUJAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LUJAN: Please excuse the lateness of this reply to your letter of March 30, 1981, in which you state your concerns of foreign takeovers of U.S. mineral resource companies in the wider and longer view of impacts on adequate and secure mineral supplies for the U.S. Specifically, you suggested that the Department of the Interior undertake a review under the reciprocity provision of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 to determine what impacts foreign acquisitions have on domestic mineral capacity.

You are aware that the $2.03 billion tender offer for St. Joe Minerals Corporation by the Canadian firm, Seagram Company, was never consummated. The American-owned Fluor Corporation has been reported to have offered St. Joe a $2.9 billion package to acquire 45 percent of St. Joe's common stock at $60 per share and the remaining shares through a stock exchange.

The Secretary of the Interior has the responsibility under the "similar or like privileges" provision of the 1920 Act to review foreign citizen ownership of U.S. firms applying for leases under that Act. Understandably, management of the leasing program in compliance with that provision has sometimes created problems. A publicly traded U.S. corporation with a large amount of outstanding shares may be unaware of certain stock ownership that can change daily in the market especially when small blocks of stock are involved. Because of the almost impossible task of ascertaining the nationality of foreign citizens holding minor ownership in U.S. companies, the Department of the Interior as a matter of policy does not inquire into the nationality of those holding less than 10 percent of such stock. In no event, however, is foreign ownership in U.S. companies allowed to exceed the limiting percentage for foreign ownership prescribed in the laws of reciprocal countries.

As you also are aware, there has been increasing concern in the Congress over the last half of the 1970s about the obviously increasing rate of foreign investments in the U.S. and their potential implications. This concern has resulted in a series of laws that require more complete disclosures of foreign investments and improved Federal monitoring. The policy of the U.S. has been generally one of noninterference in the flow of capital across international borders except where the national security or sensitive sectors of the economy may be compromised. Likewise, our international commodity policy is based on the principle that government intervention in markets should be minimal. Nevertheless, the GAO in its latest report, "Foreign Direct Investment in the United States—the Federal Role," stressed the need for improving the analyses of impacts of such investments.

Most would agree that the international setting that affects the flow of minerals is becoming more intense and complex. For instance, the governments of Australia and Canada, countries that provide major shares of U.S. mineral imports, have moved toward more intervention in their resource producing sectors, particularly with respect to foreign interests. While there has not been a major shift away from the open-door investment policies of these two countries, any shift of consequence could have a major impact on U.S. investments there. It is therefore important, we believe, that the U.S. not take actions that would increase the uneasiness on the part of foreign governments toward their inward investments.

This is not meant to infer that a study should not be done. The very evident concern of Congress would indicate the opposite. However, a study by the Department of the Interior of the impacts of foreign acquisitions on U.S. mineral productive capacity—more particularly as it might affect the economy and national security—would need to be far more encompassing than a study of just those companies that have foreign ownership involved in lease rights under the 1920 Act. As you know, the minerals that are of concern to the national security are primarily certain hard rock minerals, which in the case of public lands come under the mining laws rather than the mineral leasing laws. Moreover, the interrelationship of ownership to mineral production and supply extends beyond our borders. The fact that the U.S. has become increasingly attractive to foreign investors needs also to be reconciled from the perspective that the U.S. remains the largest investor in foreign minerals and that this has been possible under international rules that support free and open trade and investment.

We know and appreciate your interest in this aspect of mineral policy. We intend to keep you informed as we look further into this problem.

Sincerely,

DONALD PAUL HODEL,
Under Secretary.

Enclosure.

MINERAL LEASING ACT OF 1920—RECIPROCAL COUNTRIES

The following countries are considered as being reciprocal within the meaning of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) as amended.

Anguilla, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bermuda, Brazil, Canada, Cayman Islands, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Formosa (Taiwan), France, Great Britain, Greece, Hong Kong, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg.

Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Malaysia, Mexico, Netherlands, Netherlands Antilles, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Singapore, Sweden (limited 20 percent), Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela, Spain, South Africa, Philippines (40 percent), and British Virgin Islands.●

STATEMENT BY HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR., ON PRESIDENTIAL PROTECTION COMMISSION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, ever since President John Quincy Adams chose to ignore the threat on his life by a court-martialed Army sergeant, American Presidents have shown little interest in taking precautions to insure their physical safety. But the history of our Nation—especially our recent history—demonstrates a compelling need to reassess the steps we take to protect our Presidents.

In the 205 years of our Nation's existence, there have been 13 attempts to assassinate our Chief Executives. Six of these assaults have come in the last two decades. In fact, four of our last eight Presidents have been targets of attempted assassinations. So, when President Reagan was wounded by a would-be assassin on March 30, it seemed more like the continuation of a terrible trend than an unthinkable event.

Too often we have heard the comment, "If someone really wants to get to the President, there is nothing anyone can do to prevent it." This notion accepts the unacceptable. I think we can do better.

That is why I am introducing a bill to authorize a Presidential Protection Commission to make recommendations on ways that we, as a nation, can better protect our Chief Executive.

It is true that the general level of violence in America has been increasing over the last 20 years. But there is more behind the assaults on our Presidents than this general phenomenon. There are special conditions, such as greater length of Presidential campaigns and more extensive travel, that make a President or Presidential candidate in the 1980's more vulnerable than his predecessors.

Despite these factors, and a growing public concern for the safety of the President, there has not been a formal study of Presidential protection since 1963 when President Johnson initiated Project Star in the aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination.

The Presidential Protection Commission proposed by this legislation has one basic objective—to recommend ways to better protect the President from physical harm. To do this, the Commission will take a close look at the adequacy of Secret Service procedures; the statutory authority given to our protection agencies; the character of political campaigning; and other types of public activity by the President.

The Commission will have former Presidents Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford as its cochairmen. Both these men faced long campaigns and hundreds of public appearances as our Nation's Chief Executive. President Ford was the target of two would-be assassins in 1975. I expect both Presidents Carter and Ford to offer valuable insights and opinions on reducing the risks of assaults during Presidential appearances, and on general policies that will better protect our present and future Presidents.●

WELCOME TO OUR NEWLY NATURALIZED AMERICANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I congratulate the 57 Orange County residents of New York's 26th Congressional District who have recently chosen to become citizens of the United States, with all of the privileges, freedoms, and responsibilities that American citizenship entails.

Our Hudson Valley region in New York State is proud of its newest citizens and I invite my colleagues to join me in welcoming the following newly naturalized Americans and extending to them our best wishes for a happy and prosperous life in their new homeland:

NEW CITIZENS

Lambros Adamis, Alberta Barren, Anne Bradford Bell, Bernard Bercu, Rosario Bologna, Hector Britos, Elisa Britos, Angella Burton, Blanca R. Caballero, Armando Caballero, Enore Campana, Gloria Campana, Maria C. R. Catizone, Joanna Choo, Kathleen Clark, Luigi Costagliola, Florencia Enriquez, Rebecca Farrell, Rachael Garland, Sotirios Giagiakos, Patrick Gilligan, Isaak Gluck, Rodrigo Miguel Hernandez, Huon Huynh, Abraham Kaufman, Eileen Killeen, Corazon Laput, Juliana Last, and Sheila McIntyre.

Regina Mendlovits, Jennifer Ann Molesworth, Jesus Navarro, Phuong-Lan Nguyen, Khang Nguyen, Maria Nunez, Irmgard G. Papagianakis, Sapna Parikh, Melinda Rutkowsky, Marco Sachez, Sergiu Schapira, Erna Schepers, Maria Scumaci, Shu May Sein, Zbigniew Serkowski, Chung K. Shum, Pik Ying Shum, Catherine Simpson, Ines Acurantes Sison, Sarah Spilman, Aizik Spilman, Juda Steinmetz, Palmerino Svizzero, Blanca Valdebenito, Marina Vargas, Teresa Vasquez, Estela Veloso, Norma May Wilson.●

THE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATORY COST ESTIMATES ACT

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues Mr. LUNDINE and Mr. ZEFERETTI to introduce the State and Local Government Regulatory Cost Estimates Act. This legislation would require Federal agencies to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking listing estimates of the costs that new rules and regulations will pass on to State and local governments.

The conditions necessitating this legislation were intensified by recent efforts to cut back and eliminate many Federal programs, consequently placing the burden on State and local governments to carry out these programs. The Federal Government has the responsibility to recognize the consequences that a minor change in regulations can have on State and local revenues and spending. This legislation would direct agencies of the U.S. Government to give State and local governments notice of any plans to enact rules and regulations which would impact State and local governments who devote many man-hours to meet federally imposed requirements.

For instance, in my own district, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act will cost San Jose $100,000 in unanticipated costs in fiscal year 1981 to meet the regulations requiring access for the handicapped to public buildings. I strongly support section 504 and am not objecting to this requirement, but the point I wish to make is that the city had not planned or budgeted for this contingency. Under this legislation, State and local governments will have some indication in advance of proposed regulations and can plan for them.

This legislation closely corresponds to the State and Local Government Cost Estimate Act—H.R. 1465—which Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. ZEFERETTI, and I introduced a few months ago. The State and Local Government Cost Estimates Act would require the Congressional Budget Office—CBO—to estimate the costs incurred by State and local governments in carrying out every significant bill or resolution reported in the House or Senate. Under current law, CBO prepares estimates of the costs to the Federal Government only.

As communities try to cope with inflation, growing demands for services, and dwindling revenue sources, we at the Federal level must be much more cognizant of the intergovernmental ramifications of our legislation and of Federal agencies' rules and regulations. Enactment of the State and Local Government Cost Estimates Act and the State and Local Government Regulatory Cost Estimates Act would better equip State and local governments for their fiscal decisionmaking. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support these bills.●

GREGORY FACILITY MUCH NEEDED

HON. CLINT ROBERTS

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. ROBERTS of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to authorize construction of a pumped storage hydropower facility to be located adjacent to Lake Francis Case in Gregory County, S. Dak.

The Gregory facility would have a peak capacity of 1,180 megawatts. This peakload capacity cannot be efficiently met by conventional power sources. Coal-fired plants and nuclear facilities operate on constant rates and fail to meet extreme peakload needs. The future needs of the Midwest and West in energy consumption will need to be met.

Public support in South Dakota for this facility is high, with the anticipation that concurrent facilities can be based off the pumped storage such as dependable water supplies for rural, municipal, and industrial use.

A pumped storage plant acts much the same way a giant storage battery would—that is, energy generated by other sources during periods of low demand can be stored for later use. Pumped storage hydropower is dependent on other powerplants for its energy source, but is approximately 70-percent efficient as a peak energy source.

The Western Area Power Administration estimates that peak demands will increase from 19,300 megawatts in 1979 to approximately 50,000 megawatts by the year 2000. Significant growth in energy and peak demands will occur in the next 20 years and now is the time to prepare for these needs.

At this time, pumped storage is the only known method of storing large amounts of energy. It is attractive because it can fit easily into the operation of conventional hydro and thermal power resources. By utilizing available offpeak thermal and nuclear energy to pump water into an upper reservoir, cheaper offpeak baseload energy can be converted into more valuable peaking power.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Congress will believe as I do that now is the time to utilize our energy potential for our energy independence.●

THE REMARKABLE TRANSFORMATION IN JAMAICA

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, some recent newspaper reports indicate there may be a slowing down in the administration's commitment to develop a program to help the Caribbean basin. I hope those reports are incorrect. I believe it is vital to present an alternative to the leftist forces in the region and to encourage the development and expansion of the free market forces in that area.

I have urged the administration to support those democratic governments in the Caribbean basin by encouraging those programs that will promote private investment and development. The example of Jamaica is particularly impressive for the turnaround it has achieved during the past year.

The following newspaper report by Georgie Anne Geyer vividly describes the dramatic transformation in Jamaica that has marked the first months of the government of Prime Minister Edward Seaga. I urge my colleagues and the administration to pursue a coordinated program that will advance the cause of development, closer relations, and U.S. interests in the Caribbean region.

REMARKABLE TRANSFORMATION IN JAMAICA

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

Fourteen months ago, Edward Seaga sat in his law office in Kingston and coolly and deliberately related the way the pro-Cuban government of his country was destroying Jamaica and even possibly attempting to assassinate him.

Today the efficient Mr. Seaga, now prime minister, smiles a lot. In barely nine months of his leadership, he not only has turned Jamaica around, away from Cuban-style communism, he has also come forward as the force behind the new Marshall-style plan designed to turn around the entire Caribbean.

Interviewed recently in Washington, the prime minister pleaded that this moment be seized. "Last year the Caribbean basin came through six elections, and all reinforced the moderate side of the electoral spectrum," he said. "The mood exists at present and is an opportunity that ought not to be lost."

OPPORTUNITY KNOCKS

"Now the shift has been made by the people, politically; but the region does not have the wherewithal to lift itself up economically. If we lose this opportunity, we will cause a shift back to the leftist side—the Reagan administration recognizes that and has shown responsibility in taking the lead."

Only a year ago, the then lawyer and opposition leader was a dour and dogged man, his beautiful island torn asunder. The leftist but charismatic government of Prime Minister Michael Manley had, in eight years in power, brought the economy to total bankruptcy.

Violence reigned everywhere. The Cubans were training 1,000 young men to the ideological spearhead of the new order that would spread from there around the Caribbean. Even if Seaga won the election—as he did solidly last autumn—it looked as though it would take years to bring things even remotely back to normal.

But it has not taken years, a lesson that might be useful elsewhere. He points out: violent crimes are down 39 percent over last November; after his first six months in office an annual inflation rate of 25 percent is now down to 1.2 percent; the blackmarket in foodstuffs is virtually destroyed and the independent food market is thriving; foreign investment, which many thought totally dead, is responding remarkably well.

"We have had a fantastic response from foreign investment," he said, looking a little surprised himself. "We set up a special unit to handle it and that is one of the reasons for the flood of investment. They find it easy to operate in Jamaica."

After years of squabbling between the Manley government and the International Monetary Fund over money for the nearly bankrupt island, the Seaga people have settled nicely with the IMF—and done it with a new, supply-side strategy.

The prime minister sees the entire mood as changed. "First there is the wave of confidence in the government," he said. "As a result of that, the country is more stable and people are applying themselves to projects. Before, there was no purpose in doing so because there was no hope."

Even the 1,000 young men who were being trained in Cuba to be the ideological and paramilitary shock troops of the "second Cuba" in the hemisphere have just "melded themselves into society," he said.

"They were supposed to be the forward thrust, the strong hand. They would be rewarded with economic contracts. Since none of that has been forthcoming, they have melted away. But that doesn't mean they don't constitute some kind of potential."

What Seaga's Jamaica has shown so dramatically is that even a rich but bankrupt island, "gone" as far as Jamaica was, can still return, with the right management and leadership. "It is very important that Jamaica be successful, because Jamaica's example is the most dramatic, classic case of the turnaround, an example of what can be done with the market system and popular elections and a strong protection of human rights."

ALTERED LEADERSHIP STYLE

That is why he is now pushing to extend, in effect, the Jamaican experience through a Marshall-type plan for the area. It would require between $1 billion and $3 billion a year from many sources in order to create the public infrastructure on which to build good market economies and democracies.

But what is perhaps most interesting is the way in which leadership styles have also changed. Michael Manley was the epitome of the charismatic, personalistic, macho leader, a type that has taken the attention of so much of the world for so long. He spoke to the guts and to the emotions.

Seaga, on the other hand, represents the cool, managerial leader, the dour doer who speaks to the rational mind. We are leaving the turbulent, violent world of Manley's machismo. The world we are entering is going to need many more of Seaga's type of leader if countries are really to develop and not simply wither away.●

OPERATION YOUTH

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding program—Operation Youth—which recently took place in my district. Operation Youth is a week-long conference during which interested young men and women learn about our system of government.

This year's conference, the 31st edition, was held June 6-13 at Xavier University in Cincinnati, and 95 selected Ohio high school students participated in the program. The agenda included speeches by leaders in government, education, and the media on topics such as "America's World Affairs," "Science, Energy and Society," and "Free Enterprise Economics." Forums were then set up so the students could discuss these topics and other current issues. In addition, the students formed political parties and elected officials to a mock municipal government. I am extremely proud to recognize those who were elected to office as well as those who participated in all other aspects of this valuable program.

They are as follows: Mayor, Stephen J. Cook, Moeller High School; vice mayor, Beth Stallbaumer, Goshen High School; city manager, Greg Schildmeyer, Roger Bacon High School; clerk of council, Jim Barone, Moeller High School; and city council members: Marty Berning, Elder High School; Tom Breitenbach, Moeller High School; Beth A. Donabedian, McNicholas High School; Joe Sabato, Elder High School; Bill Telles, Elder High School; Barry Tiemeier, Elder High School; and Stephanie Young, London High School.

Also participating in the conference were: Jeff Arling, Minster High School; Mark Arnold, Greenhills High School; Daniel R. Baker, Goshen High School; Leon D. Baranovsky, Wyoming High School; Christoper Barton, Cardinal Stritch High School; Gregory G. Bernardo, St. John High School; Michelle Boehl, Lockland High School; Paul D. Brown, Greenville High School; Victoria R. Brown, Shelby Senior High School; Melissa Buschelmann, Reading High School; Mike Callahan, Deer Park High School; Doris Cannon, Hughes High School; Rebecca Cherry, Notre Dame Academy; Lisa Clark, Lima C. Catholic High School; Christopher L. Cloran, Bishop Fenwick High School; Colleen Cullers, Greenville High School; Richard D. Davis, Jr., Northmont High School; Charles Delahunt, Wyoming High School; Steve Dinkins, Newcomerstown High School; Noreen Donovan, Our Lady of Angels High School; Walter Engle, Miami Trace High School; Gail Enright, Mother Seton High School.

Debra Fogle, Shelby Senior High School; Sherry Forste, Deer Park High School; Kathy Funderburg, Greenville High School; Jeannie Gravenkemper, Southeastern High School; Brenda Green, Loveland Hurst High School; Mary T. Green, St. Ursula Academy; Thomas E. Gremling, Lima C. Catholic High School; Karen Grimm, Mother Seton High School; Gabrielle Gundrum, McNicholas High School; Derek Hart, Oak Hills High School; Maureen Hennie, Mother of Mercy High School; Jeffrey Hensley, Loveland Hurst High School; Martha Homan, Marion Local High School; Robert J. Hughes, Elder High School; John Janning, Roger Bacon High School; Kimberly M. Jones, Eaton High School; Stephen E. Kauffman, Findlay High School; Scott Kinnison, Sidney Lehman High School; Jerome E. Klems, Purcell High School; Janet A. Koch, Bishop Fenwick High School; Dough Kremer, Marion Local High School; Andy Kress, Toledo C. Catholic High School; Bill Lehmkuhl, Minster High School; Jennifer Lewis, Bishop Rosecrans High School; Jeff Logsdon, Findlay High School; Lynn Marggrander, Loveland Hurst High School.

Erik Mattes, Madeira High School; Esther Mattick, Taylor High School; LuAnn Mayle, Notre Dame Academy; Forrest G. McClain, Talawanda High School; Melissa McDonald, St. Ursula Academy; Linda McKenzie, McAuley High School; Andrea L. Metz, Mt. Healthy High School; Nancy Minning, Mother Seton High School; Joanie Mooney, New Lexington High School; Annette Morris, Indian Lake High School; Christine Muller, Wyoming

High School; Michael O'Hearn, Todedo C. Catholic High School; Maria T. Ollier, Ursuline Academy; Holly Ann Parnell, Oak Hills High School; Thomas L. Pommering, Loveland Hurst High School; Tricia Powers, McNicholas High School; Betsy Roth, Mother of Mercy High School; Susan E. Schmid, Madeira High School; Gregory J. Sertell, Arlington High School; Terry Siebel, Norwood High School.

Kelly Lyn Smith, Western Hills High School; Stephen S. Smith, Mason High School; Steven Sokoloski, Columbus DeSales High School; Ronald J. Steinbrunner, Coldwater High School; Cindy Sullivan, New Lexington High School; Tim Taylor, Moeller High School; Cheryl L. Thielmeyer, Princeton High School; Richard C. Vandewalle, Taylor High School; Michael D. Watson, St. Bernard High School; Dawn M. Wilbers, Western Hills High School; Wayne C. Wilkey, Oak Hills High School; Marie Wurzelbacher, McAuley High School; Donald P. Zimmerman, Norwood High School; Douglas Zink, Turpin High School; Mary A. Zocolo, Salem Senior High School; Sharon K. Cannedy, Aiken Sr. High School.

I would especially like to honor William E. Smith, director of Operation Youth and Professor of Accounting and Finance at Xavier University. His dedication in insuring the success of this program has been unsurpassed. His efforts, as well as those of his staff: Tom, Gardner, Maureen Murphy, Rev. Lee J. Bennish, Kevin M. Bien, Lisa Bruemmer, Bill Maly, Glen Napolitano, Jean C. Bolen, Dan Eddingfield, Pam Ehrman, Karen Fahlbusch, Karen Schilling, and Rob Semmel, enabled 95 young citizens to gain new insight into the workings of democracy.●

CRIME

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, crime has become a nationwide problem. It affects the cities, towns and, increasingly, the rural areas of our country. The rising rate of crime robs Americans of their security and freedom. That is why we must give crime prevention the same priority we have given national defense, for indeed, national security has domestic dimensions as well as international ones.

The city of Cleveland—which includes the 20th District of Ohio which I represent—has not been spared the blight of crime. The experience of the citizens there mirrors that of so many other areas in our country. The Plain Dealer of Ohio recently ran a week-long series analyzing the problem in its many dimensions. The introduction, "A Nation Afraid" shows how much crime does rob Americans of the freedom we cherish. The introduction, printed below, and the entire series show how crime makes many millions of our citizens victims every day of their lives.

The following is an excerpt from the first article of this important series.

[From the Plain Dealer, June 7, 1981]

WE, THE PEOPLE: LOCKED BEHIND BARS OF FEAR

(By Alan A. A. Siefullah and W. C. Miller)

"The decent people are living behind bars, threatened by criminal terrorists who seem to be roaming the streets with immunity from punishment," said Police Chief Joseph D. McNamara of San Jose, Calif.

The shootings of public figures—Pope John Paul II, President Reagan, John Lennon, Vernon Jordan—magnify the pervasive, sickening feeling that anyone and everyone in America is a target.

In Atlanta, the unsolved slayings of 28 black children and young adults provide constant reminders of how vulnerable people are. These are the well-publicized cases. Thousands of other senseless, violent crimes—murder, rape, aggravated assault and robbery—occur each day.

"We all have a fantasy, a fear of this happening to us," said Michael B. Leach, a Cleveland psychologist who counsels crime victims and their families. "When it does happen, people talk about it over and over again."

Soon, Leach said, a dozen people are afraid, a dozen lives affected. "People who never have anything happen to them become terrified they might."

On America's crime clock, someone is slain every 24 minutes. A rape takes place each seven minutes. A robbery comes each 68 seconds, an assault each 51 seconds.

In Cleveland last year a slaying was committed every 32 hours. A rape took place every 12½ hours. A robbery occurred nearly every hour, and an assault every 12½ hours.

Nationally, in two-thirds of these violent crimes, the victims did not know their assailants. This is perhaps the most terrifying fact of all.

"It's spooky talking to some of these guys," said Cleveland homicide detective Robert Shankland. "Killers today are different, unfeeling. I had a half-dozen guys fall asleep on me last year while I was interviewing them."

A Cleveland ice cream vendor, shot and killed in a holdup. An old East Cleveland man, dead after a robber pushed him to the ground. A young woman, raped by a "Good Samaritan-type" who offered to help her change a tire on the freeway.

And then there was the witness to a grocery store stickup who was chased, then fatally shot in the head by a robber eager to eliminate a witness. Many of these stories make headlines.

"We all read and hear about these kinds of crimes," said David Ward, a University of Minnesota sociologist. "And we think, 'Good God! Things are going to hell. It's not safe to be on the streets.'"

Many suburbanites fear increases in property crimes will lead to increases in violent crimes.

Charles Silberman, a New York writer who has spent 10 years studying crime, said "What we're discovering is that no one is immune, and the places to hide are fewer and fewer."

A recent Gallup poll, conducted for the National League of Cities, showed crime has emerged as the No. 1 concern of Americans. Twenty-five years ago, crime was not even among the top 10 problems named.

The FBI says crime has climbed steadily each year since the early 1960s, except for a slight decrease in 1976. According to the FBI, the numbers of violent crimes reported to police jumped 80% during the past decade.

FBI statistics take on an added dimension when considering that two out of three violent crimes are not even reported to police.

Despite this increase in reported crimes, the National Crime Survey, a semiannual report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, shows no indication of a crime boom.

The National Crime Surveys maintain that crime rates have been unchanged since the mid-1970s, though their findings give little solace.

Each year, one of 17 households experiences a murder, rape, robbery or assault, the survey says. One of every 13 households is burglarized.

"When everyone on your block can expect to be victimized by a violent crime or burglary at least once during the coming decade, then you have a massive problem of crime," said Harry A. Scarr, director of the statistics bureau.

As fast as crime spreads, fear of crime spreads faster. Surveys show that four of 10 Americans are highly fearful they will become victims of violent crimes. Yet less than one-half of 1% will.

Skyrocketing sales of guns, guard dogs, burglar alarms, locks and chemical repellant are only the superficial signs of the fear that seems to paralyze America. Other, behavioral signs are much more subtle.

Fearful Americans are less likely to go shopping or to movies at night. Many downtowns and urban parks are deserted. "You used to see couples strolling their neighborhoods at night," a Houston policeman said. "Not anymore." Indeed, polls show, three of five urban Americans are afraid to walk in their own neighborhoods at night.

The Figgie Report, a nationwide survey of 1,000 people, last year found more than half of American women make sure they have companions when going out at night. Seven of 10 women telephone friends to report they have arrived home safely.

The study, commissioned by Figgie International of Cleveland (formerly A-T-O), said nine of 10 Americans always lock their doors when leaving home, and almost everyone identifies visitors before letting them inside.

This fear is especially intense among the elderly and women, though statistically they are among the least likely victims of violence.

"Figures scare people," said Gary Mendez, a National Urban League official, "because they don't understand them. But whose lives are actually in danger?

"Young black males. That's who is getting killed and that is who has been getting killed over the years. The leading cause of death for young black males is homicide."

Northwestern University researcher Wesley G. Skogan said the fear of being a crime victim is understandable.

"We react to almost every fear in life by comparing ourselves to people near us," Skogan said. "Crime should be no different.

"In the cities we surveyed, 60 percent of the people knew someone in their neighborhood who had been burglarized. People should be afraid. That's a strong reality base."

There is debate at times over the accuracy of crime statistics, but most law enforcement officials say the number of homicides provides the best yardstick.

"You can't argue with the bodies," said Patrick V. Murphy, president of the Police Foundation, of Washington, D.C., "and those numbers have been going off the chart."

Homicides and other violent crimes were at all-time highs last year, but it is the changing pattern of slayings that is most alarming. In the mid-1970s, four of five victims knew their assailants; now nearly half are killed by strangers.

Police say the increase in killings—particularly those taking place during rapes, robberies and other crimes—proves their contention that criminals are becoming more violent.

"It's almost a fetish," lamented Miami Police Sgt. Robert D. Love. "They actually have a fetish about hurting people, about seeing blood."

How did these violent times develop? Some experts blame a decline in values traditionally nurtured by family, neighborhoods and church. Others say violent television shows and movies have conditioned youngsters to bloodshed.

"Violence has become a habit of youth," said Dr. Samuel R. Gerber, in his 45th year here as Cuyahoga County coroner. "They begin to believe this is the natural way to react. We've lost two generations."

There are also the handguns—60 million of them in the United States, uncounted thousands in Greater Cleveland. Narcotics, many believe, is a major breeder of crime. And the post-World War II baby boom is blamed. It brought an influx during the '60s and '70s of 18- to 24-year-olds—the crime-prone age.

The Figgie report found the American public, too, has plenty of ideas about reasons for the crime surge.●

CELEBRATION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF GOSHEN, MASS.

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call to the attention of my colleagues today the ongoing celebration of the 200th birthday of the town of Goshen, Mass., in my home district. This celebration marks the anniversary of a town whose citizens epitomize the independent spirit that made America the great Nation that it is.

Goshen's long and distinguished history began on May 14, 1781, when it was incorporated after splitting from the neighboring town of Chesterfield in a border dispute. It took its biblical name from the fact that Goshen was the best part of ancient Egypt. This year the town celebrates its incorporation with a summer long series of festivities and events designed to provide opportunities for all to participate.

Last month, on May 14, the citizens of Goshen kicked off their celebration with a dramatization of their first town meeting. The festivities included a reading of the bicentennial proclamation by Selectman Mitchell Cichy, and the raising of a new U.S. flag in front of the Goshen Central School.

These activities will continue throughout the summer months through the dedication of Goshen's Bicentennial Committee. Its members, Harold Mollison, Anthony Thomas, Jr., and Eileen Fuller have planned dances, a flower show, and many other events, including a parade on Sunday, August 2, to properly celebrate this great occasion.

Goshen has much to celebrate. It is blessed with areas of unspoiled woodland and the beautiful Highland Lakes known for their excellent fishing and swimming areas. Goshen is the home of the first DAR forest as well, and offers camping and recreational areas unsurpassed in natural beauty.

The spirit that is being celebrated in Goshen's bicentennial year is the spirit of America. The pioneers who built this great Nation sought places like Goshen in their pursuit of freedom, peace, and prosperity. Today, Goshen offers the same attraction in its land and people—but especially its people. Their spirit of volunteerism and dedication to the principles and ideals that made this country the greatest on Earth continues today and is celebrated this year in Goshen's bicentennial.

I urge my respected colleagues to join me today in honoring this spirit and dedication and congratulating the citizens of Goshen on their first 200 years as an independent township. Let us recognize Goshen as an example of one of America's greatest assets and wish it many more years of success as a place to live and work in peace and prosperity.●

THE KOREAN WAR—HOW SOON THEY FORGET

HON. JAMES K. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. JAMES K. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, 31 years ago today war erupted on the Korean peninsula. Tens of thousands of brave Americans soon found themselves embroiled in a conflict a long way from home.

One of those brave Americans was Mr. Robert E. Gicker, now of Fairless Hills, Pa. Mr. Gicker spent 14 months in Korea, half of which was spent in active duty against the communist invaders.

Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the plight of the Vietnam veteran recently—and deservedly so. The Korean veteran, however, has been all but forgotten in recent years.

Mr. Gicker wants to bring the Korean conflict back into America's consciousness—and I applaud him for it. He has written a revealing article entitled "The Korean War—How Soon They Forget" that I would like to insert into today's RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, Robert Gicker deserves much credit for his commitment to the Korean veteran. I am proud to call him a constituent.

THE KOREAN WAR—HOW SOON THEY FORGET

(By Robert E. Gicker)

On this date, June 25, 1950, the Korean War began, with a bang. It ended 27 July 1953 with a tenuous, oft broken armistice.

Before the South Koreans knew what hit them the north was rolling south on their way to Taegu and Pusan and a complete sweep of the peninsula.

Had the North Koreans succeeded they would have jeopardized Japan and Southeast Asia. The communists would have been in good position to chase the U.S. out of the Pacific basin, severely damaging our prestige and trade in that vital area of the world.

Quick thinking, by President Truman and superb generalship by General Douglas MacArthur, turned a rout into victory. Because of General MacArthur's brilliant Inchon Landing tactic, the American Forces were able to push the enemy all the way to the Yalu River, and almost consolidated the Korean Peninsula into one political entity, on Democracy's side.

Poor judgment on the part of the politicians resulted in another reversal for anticommunist forces. A little sabotage and backstabbing from the United Nations helped encourage the Chinese to aid their North Korean brethren, resulting in a retreat back to the 38th parallel.

Again the military prowess of General MacArthur saved the day. The allies were able to regroup and set up an effective military defense at the 38th parallel.

From that time to the end of the war, the allies and chinese were stalemated, in the vicinity of the 38th parallel with no serious attempt made to gain ground.

The war ended in a qualified loss, by the allies, and paved the way for the Vietnam debacle.

Because of the no win Korean War, the allies have been on the defensive against communist and terrorist aggression ever since. A total of 33,629 military personnel were killed in the Korean Police Action, 103,284 were wounded and 3,597 were POW's in the brutal North Korean prison camps (some are still missing). A total of 5,720,000 men of the United States armed forces plus a few thousand from our allies fought the Korean war.

All that sacrifice was in vain. Today the Korean War has all but been forgotten, except, by the people who fought it, or who suffered as a result of it.

Check any bookstore and try to find a book on the Korean War. World Wars I and II are represented, as is the Vietnam War. There are a significant number of history books on the war machines and personalities on other historical events, during the period prior to and after the Korean War but nothing, absolutely nothing, about the Korean War.

After years of search I have been able to purchase exactly three out of print books on the Korean war. Others, very few have been written but do not find their way to library shelves.

Why am I reiterating this old history, of so little concern to America and Americans?

Because I fought there, my comrades were injured and died there and millions of men had serious interruptions in their lives because of the Korean War. Some like myself reenlisted for other countries rather than return home a loser.

We can identify with the Vietnam Vets. We were idealistic and wanted to prove ourselves like our brothers, who comprised the victorious American armed forces during the second world war.

What a waste! Perhaps we should have done our thing by evading the draft, or been selfish enough to consider our own future instead of gambling on Democracy. We did nothing but spin our wheels, in an Asian rice paddy, while other, less patriotic or more cunning, souls, were moving ahead in their career fields.

America you forgot about our sacrifice. You could care less about the idealistic youth who succumbed to the battle cry of "Let's make the world safe from tyranny." After the last shot is fired, American leaders are only willing to deal and trade with the tyrants, they so vociferously denounced. After all, what's a little blood between adversaries, when there is money to be made.

When the Korean War Vets returned they weren't even accorded the freedoms for which we allegedly fought. Some were forced into gangster run unions, under the guise of the Union Shop. Some who resisted were terrorized by union goon squads. Others were denied free choice of residence (the blacks) until they began demonstrating in the 1960's. All the goodies of our society, were reserved for the politicians and their friends, for big business and their kind, for the slackers and hustlers who wait like vultures to grab the bounty of this great land.

To me the anniversary of the Korean War is a time to remember. I will never forget our foolish idealism and the unconcern of the people, whose so called Democratic principles, we were supposed to be defending.

To my comrades of the 14th Infantry Regiment, 25th Division, I want to say thanks. I will always remember the thrill of being part of a noble force, who held their ground until the politicians capitulated. Too bad our efforts were in vain.●

NYSE DECISION RUNS COUNTER TO WISHES OF CONTINENTAL EMPLOYEES

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the New York Stock Exchange effectively threw up a major hurdle to the creation of the Nation's largest employee stock ownership plan (ESOP) by the employees of Continental Airlines. The Exchange now stands as the only obstacle to fulfilling the wishes of more that 10,000 Continental employees.

In April, 41 members of the House Task Force on Industrial Innovation and Productivity—Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives—joined me in writing to the Civil Aeronautics Board on behalf of the Continental Airlines employee stock ownership plan. We hailed the plan of Continental's employees as a significant milestone in the renewal of American business through increased productivity and capital formation.

Since that time, the CAB and the Securities and Exchange Commission have rejected repeated attempts by Texas International Airlines to block the plan of Continental's employees. Moreover, the U.S. District Court in Los Angeles, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Superior Court for the State of California have all refused the request of Texas International to enjoin the plan.

Now, by demanding a vote of stockholders before listing the new Continental stock for the ESOP, the New York Stock Exchange is standing squarely in the way of this plan. On behalf of the House Task Force on Industrial Innovation and Productivity, I strongly urge NYSE to reconsider its decision and join in this partnership for renewing American business by approving without condition the listing of the shares to this historic employee stock ownership plan.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE FOOD SAFETY AMENDMENTS OF 1981

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle and in the other body today in cosponsoring the Food Safety Amendments of 1981.

On an increasing number of occasions during the past 20 years, our food safety laws have shown that they have not withstood the test of time. Yes, we do have the finest and most abundant food supply in the world. But will we continue to meet the needs of our people if our "no risk" food safety policies are adhered to? I do not think so, and I fear the consequences.

My inquiry into the proposed nitrite ban, commencing in 1978 has led me to believe that we must make changes in our food safety laws now. My experience in the nitrite matter has given me ample opportunity to examine the consequences of inflexible regulation and the oftentimes failure to utilize good scientific procedures in regulatory decisionmaking on the whole meat industry, a subject which I would like to address first.

Livestock and poultry production, and meatpacking and processing are the largest segments of America's food industry. Close to 40 billion pounds of meat are produced, packed, and processed every year by farmers, ranchers, and companies large and small. While the product volume is substantial, net earnings are small—with packers earning less than 1 percent of total sales—and regulatory burdens heavy. In addition to the requirements of the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration which directly regulate food processing and marketing, meatpackers and processors must comply with the disparate regulatory requirements of other Federal agencies and State and local governments. But it is the food safety regulatory activities of the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration which must be modified if we are to create a less burdensome regulatory environment that will allow the public health to be protected and insure public confidence in the food system.

Although the United States indisputably has the world's safest, most wholesome, and most abundant food supply, there is a misguided fear among some well-meaning Americans that much of our food and food ingredients are dangerous to the public health.

This misapprehension stems from a virtually constant barrage of episodes over the past two decades in which various foods and food ingredients have been implicated. These highly publicized episodes and others that certainly will occur unless our food safety laws are modernized will cause an erosion of public confidence in the food industry and in the regulatory agencies—both of which share the common goal of insuring a safe food supply. The food industry is perceived collectively as "profiteers." The regulatory agencies are viewed as either not fulfilling their mission or being overzealous in their efforts to do so. Against this background, a widespread consensus has developed among academia, industry, regulatory agencies, and, in some instances, consumer organizations that the present body of food safety laws are scientifically outmoded, inconsistently implemented, and unnecessarily inflexible. These problems have resulted in unduly restrictive regulatory decisions.

Former Food and Drug Administration Commissioner Donald Kennedy, now provost of Stanford University, has stated that changes in food safety laws are necessary to recognize that "some level of risk is acceptable if there are significant benefits from the use of the substance, as long as the benefits accrue to the people experiencing the risk."

Now is the appropriate time for developing a rational approach to the food safety laws which would benefit the industry, the regulatory agencies, and the consuming public. Impediments in the current food safety laws harm the farmer-producer by fostering an unstable marketplace for his products.

The present state of the law concerning food safety can be characterized as complex, confusing, irrational, arbitrary, and in dire need of rethinking and rewriting. There exists a host of legally distinct categories of food substances. Placement of a food or food ingredient into one or another of these distinct categories can result in radically different regulatory treatment with dramatically different ultimate effects.

Food safety is an area that is ripe for regulatory revamping. The basic laws and concepts which regulate the safety of food are over 20 years old. The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was enacted in 1938 after that agency was split off from the Department of Agriculture. The food and color additives amendments, each containing the Delaney clause, were adopted in 1958 and 1960 respectively. However, the greatest real change over recent years has been the scientist's ability to detect low-level traces of substances or discern low levels of potential risk. This technological advance has increased our capability to detect particles 1 million times smaller than when the Delaney clause was enacted. These same technological advances have led some to use this new information to create greater inferences and sensationalism regarding the possible risks which may result from the finding of these miniscule amounts of chemicals in foods, food packages, and food additives. Included within this group are aflotoxins, acrylonitrile, saccharin, and nitrites. For example, meatpackers have had to defend the use of the preservation dosium nitrite against allegations drawn from fundamentally faulty research. Packaging materials have been suspect where a single molecule of a suspected contaminant migrated from package to product. This process has needlessly eroded consumer confidence in the food supply.

Safety legislation administered by the Consumer Produce Safety Commission does not adopt the no-risk standard which FDA seems to accept for food safety legislation. Instead, each of the consumer product safety acts under CPSC jurisdiction specifies a lesser standard than absolute elimination of risk and lists balancing criteria which the Commission must consider in promulgating product safety rules.

Another example, as fundamental as food, is the Safe Drinking Water Act which seeks to insure that public water supplies meet minimum national standards for the protection of public health.

While EPA's position is that carcinogen contamination should theoretically be reduced to zero, it has promulgated a regulation setting maximum contaminant level for trihalomethanes, a known carcinogen, in drinking water. The agency established this regulation after balancing the adverse health effects resulting from a ban on TTHM and the technological infeasibility of such a standard against the potential health hazard of setting standards greater than zero.

It is time for a revision of food safety policy—one that will benefit consumers by increasing consumer health and safety, while at the same time, provide clearer guidelines for approving or disapproving the use of ingredients in foods. Such a policy should be consistent with other health and safety Government policies and should take into consideration questions of risk assessment, scientific peer review, and regulatory flexibility which prevents precipitous Government action that fosters instability in our food system.

Such action on the part of Congress will help producers by insuring that precipitous Government action against their product could not occur, help by providing stability to the processor, but most importantly this change is needed to insure the continued confidence of the American consumer in the food system.

A new food safety policy is needed to protect the public against unwarranted scares and fears and to insure that the public is not deprived of a sound and healthful food supply due to outmoded and inflexible regulatory policies.

The legislation which we are introducing today is a major step in the process of reforming our outdated food safety laws. I look forward to our expeditious consideration of this legislation in the Agriculture Committee.●

COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR FEDERAL RETIREES

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe in retaining the twice-a-year cost-of-living adjustment for Federal retirees. A reduction in this allowance places an extreme burden on those who deserve the needed benefits they have earned.

I was outraged at the action taken by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, a committee controlled by the Democrats, which pitted one group of deserving citizens against another. The twice-a-year cost-of-living adjustment for Federal retirees was matched against the proposal to offset military retirement income for those military retirees now holding Government jobs. The committee's maneuver was unfair, unjust, and politically motivated. Its sole purpose was to deprive one group or the other of benefits which were not only deserved, but which the Federal Government is required to honor.

Unfortunately, the situation in the House today is one which has been forced on Members by the partisan political actions of the leadership. The votes I have made in the House this afternoon were a result of the parliamentary maneuvering which took place in the House. I voted in support of the President's economic package because of the concern I have for our Nation's economy—and because I believe that all Americans will achieve great benefits if inflation can be brought under control and the recent rapid rises in the cost of living contained.●

LEBOUTILLIER SUPPORTS ACTION DIRECTOR; OPPOSES SPLIT WITH PEACE CORPS

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LEBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the efforts being made to separate Peace Corps from ACTION. An amendment to accomplish this separation was passed, by a close vote, in the Senate and we may soon have an opportunity to consider the issue. The administration opposes the proposed separation and I agree—the separation is unwise and against the best interests of both ACTION and the Peace Corps.

The impetus for this effort at splitting ACTION and Peace Corps is the appointment of Thomas Pauken as Director of ACTION. Twelve years ago Tom Pauken served in Vietnam as a lieutenant in the U.S. Army—his assignment was in military intelligence. In this 12 months in Vietnam he participated in the collection of low level order of battle information; his principal duty was to write analyses, reporting on the various elements of Vietnamese society. Since he left Vietnam, Tom Pauken has had nothing to do with military or civilian intelligence operations. Both in Vietnam and at home he has had no contact whatsoever with the Central Intelligence Agency.

While in Vietnam, Tom Pauken served his country with distinction; he has done so in this country both before and since that conflict. The quality of that service is the reason the President chose Tom Pauken to head the agency which develops Federal policy on mobilizing the creative energies of the vast numbers of Americans who seek ways to help their fellow citizens who may be in need. As the Federal Government returns the means to effect social change back to the people, as the burden of taxation is reduced and the intrusions of Government into the lives of our people are ended, the task will fall to the people themselves, through their voluntary efforts, to contribute to each others' well-being. It is important that a man of Tom Pauken's caliber be available to focus attention on the reemphasizing personal commitment that is once again to be the foundation of our society.

The opponents of Tom Pauken's nomination urged in the Senate, unsuccessfully, that Tom Pauken's service as a lieutenant in the Vietnam war 12 years ago would lead to the widespread misperception that the Peace Corps would now be used to gather intelligence for the United States. Averring always that this was not the case in fact, and that neither Tom Pauken nor the President intended the Peace Corps to function in such a manner, the opponents nonetheless insisted that around the globe people in countries served by the Peace Corps would have a dramatic and otherwise unexplainable change-of-heart with respect to the sincerity of the volunteers who worked among them. Suddenly, the Peace Corps volunteer would be viewed as a spy and his life might be in jeopardy.

The notion that Tom Pauken as Director of ACTION will make any practical difference in the conduct of Peace Corps volunteers or in the perception of the volunteers by the host countries, is absurd. Tom Pauken is Director of ACTION, the parent agency of Peace Corps. As such, he has no authority at all over Peace Corps policy, which is established by the Peace Corps Director. Program development and implementation, planning and volunteer selection and placement likewise remain in the sole province of the Director of the Peace Corps. ACTION provides the Peace Corps with certain limited support functions, which do not involve policymaking; even with respect to the authority over these support functions, Tom Pauken has delegated all power to his deputy.

Furthermore, the official policy of the Peace Corps would allow Tom Pauken to be employed in any position in Peace Corps. Its Order 300.5 provides that only if an applicant has ever been in the employ of the CIA or has served in an intelligence agency in the last 10 years, is the applicant ineligible for Peace Corps employment. Tom Pauken meets the Peace Corps criteria for employment. If he applied, Tom Pauken could not be turned down by reason of his intelligence background for any Peace Corps position, including any position that directly establishes policy or runs operations. It follows that the Peace Corps must be assumed to have hired, and to currently have in its employ, people at the highest levels of the agency, people with military and civilian intelligence experience, and experience of far greater breadth and responsibility than Tom Pauken's. Such experience could well include work in covert operations, not merely in gathering intelligence, and not at the behest of an ally in wartime. As Fred F. Fielding, Counsel to the President, wrote to Senator CHARLES PERCY, on April 3, 1981:

Since 1975, by Order 300.5, it has been public knowledge that the Peace Corps stands ready to employ persons who have worked for a non-CIA intelligence agency more than 10 years before their application.

The reality is that Tom Pauken as Director of ACTION in no way jeopardizes the safety of Peace Corps volunteers or the effectiveness of the Peace Corps operations overseas. The perception of the Peace Corps is in no way altered by Tom Pauken's selection as ACTION Director. It is a distortion of the truth to argue otherwise. To fully understand how distorted this argument is, it is important to put the Peace Corps program in perspective. Examining the reality of the Peace Corps as an arm of the U.S. Government places in clear perspective how little Tom Pauken as Director of ACTION means to the perception of the Peace Corps as an intelligence-gathering agency.

Senator ORRIN HATCH put the issue well when, in debate on Tom Pauken's nomination, he stated:

For instance, it is my understanding that the Peace Corps country directors meet with and report to the respective Ambassador on a regular basis. Our Ambassadors are certainly not restricted from communicating all they know, including their communications with Peace Corps country directors, to the appropriate intelligence agencies. Does this represent a perception of an intelligence connection that threatens the safety of Peace Corps volunteers? If so, what should we do about it?

It is also my understanding that the Peace Corps uses the State Department's cable system when communicating from the host country to the Washington Peace Corps office. These cables use classifications developed by the State Department. Indeed, Secretary of State, Alexander Haig's name is printed and appears on each cable. Does this mean that the State Department—which has its own intelligence gathering bureau (the Bureau of Intelligence and Research)—is using the Peace Corps for intelligence purposes? Surely, if we accept the so-called perception argument, then this is a legitimate conclusion. But, of course, such arguments are not credible—just as the opposition to Mr. Pauken's nomination on military intelligence grounds, is not credible.

The Peace Corps Act makes plain that the Peace Corps is not only an arm of the U.S. Government, but that it is to serve the foreign policy of the United States under the ultimate direction and coordination of the Secretary of State. In each country in which Peace Corps volunteers serve, their activities shall be coordinated "with other activities of the U.S. Government in each country, under the leadership of the U.S. diplomatic mission." Section 4(2). Furthermore, the Secretary of State shall continuously supervise and generally direct the Peace Corps programs "to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby." Section 4(3). Peace Corps volunteers may be motivated by idealism, but in the field they operate by and for the interests of this country; if they follow the dictates of their idealism and not those of the Secretary of State, they violate the law of this Nation, and must be dismissed from service.

The training and recruitment of the Peace Corps volunteer emphasizes the position of the Peace Corps as a foreign policy adjunct of this Government.

All volunteers must swear an oath of loyalty to the United States, section 5(j), and all volunteers must receive "instruction in the philosophy, strategy, tactic, and menace of communism." Section 8(c). Furthermore, all Peace Corps employees must be investigated for loyalty to the United States, and to insure that they are not security risks. Section 22.

The Peace Corps Act clearly contemplates that the Peace Corps shall serve the needs and interests of this country. As long as this Congress continues to fund the Peace Corps, we will, I am confident, require such fealty from every employee and volunteer in this country and abroad.

The argument made by Tom Pauken's opponents, who make up the proponents of Peace Corps separation, is plainly specious. It ignores the reality of the real connections between Peace Corps and the other branches of the U.S. Government. The proponents of separation claim that Tom Pauken as Director of ACTION creates a perception of Peace Corps involvement in intelligence activities, when the Peace Corps publicly advertises the fact that people with far greater involvement in intelligence activity can be hired to posts with vastly more influence over Peace Corps policy and programs than Tom Pauken will ever have.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the people the Peace Corps volunteers serve have failed to take the separation proponents' argument seriously. Since Tom Pauken was confirmed as ACTION Director almost 2 months ago, there has been no uprising, no new surge of attacks on Peace Corps volunteers abroad. Now is the time to reject the canards, to destroy the myths, to reject once and for all the lightly-veneered attacks on the competence and patriotism of a great American, and the highest ranking Vietnam veteran in this administration. Tom Pauken is rightly Director of ACTION, and Peace Corps is rightly in ACTION.●

LARRY HOLMES

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the great enthusiasm I feel for my constituent and good friend, Larry Holmes of Easton, Pa.

Once again, Larry has shown us his remarkable boxing talents with his recent third round TKO against Leon Spinks. Thus, Larry has successfully defended his heavyweight title for the 10th time, boosting his boxing record to an impressive 38 wins without a loss.

Larry is a fighter in the true sense of the word. As 1 of 12 children, he worked hard to support his family and, at the same time, found opportunities to develop his boxing skills. Today, much of his time outside the ring is spent working with children in local boys clubs and youth centers throughout Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley.

Not only is Larry a champ inside the ring, but he's one outside as well. Many times I have had the pleasure to join with him in community charity events. He always comes through for the Lehigh Valley. People look up to Larry, because they see a man who has fought hard to earn success, a man who understands the obstacles one must overcome to be called a champion. He is truly an inspiration to all of us. I'll never forget the time he was instrumental in helping to raise funds for a Greek children's orphanage in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be among the many friends—and fans—of Larry Holmes. Larry has never forgotten those of us in the Lehigh Valley. Although he is known inside the ring as the Easton Assassin, I think of him more as one big-hearted guy surrounded by throngs of loving kids. Larry, thanks a lot for being the great guy you are. All of us in the Lehigh Valley wish you the best of luck in your brilliant career.●

REASONS TO OPPOSE SEPARATING THE PEACE CORPS FROM ACTION

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1981, a slim majority in the Senate voted in favor of Senator ALAN CRANSTON's amendment to S. 1193, the Department of State authorizations bill for fiscal year 1982 and 1983, to separate the Peace Corps from the ACTION agency. I submit that this action is actually a thinly disguised attack not only upon the President's choice for Director of ACTION, Thomas W. Pauken, but also all of us veterans who served in Vietnam.

I should note here that in 1979, when the issue of whether to separate the Peace Corps from ACTION came before the House floor, I was one of only a handful of Republicans to vote against the proposed separation. When the matter comes up again in this Congress, I will once again vote against separation.

This time, however, I feel it is necessary to briefly discuss some of the events surrounding the recent Senate action.

In late February of this year, President Reagan nominated Thomas W. Pauken for the post of ACTION Director. Mr. Pauken was quickly and routinely approved by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee without dissent. His nomination was ready to proceed to the Senate floor; however, an unusual request was made by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for sequential referral of the nomination.

This request was most peculiar, since the only possible connection the ACTION Director has with the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is that the Peace Corps is a component of the ACTION agency. But that is little more than a technical connection which allows the ACTION agency to supply support services to the Peace Corps. Indeed, Executive Order 12137, issued by President Carter on May 16, 1979, transformed the Peace Corps from a program within ACTION to a semiautonomous agency within ACTION. Consequently, there is no doubt that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had jurisdiction to advise on the nomination of the Peace Corps Director, but it is still questionable in my mind if it had authority to advise on the nomination of the ACTION Director in light of the issuance of Executive Order 12137 on May 16, 1979.

It soon became apparent that there were those who simply could not tolerate the thought of Thomas W. Pauken—a Vietnam veteran who served his Nation honorably and with distinction—replacing antiwar advocate and new left activist Sam Brown as the Director of ACTION.

It should be noted that Sam Brown's confirmation process was completed about one month after his name was placed in nomination by President Carter. It wasn't until approximately 10 weeks after his nomination that Tom Pauken was finally approved by the Senate. It is significant that once Mr. Pauken's nomination reached the full Senate, he was confirmed without objection.

But what was it in Mr. Pauken's background that raised alleged doubts, in the mind of a small minority, about his ability to serve as ACTION Director? After all, he had volunteered to serve his Nation in the Vietnam war and was even the recipient of the Joint Service Commendation Medal for:

> Analysis provided the Commander, United States Military Assistance the Intelligence Community with intelligence information of great value in the counter-insurgency effort in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, as remarkable as it may seem, that was the alleged flaw in this nominee's background. He had served his country too well by volunteering to serve the cause of liberty when many of his peers chose to flee from their responsibilities, or even worse, chose to undermine our efforts by organizing internal unrest.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that Tom Pauken's service in Army Intelligence for less than 1 year, over 12 years ago, in no way prevented him from serving as the Director of ACTION. In fact, it would not have prevented him from serving as the Director of the Peace Corps or even as a Peace Corps volunteer. There simply are no statutory or ACTION/Peace Corps policy bars—and so the Senate concluded when it confirmed Mr. Pauken.

The Cranston amendment to S. 1193 as well as the language contained in S. 1015, the Peace Corps Autonomy Act, and S. 1196, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981, which all call for the separation of the Peace Corps from ACTION make no reference to "intelligence" or "intelligence-related activities." Quite clearly, even with the adoption of the separation language, any nominee for Peace Corps Director who has an extensive background in intelligence is in no way barred or prevented from serving in that capacity. In addition, none of the language which appears in H.R. 3566, the House version of International Security and Development Act of 1981, restricts a nominee for Peace Corps Director from serving in that capacity.

There is no doubt that separating the Peace Corps from ACTION will result in duplicating services and increased costs to both the Peace Corps and ACTION. In this regard, I would like to submit for the record a letter from David Stockman, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to Senator CHARLES PERCY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, wherein Mr. Stockman states his strong opposition to the proposed split for reasons of efficiency and cost:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1981.

Hon. CHARLES PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I am taking this opportunity to provide you with the Administration's view that S. 1015, the Peace Corps Autonomy Act, should not be enacted.

Section 2 of S. 1015 provides that, effective on the date of enactment, the Peace Corps shall become an independent agency within the executive branch of the Federal Government and shall not be an agency within the ACTION Agency or any other department or agency of the United States. Section 4 of the bill would restrict the President's authority to delegate functions under the Peace Corps Act to the Director of the Peace Corps. Section 5 of the bill provides that references in statutes, reorganization plans, executive orders and other official documents to the ACTION agency or the Director of ACTION which affect functions or activities relating to the Peace Corps shall be deemed references to the Peace Corps. This section also requires that within 60 days after enactment of S. 1015, the Directors of ACTION, the Peace Corps and the Office of Management and Budget must submit a report to appropriate Committees of the Congress concerning the steps taken to implement S. 1015.

The administration strongly opposes the passage of the bill on the grounds that it would create inefficiencies that would disadvantage both ACTION and the Peace Corps in carrying out their missions and would produce duplication of Federal Government services inconsistent with administration policy. Our analysis indicates that there are significant functions now jointly serving the Peace Corps and ACTION (e.g., recruitment, volunteer payroll, accounting, health services and computer services) that would have to be duplicated at substantial cost if Peace Corps were to become an independent agency. We have estimated this additional cost at up to $3 million. Under the budget discipline imposed by the Congress in cooperation with the administration, the imposition of needless administrative expense on any agency of the Government would be unwise. In the current budgetary environment, it would be a disservice to the taxpayers to incur this additional expense for no measurable program improvement.

The administration is committed to restraining the rate of growth of the Federal Government and, where possible, to cutting back on the number of Federal employees and Federal programs. In this time of austerity, separate new Federal agencies should not be created except on a showing of the most urgent need. Where, as in the case of the Peace Corps, no such urgent need exists, formation of a separate new agency is a needless extravagance.

Additionally, it is apparent that the precipitating factor for introduction of this legislation has been the appointment of Thomas Pauken as the Director of ACTION. To tie the nomination of Mr. Pauken—an entirely separate issue and one which has been resolved by Senate confirmation—to the legislation at hand is inappropriate.

Establishing Peace Corps as a separate agency will not deter those who persist in suggesting that the Peace Corps engages in intelligence activities. The Peace Corps is an arm of the U.S. Government and operates in foreign countries in part through support facilities provided by the State Department. While the Peace Corps Country Director meets with the Ambassador as part of the "country team," this relationship does not in any way implicate the Peace Corps in intelligence-gathering activities.

For the above-stated reasons, I urge that S. 1015 be opposed as not in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. STOCKMAN,
Director.

The administration has strongly stated its opposition to the proposed separation. I would also like to submit for the RECORD a letter from Max L. Friedersdorf, Assistant to the President, to Senator CHARLES PERCY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which further emphasizes the administration's view that ACTION and the Peace Corps should not be separated.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 27, 1981.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: This letter provides further information in response to questions on the Peace Corps raised in your letter of April 2.

A quick analysis of the jointly supported services of Peace Corps and ACTION has been done by OMB, in consultation with Peace Corps and ACTION staff. This analysis, a copy of which is attached, indicates savings of up to $3 million as a result of joint operations in 1981. While there is some uncertainty about the exact magnitude of the savings, the analysis only reinforces the Administration view that the agencies should not be separated.

I am sorry for the delay in getting this additional information to you.

Sincerely,

MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF,
Assistant to the President.

Enclosure.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE SAVINGS FROM ACTION/PEACE CORPS JOINTLY SUPPORTED SERVICES

ACTION staff have prepared estimates of additional costs associated with dividing certain of the offices providing services to both ACTION and Peace Corps. These have been refined by OMB to indicate the rough magnitude of the total costs of such a move. The analysis is based on the present configuration of offices and on the assumption that only a minimum number of additional managerial staff would be added for the Peace Corps offices. It is assumed in each case that only relevant supervisory personnel would be duplicated in a new Peace Corps operation, along with necessary space and equipment. No attempt has been made to factor the effects of possible agency responses to a shift, such as major reorganizations or space reallocations into the analysis.

The analysis involved examination of three support offices that account for $8.3 million (30 percent) of the total 1981 budget of $29 million for jointly supported services, and computer services. Within those operations, the minimal assumptions about duplication of management-level personnel mentioned above were made. These additional personnel were assumed paid at slightly above the office-average salary for 1981 and provided with roughly the agency-average amount of space, furniture, phone services, etc. All of these assumptions appear to be conservative given the likely grade of these staff. Staff-level personnel and associated space and equipment were assumed divided between the agencies.

On a base of 150 staff, this methodology led to a conclusion that 26 senior staff would be duplicated resulting in an increase of roughly $1 million in operating costs on the base of $8.3 million for 1981. This would represent an 11 percent increase for these three offices. Substantial uncertainty is introduced in attempting to project total costs from this sample estimate. A simple linear projection of the savings to the full $29 million joint services budget would indicate an increase of $3 million. This figure is likely to be too large, however, because Peace Corps does not buy the same level of services in all areas. While it buys significant recruitment and health services from ACTION, Peace Corps would not duplicate positions from the Office of Policy and Planning since it already has its own independent offices. Therefore, the $3 million figure should be viewed as an outside estimate for additional operating costs.

Both Ms. Loret Miller Ruppe, the Director of the Peace Corps, and Tom Pauken have testified at their respective confirmation hearings that they support the status quo; that is, they oppose any attempt to separate the Peace Corps from ACTION. We can legitimately and properly assume that they do so on behalf of program efficiency and in order that they may carry out their legal responsibilities.

If separating the Peace Corps from ACTION does not prevent an individual with intelligence experience from serving in that position; if separating the Peace Corps from ACTION will result in the duplication of services, inefficiences and likely larger budgets for both the Peace Corps and ACTION in the future; and, if the administration—including the Directors of Peace Corps and ACTION—oppose separation, then why is its adoption being urged so agressively?

To those of us who have been following this issue in the Senate, the tenor of the debate of the proseparation advocates appears to be not only a veiled slap in the face to Mr. Pauken, but a deep and penetrating blow to Vietnam veterans of which I am one. I say this because at no time during Mr. Pauken's confirmation process did those few who spoke out in opposition to him ever speak of or look at his individual commitment to peace; his desire to help those in need; or his outlook for the future.

In truth, the debate over his confirmation, and the attempt to separate the Peace Corps from ACTION which will soon confront us all, results from a stereotyping of the Vietnam veteran which is simply dead wrong.

By voting to separate the Peace Corps from ACTION, are we not saying that virtually any Vietnam veteran involved in "covert" operations (what military operations are not covert), even for a short period, will be greatly handicapped by the Congress when appointed to public office?

Soldiers are like the rest of us. They want peace, they are prepared to sacrifice—to a greater degree than most, and they recognize their responsibility to their country, family, and fellow citizens.

To call on these outstanding citizens to sacrifice their lives for liberty, and then to deny them the opportunity to fully serve their Nation during a period of peace, is unconscionable and an absolute abomination.

I hope this body will reverse the unfortunate action taken by the Senate and vote against any attempt to separate the Peace Corps from ACTION.●

ROUSSELOT PAYS TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF SIERRA MADRE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it was back in 1881 that Sierra Madre's founder, Nathaniel Carter, purchased the land that he called the Sierra Madre tract and began subdividing. This tract comprised 1,103 acres, a little more than 3 square miles, and this became the city of Sierra Madre.

Resting in the shadows of the Sierra Madre mountain range, at the foot of Mount Wilson, lies the lively little city. Here one can meet people from all parts of the country who were drawn to Sierra Madre for its beautiful surroundings, its quietude, and the health giving quality of its climate.

In fact it was for just those reasons that Nathaniel Carter bought the land 100 years ago. He, a former resident of the East, promoted the Sierra Madre area for health, recreation, and investment as a result of his own return to good health after settling there.

One of the proudest claims of Sierra Madre citizens is the extent to which residents get involved in their community. An example of this participation can be seen each year on the Fourth of July when Sierra Madre presents its Independence Day parade and festivities that are considered by many to be beyond compare.

This Fourth of July pageant marks the 100th anniversary. It is for this reason that I bring Sierra Madre's attributes to the attention of my colleagues, because I am proud to represent this fine city in the 26th Congressional District of California.

President Reagan wrote to the citizens of Sierra Madre, "The spirit which has built your community is a reflection of the energy which has forged America into a land of wonder." I am sure that my colleagues join the President in congratulating Sierra Madre on its 100th birthday.●

SOCIAL SECURITY AND UNCERTAINTY IN RETIREMENT

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to our colleagues' attention an article by Paul Brookshire which appeared in the South Dade News-Leader on June 17, 1981, which, simply but forcefully, describes the unsure future awaiting the middle-aged work force as we reexamine the programs of the social security system. Mr. Brookshire, editor of the News-Leader, has shown how the rages of inflation and high tax rates are fostering growing doubts and frustrations on the part of those who have participated in the social security system for 30 to 40 years, and who may now find that the rules of the game are to be changed just at the time when they hope to reap the benefits of contributions made in good faith.

DANGER! POVERTY AHEAD

(By Paul Brookshire)

The closer I get to retirement age the more pronounced the urge gets to retire. But the fear continues to grow that I cannot afford to retire when the time comes.

Those of us who have paid into the Social Security program all of our lives become more fearful every day that there won't be anything there to collect when our time comes.

And now we have a President who is telling us that he wants us to work longer—and wait longer to collect our benefits.

He would not let us retire at say 62 and collect 80 percent of our Social Security as is now possible. The retirement age would eventually be moved up to 68 and we would not be able to retire until 65 to get 80 percent.

I have no quarrel with the President's efforts to do something to save the Social Security system. But workers like me who have been taxed every since we went into the work force at the age of 18, should be able to collect their Social Security benefits as promised.

There are millions of dependents and other persons eligible for Social Security benefits—and who are receiving them—who never paid a single dime into the system.

Of course Social Security was never initiated with the idea that it would be an "old age pension." Social Security was merely to supplement your income.

However, millions are now living on Social Security—some benefits run into several hundred dollars a month.

I can remember during the 1930s when some of the states began "old age pensions." Personal property had to be signed over to the state in many cases to make a person eligible to receive these checks.

Many people were too proud to sign up for old age pensions. They were the same people who were too proud to stand in soup lines and receive government handouts. But those days are over.

No one living today that I know of is too proud to receive a government check. In fact, the more government checks we get, the better we like it. Even millionaries, I suppose, get their government checks like everyone else.

But my government check may never come. That is my fear.

In fact, according to a recent poll, over half of U.S. workers fear they won't be able to afford to retire. Their current savings for retirement are inadequate and with inflation being what it is, they simply cannot save more.

Here we are at the peak of our careers—and our earnings—but we cannot afford to put anything aside for the proverbial "rainy day." That will be the day after the day of retirement for most of us.

And next year won't be any better.

We know already that our property taxes will go up because our homes are going to be assessed at a higher evaluation. We know that either the sales tax will be increased or we will have to pay more for gasoline.

We know that our utilities—water, electric, telephones—will cost us more next year than they did this year.

So, I ask you, how is saving for retirement a possibility?

Most economists estimate that for retirees to maintain their preretirement lifestyle within reasonable limits, they will need a retirement income equal to 60 to 70 percent of their earnings immediately preceding retirement.

Even if Social Security is "saved" and improved, this is a goal beyond the reach of most older Americans who, on the average, have half the income of their younger counterparts.

One seventh of the over 65 population now lives below the poverty level.

Most of the aged poor did not become poor until they retired—and their incomes dropped by 50 to 60 percent.

I haven't been "poor" since 1935 and it is going to be extremely hard for me to cope with my newfound poverty the day I retire.

So, it appears President Reagan will have his way—we cannot retire. Not because we do not want to but because we don't want to live in poverty.

If we grow tired of our current jobs, we simply must seek new careers. That is our only hope.

Instead of taking our retirement check month by month, many of us will have to get a bulk settlement and invest it in a new career or perhaps a small business. Looks like we may have to die with our boots on.

No more of quitting jobs at 60 or 65, buying a little home in Florida, and going fishing the rest of our days.

No, we are going to have to work 'til the rocking chair really gets us.

It is not a pleasant outlook for those who have been in the work stream for 40 or 50 years.

I am galloping toward that so-called retirement age so fast that I feel like "Pleasant Colony" in the Belmont Stakes.

But, unlike the horse, I haven't banked a half-million. There is no way I can be turned out to pasture.

Looks like I will just have to keep on racing to meet those deadlines until I pick up the paper one day and read my obituary.●

INTRODUCTION OF FOOD SAFETY LEGISLATION

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

• Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, today, in partnership with Mr. WAMPLER of Virginia, the ranking minority member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am joining a number of our colleagues in introducing the Food Safety Amendments of 1981. This is the first step toward what I believe will be one of the most important congressional decisions in decades.

The issues we are raising in the bill we are introducing today will affect the welfare of every American. Our object is to create a food safety system which gives our people continued assurance that their food supply is safe and free from substances which could do harm—but which also takes account of the fact that the consumer has a great stake in the adequacy and cost of the food supply. We want a system which recognizes that harmful contaminants must be avoided; but which also recognizes that people suffer harm when they cannot get enough food, or when food is priced beyond their ability to pay.

The bill we are introducing does not represent a determination that this measure in its current form has the best and final answers to the problems which currently exist. This bill is, instead, a starting point for considering all the complex issues involved in food safety and finding, in consultation with all interested parties, a workable solution to a serious national problem. We appreciate the need for thorough consideration of all facets of this legislation and of any alternatives which may be advanced in what is certain to be a comprehensive and careful hearing process in several congressional committees.

Our colleagues in the House, and the public, should note this point which I wish to stress:

We do not intend any reduction in safety. On the contrary, it is our intent to give the public a greater degree of protection by seeking insurance against disruption in the food supply along with insurance against the presence of harmful ingredients in food.

We need an overhaul of our system of food safety law, however, because the current system is too complex, too rigid, and could under some circumstances result in actions which seriously reduce food supplies without—and I underline without—making any real contribution to food safety.

For example, our present system is based on what scientists call a no risk policy when dealing with substances which could cause cancer. But this policy, which reaches for a goal on which we all agree, was drafted in a period when the ability of technologists to detect substances in food was crude by today's standards. Today, laboratories can measure components of food in amounts of 10 parts per billion. They can tell us that substances are present and, under existing law, they can pose the possibility of serious disruption in food production. But these detection devices cannot tell us whether a trace residue which would have been reported as a zero with the technology of the past is, in fact, a real danger to health.

The American system of food safety and quality assurance gives our people better protection than any other similar system in the world. But it has had problems in the past which could erode public confidence in the regulatory agencies which protect our food supply, and in the food industry. And as serious as the past problems may have been—involving cases like the controversy over saccharin and over nitrites in meat—the most serious problems could lie ahead of us. As the ability of science to detect increasingly small traces of possibly meaningless residues continues to grow, the possibility of a tragically disruptive and needless action affecting our food supply continues to increase.

We are living today with a network of law which is full of contradictions and conflicts. For example, Government regulators under existing law may allow the marketing of foods which contain unavoidable contaminants due to natural environmental factors. Yet, the presence of certain additive materials in food can produce a ban even if the materials are used in amounts too small to cause cancer in man.

The bill we are introducing proposes to move toward an improved food safety system by setting a standard of safety which takes account of changing technology, and by requiring that food safety decisions must be based on the best available scientific judgments. The legislation seeks to make it clear that food safety decisions are to be based on protecting the American people against significant risks which pose real dangers, not on maintaining a zero risk policy which many scientists now agree can lead to more problems than it solves.

If we can succeed in improving our food safety law, we will be helping consumers and we will also be helping farmers who are faced under existing law with constant threats of unrealistic and unnecessary regulatory actions.

Our bill would retain the basic structure of current laws—the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act. Provisions in these acts would, in the new bill, be made consistent with each other so that the same kinds of standards and procedures would apply to all foods.•

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF PROCLAIMING UKRAINIAN STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

• Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1981, marks the 40th anniversary of the date when the Ukraine proclaimed the renewal of its independence against the German occupation. This is a very important date, not only to the people in Ukraine or to Americans of Ukrainian descent, but for all those who cherish the values of freedom and independence. Unfortunately, since 1941, the civil liberties of the Ukrainian population have been severely repressed and those people have not enjoyed the values of freedom and independence.

The day celebrating the renewal of Ukrainian independence presents an opportunity for commemoration and reflection by us in the United States. First, as a day of commemoration, we offer a tribute to the strength and courage of the Ukrainian people who have endured hardships for many years now.

Moreover, as Americans who enjoy guaranteed constitutional rights, we reflect upon the fact that not all people everywhere in the world are as privileged as we. Until human rights are the reality for all, let us not waiver in our commitment to human freedom and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to know of the bravery and determination exhibited by the Ukrainians. These people stand as an example to those of us who have not known such suffering. I am also proud to know of organizations in the United States, such as the Organization for Defense of the Four Freedoms of the Ukraine, who have accomplished much fine work in reminding us of the past and present conditions of those living in the Ukraine.•

STATEMENT OF LINDSAY ROUX

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

• Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the RECORD the June 15, 1981, testimony of Mrs. Donna Stamey before the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care of the

Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Today, I would like to share with my colleagues the testimony of Mr. Lindsay Roux. As you will read in his statement, Mr. Roux firmly believes that his life was saved by the excellent counseling he received from the staff of the Atlanta Vet Center.

STATEMENT OF LINDSAY ROUX

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee and fellow vets, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for allowing me to testify before you today.

My name is Lindsay Roux and I served in the Vietnam Theater in 1969 and 1970 in the United States Air Force for eleven months when I was rotated and discharged. My unit was a special operations outfit based in Thailand but operating in Laos. My duties were as an insurgent carrying out covert operations. While in Laos I wore civilian clothes and most of the time carried no identification. I was informed that due to the nature of the operations, its success was based on total secrecy both in Theater and at home. While in Laos we were also very much on our own, in so much as there was not vast U.S. military backups to support us or come to our aid as in Vietnam.

The reason I have mentioned the above is because, during my tour of duty, I was under tremendous pressure, both in physical danger and mentally from the alienation from my peers and family. I had to learn, and practice daily, being cold and unfeeling about human values and life. I had to hide and mask what feelings I did have as well as control my communications with others in all forms. All of this was carried over into civilian life due to my rapid transfer from operational status to stateside release in a matter of three days with no decompression or debriefing time. To make matters worse, I left, participated in, was injured, and started home with the pride of having served my country and was welcomed back with a spit in the face and ridicule for being over there. Don't get me wrong, I am proud that I served, but to this date I am confused as to why our nation couldn't and generally still can't separate the war from the warrior. These things were instrumental in cementing my inability to readjust.

Shortly after my return home I went to work and three years later I was married. The memories, confusion and learned traits remained even though my wife, family and friends told me to put it out of my mind and forget it. Because of my inability to communicate and my controlled communication trait I was unable to put it out of my mind or forget it. Because I could not adjust to civilian life, my wife asked me for a divorce. The pressure of loosing the only person I had been able to gain any feeling for after my return home, including my family and my own daughter, plus the pressure of eleven years ago was more than I could handle. I tried going to a psychologist and a minister for counseling and treatment. They felt my war experiences were the main factor to my problems and state of depression. I was given a choice of being committed to a psychiatric institution or coming to Atlanta and going to the VA Hospital. They recommended I go to the Vet Center, something I had never heard of before, rather than coming there. I arrived at the Vet Center shaking so hard I could hardly get a cigarette in my mouth much less light it. At that point I was taking over 80 milligrams of valium daily, could keep nothing but milk in my stomach, and was crying uncontrollably for no reason. One of the Vet Center counselors, Willie Chappell, spent three days almost continuously with me, talking, wiping tears, reasoning, and trying to help me gain control. Thanks to Willie's and Dr. Steve Levenberg's help and getting involved in the peer rap groups at the center, I was able to overcome many of my problems.

In order to continue my recovery, I have had to remain in Atlanta to go to the Vet Center leaving my wife, six year old daughter, and home in Savannah. This, in itself, has caused me to make a serious decision; to remain here and loose any chance of reconciliation, or, go home and loose the only chance I have had of straightening out my life.

If the Vet Center had not existed I would have taken my own life by now. I have tried. Unfortunately, there are many more veterans that are in the shape I was once in and they have not been informed of this program. The program is now in danger before it has even done its job, thus, endangering the lives and well being of many thousands more men and women who served in good faith. I hope the government can now understand that, unlike any other program, the Vet Center is working to bring many people like myself home and give us back our feelings. I only hope the program can continue and be expanded to reach the many other veterans not yet informed.

Gentlemen, thank you for letting me testify before the committee today and I will be glad to answer any questions you might have.●

INCREASING CRIME RATE

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, the two issues that concern Americans most are the rising cost of living and the ever-increasing crime rate. A great deal has been said recently of the former, but not nearly enough of the latter.

The tense atmosphere that has enveloped the Nation in response to the crimes against black children in Atlanta has been expressed in the Congress in the form of seven bills expressing outrage and offering Federal assistance to the authorities in Atlanta. These steps need to be taken, as the horrendous series of murders is never far from our minds.

The Atlanta murders are particularly poignant because all of their victims are black and young. Their tragic deaths, and the information which media coverage has revealed about their lives and the atmosphere of fear and racial tension which this situation has created in Atlanta, has given us reason to reflect upon the issue of crime, and the impact it has on all of our communities.

A short while ago, I sent a newsletter to my constituents in Philadelphia, and of the responses I received, crime was listed at the No. 1 concern. Crime is not a localized problem; it affects all people, nationwide. Living in fear has done inestimable damage to the spirit of our communities.

Recently, I received a letter from the members of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Omega Omega Chapter, a predominately black organization in Philadelphia. They made suggestions which I feel are concise and address the problem of crime from a black perspective, in a forthright and novel manner. I would like to share them with my colleagues today.

1. Encourage legislation which will develop mechanisms by which there will be close collaboration among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in cases of violent crime where there is a reasonable basis to presume racial motivation.

2. Support legislation which requires those connected with violent crimes to compensate victims of those crimes (or their survivors) from their own personal resources or through work for which they would be remunerated.

3. Support efforts which foster more positive relationships between various ideologies within the community, while at the same time speaking out against racism.

4. Actively campaign against random acts of violence perpetuated against blacks which are racially motivated.

5. Declare your support for all economic policies that serve to close the gap between the "haves and have nots" in American society.

We do not know if the person or persons behind the Atlanta killings is racially motivated, but two facts have been highlighted as a result of the national focus on the murders. The first is that fear of crime is almost as crippling as being the victim of a criminal act. The second is that, across the country, the number of blacks who are victims of crime is disproportionately high.

These are problems that must be addressed in any attempt by the Government to respond to the issue of crime as a whole.●

DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION FOR OUR MENTALLY DISABLED CITIZENS

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the testimony of Ms. Jeanne Farrell, who is the commissioner of social services for the town of Greenwich, Conn. Ms. Farrell presented her thoughtful and incisive remarks at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped last month here in Washington. Her comments outline the many problems the national goal of deinstitutionalization has created for all citizens.

Ms. Farrell's remarks graphically illustrate the practical problems communities experience when they are called upon to implement a policy without adequate local resources. The current method of deinstitutionalization for our mentally disabled citizens creates undue hardship for these communities and causes needless suffering among the special citizens the system intends to serve. Ms. Farrell's testimony further indicates that the current policy of systematic neglect must be promptly replaced by one which provides for the optimum therapeutic treatment setting for all mentally disabled citizens.

Ms. Farrell's remarks follow:

DEINSTITUTIONALIZING MENTALLY ILL: SHOULDN'T IT WORK IN GREENWICH?

(By Jeanne Farrell)

Two unrelated events—the discovery of the miracle drug Thorazine in the 1950s, and the Kennedy family's campaign for the rights of the retarded in the 1960s—paved the way for deinstitutionalization of retarded and mentally ill people. People with different handicaps, but similar problems.

No longer would mentally ill or retarded people be confined to large, impersonal institutions which generally were located far from the patient's family, friends, and community.

No longer would handicapped citizens be "warehoused," sometimes for life, when they could return to their home towns where they could live, work and play—like the rest of us—and be helped by caring communities.

Miracle drugs would help the mentally ill modify their behavior to "acceptable" norms. They'd walk the same streets as their neighbors, go to school, hold a job, socialize as they wished, vote. Acceptable. Just like you and me. The same would hold true for the retarded. The Kennedy's said so. After all, those were the days of Camelot.

No longer would the mentally ill and the retarded be detained in big institutions which were "bad." They would go home. And this, of course, was "good."

As the years went by, more miracle drugs were discovered. They were given in bigger doses to the mentally ill. Many of them began to feel better. It was easier to get through the day. To think again about school. Jobs. Ball games. Dancing. Walking through the fields on a summer day. Above all—leaving the hospital. Going home.

For the retarded, the late 1960s and 70s saw tremendous grass roots support—mostly from relatives—for deinstitutionalization. There was no reason, as the theory went, why retarded people could not go home, attend neighborhood schools, work, and lead productive lives. For those who had no family, there would be group homes and apartments. The frosting on the cake? Community care would be cheaper than institutions. In other words, as deinstitutionalization took hold throughout the land, everyone would live happily ever after.

It was a new era.

Or was it?

Let me tell you what happened in Greenwich, Connecticut as theory came into conflict with reality. But first, may I suggest that if deinstitutionalization should have worked anywhere, it should have worked in my town. An attractive community of 62,000 people, located 35 miles from Manhattan Island, Greenwich is sophisticated, affluent, knowledgeable. It cares about people and it has many services.

Greenwich also has problems: drug abuse, poor people, traffic jams, a zero housing vacancy rate. Trains run late, the aging population has grown beyond our resources, and, last year, our water reserve dwindled to a 19-day supply. But Greenwich is a nice place to live despite these annoyances.

It should have been easy for us to absorb handicapped people into our community. Easier than for larger, more troubled cities or rural areas with fewer services.

In fact, neither the retarded nor the mentally ill has fared well with deinstitutionalization—in relation to need—although the former group has made more progress than discharged mental patients. Perhaps, because mental retardation is a bit more acceptable than mental illness which remains shrouded not only in secrecy, guilt, and suspicion, but also within a widespread and inherent fear of the disease and the people it afflicts. Madness and spookiness go together, as story tellers such as Poe, Horrman and Wilkie Collins well knew.

Perhaps it was the widespread support for the deinstitutionalization of the retarded. Or maybe it was an organization called the Greenwich Association for Retarded Citizens. Founded 27 years ago, this agency has helped many retarded people lead productive lives. It also sponsors a residence for women with a capacity for eight. Two of the residents came from an institution, 10 more are waiting to come home but there's no space, and four more people returned to their families with the Association's help. A few others, unknown to the Association for Retarded Citizens, also returned to Greenwich but we don't know how they are doing. Let's hope all is well.

Progress? Certainly. But, all told only 20 people have come home in five years.

Of course, if we measured the benefits of deinstitutionalization in purely humane terms and not in numbers, we should consider a comment made recently by a Greenwich woman who had spent 30 years in an institution. As she and some friends sat around one evening after dinner, she said, "You have no idea how wonderful it is to be able to decide what you want to eat." Something the rest of us take for granted.

The story of deinstitutionalization for mentally ill people is different. There is no Greenwich Association for Mentally Ill Citizens. I suspect there is no such organization anyplace in the United States. I hope I'm wrong.

Here's what's happened to some of these people in Greenwich.

Sam is 26. He's been in and out of mental hospitals since he was 16. He's a floater, has no skills, no family, no income, no home. Several weeks ago the state hospital called. Sam had readmitted himself, was considered for the Alcoholic Unit but rejected. The reason? He needed long-term treatment, and, as the theory of deinstitutionalization goes, Sam's community should provide this care. Sam was put on a bus for Greenwich. No plan. No money. He ended up on welfare at a commercial boarding house in a nearby town with an assortment of drug addicts, ex-convicts and other "misfits." He came to see us on Christmas Eve and asked to be sent to Boston to stay with friends. We called Boston and then we put Sam on a train. He hasn't been seen since.

Rosita is 36. She was divorced, has three children, ages 10, 12 and 14. A schizophrenic, Rosita has been hospitalized 14 times in 18 years. The police called at 2 a.m. when they found her and the children in a stalled car on U.S. 1 in central Greenwich. The children were put in an Emergency Shelter. Rosita "went berserk" at police headquarters and was brought to the local hospital. Next day, she was committed to the state hospital, 45 miles away. The children stayed at the Shelter, Rosita improved a bit, and three days later she was discharged. Again, no money. No plan. She disappeared. We sent her children to Pennsylvania to be with their father. Later the state hospital told us that "community care" was the answer for Rosita.

Another case. Heidi is 22. She's a beautiful young woman whose mother committed suicide when Heidi was 14. Her father then deserted his four children. Heidi had been hospitalized on six different occasions in five years because she is "dangerous" to herself and others. Last month she was hospitalized for the seventh time but was promptly sent back to Greenwich. Again, on a bus. The reason? She is "chronically ill, needs community care."

Community Care. It sounds as if it comes in a bottle and can be purchased at the drug store. Translated, it means food, clothing, shelter, medical and rehabilitation services, transportation, training, a job, and someone to talk to, not to mention bolstering family ties where one exists. So far we've been able to provide Heidi with food—a meal ticket at a local restaurant—and a lonely room in a boarding house.

Medical care? Training? A job? Heidi says, "What's the use?" But we're trying and, with the help of a new mental health coordinator, funded with a Housing and Urban Development grant, we believe we can help Heidi, and Sam, and Rosita and all the others. Perhaps we even can help Anna who is 62, and Perry who is almost 50. Anna was sent to the state hospital after her husband's death two years ago. She was reclusive, wrote strange letters to the F.B.I., refused to pay bills, and sometimes threatened neighborhood children. She improved considerably while hospitalized and was discharged to a nursing home upstate. She's unhappy and wants to return to Greenwich but there's no place for Anna.

Perry is epileptic; has an I.Q. of 65, and is chronically depressed. He's wrecked three cars over several years. He's injured people in fits of anger and his family doesn't want him. Neither does the state hospital.

My assignment today was to tell you how Greenwich is helping people sent home from institutions to reenter the community and to lead productive lives. As I reviewed several cases, I found that we are struggling just to help these people with food, shelter, medical care. Employment is pretty far down the road in the order of priorities.

Why? Why such a struggle? Why isn't deinstitutionalization working in Greenwich except for the few retarded people I mentioned?

First, no one asked us if we could absorb these people into our community. It seems that no one even thought about our ability, our readiness, or even our desire to do so—questions that surely were researchable if mental health leaders had remembered to talk to us. Instead, they decided that salvation was to be found for the retarded and the mentally ill at home.

Second, since Greenwich had no say about deinstitutionalization, we had no opportunity to ensure smoother sailing for people coming home from institutions. More importantly, when the movement began, no one really knew—and we still don't know—precisely what's needed to help people reenter the community successfully. Too much emphasis has been placed too soon on the dominant role of social factors. Apparently policy makers have not observed that maybe these factors are important in some kinds of mental illness and mental retardation but not so much in others.

Third? Our society believes that everybody is equal . . . on the surface; but we don't like people who are different. And most of us tend to think of people who are retarded as "different." We also don't like unexpected behavior and most of us associate mental illness with danger. We don't like that. It upsets us. So we sweep it all under the rug. Along comes deinstitutionalization. Not only must we face up to reality, but we have to deal with it in our own backyard. That hasn't been easy for Greenwich. We're not so different from everyone else.

Perhaps we still can find the answers for Sam and Rosita and Heidi. And maybe for Anna and Perry. For the retarded people who are waiting to come home. And for all the others. But we can't do it alone nor should we try to do so. All of the pieces must be put together for each person—food, shelter, medical care, transportation—the whole package.

This means cutting across community lines to mobilize all available resources, not just those in Greenwich.

My conclusion is that no one—retarded or mentally ill—not one single person—should be deinstitutionalized until an individual plan has been made to ensure a successful reentry into the community. Otherwise, vulnerable people are hurt in the name of progress.●

SUPPORT OF FEDERAL STUDENT AID PROGRAMS

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 16, the House Education and Labor Committee agreed to restore funding for guaranteed student loans (GSL). The House committe would add $250 million back to the 1982 GSL budget by lifting its proposed income cap, but would cut $125 million by raising its proposed loan fee from 3.5 percent of a loan to 4 percent. This action would put the GSL budget at $2.702 billion in fiscal year 1982, saving $380 million instead of the original $505 million. Under the new GSL plan, students would have to pay a fee up front to get a maximum $2,500 loans, whereas, they would have only had to pay $87.50 under earlier proposals. That fee compares with the $125 a student would have to pay under money-saving plans approved by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. The Senate committee also proposed a $25,000 income cap; whereas, the House committee would place no restrictions on those wishing to apply for the loan.

Testimony received by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee indicated that loan proposals advanced by the administration would have resulted in no guaranteed loans made this fall. More than 2 million students would have found that they could not obtain a loan. It is further estimated that college enrollments would have declined by 500,000 to 750,000 students. Needless to say, this occurrence would have turned Mr. Reagan's so-called program for economic recovery into a national tragedy.

Relatively speaking, the administration's cost reduction proposals in Federal student aid programs would have a dramatic impact on Pennsylvanians. From recently conducted research by the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency (PHEAA), it has been estimated that a total reduction of at least $161 million in loans would occur. Almost 43 percent of the total GSL loans expected to be received by Pennsylvania students to attend Pennsylvania institutions would be forfeited in 1981-82. Within this total, full-time dependent undergraduate borrowers would lose at least $123 million, or 46 percent of the loan moneys made accessible to them in 1980-81. Full-time independent undergraduate borrowers would lose at least $9 million, or 26 percent of the loan moneys.

Another survey taken in my home State indicates that 90 percent of the Pennsylvania lenders might possibly participate in the current parent loans for undergraduate students (PLUS) program, as it was written into law by the Higher Education Act of 1980. However, less than 5 percent of the surveyed lenders said that their banks were likely to participate if the administration's proposal to eliminate special allowances paid to lenders and extend repayment terms from 10 to 20 years were enacted. About 40 percent of the lenders said they would not participate in PLUS under these conditions and about half said they were very unlikely to participate. Therefore, the administration's proposal would obviously make the loans to parents inoperative in Pennsylvania.

Another proposal by the administration would give the lender an option to collect the interest from the student as the interest becomes due payable during the in-school and grace period. Of the lenders surveyed, 31 percent indicated that they would not participate in the program under this condition and 42 percent expected a decrease in their participation in the GSL under the same condition. In other words, these loans would simply become unavailable in Pennsylvania because of their unattractiveness to the lender, thus making it nearly impossible for parents to receive loans to help meet their children's needs.

The administration's proposed revisions in the GSL program, along with other changes in the Federal student aid programs (Pell grants and the Student Loan Marketing Association), would be a detriment to all those seeking an education. Administrative recommendations regarding GSL's would place an increased burden on the American family, particularly the middle-class families. The contributions of the GSL program are too vital to be lost unnecessarily, therefore, it is my belief that we should be doing all we can to insure educational equity to our future professional.●

THE NEOVANDALS IN THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Tennessean had some rather harsh words to say May 28 and June 17 on the Secretary of the Interior's plan to dismantle the Office of Surface Mining.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 28, 1981]

REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S CONTEMPT FOR ENVIRONMENT

The Reagan administration has begun its expected move to gut the stripmining regulatory process in the nation by eliminating half of the federal offices which enforce stripmine regulations.

The administration claims it wants to protect the environment and see that strip miners are prevented from abusing the landscape. But it would be difficult for anyone to perceive this from the administration's actions.

Interior Secretary James Watt said last week he was closing down the Office of Surface Mining's regional office in Knoxville, which oversees regulations in a five-state area, and the federal inspections offices at Crossville and Norris.

These are the only offices the OSM has in the state to patrol the vast stripmining area of East Tennessee. In their place, the Interior secretary said, he will establish a "state liaison office" in Nashville, far from the site of stripmine operations.

It is a mystery what the OSM needs with a liaison office in Nashville. This is an indication of the Reagan administration's seriousness about controlling stripmine abuses. The federal officers in East Tennessee are about the only ones that have ever enforced regulations against strip miners. The idea now seems to be to get them out of the way and turn the strip miners loose to do what they please to the mountain landscape.

The administration says it wants to turn the duty of enforcing stripmine regulations over to the states. This has a certain shallow appeal to some. But too often "turning authority over to the states" is just an excuse for doing nothing in some field where action is called for.

Few states have ever done much of anything to prevent stripminers from butchering the land, polluting water supplies and leaving vast regions a wasteland. And Tennessee is among the states doing the least.

Anyone who has seen the Tennessee legislature bend to the will of the strip-mine lobby on almost every pertinent mining issue coming before it has some idea of what state regulation of strip mines will be like.

The OSM was created by Congress in 1977 because state governments failed to enforce a 1972 law designed to halt abuses in the coal stripmining industry. Nothing has happened since then to lead anyone to believe the states will be any more inclined to enforce the regulations now than they were in 1972.

Understandably, the mining industry in Tennessee was delighted with the administration's announcement. Members of the industry who want to stripmine the land as they please without any interference from anyone know they have little to fear from state mining inspectors. And if some inspector should get conscientious and try to enforce the regulations, some miners know how he can be handled.

The administration's course is inviting anarchy in the coal fields. Inspectors have been chased away from mining sites by guns and threats of violence, and it is likely to happen again unless the inspectors are backed up by the police power of the state.

The Reagan administration is callously destroying a regulatory agency created by Congress to serve a vital public need. It is sickening to see the public good sacrificed to greed and political expediency and legitimate environmental concerns held in contempt by the nation's highest leadership.

[From the Nashville Tennessean, June 17, 1981]

STRIPMINE LAW SHOULD BE ENFORCED

The U.S. Supreme Court—in a strong, unanimous decision—has upheld the stripmine-control law passed by Congress in 1977.

The high court struck down two lower court rulings that provisions of the bill requiring surface coal miners to restore land to its original contours when they finish mining violate the Constitution.

The Supreme Court held that the law did not violate the Constitution and that Congress had acted within its authority to regulate interstate commerce. The lower court decisions were appealed by the Justice Deparment while former President Carter was still in office.

The law, which took five years for Congress to pass, began to be attacked on constitutional grounds almost as soon as it was signed. Some suits are still pending, but the positive quality of the high court's ruling this week gives hope that the law will stand up under all challenges.

The Supreme Court's opinion would be a landmark in the long, hard fight to protect the environment from the ravages of surface mining but for the fact that the Reagan administration and especially its Secretary of Interior, Mr. James Watt, have little interest in enforcing it.

If the lower court rulings had been made after Mr. Reagan became president, there is little likelihood they would have been appealed. Now that the Supreme Court has said the law is constitutional and a valid exercise of congressional authority, there is little likelihood that Mr. Reagan and Mr. Watt will enforce it.

It seems that Mr. Reagan's and Mr. Watt's main interest is not in protecting the environment or in serving the public, but in pleasing the big business interests—in this case the mining industry.

Thousands of Americans—frustrated by the refusal of the states to protect their landscapes from the stripminer's bulldozer—have worked many years to obtain a strong, effective federal stripmine-control law. Now that this goal has been achieved, the present occupant of the White House and his Secretary of Interior want to turn the job of stripmine regulation back to the states. This would be a return to the condition which existed before—no protection at all for the environment.

Those who have fought so hard to obtain this protection for the environment should not accept this. They should fight a little longer to see that the stripmine law is enforced. The law has been passed by Congress and upheld by the Supreme Court. It should be enforced just as any other law is. Mr. Reagan and Mr. Watt should not be able to just decide not to enforce it. Those who are concerned for the environment should demand that it be enforced.●

W. E. MICHAEL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, there are those who continue to serve long after they have paid their dues to their profession and fellow man. Fifty-five years of service in the legal profession would seem to be enough for anyone, but for W. E. Michael the years are simply markers showing where he has been and showing an open road of discoveries yet to be made.

On Independence Day those many friends he has accumulated in his years of service will gather at 701 North Oak Street in Sweetwater, Tenn., and honor him on the anniversary of 55 years spent in the practice of law. It will be a time to recall the many contributions he has made to Monroe County and its citizens over the last half-century.

Lawyer, author, legislator, developer; though each of these are titles W. E. Michael has carried they describe him only in part. He has also been a good father and teacher; a man willing to contribute his time and experience in the promotion of his community and improving its quality of life.

W. E. Michael began his long career of legal service as a 21-year-old. Born in Wilkes County, N.C., he attended the schools in McMinn County, Tenn., near his present home. He went on to what is now East Tennessee State University in Johnson City and Carson-Newman College in Jefferson City. By the time he was 19 years old he was a professor teaching Spanish at Cumberland College in Lebanon, Tenn., and at Carson-Newman.

From these roots a legal career grew. With the career came a devotion to civic duty. W. E. Michael was the city attorney for 25 years in Sweetwater. He served three terms in the Tennessee General Assembly as a State legislator. Since 1968 he has served as chairman of the Cherohala Commission aimed at regional planning for the Cherokee and Nantahala National Forests area.

Politically he is a Republican, but his friends come from both sides of the aisle. Estes Kefauver, the former Tennessee Senator and Democratic Party nominee for Vice President in 1956 was a neighbor of Michael's from Madisonville. In a Senate hearing on the Tellico Plains-Robbinsville Road project Kefauver referred to Michael as one of his "best friends." He also became close friends with the man who defeated him in his run for the Third Congressional District seat in Tennessee. He may have lost the election, but he won a friend in J. B. Frazier during that campaign.

Somehow during these years of legal and civic activities he found time to write "The Age of Error," a study of Supreme Court decisions and their impact on society. W. E. Michael also took part in the development of tourism in Monroe County through the promotion of Lost Sea, "The World's Largest Underground Lake." He also was responsible for the establishment of a tobacco market in Sweetwater to serve the region's farmers.

The law is not W. E. Michael's only love of the past 55 years. Only 6 months after going into practice he married Claudia Reeves. From this marriage came two children, Jean Michael Summitt and Van R. Michael. Van is following in his father's footsteps and is his law partner in the firm of Michael & Michael.

This anniversary provides an opportunity for those of us who know W. E. Michael to reflect on the accomplishments he has made. He has paid his dues and earned his rest, yet he continues to work for the people of Monroe County and I for one am glad he does.●

THE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATORY COST ESTIMATE ACT OF 1981

HON. STANLEY N. LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my colleagues from California (Mr. MINETA) and New York (Mr. ZEFERETTI) in introducing the State and Local Government Regulatory Cost Estimate Act of 1981. This legislation requires Federal agencies to provide estimates of costs to State and local governments of all proposed rules and regulations.

I offer this legislation because I believe that the Federal Government has failed to fully assess the consequences of its actions on States and localities. In our increasingly complex economy, even minor changes in Federal programs and policies can impose significant burdens on local governments, burdens which are often unexpected and usually unintended.

It is important that both Federal and local officials have the opportunity and the means to assess all potential costs and consequences of Federal actions. The legislation we are introducing provides the means for making such assessments by requiring Federal agencies to include in notices of proposed rulemaking an estimate of the costs to State and local governments resulting from the proposed rule or regulation. The proposal would also require agencies, whenever possible, to identify available sources of funding to pay such costs, or to indicate that no such funding is available. Finally, the proposal would require Federal agencies to include in notices a statement requesting comments from State and local governments regarding the cost estimates and the identified sources of funding to meet these costs. These proposals are similar to legislation introduced in the Senate (S. 1225) by Senators SPECTER, SASSER, and D'AMATO.

I believe there is a very clear need for such a procedure. During the past decade we have witnessed an unprecedented expansion in Federal assistance and a corresponding growth in Federal regulations and controls. Power has shifted from local elected officials to Federal bureaucrats. State and local governments have had their traditional policy and funding priorities disrupted and their operations so encumbered with the details of responding to Federal agencies that many have lost their capacity to respond to the concerns of local citizens.

During the 1970's more than 150 new categorical aid programs were enacted by Congress, bringing the total number of such programs to nearly 500. Each program has come with its own set of requirements and regulations and its own set of hidden costs. In addition, Congress enacted numerous regulatory measures requiring State and local jurisdictions to engage or refrain from certain actions deemed to be in the public interest. These measures imposed new costs on local governments with little or no reimbursement for these costs.

A recent study conducted by the National Science Foundation found that local officials in the jurisdiction surveyed are required to comply at any given time with a minimum of 1,000 Federal and State requirements. These requirements may appear beneficial on paper, but many prove extremely costly to implement. A study of 10 local jurisdictions sponsored by the Joint Economic Committee found that in 1978 the additional cost to these jurisdictions of just 10 Federal laws amounted to $52 million in incremental operating costs and $113 million in additional long-term capital costs. These jurisdictions were required to spend an average of $25 per capita to meet the additional costs imposed by the legislation.

This expansion in Federal assistance and regulation has not had the intended effect of making Government more responsive to social needs and public concerns. In fact, the opposite has occurred. The uncentralized and uncoordinated administration of hundreds of Federal programs has increased the overall cost of Government, has made it less efficient and, most important, has made it less responsive than ever before.

It has become clear that Federal legislation and rulemaking can no longer be considered in isolation. Federal objectives cannot be achieved, nor current programs simplified by merely shifting a greater burden of the cost to State and local governments. The public's growing resistance to higher taxes and new public expenditures should serve to remind us that the cost of government, whether at the Federal, State or local level, ultimately falls on the same taxpayers.

The cost estimate provisions we are introducing would require Federal agencies to identify early in the rulemaking process, all the significant costs associated with a proposed rule or procedure. This can result, I believe, in more responsive, less costly regulations, while encouraging greater participation by State and local officials in the rulemaking process.

This proposal complements a bill we introduced earlier in the session. The State and Local Government Cost Estimate Act (H.R. 1465), which requires the Congressional Budget Office to prepare estimates of costs to States and localities resulting from legislation reported out of congressional committees. H.R. 1465 is designed to permit Congress to identify, early in its deliberations, the costs that could be passed on to local jurisdictions as a result of specific legislative actions. Our new proposal would take this concept one step further by requiring estimates of costs to States and local governments of all rules or regulations issued to implement or modify existing programs and to carry out the decisions of regulatory bodies.

In both instances, the cost estimates would serve as warning signals. They would provide Federal agencies and Congress with an indication that proposed actions may have harmful fiscal consequences for State and local governments. If Congress or a Federal agency decide to proceed with the new law or rule, they can do so with a clear idea of the fiscal implications and can adapt these measures accordingly.

The idea of requiring cost estimates for legislation and regulations is not a new one. Cost estimate procedures have operated at the State level since the late 1950's. Given the constitutional limitations on the taxing and budgetary powers of many States, providing cost estimates, or fiscal notes, has proven to be an excellent means of anticipating all the costs associated with new legislative or executive actions. Currently, 47 States employ some method for estimating the costs resulting from State actions. Thirty-five of these States specifically provide estimates of costs to local jurisdictions. In States where these systems have operated for many years, local officials are convinced the process has provided substantial savings to local governments and to taxpayers.

I think it is time for Congress to adopt some of the cost-savings measures that have been developed by local officials in response to inceasingly tight budgetary conditions. This legislation, and the cost estimate proposal in H.R. 1465, offer important steps toward achieving the kind of fiscal responsibility at the Federal level the American people have been demanding of all levels of government. I urge my colleagues to support these proposals.●

LIMITED CONGRESSIONAL TERMS, 4-YEAR HOUSE TERMS

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced two separate and alternative resolutions proposing a constitutional amendment to change the terms of office for Members of Congress. The first resolution, House Joint Resolution 264, limits Members of the U.S. House of Representatives to six 2-year terms and Members of the U.S. Senate to two 6-year terms. It is a companion bill to Senate Joint Resolution 25. According to the Library of Congress, since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, no single proposal to limit terms has received as many cosponsors as House Joint Resolution 264.

The second resolution, House Joint Resolution 267 increases the length of terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years with staggered elections being held so that half of the House will be elected every 2 years and limits the number of terms which can be served by House and Senate Members.

This resolution comes the closest possible to providing three 4-year terms for House Members under the staggered term concept. In my judgment, staggered terms, whereby as close as possible to half the Membership of the House is up for election every 2 years, are essential to maintaining the House as that body of Congress closest to the people. If all House elections coincided with that of the

President, there is a greater likelihood for setting a pattern of straight ticket voting. Providing for off year elections will protect against coattail sweeps. This way an important check in the great system of checks and balances created by our Founding Fathers would be maintained. Lengthening terms of House Members is an important supplement to limiting the terms to correct the problems which have clearly arisen, but it should not be done in a manner which could threaten the checks and balances system which forms the bulwark of our constitutional government.

Since reapportionment requires a redistribution of congressional seats among the States every 10 years and a redrawing of district lines, it is impossible to have a staggered system of electing House Members to three consecutive 4-year terms. The resolution I have introduced takes this into account and provides for the election of all House Members once every 10 years following reapportionment and thereafter a resumption of staggered 4-year terms. As a result a Member could conceivably serve 2-year terms on two occasions and remain a Member for as long as 14 years, although 12 years is the common base of the limitation. The Senate elections do not pose this problem and the limitation is for two 6-year terms.

My overriding concern in introducing two alternative resolutions is with gaining a reasonable limitation on terms of office in both Houses of Congress and stimulating the debate in the legislative process necessary to achieve this. My personal preference is for the amendment which includes a modified lengthening of the terms of office of House Members to 4 years.

The present 2-year term of Members of the U.S. House came from a compromise by those who wanted a 1-year term and those who wanted a 3-year term at the Constitutional Convention in 1787. When the 2-year term was approved on June 21, 1787, it was so much of a compromise that the only person who spoke in favor of it was George Mason.

During the first 39 Congresses there was little challenge to the 2-year term. On February 8, 1869, during the 40th session of Congress, the first recorded resolution to lengthen the House term to 4 years was introduced. Since 1869, only five Congresses have not seen the introduction of at least one proposal to alter the House terms. Altogether there have been over 200 constitutional amendments introduced to lengthen the House term. The closest Congress has come to such a decision was a vote in 1906 of 89 in favor to 86 opposed, but the effort to gain a 4-year House term failed to achieve the two-thirds majority required for passage.

In 1951 President Harry S. Truman proposed a 4-year term for Members of the House and later urged a limit of 12 years of service on each body of Congress. In 1955 President Dwight Eisenhower supported the 4-year term for House Members and also later advocated a limit of 12 years of service. In 1966 President Lyndon B. Johnson urged the lengthening of House terms to 4 years, and in 1973 President Richard Nixon advocated the same.

The idea of limiting terms of Congressmen is not new either, but only modern political realities have made its enactment a necessity and sparked public and congressional interest. The earliest proposed constitutional amendment to limit terms was introduced in the First Congress in 1789. The resolution stipulated that no person could serve more than 6 years in an 8-year period. Actually the concept predated our Constitution; the Continental Congress adopted a proposal by John Dickinson of Delaware in 1777 limiting delegates under the Articles of Confederation to serving 3 years in any 6-year period. However, after the First Congress, the issue of limiting terms lay dormant until the mid-1940's. The primary reason for this dormancy was the tradition in the early years of our country to serve only two terms in the U.S. House and then retire. As late as the 1840's, 40 percent to 50 percent of the Congress left office at each election. From 1860 to 1920 the average length of service doubled from 4 to 8 years. By 1901 when the 57th Congress convened, for the first time less than 30 percent of its Members were freshmen. In 1981, when the 97th Congress convened, only 17 percent of the U.S. House of Representatives were freshmen.

Perhaps the most significant development in recent times has been the tremendous growth in public support for both lengthening terms of House Members to 4 years and limiting terms of all Members of Congress. A 1946 Gallup poll showed 40 percent of the American public favoring lengthening terms of House Members to 4 years. By 1961, 51 percent of the public supported 4-year terms and this was approximately the same in 1977. However, in the most recent Gallup poll published in the Washington Post on May 17, 1981, a clear 59 percent of the American people support the lengthening of terms of House Members to 4 years. That same poll shows that by a margin of 2 to 1 the American public wants to limit U.S. Senators and Representatives to a maximum of 12 years in office. The degree of support was similar in all population groups studied by the poll including both political parties and all levels of education.

The American people have spoken, and it is time to both limit terms of Senators and Representatives and to lengthen the terms of the House Members. The two go hand-in-hand.

Congress has become a career for many, which was never envisioned by our Founding Fathers. In the early days Congress would meet for 2 months a year or so, and meeting for 3 months was a really big year. A Congressman was a citizen legislator who would go home after a session and spend most of his time running business or practicing law or whatever. In modern times the sheer size and volume of the business of the Federal Government has made service in Congress a full-time job, and many who have come to Washington have given up their jobs back home and with each passing year of congressional service are more reluctant to go back home and reenter the job market. As a result, the tendency for a great many is to stay as long as possible, and they have been very successful as evidenced by the fact that since World War II more than 90 percent of incumbents seeking reelection have been returned to Congress.

The simple fact is that the concern of most Congressmen for getting reelected causes them to spend a good deal of their time and energy on matters related to that and often influences their decisionmaking away from what would otherwise be the course of their better judgment. A limitation on terms would assure that a substantial portion of Congress at any one time would be ineligible for reelection and virtually unfettered by the constraints of reelection concerns. If in addition to limiting terms, there were a lengthening of the terms of House Members from 2 to 4 years, there would be even more relief from the effects of reelection concerns on the actions, effectiveness, and efficiency of individual Congressmen. At the present time a Member of the House feels compelled to almost literally start reelection efforts as soon as he is elected since, in the world of politics, 2 years go by very quickly. Under those circumstances the career politician is bound to be worried most of the time about reelection and this can easily be to the detriment of performing his legislative duties.

One of the most time-consuming parts of the reelection campaign process for Members is fundraising. The cost and expense of running campaigns in the era of electronic media is staggering. To offset as much of the cost as possible, Members tend to play to both the print and electronic media on a regular basis during sessions of Congress in hopes of gaining such high name recognition among the voters that challengers will be few and far between and unsuccessful. Certainly the public needs a constant line of communication open to elected representatives and no one advocates restricting this interplay in the print and electronic media. However, there needs to be a restriction on the motivating factors which cause too many Congressmen to spend too much time creating opportunities for media exposure, not to communicate but to insulate themselves from reelection challenges.

Then there is the work schedule dictated largely by reelection considerations which affects the efficiency of the individual Congressman. It is not uncommon for a Congressman to work until 9 or 10 o'clock each night, board a plane on Friday to go back to the district and work equally as hard meeting with groups and individuals throughout the district. He then flies back on Monday morning expected to be fit and ready for a serious hearing or the other important business of Congress. The workload is enormous and is compounded by the relentless pressure of reelection considerations.

On the other side of the coin are those Congressmen who have been in office so long that they have truly insulated themselves from reelection challenges and may only occasionally return to the district. They generally take legislative business seriously, but without the needed sense of urgency that can fade over the years, even for those who return to their districts regularly, and without the exposure to fresh ideas that come only from direct contact with the people. Both extremes are bad and both extremes are what dominate Congress today.

The result is an often stagnant and inefficient Congress. The result is many long-term legislators who have become Washingtonians who have a tendency to lose touch with life back home. The result is that the longer one remains in Washington, the more likely one becomes convinced that society's problems can or should be solved by the Federal Government. The result is many Members of Congress who are more interested in getting reelected than acting in the best interests of the country and devoting the time necessary to excel at public policymaking.

We need a much larger turnover in Congress on a regular basis to revitalize representative government, bringing into service men and women with more diverse backgrounds who have a fresh impression of what it is like living back home under the conditions created in large measure by the Federal Government and who have the fire burning in them to motivate Congress to make the changes necessary if the Federal Government is to work. Further, if terms were limited there would be created a perception among the people that one does not have to be in Congress for many years in order to play a significant role in the process, and undoubtedly more men and women would be willing to make the sacrifice of temporarily leaving careers in businesses and professions which hold the promise of great financial success to make a try for Congress, and the total number of high quality candidates and the level of debate of the issues for each office would improve. The combination of the seniority system and unlimited terms by its very nature often deters new blood from running for Congress.

Now none of this is to say that we do not have good, talented men and women presently serving in Congress. We do. In fact, all that is accomplished, given the pressures involved, is a tribute to the exceptional quality of those serving in the House and Senate as a whole. But the system is riddled with problems that most Members of Congress will admit privately, if not publicly, which are in large measure derived from the forces at work when you have full time career Congressmen who are either constantly concerned with reelection to save those careers, or are so removed from reelection concerns and the people that they have lost the sense of urgency and have few fresh ideas.

The essential constitutional duty of the Congress is to legislate on behalf of the American people. The sensible thing to do is to free as many Congressmen from as many nonlegislative pressures as possible while still keeping them responsive to the public. The best way to do this is by limiting terms, and in the case of the House by lengthening the term and staggering the elections. It is not enough to simply limit the terms.

In his book, "Waging Peace," Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote that each person serving under term limitation—

> would tend to think of his congressional career as an important and exciting interlude in his life, as a period dedicated to the entire public rather than as a way of making a living or making a career of exercising continuous political power * * *. More rapid turnover of the membership in both houses with its constant infusion of new blood would largely eliminate the "career" politician in Congress, but I can see little damage that would result from such a change except possibly to personal ambitions of particular individuals.

He went on to say that:

> Experience may produce greater skill in political maneuvering in the legislative process, but does not necessarily produce better statesmen.

Many of his observations apply as well to the need to lengthen terms of House Members.

The price of a free society is the eternal vigilance of the people. As clearly stated in the recent Gallup poll, the people have spoken, and the cavalier manner with which the issues of limiting terms of Congressman and lengthening House terms have been treated for the most part in past Congresses is directly contrary to the very essence of liberty and representative government upon which this Nation was founded. I call upon my colleagues to join in a concerted effort to bring about the debate and hearings necessary to resolve the differences among the Members and the people and meld together an appropriate constitutional amendment that both limits terms of Congressmen and lengthens those of the House as well.●

FINANCING THE RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration's budget package includes proposals to end the traditional Federal participation in the financing of rural electric cooperatives. This Federal participation has taken several forms including access for the co-ops to the Federal Financing Bank and low-interest guaranteed loans. The justification for this change is that the co-ops supposedly should be able to compete in the market for capital and that this move away from Government participation would reduce Federal spending.

I would like to provide some information that casts considerable doubt on that presumption. In fact, it appears that eliminating these financial arrangements would end up costing both the Federal Government and the consumers more.

It would be helpful for those who are interested to consider the statements made on May 14, before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification of the Senate Agriculture Committee by investment banker Jerome Katzin and finance expert and executive H. Russell Fraser. They conclude that the present system is the most cost-effective.

The following analysis contrasts the financial structure of the electric cooperatives with that of other utilities and concludes that the Federal Financing Bank represents the only proven source of long-term financing for the generating and transmission cooperatives of the rural electric system.

I include in the RECORD the following analysis by Donald Smith, chief economist of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

FINANCIAL COMPARISONS OF RURAL ELECTRIC G&T COOPERATIVES AND OTHER ELECTRIC UTILITIES

FINANCIAL COMPARISONS

Major financial characteristics of Generation and Transmission (G&T) cooperatives are listed in Table I. Equity as a percent of assets, a common market ratio, averages only 3.7 percent for the G&T cooperatives. A favorable financial level, attractive to investors, would be in excess of 40 percent, as is the industry average for investor-owned electric utilities.

Profitability of the G&T cooperatives is reflected by the excess of revenues over expenses (including interest), termed "net margins and patronage capital." Margins averaged $803,000 for the G&T's in 1979 and eight of the co-ops incurred deficits. Margins as a percent of total income or revenue were similarily low for the G&T co-ops. These averaged a slight 1.4 percent in 1979 or only about one-tenth the industry average.

A common Wall Street financial standard is interest coverage, or the Times Interest Earned Ratio (TIER). This is calculated simply by dividing margins (profit) plus interest by interest. The average TIER for G&T systems in 1979 was only 1.2, exactly one-half the industry average.

Another common financial ratio, Debt Service Coverage (DSC), was only 1.3 for the G&T cooperatives. DSC levels for the other utility sectors are substantially higher, due in part to the differences in the amortization of debt.

By all accounts, the key financial ratios of the rural electric Generation and Transmission cooperatives are substantially lower than those of the investor-owned and publicly-owned electric utilities. These utility sectors, although more attractive financially than the G&T utilities, are experiencing serious difficulties in securing long-term financing. Interest rates are exorbitant, currently in excess of 16 percent for the average rated investor-owned utility.

By contrast with the G&T co-ops, the lowest rated utility, a single B (Moody's), has the following financial characteristics: 40 percent equity, 1979 profit of $105 million, TIER of 3.4.[1] Although these financial ratios are superior to those of the G&T co-ops, the B rated utility would probably pay at least 20 percent interest on new financing *if* such financing could be obtained at all.

[1] Department of Energy, "Statistics of Privately-Owned Electric Utilities in the U.S.," 1979, Metropolitan Edison Company.

CONCLUSIONS

A comparison of the financial characteristics of G&T cooperatives with those of the privately and publicly-owned electric utilities (Table II) provides conclusive evidence of the following:

(1) G&T financial characteristics are significantly lower than those of other utilities.

(2) G&T financing would not be considered attractive by private financial investors.

(3) REA loan guarantees are essential to enable G&T financing, given their financial characteristics.

(4) The Federal Financing Bank (FFB) represents the only proven source of long-term G&T financing.

TABLE I.—FINANCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF G&T COOPERATIVES

[Dollars in thousands]

State and G&T co-op	Equity—percent assets	Margins	Margins—percent revenue	TIER [1]	DSC [2]
Alabama: Alabama EC	0.8	$267	0.4	1.01	1.10
Arizona: Arizona EPC	−.1	−1,490	−.2	.93	1.06
Arkansas:					
KAMO EC	11.4	1,615	3.0	2.42	1.69
Arkansas ECC	−.7	−3,847	−4.7	.82	.94
Colorado:					
Colorado-UTE	.8	4,570	9.1	1.22	1.42
Tri-State G&T	3.3	6,576	8.3	1.20	1.22
Florida: Seminole EC	1.1	162	2.2	1.18	1.80
Georgia: Oglethorpe EMC	4.0	11,043	5.1	1.18	1
Illinois:					
Southern Illinois Power	2.6	−221	−1.1	.97	1.24
Western Illinois	1.1	−243	−1.2	.96	.98
Indiana: Hoosier Energy	1.5	1,116	2.3	1.06	.22
Iowa:					
Central IA	7.6	3,547	9.6	1.59	1.60
Corn Belt PC	6.6	265	.9	1.06	.99
Northwestern Iowa PC	6.0	934	5.4	1.17	1.70
L&O PC	29.6	311	12.8	5.13	3.08
Kansas: Sunflower EC	−3.9	−887	−2.7	.49	.71
Kentucky:					
East Kentucky PC	1.1	−2,511	−2.8	.90	1.01
Big Rivers EC	2.5	8,072	6.5	1.40	1.24
Louisiana: Cajun EPC	2.0	9,309	11.1	1.23	1.41
Michigan:					
Wolverine EC	−.7	200	1.3	1.03	5.92
Northern Michigan EC	1.5	−54	−.2	.99	.09
Minnesota:					
Cooperative Power Association	1.5	1,966	2.9	1.04	1.33
United Power Association	3.4	6,276	8.6	1.19	1.19
Mississippi: South Mississippi EPA	1.4	3,413	3.5	1.20	1.43
Missouri:					
Sho-Me Power	9.1	296	.7	1.20	1.13
M&A EPC	18.6	1,265	7.5	2.97	1.87
Northeastern Missouri EPC	44.3	2,597	11.9	10.58	3.33
Central EPC	11.8	1,295	4.4	2.63	1.52
Northwestern EPC	25.8	1,966	8.7	4.69	1.83
Assoc. EC	1.9	14,752	8.6	1.48	5.94
Montana: Upper Montana G&T	32.1	135	1.5	4.89	5.61
Nebraska: Nebraska Electric G&T	1.0	−8	0	.93	.99
New Mexico: Plains Electric	19.2	1,537	4.5	2.78	2.02
North Dakota:					
Minnkota PC	12.0	5,681	10.1	1.73	1.25
Central Power	18.3	718	5.1	2.53	1.97
Basin EPC	.3	4,560	5.6	1.08	1.25
Square Butte	.2	283	.5	1.01	1.02
Ohio: Buckeye Power	10.8	3,488	2.9	1.11	1.47
Oklahoma: Western Farmers	7.9	1,711	2.2	1.18	1.23
Pennsylvania: Allegheny EC	4.2	2,122	4.9	1.16	1.17
South Carolina: Central EPC	2.7	336	.5	1.13	1
South Dakota:					
East River EPC	16.1	1,034	4.5	1.84	1.65
Rushmore EPC	33.2	463	2.8	12.61	1.98
Texas:					
Brazos EPC	9.6	1,714	2.6	1.44	1.20
South Texas EC	7.9	703	3.0	1.74	1.31
Wisconsin: Dairyland Power	13.9	3,430	3.4	1.22	1.20

[1] Times interest earned ratio: interest plus margins divided by interest.

[2] Debt service coverage: margins plus interest plus depreciation divided by debt service.

Source: REA, Annual Statistical Report, 1979.

TABLE II.—FINANCIAL COMPARISONS

[Dollars in thousands]

	Equity—percent assets	Average profit	Profit—percent revenue	TIER	DSC
G&T cooperatives	4	$803	1.4	1.2	1.3
Investor-owned utilities	41	45,710	11.2	2.4	3.1
Municipal electric utilities	24	5,012	13.0	1.9	2.4

Sources: REA, Annual Statistical Report, 1979. DOE, Statistics of Publicly Owned Electric Utilities, 1979. DOE, Statistics of Privately Owned Electric Utilities, 1979.●

SECTION 406 SUBSIDY

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to testify before the House Aviation Subcommittee regarding the proposal by the Civil Aeronautics Board to terminate section 406 subsidies to certain airlines.

Since this issue may have a most significant impact on my State, I insert my testimony in the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to express my gratitude to you for the opportunity to appear here before you today. I commend you for your interest in resolving the issues pertaining to section 406 subsidy termination.

If I were to be completely candid with you, I would be forced to admit that the testimony which I am about to give would have been significantly different 6 months ago. But a great deal has happened since then.

Six months ago all that most of South Dakota knew about the airline industry was found on the seat insert in front of us as we sat in the plane.

Six months ago, all that most of South Dakota knew about the future of airline service in our State was that the price of that service was likely to increase . . . but with at least some certainty that the level of service would stay the same.

Six months ago, it was generally believed that whatever subsidy was being given the airlines by the Federal Government to serve South Dakota was money well spent.

That money was, of course, provided through the 406 subsidy. And I, not knowing any viable alternative, was a believer.

But as I said, Mr. Chairman, a lot of things have happened in these last 6 months.

In February, it was announced that one of our most important airlines, would be pulling out of at least four cities in eastern South Dakota, as soon as some viable replacement could be found. At least two other major commercial centers in my state may also soon find themselves with little or no service.

There are nine certificated points in South Dakota, seven of which are receiving air service from Republic subsidized under section 406. While Republic's service in the State, primarily with 48-seat Convair-580 aircraft, has attempted to meet the needs of these communities in the past, I am not optimistic about the prospects for the carrier continuing its service in the future, even with the continuation of section 406 subsidy. One need only look at the low load factors Republic has achieved recently on its operations in South Dakota to recognize the reasons for Republic's plans. The load factors on Republic's South Dakota operations averaged only 43 percent in fiscal 1980, a level well below break even. The four cities which will soon lose Republic service generated an average of 7 to 12 enplanements per day last year. These traffic levels cannot support service with the Convair aircraft, let alone with the larger DC-9 aircraft that constitutes the bulk of Republic's fleet.

And it was during these months that the Civil Aeronautics Board first proposed the termination of the 406 subsidy and the enhanced utilization of the 419 program.

With these new realizations now clear, the last 6 months have been a time when the people of my State have been introduced to a whole new world of airline service through the commuter industry. And the more they see, the more they like. The more they learn, the more they are excited about the prospects of not only comparable service to which they have become accustomed, but even improved service in those cities which had almost given up on quality air travel in recent years.

They are impressed, as I am impressed, with the fact that commuter passenger traffic has increased almost 40 percent in just the last 2 years. They share the enthusiasm, now, which is evident in nearly 90 percent of all cities receiving scheduled air service for this new mode of air travel, now growing at a rate unprecedent in the airline industry.

Unlike Republic, these carriers are largely reliant on the development of air traffic in communities just like these for their overall success, and this mutual interest is beneficial to the communities. At present, no commuter air carrier operates in the State of South Dakota, and this in part may be a result of our maintaining Republic's service by subsidizing it under section 406. More importantly, the notice by Republic to suspend service in these communities has brought forth a number of commuter air carriers who are anxious to enter South Dakota once Republic leaves. I believe this is a healthy sign and affords us the opportunity to develop service suited to the size and needs of these communities, with assistance under the section 419 program to the extent necessary. It also suggests that to prolong Republic's service at other small communities by continuing section 406 when we could be developing new carriers and service is not in the long-term public interest, particularly when it is likely that Republic will ultimately suspend services at these points regardless.

In 1980, Republic received an annual rate of over $4.5 million to serve the seven communities in South Dakota. In 1981 the rate increased 18 percent. For Brookings, Huron, Mitchell, and Yankton, they received approximately $1.9 million in 1980. While it is too early in the section 419 process to know what the cost will be under section 419, the CAB believes, based on other similar cases already completed, that it will be substantially less than the current 406 cost. More importantly, the funds spent under section 419 will probably have more long-term benefit for the South Dakota communities in that they will help to foster the development of new carriers and service suited to the size and needs of these communities.

This is really what the question here today is really all about. The genuine concern of each of the members of this subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, is surely that which asks whether or not we can actually phase out the huge subsidy to the large airlines and yet protect those communities which are now being served by those airlines.

I believe that the answer from the communities in eastern South Dakota is a resounding "Yes."

Yes; we can not only survive but improve with commuters.

Yes; we can cut costs and improve service.

Yes; we can make the airline industry work better through the efficient use of the 419 program.

This approach of eliminating section 406 and relying solely on section 419 to meet the service needs of small communities raises the question of how successful the CAB has been in implementing the section 419 program in terms of working with the communities and in attracting replacement carriers. Here again the evidence in South Dakota is extremely revealing. Since Republic notified Brookings, Huron, Mitchell, and Yankton of its intent to terminate its service there has been a cooperative and concerted effort by all of the communities in the State, the South Dakota Department of Transportation, and the CAB to analyze the overall air service requirements of each community in the State, to seek carriers interested in providing service to the communities and to effectuate a smooth transition in service. The CAB office in Kansas City has done one of the finest jobs of providing top quality Government service that I have seen in my years in public office.

Meetings have been held with local and State officials, air carrier representatives, and CAB staff to discuss the plans and prospects. The State has commissioned an air service study to evaluate the needs of the communities and the opportunities for carriers. The CAB, in cooperation with this effort, extended the normal time period for filing of service proposals until mid-July to enable the State to complete this study for use by prospective carriers in formulating their proposals. One proposal, already filed to serve the four communities, offers a comprehensive pattern of air service with 29-seat Nord aircraft.

The CAB advises me that they will be carefully reviewing all proposals filed and the fitness and reliability of the prospective carriers to insure that both the quantity and quality of service meet the requirements of the essential air service program. In examining a carrier's ability to provide essential air service, the Board expends considerable effort to assess the operational capabilities and financial position of the carriers.

Mr. Chairman, we probably never will be airline experts. And the commuter airlines are not yet serving in our State. We aren't even certain which of the airlines will be. But we are encouraged. We are encouraged because no less than five different airlines have already expressed an interest in coming to our State. We are encouraged because already most of those airlines and others have visited our State, have talked to our people and have begun making plans.

Having had these experiences, however, we are becoming experts on air travel in South Dakota. The old beliefs no longer have the same validity they once had. And having begun to develop this expertise, I can say without hesitation that the communities of my State, the CAB proposal to terminate the 406 subsidy is not only a proposal which makes budgetary sense, it may be a key to the new world of travel to which we now look with great anticipation. That anticipation, however, should not blind us to the fact that there will be some temporary confusions and dislocations of service. In particular, I refer to the possibility of carriers presently serving under 406 subsidy being able to continue their service under the 419 program. I have the assurances of the CAB that every effort will be made to see that these carriers, including Republic, will be given every opportunity to establish their eligibility for 419 subsidy, if they can show that such a determination will, in fact be the most cost-effective way to provide essential service. I certainly would encourage such a process, and hope that the affected carriers would pursue it with diligence.

Thank you.●

SALUTE TO SAM FREEMAN OF CINCINNATI, OHIO, UPON HIS BEING NAMED NATIONAL BIG BROTHER OF THE YEAR BY THE BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS OF AMERICA

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1981, Sam Freeman of my congressional district was recognized for his outstanding service to our community by being named National Big Brother of the Year by the Big Brothers/Big Sisters of America.

Sam Freeman has been a member of the Big Brother movement for the past 12 years and has worked with five consecutive Little Brothers. He has been a patient friend and adviser to these boys, sharing their triumphs and helping them through their difficult times. His expectations for each boy were high, but within reach of their individual potentialities.

He is also an active member of the Agency's Board of Trustees as chairman of the Investment Committee and a hard-working fundraiser.

Sam Freeman is a special man. He lives by the high standards he has set for himself. He leads a full productive life and has blended his energies admirably between his family, his Little Brothers, his profession, and the community. Through his work with Big Brothers, Sam Freeman becomes a living example of the words, "it is in giving that we receive."

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to share this man's accomplishments with my colleagues and to seek national recognition for this unselfish man.●

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES WHITE

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute to share with you and my colleagues some of the outstanding accomplishments of the late Charles White, who died last year at the age of 62. This fine American distinguished himself in the field of art and is well known in art circles for his murals and graphic art work, having won fellowships, grants, awards, and gold medals from academies and museums all over the United States and Germany. Mr. White's life was dedicated to capturing on canvas the dignity and heroism of blacks. Many have called him the Diego Rivera of Black people. During his lifetime he was cited many times, including a White House citation from President Carter.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. White's paintings have been exhibited at countless American museums, including the Metropolitan and Smithsonian, as well as at the Hermitage Gallery in Leningrad, and in museums in Paris, Moscow, Leipzig, Czechoslovakia, and Switzerland. Much of White's work was devoted to sketching children and he always found time to accept teaching assignments, which provided many of today's artists with the inspiration we all must have to succeed. It seems only fitting that Otis-Parsons Art Institute, Los Angeles City College, and Southside Art Center in Chicago have set up scholarships in his name, and this year's National Conference of Artists was dedicated to him. A documentary film has been made of his life, and a biography is now in print.

Mr. White lived a quiet life in Altadena, Calif., with his devoted wife, Frances, where a new Charles White Community Park was christened in his honor recently with special dedication ceremonies. Many artists, community leaders, and dignitaries paid tribute to this remarkable man.

I know that my colleagues here in Congress will want to join with me in honoring this distinguished citizen whose contributions have truly enriched our lives.●

UKRANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1981, marks the 40th anniversary of the renewal of Ukranian independence. This date symbolizes the continuity of the struggle of the Ukranian people for freedom.

The history of the Ukranian people is filled with outstanding achievement and includes a long record of opposition to Soviet dominance and Soviet human rights abuses. Upon the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire, the Ukranian National Republic was established on January 22, 1918. By 1920, that independent republic was destroyed by Russian aggression. Yet the Ukranian people remained unwaivering in their commitment to freedom and independence. On June 30, 1941, they proclaimed their independence again, and denounced both their Soviet and Nazi enemies. On June 30, we will celebrate that valiant yet short-lived renewal of independence.

In the past 40 years, the Ukranian people have withstood a barrage of Soviet religious persecution, KGB terror, and intensified russification of Ukranian economy, industry, and education. Indeed, a special spirit of freedom lives on in the hearts and minds of all Ukranians.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Baltic States and Ukraine, I believe it is vital to focus public attention on the quest for liberty for these gallant people. That is why I have cosponsored a resolution introduced by Congressman William Green, to designate June 30, 1981 as Ukranian Independence Day. Passage of this resolution will demonstrate America's support for the aspirations for freedom of peoples and nations throughout the world.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the resolution for Ukranian Independence Day.●

TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE O. ALLEN

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine work and community dedication of Mr. Claude O. Allen. This contribution to the bay area community will be honored at a testimonial on the 28th of June, 1981.

Mr. Allen was born on July 29, 1916, in Lumberton, Miss. He attended grade school in Brookhaven, Miss., and Cleveland, Ohio, returning to Brookhaven to attend high school. He commenced his college education at Jackson College, Jackson, Miss., graduating form Alcorn A. & M., Alcorn, Miss., in 1936. After several years, he attended the Lincoln University Law School, graduating in 1953. In 1954 he was admitted to the State bar of California.

Mr. Allen has been central to the foundation of several key organizations in the Oakland community. As a lawyer, he helped organize the Trans-

Bay Engineers & Builders and the Minority Contractors Association. He was one of the charter members of the Charles Houston Law Club, now the Charles Houston Bar Association. As a citizen, he has served in such organizations as the Men of Tomorrow, the NAACP, California Democratic Club, Oakland Voters League, Alameda County Bar Association, and the California State Bar Association. He served two terms on the Alameda County Democratic Central Committee. As a church man, he has been a member of the Church of All Faiths and has served as its legal adviser during its organization.

Mr. Allen is recognized as a skilled practitioner, who has given considerably to the community. During the course of his law work, he has formed association with many capable trial lawyers, some of whom are now legislators, judges, or other public officials. He is a person who has helped spawn creativity and participation in the black community.

With those who will be assembled on the 28th, I join in paying tribute to a great man who has given much to the community.●

HEALTH RESEARCH GROUPS SUPPORT BUDGET COMMITTEE BILL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today, I received a letter regarding research and research training programs at the National Institutes of Health, signed by a very impressive array of biomedical research organizations. The letter comments upon the various provisions of the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, as they relate to the biomedical research field. The letter supports the Budget Committee bill, which incorporates the reconciliation recommendation of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and I would like to bring its cogent and compelling arguments and the names of signers to the attention of my colleagues.

The letter comments on two provisions of legislation now under consideration by the Congress. The first is research training, and the second is the proposed authorization and appropriation restriction on the National Institutes of Health proposed in the Senate legislation.

JUNE 24, 1981.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Energy and Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the House of Representatives approaches its final decisions on the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, the organizations listed below, all of whom have been deeply concerned and heavily engaged with the health and medical programs of this nation, have carefully studied the two contending proposals in this area. One was drafted by Representative Waxman and is included in the "Dingell package;" the other will probably closely reflect the views of the Administration.

The spending ceilings in the First Concurrent Budget Resolution have been dictated by the tenor of the times. It is noteworthy that both the Dingell/Waxman and the competing proposal fall within those Gramm-Latta targets. But here the similarity in the two proposals ends. The Dingell/Waxman provisions are thoughtfully considered accommodations to an unhappy circumstance, structured in such a way that unavoidable short-term sacrifices will not compromise long-range program objectives. The substitute proposal appears, whether so intended or not, to be severely harmful to critically important health programs that have been built slowly, with the painstaking care and careful nurture, over the last three decades.

The major element that unites this group of organizations is their deep and lasting concern about funding for biomedical and behavioral research training, because of its importance to the future vigor of the nation's research endeavor. The primary responsibility of the federal government for sponsorship of the nation's biomedical research enterprise is both well established and unquestioned. An essential derivative of that responsibility involves the assurance of an adequate research manpower pool, as measured in terms of quantity, quality and diversity. This is not to say that the federal government necessarily should bear the total costs of training all of the nation's biomedical scientists; indeed, significant numbers of trainees receive their stipends from other than federal sources. But, as with the research program itself, the federal government is the only potential sponsor able to assure the otherwise unmet needs. Arising from that federal research manpower responsibility has been recognition of the importance of establishing and subsequently maintaining a high quality in the scientific environment in which research training takes place. Thus, the NIH, for almost forty years, and the NIMH have purposefully provided funds over and above those necessary to support individual trainees so as to assure a proper institutional training capability. Furthermore, those agencies intended that all trainees in these locales should benefit from this augmented funding, regardless of the source of their stipends.

Dingell/Waxman recognized fiscal stringency by substantially reducing the authorization ceilings for these research training programs. At the same time, it preserves the basic character of the programs, including retention of support components that have been responsible for the creation and maintenance of high quality training environments in virtually all of the disciplines of biology and medicine. In contrast, the substitute proposal couples an excessive reduction in funding with a deletion of the authority for institutional elements of these programs that, in part, have made them so productive. (The Dingell/Waxman proposal authorized $194 million for fiscal year 1982, down from $222.5 million in fiscal year 1981, and provides for 10,000 research trainees and institutional support to assist in the training. The other would cut the funding to $147 million for fiscal year 1982 and provides for no institutional support.) This is in direct contrast to the action of the Congress just two weeks ago in rejecting most of the rescissions for fiscal year 1981 appropriations for NIH. That action endorsed full support for a high number of stipends as well as institutional support and indirect costs.

All things considered, in the area of health, the Dingell/Waxman proposal is far more in the public interest than its competitor. For this reason, all of the undersigned organizations and their constituents endorse the "Dingell package" and are communicating that position to your colleagues in the House.

Soon after passage of this legislation, the Senate-House Conference will be held to reconcile differences. The research training program will be at issue there also and, additionally, the Senate version likely will contain a provision profoundly damaging to the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health. Again, on the crucially important issues related to biomedical and behavioral research and research training, the undersigned organizations hope that you will succeed in retaining the Dingell/Waxman authorization level and in eliminating the arbitrary, unprecedented and unnecessary funding "cap" that the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources proposes be placed on the entire National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health operation and the research and research training programs in mental health. This latter provision would terminate a tradition of unusual but strikingly effective Congressional treatment of agencies of the federal government, the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health, that have, as result, emerged as the most important force in medical science that the world has ever seen.

In your many years on the Committee which has overseen the work of these agencies. You have been a major advocate of their objectives and programs, and you know, as well as we, that support for all of that time has been full and bipartisan in the Congress. We believe that such a provision would profoundly and adversely affect these agencies, and we plead with you that you do your best to prevent it from being enacted.

We deeply appreciate your leadership and that of Congressman Waxman in these vital matters.

ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSING THE LETTER

Endocrine Society.
American Surgical Association.
American Academy of Neurology.
American Academy of Ophthalmology.
American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons.
American Association of Chairmen of Departments of Psychiatry.
American Celiac Society.
American College of Gastroenterology.
American College of Physicians.
American Council on Education.
American Association for Thoracic Surgery.
American Association for Dental Research.
American Gastroenterlogical Association.
American Federation for Clinical Research.
American Physiological Society.
American Psychiatric Association.
American Society of Biological Chemists.
American Society for Clinical Investigation.

American Neurological Association.
American Liver Foundation.
American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition.
American Society of Hematology.
American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy.
Association of American Universities.
Association of American Medical Colleges.
Association of Anatomy Chairmen.
Association of Advanced Technology and Biomedical Science.
Association of Medical School Microbiology Chairmen.
Association of Medical Schools of New York.
Association of Orthopedic Chairmen.
Association of Professors of Gynecology and Obstetrics.
Association of Professors of Medicine.
Association of Program Directors in Internal Medicine.
Association of University Professors of Neurology.
Association for Academic Psychiatry.
Association for the Study of Liver Disease.
Center for Ulcer Research and Education Foundation.
Central Society for Clinical Research.
Child Neurology Society.
Children's Liver Foundation.
Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.
Friends of Eye Research, Rehabilitation and Treatment.
Gluten Intolerance Group.
International Association of Enterostomal Therapy.
International Foundation for Ileitis and Colitis.
North American Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology.
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
Pediatric Liver Research Foundation.
Public & Scientific Affairs Board, American Society for Microbiology.
Society for Gastrointestinal Assistance.
Society for Investigative Dermatology.
Society for Neuroscience.
Society for Critical Care Medicine.
Society of Teachers of Family Medicine.
United Ostomy Association.
Western Institute for Occupational and Environmental Science.
Society for Pediatric Research.
Infectious Disease Society.●

BIAGGI BILL TO GIVE CREDIT TO SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM FOR UNCASHED CHECKS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation aimed at correcting a little known but serious problem affecting the social security system. The Social Security Administration estimated that their trust funds have lost over $200 million and will lose an additional $28 million over the next 4 years because of one simple reason—uncashed checks.

The Social Security Administration certifies to the Department of the Treasury, the amount of benefits (checks) paid to social security recipients. At the time of certification, Treasury transfers that amount from the social security trust funds to a Treasury transfer account. Treasury then mails the recipients their checks.

Under existing law, Treasury is not authorized to cancel uncashed Government checks and credit the value of those checks for the trust accounts upon which they were originally drawn. In fact, one provision of law illustrates the dilemma under the terms of title 31 United States Code, sec. 132—Payment of Checks—it reads "Government checks are payable forever."

Consequently, the social security trust fund throughout its 46-year history has been unable to be credited for either the value or the interest of an uncashed check. In most cases, these checks revert back into General Treasury accounts and have no relationship with the trust fund.

The bill I have authored would rectify this situation in two ways: First, it would authorize a one-time payment to the social security trust fund for the value, including interest of all uncashed checks. Second, my bill would credit the trust fund for the value of any check which goes uncashed for 3 years.

The concept involved with my legislation has been considered before. Both the Social Security Administration and the Department of the Treasury have agreed that legislation is needed to enable the trust fund to be credited for uncashed checks but they differ on specific provisions. I believe my bill provides for a sensible solution to this problem.

In recent months, many older Americans have been anxious about proposed cuts in social security benefits as proposed by the President. I believe my legislation gives Congress a unique opportunity to enact a needed reform in social security which could help to replenish the dwindling reserves in the old age and survivors trust fund to help avert any reductions in benefits. I hope this can be offered as an amendment to H.R. 3207 or whatever social security reform bill comes before the House.●

MANATT CRITICAL OF WHITE HOUSE INACTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS POST

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Manatt, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, recently voiced his concern about statements from the administration that the President might not send up a new nomination for the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

I urge my colleagues to take note of Mr. Manatt's call for the President to fill the post as soon as possible.

MANATT CRITICAL OF WHITE HOUSE INACTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS POST

LOS ANGELES.—The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee has termed the apparent decision of the Reagan Administration not to fill the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, "petulant" and "unseemly," and said such a decision would send out the "worst possible signal to friends and allies about how U.S. foreign policy is made."

Charles T. Manatt, speaking before a meeting of Los Angeles political writers and correspondents, responded to suggestions by the top White House officials and recent newspaper columns indicating the White House would consider abolishing the post and not nominating a replacement for rejected nominee Ernest W. Lefever.

"A full week has passed since the Senate Foreign Relations Committee defeated the Lefever nomination, yet the only indication we have from the White House is a series of trial balloons and whispered asides to columnists that President Reagan may scrap the important Human Rights job," said Manatt.

"While it is understandable that the President is disappointed at the rejection of his nominee by the Senate, it would demean the Office of the President to refuse to fill the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights out of presidential pique. Such an attitude is equivalent to the playgrounder's threat to 'take one's bat and ball and go home' when an umpire's decision goes the other way and is unseemly for the President of the United States," Manatt said.

"Such a decision would also send the worst possible signal to our friends and allies abroad about how U.S. foreign policy is made. It would suggest that U.S. foreign policy depends on personalities instead of a strategic calculus of U.S. interests. It would convey a continued impression of inconsistency in the Administration's foreign policy apparatus—just when the opposite impression is badly needed."

"Finally, to refuse to fill the most important government position responsible for human rights would send a signal abroad that America is abandoning its ideals and its commitment to the defense of human rights—a signal the Administration claims it does not want to send."

"If it was sound policy to fill this position before the Foreign Relations Committee vote—and it was—nothing has changed to make it any less compelling today. It is petulance, not policy, to send up scarcely concealed trial balloons by top Administration spokesmen suggesting that President Reagan intends to drag his feet on finding a new candidate for Assistant Secretary of State.

"And it is hypocritical to meet with the wife of Anatolyi Scharanski last week—as President Reagan did—and turn around the very next week and threaten to abolish the most visible symbol of America's commitment to freedom and human rights—the post of Assistant Secretary," Manatt continued.

"The decision of the Foreign Relations Committee was a bipartisan decision on the merits, made by Republicans and Democrats alike. It should not be turned into a partisan test of strength by the Administration. The clear duty of the President, both to the

Nation and the millions of human beings struggling for freedom around the world who look to America for support, is to fill the position of Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights with a qualified and fitting representative of our Nation as soon as possible."●

PETER BENSINGER, A GREAT ADMINISTRATOR OF DEA

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, July 10 marks the end of an outstanding term of office for a longtime friend of mine, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, Peter B. Bensinger.

Mr. Speaker, I have known the Bensinger family on a personal and business basis for approximately 15 years, as they come from Highland Park, Ill., which was, for many years, within the boundaries of my congressional district.

Almost from the beginning Peter has centered his career on fighting crime. Prior to his appointment as Administrator of the DEA, he was chief of the crime victims division of the Illinois attorney general's office.

Before that, he was executive director of the Chicago Crime Commission, the first director of the Illinois Department of Corrections, and the chairman of the Illinois Youth Commission.

Mr. Speaker, during his 5½ years at DEA, Peter has been devoted to reducing drug-related crimes and curtailing drug trafficking and addiction—with no task being too large or too small.

For instance, in 1979 Peter took time from his busy schedule to appear at the Lake-McHenry Criminal Justice Conference in my congressional district. There, he called on parents and teachers to join together to fight the use of marihuana by teenagers.

Mr. Speaker, Peter's contributions to our country's ongoing battle to eliminate drug abuse will not be forgotten. My wife, Doris, joins me in wishing Peter and his family the best of luck in their future endeavors.●

U.S. POLICY TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA

HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press, one of my district's most respected newspapers, has recently taken an editorial stand in opposition to the Reagan administration's policies toward South Africa. The editorial, which I insert into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues, examines the long-term implications for the United States if we continue with the policies endorsed thus far by the Reagan administration and its officials.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Detroit Free Press, June 14, 1981]

AFRICA: THE U.S. STANDS TO LOSE A LOT AS IT COZIES UP TO RACIST SOUTH AFRICA

It turns out that black Africa's fears about a growing coziness between South Africa and the U.S. weren't paranoid delusions. Apparently, they reflected a real trend.

According to purported State Department documents, the administration wants more "friendship and co-operation" with South Africa, a country it views as a potential defender of Western interests. The U.S., according to the memos, will work to end South Africa's "polecat status" in the world if Pretoria works out an acceptable settlement for the independence of South West Africa, also known as Namibia.

The papers containing this information were made available by Randall Robinson, director of TransAfrica, an anti-apartheid private research group based in Washington. Mr. Robinson did not disclose how he got the documents. If they are, indeed, accurate, they raise major questions about the political sophistication of key administration officials.

Can the administration really fail to recognize the consequences it would pay in the Third World for a shift toward South Africa? Is it ready to risk losing oil from Nigeria, the second largest U.S. supplier, for pursuing such policies? Does it truly believe South Africa deserves major concessions for freeing a territory it illegally holds?

Feedback from the administration so far suggests the answer may be "yes" on all points. The State Department reportedly has launched an investigation to determine who leaked the documents but no probe is planned of the launching of such wrongheaded policies.

The final unanswered question is why conservative U.S. elements continue trumpeting the cause of the racist African regime. The need for Pretoria's vital minerals is the reason most often cited. But a new major study suggests the West really needn't fear any long-term loss of strategic resources from South Africa. According to the Rockefeller Foundation study, "South Africa: Time Running Out," the West is the prime market for South Africa's minerals. Moreover, black Africa could provide some of the strategic materials Pretoria provides, particularly if aided in building better transportation systems.

The report, which also urges maintaining sanctions against South Africa, is not likely to have much effect upon current U.S. Africa policy. Jeane Kirkpatrick, U.S. ambassador to the UN, has called sanctions an unrealistic way of pushing South Africa to grant independence to Namibia. And the U.S. is boycotting a UN-sponsored conference now underway on the question of sanctions against South Africa.

Meanwhile, efforts are under way to repeal the Clark amendment prohibiting covert aid to anti-government forces in Angola. The U.S. also recently cast the only vote against a World Health Organization code urging an end to promotion of infant formula, which is blamed for increasing infant health problems in many underdeveloped nations.

The truth seems to be that when it comes to an Africa policy, there is nothing too far-fetched for this administration. As a result, increasing numbers of Third World nations are starting to view the U.S. as a country more concerned with profits and power than any moral imperatives. The time is running out for Washington, as well as Pretoria, to change its mind.●

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS FROM MICHIGAN'S 15TH DISTRICT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the results of my annual questionnaire survey of the residents in Michigan's 15th Congressional District, which I have the distinct honor to represent.

These percentage results represent the tabulation of the first 14,000 replies, a considerable increase over previous years' returns. This high response, no doubt, is an indication of the intense interest my constituents have in the issues currently before the Congress.

This annual survey, is one of the most valuable projects which we carry out each year. It has proven to be an effective way of obtaining a broad cross-section of opinion among my constituents.

In addition to a number of questions on specific areas of national concern, I have asked my constituents each year to tell me what they consider the most important problems facing our Nation. Over the years, several items have consistently appeared in the top four or five—crime, inflation, unemployment, energy, and drugs.

For the fourth year in a row, inflation heads the list, chosen by half of the respondents as the single most important problem facing our Nation. Unemployment ranked as the foremost problem for 24 percent, while taxes was chosen by 20 percent and energy and national defense were each chosen by 10 percent of the respondents.

I also asked my constituents areas of the budget they would increase and/or decrease. As in past years, an overwhelming majority—69 percent—recommended the United States spend less in foreign aid. Although my constituents for the most part prefer the same level of expenditure in Federal programs which they now benefit from, there was some sentiment for cutting jobs programs, 37 percent, home mortgage and other housing programs, 38 percent, and agriculture and rural development programs, 32 percent. Interesting, the category in which the largest percentage prefer level funding is in the area of defense at 48 percent.

In the areas which my constituents want more Federal spending, crime control topped the list at 49 percent, while increased aid to the elderly garnered 42 percent. Forty-one percent of the respondents would prefer more attention for energy research, and 34 percent want higher funding levels for defense.

I know I found the results from my questionnaire this year very revealing. I am sure they will be of interest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to our colleagues here in the Congress.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. Inflation: If the economic situation fails to improve, would you favor mandatory wage and price controls? Yes, 50 percent; no, 33 percent.

2. Foreign policy: Do you agree with the administration's plan to expand military aid to El Salvador? Yes, 28 percent, no, 52 percent. Do you favor the President's announced plans to send additional military advisers to El Salvador? Yes, 29 percent; no, 50 percent.

3. Trade and imports: Because of economic slumps in American industry—especially in the automobile industry—approaches are being considered to help U.S. manufacturers compete with foreign producers. If you were making trade and economic policy, would you? a. Place legal limits on imports to protect American jobs, 38 percent; b. Help American industry to compete better through loans and subsidies, 15 percent; c. Negotiate flexible, voluntary trade agreements with our trading partners and concentrate on increasing American productivity through tax and regulatory policy, 33 percent; d. Let the international market work without Government interference, 23 percent.

4. Environment: Protection of our environment still remains a major concern for many Americans. Some contend that we should press even harder in this area, while others fear that we have been moving too fast, and are sacrificing jobs and economic progress. How do you feel? a. Work harder for environmental protection, 25 percent; b. Cut back our efforts on environmental protection, 20 percent; c. Maintain our efforts at the same level, 33 percent; d. other, 5 percent.

5. Important issues: What do you consider our Nation's most serious problem? a. Inflation, 50 percent; b. Taxes, 22 percent; c. National defense, 10 percent; d. Energy, 3 percent; e. Unemployment, 24 percent.

6. Social security: The Reagan administration has asked Congress to eliminate three social security benefit programs, and tighten eligibility on a fourth. The programs are listed below. Should they be cut or saved? a. Eliminate the minimum benefits program, which provides a base payment of $122 a month to anyone eligible for social security, cut, 26 percent; save, 49 percent; b. Eliminate payments made to adult students—aged 18-22—who are children of retired, disabled or deceased workers, cut, 54 percent; save, 23 percent; c. Eliminate the lump sum death benefit of $255 if the deceased had no surviving spouse or children, cut, 57 percent; save, 27 percent; d. Tighten eligibility requirements for disability benefits by requiring that beneficiaries must have worked in employment covered by social security for 1½ out of the 3 years preceding disability, cut, 53 percent; save, 24 percent.

7. Federal spending: Do you think the Federal Government's budget should spend more, less, or about the same in the following areas?

a. Aid to the elderly, more, 42 percent; less, 7 percent; same, 33 percent;

b. Assistance to the poor, more, 14 percent; less, 33 percent; same, 32 percent;

c. Jobs programs, more, 24 percent; less, 37 percent; same, 20 percent;

d. Home mortgage and other housing programs, more, 16 percent; less, 38 percent; same, 25 percent;

e. Health care, more, 29 percent; less, 20 percent; same, 30 percent;

f. Social security, more, 27 percent; less, 19 percent; same, 34 percent;

g. Education, more, 23 percent; less, 29 percent; same, 30 percent;

h. Crime control, more, 49 percent; less, 11 percent; same, 24 percent;

i. Defense, more, 34 percent; less, 16 percent; same, 48 percent;

j. Foreign aid, more, 2 percent; less, 69 percent; same, 10 percent;

k. Agriculture and rual development programs, more, 16 percent; less, 32 percent; same, 32 percent;

l. Veterans benefits, more, 25 percent; less, 15 percent; same, 43 percent;

m. Energy research, more, 41 percent; less, 14 percent; same, 24 percent;

n. Environment, more, 17 percent; less, 29 percent; same, 35 percent;

o. Highway construction and improvement, more, 17 percent; less, 24 percent; same, 40 percent.●

AMENDMENT TO CUT OFF FUNDING TO UNESCO

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I sent a letter to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ZABLOCKI, regarding an amendment I intend to offer when the House considers the Department of State authorization bill.

My amendment will prohibit funding to UNESCO if that organization implements any policies or procedures designed to regulate news content and formulate rules and regulations for the operation of the world press.

For some time there has been considerable discussion over the concept of the so-called new world information order, which represents a direct assault on the right we Americans so highly cherish—freedom of the press. It is vital that Congress send a clear signal to the member states of UNESCO that expresses the seriousness of our purpose. Under no circumstances will we tolerate efforts by that body that are inconsistent with the notion of free dissemination of the news.

We can expect the State Department authorizing legislation to incorporate an amendment expressing disapproval of the new world information order. But the question is, isn't it time that this House assert its will with more resolve than mere words? My amendment accomplishes this goal.

I am inserting for the RECORD a copy of my letter to Chairman ZABLOCKI and an excellent editorial which appeared on June 12 in the Washington Star.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1981.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ZABLOCKI: I have been advised that the House will be considering the State Department Authorization bill shortly after we return from the July 4th period recess.

This letter is to inform you that I intend to offer an amendment to prohibit funding to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) should that body implement any policies or procedures designed to regulate news content and formulate rules and regulations for the operation of the world press.

Sincerely,

ROBIN BEARD,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Star, June 12, 1981]

UNESCO's "NEW ORDER"

Freedom of the press—above all the freedom of reporters, editors and publications to work without government control or manipulation—is an embattled principle in the world, as always. Its strengthening should be the goal of the U.N. Economic and Social Council's new International Program for the Development of Communication (IPDC), whose 35-member governing council convenes a first meeting in Paris next week (June 15-22). After all, it is among UNESCO's chartered assignments to "promote the free flow of ideas by word and image."

Unfortunately, that may not be the objective of IPDC. Some of its members and sponsors, in the so-called "developing world" and the Soviet bloc are promoting what they call "a new international information order," whose implications are in too many ways dangerously authoritarian.

A UNESCO official, Mr. Doudou Diene of Senegal, speaking recently of the communication-development program, cited "the important dimension of the cultural identities and the proper values of each nationality." Such "dimensions" and "values" might be variously defined. But we suspect Mr. Diene of using typical UNESCO-ese to telegraph his sympathy, and that of his organization's leadership, for the dilution of free press values for nationalistic or political purposes. The middle ground, after all, is narrow. Either you believe that the service of "cultural identities" and "proper values" is only incidental to the valid purposes of the press or you don't.

The so-called "developing nations" have legitimate complaints about the way their affairs are sometimes reported by the dominant publications and wire services of the West. They also need Western help in the development of communications technology. Those complaints and needs have a place on the IPDC agenda. The validity of the discussion crucially depends on whether it is assumed to be the business of the press to correct distortions, voluntarily, or whether it is assumed that governments may legitimately reshape the information flow by coercion.

At Talloires, France, in mid-May, representatives of the press from 24 nations with free press traditions met to frame a declaration insisting, in essence, on the duty of the U.N. member agencies to promote valid free-press principles. The Talloires declaration rejects the double standard so often invoked to justify repressive practices "in countries * * * insufficiently developed to enjoy (press) freedom."

UNESCO officials and others who aspire to use IPDC as a forum for the legitimation of a double standard, or of the manipulation of information by licensing, economic barriers or other means, should take heed. The Talloires declaration says, in clear terms, that subscribers to the free-press tradition will resist its perversion by IPDC, whatever form the perversion may take.

The new administration in Washington is sympathetic to the principles stated at Talloires. It is in no mood to temporize with, or indulge, the imposition of a crypto-authoritarian "information order." A recent New York Speech by Elliot Abrams, assistant secretary of state for international organization affairs, makes that clear. The U.S. is for the first time actively cognizant of the dangers of the UNESCO initiative—as both Mr. Abrams's speech and the high-level nature of the delegation to the Paris meeting show.

It is rumored, incidentally, that some of those who are being considered now for the post of ambassador to UNESCO are novices in international and UNESCO affairs, including the international information order issue. The Reagan administration can and should do better. It should seek serious and able representation to UNESCO, where so many critical issues of freedom find an international forum. It is no place for a patronage appointment.

The Star not only subscribes to the principles of the Talloires declaration of mid-May, we also believe, as do others represented at the Talloires meeting, that the information issue is important enough to merit drastic action if basic UNESCO principles are compromised by IPDC.

If necessary, U.S. participation in and financial backing for the IPDC governing body should be withdrawn. And if that doesn't sober the dispensers of "new world information order" mumbo-jumbo, serious consideration should be given to full withdrawal from all UNESCO activities.

The United States cannot countenance by compromise or meek submission any international "order" that degrades or negates the central values of democracy, whether those of the free press or any other institution.●

NEW YORK POST EDITORIAL PROVIDES EXCELLENT BLUEPRINT FOR PEACE INITIATIVE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the 121 member—bi-partisan ad hoc congressional committee for Irish Affairs, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial from the New York Post of Friday, June 19, on Northern Ireland.

Central to the editorial is the Post's advocacy of a United States role in trying to resolve the conflict in Northern Ireland. They believe that solutions should be proposed not imposed by outsiders. They support economic aid as an incentive for negotiations. The philosophy of the editorial is best captured in the following statement:

For political, economic and strategic reasons, neither the United States nor Europe can any longer afford to ignore the situation in Northern Ireland.

It is time for us to join to try to end the violence and promote the dialogue of common sense.

I commend the Post for their editorial and urge all of my colleagues who share my hope for peace, justice, and freedom for Ireland to read it carefully. At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert the editorial as well as my response to the editorial as printed in the June 22 edition of the Post.

THE IRISH AGONY: WHAT THE UNITED STATES CAN DO

The angry outbursts inside and outside the Metropolitan Opera House during Prince Charles' visit once again draw attention to the very broad American interest in Northern Ireland and to the larger role that the United States should be seeking to discharge in this protracted conflict.

"I hope that people in all parts of Ireland will be able to resolve their differences one day," Prince Charles told Mayor Koch, "and that there will be no need for the English presence in Ireland."

You can be sure that this is exactly the innermost feeling of the British government.

And that is exactly the goal the United States should be pursuing. The friendship that has for so long enhanced the special American relationship with Britain and the profound ties we have through 20 million Irish-Americans with all the Irish people demands that we provide the opportunity to end the bitterness, the sadness and the bloodshed.

As long ago as 1977 the so-called Four Horsemen—Senators Moynihan and Kennedy, House Speaker O'Neill and Gov. Carey—foresaw this need in their joint statement condemning IRA terrorism and proposing political movement. President Carter's response was on the right lines but it was half-hearted.

Carter's promise of U.S. economic assistance was conditional on the achievement of a settlement between North and South. Further, he evaded the real challenge by insisting that the U.S. would not advise the parties how to reach that settlement, saying there were no solutions that outsiders could impose.

Of course there are solutions—not to be imposed by outsiders, but most certainly to be proposed for discussion—together with the political and economic assistance to insure their success.

President Reagan should now take over where Carter left off. He should offer economic aid as the starting point of negotiations aimed at a united Ireland.

As long as Britain remains the victim of a permanent Protestant veto on any political movement, a united Ireland will never be in prospect. That veto must be bypassed.

The doomsday scenario that a British withdrawal would provoke the Protestants to rise up in arms in the North is misleading. Reagan must provide the means by which Britain can declare its interest in an all-Ireland solution.

To this endeavor the United States comes as no stranger. We did this for Europe after World War II with the Marshall plan. We did this for Japan. We do this now to maintain the fragile Israeli-Egyptian peace and we do this, also, for the Vietnamese boat people. We should offer the same good offices and financial assistance to the Irish people.

Under this international umbrella British Prime Minister Mrs. Thatcher and Ireland's Prime Minister Haughey could build on their promising talks last year which recognized the fundamental Irish dimension of the problem.

From the Irish government a reciprocal move is essential, particularly in a new constitution dwelling rather less on religious dogma. The elements for this all-Ireland compromise already exist. The special position of the Catholic Church was removed from the constitution in 1972.

Indeed, the churches, the trade unions and many sporting teams now operate on an all-Ireland basis. Half the players on the Ireland rugby team are Protestants from the North.

Intelligent opinion in the Republic is moving in this direction. Contraception has been legalized. The censorship of books and newspapers is no longer an offensive joke. The drive for divorce reform stems from a middle class long frustrated by life in a non-secular state and anxious to make the Republic attractive to the Protestants.

The delivery of a new American factory each week is industrializing the South and building a base for real prosperity. The Republic's youthful population—half are under 25 years of—shows less interest in the past than in a prosperous future. There is a longing in both North and South, as members of the EEC, to look to development together rather than to regard each other with baleful eye across a religious border.

Peace in Northern Ireland is in all Ireland's interest, in Britain's interest, in Europe's interest.

For political, economic and strategic reasons, neither the United States nor Europe can any longer afford to ignore the situation in Northern Ireland.

It is time to join to try to end the violence and promote the dialogue of common sense.

And it is time for the Four Horsemen to press President Reagan into action. They can have no interest in becoming the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse.

U.S. AND NORTHERN IRELAND—WE HAVE A ROLE TO PLAY

As chairman of the 4-year-old, bi-partisan, 121-Member Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I applaud the Post editorial on Northern Ireland. It represents a significant departure for a major American newspaper—too many of whom have been silent on this issue for too long.

Our Committee was formed because we advocate that the U.S. does have a role to play in advancing the cause of peace, justice and freedom in Northern Ireland. I have proposed, and still believe today, that the U.S. should sponsor an "Irish Peace Summit" in Washington, where all segments of political thought in Northern Ireland could come to discuss and debate various proposals for a political solution.

I thoroughly agree with your statement that economic aid should be offered as a starting point of negotiations. With the millions that this nation doles out in foreign aid annually, surely we could reserve some to help rebuild Northern Ireland.

It is imperative that the U.S. have full control over the aid to avoid its usage as a tool to perpetuate the rampant economic discrimination against Catholics which exists today in the North.

We have long advocated that the British Government, as a gesture of good faith to achieve a political solution, declare their intention to withdraw their entire presence, including forces, from Northern Ireland. It should be a gradual and phased withdrawal, perhaps monitored by U.N. peacekeeping forces.

President Reagan, in his St. Patrick's Day message offered his "personal prayers and the good offices of the U.S. for those who wish fervently for peace in Ireland." It is high time to transform this from rhetoric to reality.

The Post editorial would serve as an excellent blueprint for new Administration initiative in Northern Ireland.

MARIO BIAGGI, M.C.,
Chairman, Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs.●

ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 24, marked the 18-month anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan * * * 1½ years. Although this conflict is not on the front pages of the newspapers, the destruction and suffering still goes on. Whole villages have been razed, crops destroyed, and thousands more killed and made homeless. In Kabul, the Soviet-installed government of Babrak Karmal has virtually no popular support and only clings to power through the strong Soviet military presence.

Mr. Speaker, as a recent traveler to the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, I have seen some of the destruction wrought by this war. I have seen women and children who lost an arm or a leg, the victims of Soviet-made booby traps. I visited some of the refugee camps where over 1.5 million Afghans live. For these people, their only wish is to return to their homeland and live in peace without foreign masters.

On this 1½ year anniversary, today we must call attention to these brave people, to these dedicated human beings who are fighting armored divisions, helicopter gunships with the most limited, small arms. The Afghan Freedom Fighters need more than words—they need help to give them a fighting chance in their struggle to free their homeland. I believe the free and non-Communist world must wake up to the realities of the defense and energy implications of the situation in Afghanistan. Time is on our side if we act now.

As recently as yesterday, I met with a former top official of the Karmal regime, Mr. Farhang Saddiq. Asked to be an economic development adviser shortly after Karmal's takeover in December 1979, Mr. Farhang soon found his policies to aid his country's development thwarted by Soviet advisers. Babrak Karmal, he realized, was merely a spokesman for Kremlin policy. In April of this year, M. Farhang left Afghanistan.

Since his arrival in the United States, Mr. Farhang has kept close contact with the various Freedom Fighter groups both in and out of Afghanistan and has worked to mobilize support for these groups in this country. Mr. Farhang related to me how the Soviets exert no real control in certain areas of the country. In the mountainous areas of Central and Northeastern Afganistan, the Soviets have been ineffective in controlling guerrilla activities. Mr. Farhang noted:

> The Soviets know what would happen if they sent their armies into these mountains . . . they would disappear just like the other armies who, throughout history, have tried to conquer Afghanistan.

He further commended that only the Mi-24 Helicopter gunship has proven an effective weapon in these mountainous regions and that if the Afghans had the backpack Surface to Air Missile (SAM) the Soviets advantage would be greatly diminished. The message that came out in our conversation was the need to organize the resistance elements and supply them with effective weapons to fight with.

On this, the 18-month anniversary of the invasion of Afghanistan, I am enclosing two authoritative articles on the situation in Afghanistan. The first article was written by a constituent of mine, Dr. Robert Pearson, and views the conflict from a historical perspective. Dr. Pearson, from 1962 to 1964, served as a Peace Corps volunteer in Afghanistan and later served as Afghanistan desk officer for this organization. He is currently an English professor at Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pa. This article appeared in the spring edition of the Muhlenberg. The second article, written by free lance journalist and BBC correspondent John Bierman, appeared in the New Republic on June 6, 1981. This article explains some recent developments in the conflict.

I have enclosed both of these articles for the benefit of my colleagues.

[From the Muhlenberg, Spring 1981]

AFGHANISTAN CODE OF HONOR THWARTS RUSSIAN INVASION

(By Dr. Robert P. Pearson)

Much of the free world has been greatly disturbed by the Russian invasion of Afghanistan, and has questioned the Soviet Union's expansionist policies in that area of the world. Some indications of the outcome of the invasion may be found in Afghanistan's history and culture.

Afghanistan is an extremely rugged and desolate country almost totally mountainous in the central and northeastern parts, with hostile deserts around the fringes. It shares a 1200-mile border with Russia on the north and is bounded by Iran on the west, Pakistan on the south and east and China at its northwest tip. Throughout history, what is now known as Afghanistan has always been a place people went through in order to get somewhere else. It is the gateway to the Indian subcontinent on the east, to Persia and the Arab world on the west, to Russia on the north and, at present, it could become a gateway to the Arabian Sea and, indirectly, to the Persian Gulf on the south.

Afghan history rings with the names of the great ancient conquerors: Darius the Great, Alexander, Genghis Khan, Tamerlane, and Babur, the first Moghul emperor of India. In the late 1800's modern Afghanistan was created as a buffer state by a Tsarist Russia expanding southward and a British India expanding northward so that the two powers would have no border in common. For this reason, northeast Afghanistan was extended eastward until it touched China.

A historical survey reveals that no conqueror has ever stopped in Afghanistan. They may have married an Afghan, as did Alexander, or they may have loved the country, as did Babur, but they were always on their way somewhere else. And this is why the recent Russian invasion is so worrisome to the world.

In 1907, as a result of the British and Russian agreement that Afghanistan was to be a buffer state, Russia formally declared Afghanistan to be outside her sphere of influence and promised not to annex or invade that country. This agreement enabled the Afghans to forge, over the next 70 years, a policy of neutrality, called in Persian "bitarafi" or "without sides."

From about 1900 to the Afghan communist coup d'etat in 1978, Afghanistan was to follow cleverly this policy of neutrality, playing first Russia and Britain, and then, after the British departure from India in 1947, Russia and the U.S., off against one another for Afghanistan's own benefit.

In 1947, with the specter of a huge power vacuum in India as a result of the British departure, the Afghans moved quickly to fill that void with American aid. As a result, the Afghans and the U.S. struck a series of economic agreements which left western and Soviet influence about equal in Afghanistan during the 1940's and 1950's. The Russians built roads in the north, the Americans built roads in the south; the Russians built the Kabul Airport, the Americans the Kandahar Airport. It was during the 1950's that the U.S. tried to tilt Afghanistan toward the west by pressuring the king to join CENTO in order to help contain Russian expansion in that area. The Afghans refused, preferring to maintain their cherished neutrality, and the U.S., in turn, refused to sell them American arms. As a result, Afghanistan felt compelled to turn to Russia for military equipment and training, and Russian influence in Afghanistan increased dramatically.

In 1973, the world's oldest monarch, a monarchy that had been in place since 1747, was overthrown and a cousin of the king, Daoud, who had been prime minister from 1953 to 1963, declared Afghanistan to be a republic and took over its presidency. By 1978, however, genuine dissatisfaction with Daoud's regime led to demonstrations in the capital, Kabul, and two communist groups momentarily united and seized power.

Within a year it became evident that what was possible or bearable in Kabul was unacceptable to the rest of the country. The hated atheists, the communists, had taken over, and the rural population feared that it would not be long before the Russians would be controlling the country. By the fall of 1979, Moslem rebels, as a result of revolts throughout the country, had captured 22 of the 28 provinces and were moving in on Kabul, the capital.

The series of events which led to the Russian takeover were as follows. Nur M. Taraki, the leftist president of Afghanistan, on return home from a non-aligned conference in Cuba, stopped in Russia and was warmly feted by Brezhnev. On his return to Kabul, he found that his chief assistant, Hafizullah Amin, had set the stage for Amin's own takeover. Taraki summoned Amin to his headquarters, a shoot-out between the two men's body guards ensued, and Taraki was killed. For the next three months, Amin ruled ruthlessly and erratically and, significantly, refused Russian military aid and advice in an attempt to maintain Afghan independence. By December 1979, the Russians decided they had had enough, and they invaded, killing Amin and bringing one of his communist rivals, Babrak Karmal, back from Eastern Europe where he had been exiled by Amin.

There are now 80,000 Russian troops in Afghanistan; the currency is the ruble and defections have dropped the Afghan army from a high of 100,000 to 25,000.

Why did the Russians do it? Here are what appear to be the major factors in the Soviet Union's decision:

(1) Afghanistan was one of only four non-communist states bordering on Russia (besides Finland, Iran, and Turkey); having a ring of friendly, controllable socialist states on its borders is important to Russia's sense of internal security.

(2) the increased access to warm water seaports;

(3) the fear that an Islamic fanatic, such as Iran's Khomeini, would take over in Kabul and that the spread of Islamic fundamentalism would cross the border into Russia's own Islamic provinces.

(4) in the event of dismemberment of Iran and Pakistan, Russia would be ready to move in quickly;

(5) the Soviet Union had invested too much in Afghanistan to give up;

(6) as a demonstration to the world that Russia would fight to keep socialist regimes in place.

Will the Russians meet their objectives? All this remains to be seen. If the major Russian goal was and is, as it was with other "conquerors," to get elsewhere, then whether or not they eventually get the spoils of warm water ports in Pakistan and oil in Iran remains to be seen. Certainly they have paid a big price already, not only in terms of the estimated 10,000 Soviet soldiers killed since the invasion, but in terms of a probable permanent loss of credibility in the Moslem world. No longer will the Soviets be able to pretend that they are anything but enemies of Islam.

Russia's "internal" goal of making Afghanistan a friendly socialist buffer state and containing Islam on soviet borders, will almost certainly fail.

Afghanistan will never become a Czechoslovakia, or a Hungary or an East Germany. Afghanistan has never been successfully invaded. The land is too fierce, the people too proud and independent for that.

There is a code of living in Afghanistan called Pushtun Wali, a code of the Pushtun Hills which most Afghans subscribe to in one way or another, which extols the virtues of warfare and revenge.

Although Pushtun Wali is a complex code of living, the essence of it is that if one's honor is stained, one is duty-bound to avenge it. If it is not avenged by the father, the debt passes on to the son, to the grandson, to the great grandson, and so on.

The depth of this feeling that soiled honor to one's family, must be avenged, can be felt in the following excerpt from an Afghan short story called *Feud*, in which a father anticipates the day when his son will avenge his mother's death.

"Look" he said, baring carefully the head of the new-born infant. "See the eagle profile, the hooded brow, the creamy skin, the black, curly hair! An Afghan of Afghans! And see—he opens his right eye—has he not the eye of a killer?"

The child twisted and gave a little cry. Ali-Khan took a long, lean knife from the wall, offering its hilt to his son. The tiny hand gripped it, while the blade, point down, shone in the rays of the afternoon sun."

Blood must be avenged. Only blood or blood-money can erase the crime of murder, and what the Russians have done with their brutality in Afghanistan, with their napalm, and bombing of villages, with their helicopter gunships, is to create a situation where practically every family in Afghanistan is honor-bound to avenge themselves.

[From the New Republic, June 6, 1981]

Russia's Afghan Enemy

(By John Bierman)

The grain embargo is gone, but the low intensity war in Afghanistan grinds on. Since the return of spring to the snowy mountain passes and stony uplands, the pace has quickened. Western news organizations have been excluded from the country since December 1979. Little firsthand information is coming out about the progress of the fight against the Soviet invaders. But analysis of what objective evidence does exist makes it apparent that the Soviets have little hope of inflicting a decisive defeat on the rebel forces.

After 17 months of fighting, the countryside still belongs to the mujahiddin and even in the major cities the Russians' grip is uncertain. In Kabul, the capital, they lose men steadily in twos and threes to sneak grenade attacks and sniper fire from the rooftops. Intelligence reports say Soviet troops dare not enter the city's labyrinthine bazaar district, even in daylight. In the southern city of Kandahâr, attrition has reportedly forced the withdrawal of the Soviet garrison, and across on the relatively quiet western side of the country, near the Iranian border, a number of Soviet soldiers were murdered in their sleep recently by guerrillas who sneaked into their barracks in the city of Herât. Similarly, Soviet control of the country's main roads is far from complete after dark. Even in daylight there are occasional forays by mujahiddin on the highway between Kabul and Jalalabad. The fighters come down from the surrounding hills, ambush a Soviet convoy, and make off with arms and other supplies.

It is mainly through captured weapons that they keep the war going, but recent reports say that the mujahiddin are now receiving recoilless rifles which they use to great effect against Soviet tanks, and that they also have acquired some British-made heavy mortars. The source of these weapons is presumed to be Egypt, whose attempts to arm the mujahiddin have been hampered, but by no means halted, by the Pakistanis, who are understandably nervous about allowing too great a flow of war material to cross their territory into Afghanistan. (Other weapons are apparently trickling in across the Chinese border, including Chinese Army fragmentation grenades.) Substantial reinforcements are expected to join the mujahiddin forces soon from the refugee camps in Pakistan. One indication of this is that the inventories of the Kohat gun factories in Pakistan's Northwest Frontier Province have been cleaned out by Afghans going back to fight.

Against these poorly armed guerrillas, the Russians have deployed a formidable fleet of helicopter gunships. The gunships are at once the Soviet army's greatest strength and its greatest potential vulnerability. Guerrillas caught in the open are easily annihilated; catching them in the open, however, is no easy task. Much has been made of the fact that Afghanistan, unlike Vietnam, offers no lush jungle cover in which to hide. But the Afghans have had centuries of practice in melting into the rocks and crevices of their craggy landscape. Every Western traveler in Afghanistan has had the experience of driving for hundreds of miles and not seeing a soul, then stopping and immediately drawing a large crowd of people as if from nowhere. The high ground where the Afghan fighters camp is full of places to hide. The Soviet helicopter gunships do not fly well at high altitudes. None of the sporadic reports of gunships having been shot down has been confirmed; but if the Afghans should ever obtain even a small supply of shoulder-launched surface-to-air missiles, the Russians could be in serious trouble in the countryside.

Soviet efforts to put some backbone into the puppet Afghan army, now reportedly down to some 25,000 men from its pre-invasion peak of 90,000, have met with no success. Desertions continue to drain the army, entire platoons and companies often going over to the mujahiddin with their weapons. Those who do not actually desert show a distinct reluctance to go into battle against their countrymen, and recruiting teams come back empty-handed from the countryside.

Unlike the French and the Americans in Vietnam, the Russians have held back from pumping ever-increasing amounts of men and materiel into an unwinnable war. Their numbers have not increased significantly since the invasion in December 1979 and, according to the best information, remain at about 85,000 men inside Afghanistan and another 30,000 just across the Soviet border in a support role.

But also unlike Vietnam, the resistance to the superpower remains completely fragmented. The mujahiddin are broken up into something like 200 separate fighting groups, often based only on clan or village affiliation, seldom with effective liaison and with no common ethos except love of war and hatred of foreign intruders. The six or seven organizations based across the Pakistan frontier in Peshawar form alliances that last a few days before breaking up and reforming in some new configuration. So if the Russians can scarcely hope for a victory in Afghanistan they may well be spared the humiliating defeat the U.S. suffered against a cohesive enemy in Vietnam.

From all indications the Russians went into Afghanistan with very little understanding of the kind of people they would be up against. They should perhaps have taken note of the experience of the British, who fought three wars against the Afghans between 1848 and 1930 and were trounced each time. The Russians might have learned not only that the Afghans are consummate and cruel guerrilla fighters, but that war is a circumstance they positively relish.

Pathans are the people who are doing most of the fighting today, in the eastern provinces of Afghanistan. There are nearly nine million of them, some 40 percent of the population, with another four million across the frontier in Pakistan. Since the invasion they have killed, by some informed estimates, perhaps 12,000 Soviet soldiers. It is common to hear of clashes in which up to 100 Russians are killed and wounded.

War and honor are the Pathans' proper business, and if they had not been invaded by the Russians they would doubtless be busy killing each other, though on a lesser scale, in the innumerable and interminable blood-feuds that always have characterized the Pathan lifestyle.

Pakhtoonwali—the way of the Pathan, the harsh code by which these people live—contains an overriding first commandment: to wipe out dishonor by revenge. Disputes over land, livestock, women, personal injury, and insult can only be settled by bloodshed, and these feuds involve not just individuals and families but often clans and whole tribes, and continue for generations. The concept of bardal, or revenge, is so deeply ingrained that a loving Pathan mother will sing her baby to sleep by chanting a litany of the names of the men killed by the child's father or grandfather.

The names of the Pathan tribes—the Afridi, the Yusufzai, the Wazirs, the Shinwaris, the Mahsuds, the Mohmands—are a kind of wild poetry, and the Pathans, though largely illiterate, breed poets as they breed warriors. Their poetry is distinctive, shot through with images of violence even when speaking of love: "Your eyes are two loaded pistols/You have murdered me with your smile." The 17th-century tribal chief Khushal Khan Khattak is considered the Pathans' greatest warrior-poet. He used martial images to celebrate the beauties of nature: "The tulips are bright as flashes from the huntsmen's guns/The roses stand, a warrior phalanz, spears by their sides." He had no illusions about the innate goodness of his people: "Let but one lift his head a bit/Another quickly lays him low." Yet the Pathans had an overriding redeeming feature: "But still, O Khushal Khan, thank God for this/That they are not slaves but free-born men."

Khushal Khan had 57 sons. He didn't bother to keep count of his daughters, which says all that needs to be said about the place of women among the Pathans, then as now. Chattels they certainly are, as in most traditional Moslem societies. An unfaithful wife or an unchaste daughter will be put to death as a matter of course. Perhaps this has something to do with the tendency of Pathan women to commit unspeakable atrocities on enemy wounded. The women uphold the Pathan way as fiercely as the men.

A year from now it is not likely that much will have changed. If the Afghans get their portable missiles, the Russians will be doing somewhat worse; if not, they may be doing somewhat better. But the war will not be over. Even if their casualties mount, the Russians will be able to keep on fighting at whatever level and for whatever duration they choose. There will be no antiwar marches in Red Square, no dispatches from anguished young reporters in the Moscow papers. But the Pathans and their countrymen will not give up, even if a rational calculation of their chances dictates it. Against such people the Russians, for all their overwhelming firepower, can scarcely hope for much better than a long, bloody, and expensive standoff.●

FIRST INTERNATIONAL GATHERING OF HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the first international gathering of holocaust survivors has just taken place in Israel, 36 years after the crematoria of Dachau, Bergen-Belsen, and Auschwitz were extinguished. The few survivors of the great Jewish communities of Europe—that small "remnant plucked from the fire"—gathered in Jerusalem, the spiritual center of the Jewish people, to mourn the 6 million who were murdered, to remind the world of the dangers of hate and bigotry, and to affirm life.

We Americans can be proud of our role in putting an end to Nazi tyranny and opening the gates of the death camps. Israel, in the infancy of its statehood, surrounded by hostile neighbors, absorbed most of the survivors of the death camps. Similarly, the United States admitted over 100,000 of those who returned from the ashes and gave then the opportunity to become proud and productive citizens.

As President Reagan said at a recent White House ceremony recalling the horrors of the holocaust, "We need always guard against that kind of tyranny and inhumanity. Our spirit is strengthened by remembering and our hope is in our strength." We as a people are committed to learn from the past so that it might guide our futures.

At the conclusion of the gathering in Jerusalem last week, aging holocaust survivors, scattered to the four corners of the Earth, passed on the responsibility for remembering to the next generation. There is some cause for anxiety on this count. As Elie Wiesel, eminent author and chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council said in the reunion's closing moments, "Something went wrong with our testimony. It was not received. Otherwise, things would have been different. Look, look at the world around us: suspicion again, violence everywhere, organized state-sponsored terror, racism, fascism, fanaticism, anti-Semitism."

Nevertheless, the American people may again view their commitment with pride. Through public bodies such as the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council in Washington, D.C., through the Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, and through other groups of citizens committed to the perpetuation of the memory of the holocaust, we will secure our futures and strengthen our spirits by insuring that such cruelty can never happen again.●

CONTRACT REVIEW AT THE NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to amend the Public Health Service Act. My bill would direct the National Cancer Institute's Director to consult with appropriate scientific and technical staff, and with the National Cancer Advisory Board, When letting contracts and awarding grants.

Forty-three years after the creation of the National Cancer Institute; 10 years and $10 billion after President Nixon declared his "war on cancer," the cure for, or control of cancer still seems like elusive goals. Despite our modest success in this area—in the cure rate of some forms of childhood leukemia for example—Congress continues to be generous to NCI. Our commitment to effective and fully funded biomedical research remains unfaltering.

But this commitment would not be diminished by better oversight of contracts, grants, and cooperative arrangements let by NCI. During the hearings for the 1980 NCI appropriations, questions were raised for the first time in committee about the resources consumed by the research institutes. The Health Subcommittee, in 1979, began hearings on legislation to rewrite the authorization for the National Institutes of Health. This legislation, the Health Research Act, contained tighter controls on NCI's activities that has existed in the past.

Such controls, while resisted by Congress and members of the research community in the past, should be reexamined. Last July, articles appeared in the New York Times and the Boston Globe which brought to our attention news of falsified cancer research paid for by NCI dollars. More recently, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee has been inquiring into how NCI spends its money.

Unfortunately, this inquiry has been characterized by personal attacks against the leadership of NCI—its management. I believe that such attacks are unwarranted, and many cancer experts agree. Benno Schmitt, for example, who retired last year from the National Cancer Advisory Board, issued a statement last year praising the leadership of Dr. DeVita. Sheldon Samuels, the director of the Industrial Union Department and National Cancer Advisory Board member, agrees with my position that we must institutionalize some changes to make the contracting process better capable of handling the massive requests for funding. It was the testimony of Mr. Samuels, before the Health Subcommittee, which lead our Commerce Committee to adopt language affecting contracting in the Health Research Act.

The Senate never acted upon the House-passed bill last year. Therefore, I have decided to introduce the language involving scientific, technical, and National Cancer Advisory Board input into the contracting process. For grants and cooperative agreements under $50,000, the Director of NCI would be required to seek technical and scientific advice before awarding the funds. For grants over $50,000, the National Cancer Advisory Board would have to express its approval. For research grants over $500,000, the NCAB would be similarly involved.

As we seek to establish meaningful oversight at NCI, let this debate focus on the kinds of institutional improvements we can make. Our national effort to control cancer will not be served by personalizing attacks against the professional scientists and managers at NCI. They are the heroes of this very important scientific endeavor and public policy commitment.

The legislation follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 405(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 286(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Under procedures approved by the Director of the National Institutes of Health, the Director of the National Cancer Institute—

"(1) may approve any contract for resources for research conducted at or through the Institute, except that if the total cost of the contract to be approved exceeds $500,000, the contract to be approved only after the National Cancer Advisory Board has recommended approval of the contract;

"(2) may approve other contracts for research or training, except that—

"(A) if the total cost of the contract to be approved does not exceed $500,000, the contract may be approved only after appropriate technical and scientific review, and

"(B) if the total cost of the contract to be approved exceeds $500,000, the contract may be approved only after appropriate technical and scientific review and recommendation for approval by the National Cancer Advisory Board; and

"(3) may approve grants and cooperative agreements for research or training, except that—

"(A) if the direct cost of the grant or cooperative agreement to be approved does not exceed $50,000, such grant or cooperative agreement may be approved only after appropriate technical and scientific review, and

"(B) if the direct cost of the grant or cooperative agreement to be approved exceeds $50,000, such grant or cooperative agreement may be approved only after appropriate technical and scientific review and recommendation for approval by the National Cancer Advisory Board.".●

PROFESSOR TOM FARER RE-ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE INTER-AMERICAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, Prof. Tom Farer, who was the first American to be elected as the president of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission of the Organization of American States, was reelected for a second term by acclamation.

This is an occurrence that must be applauded and given great recognition. The United States should be honored that an American has been reelected by his Latin colleagues to this important and distinguished post.

In its work the Commission has the reputation for being fair, objective, and an effective instrument in advancing human rights in the hemisphere. The Inter-American Human Rights Commission should be a shining example for the other regions of the world.

Professor Farer, a specialist in the field of international law and foreign policy, recently wrote:

In this Hemisphere what binds peoples together into nations and the nations into a great regional compact is a shared aspiration to freedom, justice and order: That is, to human rights. In empowering the Commission to defend and promote human rights and in accepting the corresponding legal obligation to cooperate with the Commission, the Member States reconfirm their commitment to the progressive enhancement of just order. Thus the effective operation of the Commission and the ongoing support it receives from the great majority of Member States have the net effect of strengthening governmental authority within every cooperating state. Practically all governments, therefore, understand the broad and profound complementarity between their support for the Commission and the promotion of their particular interests.

Tom Farer and the entire membership of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission deserve the congratulations of all my distinguished colleagues for a job well done.●

AFL-CIO COMMENTS ON TAX BILLS

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today I am placing in the RECORD a copy of a letter sent to members of the Ways and Means Committee by Lane Kirkland, president of the AFL-CIO. His letter raises a number of provocative questions about the direction in which our deliberations on tax reductions may be taking us.

I would particulary note the endorsement of H.R. 3218 which would target tax relief to hard-pressed low- and middle-income families and which would also provide appropriate levels of relief to ailing American industries through the creation of a Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The cosponsors of H.R. 3218 include WILLIAM BRODHEAD, JAMES BLANCHARD, JOHN CONYERS, HAROLD FORD, WILLIAM FORD, PARREN MITCHELL, ROBERT GARCIA, GEORGE CROCKETT, PETER RODINO, DON BAILEY, and RICHARD OTTINGER.

I commend Mr. Kirkland's letter to you for your consideration.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The AFL-CIO urges you to reconsider the business tax decisions made yesterday.

The Committee is structuring a tax cut bill that combines the most regressive proposals of Republicans and Democrats and would saddle middle income Americans with the share of taxes now borne by corporations and wealthy Americans.

The Committee's "tentative" decision to slash corporate tax responsibility is a major disaster that would cost the Treasury more than $180 billion over the next five years and shrink the corporate share of the cost of government to only 7 percent—a 70 percent reduction from their 1960 share. This corporate share will become even less as the full effects take hold in future years. The effective business tax rate under this decision would be slashed from 29 percent currently to 14 percent by 1986 before the future reductions scheduled for 1987 and beyond take effect. (See attached table.)

The bipartisan giveaways—those voted and those anticipated—will virtually wipe the corporate income tax off the books, and heap most of the nation's tax burden onto the backs of working people who have only their wages and salaries to sustain them.

In order to present the facade of equity bonanzas to the corporations and the wealthy then will be coupled with tax reductions to individuals. But even if moderate and middle income Americans are given a more equitable tax rate cut than the Administration's three-year, 25 percent across-the-board giveaway, they will pay heavily from the tax responsibility and burdens they will be forced to shoulder as the government struggles to meet its domestic responsibilities and provide for the national defense.

Equally disturbing is the bipartisan support for other costly and long-resisted attempts to raid the U.S. Treasury, including the virtual elimination of estate and gift taxes, added tax breaks for oil royalty owners, slashes in the top tax rate on unearned income, and a variety of inequitable devices touted as "savings" incentives.

The AFL-CIO is also concerned that because of the across-the-board nature of the Committee's business tax cut, and the unfocused manner in which the benefits would be distributed, huge amounts of foregone revenue would be wasted in subsidizing investments that would take place anyway, and would provide cash to buy other companies, increase dividends, invest overseas, speculate, or to finance shutdowns and relocations that destroy jobs and blight local communities.

The only certainty is that corporate cash flow will increase and federal revenues will diminish. The portion of the additional cash flow that will go to productive, economy-building investment is at most speculative.

What is needed is a carefully-defined package which would help restore buying power lost to inflation without causing inflationary pressures, while encouraging economic growth, jobs and productivity improvements in basic industries and geographic areas characterized by outmoded public and private facilities and high unemployment levels.

We believe that the concept incorporated in H.R. 3218 would meet these objectives. At a cost of only $30 billion this measure would provide more than the Reagan Administration in tax cuts for Americans with incomes of $30,000 per year or less in the first year and would help revitalize corporations and industries in economic distress, many of which would not be helped by the Committee's business proposal.

Either Reagan Administration's corporate tax reduction proposal or the Committee's resultant product would destroy whatever fairness that now exists in the tax structure. The Committee is relegating to the scrap heap the principle of a progressive tax system based on ability to pay.

The AFL-CIO urges you to adopt a program of targeted tax cuts in a fair and equitable package that will not transfer the corporate tax burden to the nation's wage and salary earners.

EFFECT OF BUSINESS TAX CUT DECISION [1]

[By House Ways and Means Committee on June 17, 1981]

	Revenue loss (billions)	Effective corporate income tax rate (percent)
1960		43
1970		41
1980		29
1981	$3.2	28
1982	13.6	25
1983	21.7	23
1984	33.6	20
1985	45.0	18
1986	66.3	14
1987	75.1	NA
1988	80.7	NA
1989	88.1	NA
1990	96.7	NA
Totals:		
1981–86	$183.4	
10 yr. total	524.0	

[1] Immediate expensing and corporate rate cuts.

NA=Not available.

Source: AFL-CIO Department of Economic Research estimates based on Joint Committee on Taxation staff data and economic projections of CBO and OMB.

Corporate income tax share of Federal budget: 1960, 23 percent; 1970, 17 percent; 1980, 12 percent; 1986, 7 percent.●

HONORING HAROLD ROITENBERG

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, America's strength has been greatly augmented by the industrious idealism and commitment of generations whose forebears came to these shores fleeing the persecution and poverty of their native lands. Harold Roitenberg is such an American. His parents came to this country as penniless immigrants from Russia and struggled to raise their four sons with strong values and high aspirations. Life was tough and kids were rough on the wrong side of the tracks in Minsk, but by the time of his early graduation from high school, Harold Roitenberg had earned the title of "Godfather." He could never refuse a request for help and he always delivered on his promises. Today he is still the same man; no charity and no worthy cause is ever turned away without being uplifted and enriched by his generosity and compassion.

Upon graduation from high school, he immediately enlisted in the Navy. His ship, the *Mississippi*, was the first to arrive in Tokyo. Once back in the United States he completed college on the GI bill. After college, working tirelessly, Harold Roitenberg evolved a new idea—shopping through mail order catalogs and showrooms. His creative development of this concept has enabled millions of consumers to shop far more conveniently and economically than before. It has made Harold Roitenberg a classic example of the American dream.

Harold is married to Ruthie and is the father of four children. Today Harold Roitenberg is—as he always has been—a very busy man. He only has time for those who need him. For them he is always available. I wish to preserve in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gratitude and appreciation of thousands whose lives have been touched by the generosity, humanity, and understanding of this great American, Harold Roitenberg.●

ISRAEL'S STRIKE AGAINST THE OSIRAK REACTOR

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Israeli strike against an Iraqi powerplant on June 7 was an unavoidable defensive maneuver. The strike eliminated, for the immediate future, the development of an Iraqi nuclear weapon intended for use against Israel. This weapons program posed an unacceptable threat to Israel's national survival.

I recognize the seriousness of the current situation in the Middle East, and the tension injected by the raid. I hope that the Israeli Government will continue to support diplomatic efforts for a peaceful solution to the many disputes in that complicated area.

But I must point out that the conventional methods of minimizing the potential for conflict failed to deter France and Italy from supplying weapons-grade uranium and nuclear weapons technology to Iraq. Iraq itself has violated, for all practical purposes, the Non-Proliferation Treaty by repeatedly asserting its plan to develop a nuclear bomb with which to attack Israel.

Iraq has considered itself in a state of war with Israel since 1948. Iraq has supported terrorists against Israel. And it clearly was readying itself for an atomic attack against Israel.

Under these circumstances, the Israeli Government had no choice.

Perhaps, even more important than as a necessary act of self-survival, the Israeli action may serve as a last clear warning to the nations of the world of the danger which nuclear proliferation poses to the survival of humanity.

This year the source of danger was Iraq; next year it may be Pakistan; the year after Libya and so on through 175 nations. Unless the major powers assume greater responsibility now humanity is doomed. By underscoring the gravity of the situation Israel has served not only itself but all of humanity.●

WAR HERO HONORED

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the privilege of calling the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding achievements of Lt. Col. Matt Urban, U.S. Army—retired. Lieutenant Colonel Urban, the most decorated soldier in our country today, deserves our sincere thanks and highest respect for the services he has rendered the country, often at the greatest peril to his life.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this excerpt from an article about Lieutenant Colonel Urban, appearing in the Hudson Register Star on June 19, 1981, in the RECORD, for the interest of my colleagues in the Congress and others who may read the following:

[From the Hudson (New York) Register Star, June 19, 1981]

Lt. Col. Urban enlisted in the Army in 1941 and served through World War II with the 60th Infantry Regiment in the Mediterranean Theatre of Operations and the European Theatre of Operations.

He has been decorated with The Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal for Valor, Purple Heart, American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal and the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal.

Also, the World War II Victory Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge, Presidential Unit Citation, Croix de Guerre with a Bronze Star, Croix de Guerre and the Belgian Fourragere.

He was presented the Medal of Honor in July, 1980, by then President Jimmy Carter for his heroic actions with the 2nd Battalion, 60th Infantry Regiment, 9th Infantry Division.

In June, 1944, Lt. Col. Urban's company encountered an enemy attack at Renouf, France. Realizing that his company was in danger, he armed himself with a bazooka and worked his way to an ammo carrier through a barrage of enemy fire and destroyed the tanks.

Later that day in an attack near Orglandes, he was wounded in the leg by a tank gun. The next day, although badly wounded, he directed his company in another attack. An hour later, he again was wounded and evacuated to England.

In mid-July, learning of his unit's severe losses in Normandy, he voluntarily left the hospital and hitched-hiked his way back to his unit near St. Lo, France.

Still limping from his leg wound, he retook command, he directed a plan of attack to eliminate the enemy strongpoint.

He was wounded again Aug. 2 and Aug.15, both times ignoring physical trauma and led his troops to victory.

During the Battle of the Meuse, on Sept. 15, he led a charge on the enemy and was seriously wounded in the neck. He refused to be evacuated until his troops had secured the crossing point on the Meuse River.●

HUMAN RIGHTS—SOVIET UNION AND VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of the Congress have passed resolutions concerning the plight of Viktor Brailovsky. He is one of the many whose human rights are being denied in the Soviet Union. In 1976, Brailovsky was granted permission to leave the Soviet Union; however, he told the authorities that he would not go without his wife and two children. Ever since then he has faced 5 years of continuous harassment, interrogation, intimidation and numerous imprisonments, culminating in his arrest on November 13, 1980, charged with "slandering the Soviet State." Despite all efforts to secure his release and permission for him to emigrate to the State of Israel, he was sentenced last week to 39 months of internal exile.

How can the Soviet authorities justify calling themselves civilized when they imprison a man because of his active work on behalf of independent scholarship, free thought in the Soviet Union and the right to emigrate? Furthermore, Brailovsky is suffering from a serious liver ailment. Humanitarian consideration alone demands that he be released.

The resolution that passed the House and Senate called upon the President "to inform the Soviet Union the the United States, in evaluating its relations with other countries, will take into account the extent to which these countries honor their commitments under international law, particularly with respect to the protection of human rights."

As the administration conducts further negotiations with the Soviet Union concerning grain sales, I hope that it will remember Viktor Brailovsky and all the other Soviet dissidents. In the meantime, the Congress must continue to express its concern about the thousands of Soviet dissidents and reaffirm our support for the Helsinki Accords, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, all of which are being violated by the Soviet Union.●

EXPLANATION AS TO MISSED VOTE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, due to official business away from the House of Representatives on Thursday, June 18, and Wednesday, June 24, I was unable to be present for the rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on the passage of H.R. 3480, the reauthorization of the Legal Services Corporation Act. I arranged in advance to pair my "yes" vote with a colleague who planned to vote "no."

I would have voted as follows on the recorded votes:

Rollcall No. 85, "no" on the McDonald amendment to prohibit the use of Legal Service Corporation funds to provide legal assistance on any issue relating to homosexuality (my "no" vote was paired on No. 85);

Rollcall No. 86, "no" on the Sensenbrenner amendment which would have prohibited Legal Services from offering legal advice on abortion laws;

Rollcall No. 87, "no" on the Ashbrook amendment prohibiting legal assistance relating to the desegregation of any elementary or secondary school;

Rollcall No. 88, "yes" on the Fish amendment to the McCollum amendment to permit certain aliens who are legally in the United States to continue to avail themselves of Legal Services assistance;

Rollcall No. 89, "no" on the Kramer amendment requiring budget analysis of Legal Services by the OMB; and

Rollcall No. 90, "no" on the motion to recommit the bill to the committee without final consideration and passage.

Rollcall No. 98, "yes" on the conference report on H.R. 31, to amend the Truth in Lending Act to encourage cash discounts;

Rollcall No. 101, "no" on the amendment to retain quarterly (instead of annual) disbursement of funds to the Public Broadcasting Corporation; and

Rollcall No. 102, "yes" on H.R. 3238, Public Broadcasting authorization.●

LIMITING CASEIN IMPORTS

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 25, 1981

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was informed by the Department of Agriculture that Secretary Block has recommended that an International Trade Commission (ITC) investigation be conducted to determine the extent to which casein imports are interfering with the domestic dairy price support program.

This recommendation comes after a finding by the USDA in its recent study on casein that the Commodity Credit Corporation could save up to $300 million each year on purchases of nonfat dry milk through the dairy price support program if casein imports were eliminated.

While an ITC investigation of casein may be considered by many to be just another study, there is one important difference in this case. At the conclusion of this investigation the ITC can recommend and the President may impose quotas on casein imports. I applaud this probable conclusion to the ITC investigation.

This morning's Washington Post reported that the administration is recommending restrictions on foreign tobacco imports because of expected losses in the tobacco support program this year in the amount of $123 million due to domestic overproduction. The theory behind such a limitation is, of course, that every bit of foreign tobacco imported into the United States replaces domestically produced tobacco which is, then, entered into the tobacco support program.

Accordingly, I hope that the adminstration will also look favorably on quotas on casein imports that similarly displace domestic dairy products. To fail to do so would create a double standard in the treatment of the commodity programs.●