

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ALABAMA BAND HOTTEST
COUNTRY GROUP

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, the University of Alabama football team is being challenged as the most nationally famous group in Alabama.

The hottest group in country music is a band from Fort Payne, appropriately called "Alabama."

The band is composed of Jeff Cook, Randy Owens, and Teddy Gentry, three cousins all hailing from Fort Payne, Ala., and drummer Mark Herndon.

Their meteoric rise on the country music charts recently earned them the prestigious "Top Vocal Group of the Year" award given by the Academy of Country Music.

They are easily the hottest new group in country music, recently scoring their fourth No. 1 single in a row as "Feels So Right" charged to the summit. Previous No. 1 hits were "Old Flame," "Tennessee River," and "Why Lady, Why." They also have a top-selling album.

One of their early hits, "My Home's In Alabama," has become sort of a theme song for those of us who love country music and our beautiful State.

One hears so often about overnight successes in the entertainment field, while the truth is that most entertainers labor for years before they become "overnight" successes. This is true of Alabama.

The band has been working hard for 11 years, and only this year have they hit the top of the charts. However, the fact that they have four consecutive No. 1 hits indicates they have found the magic combination and are destined to become one of the most popular and successful groups of our time.

I think it speaks well of my State that after Alabama achieved the pinnacle in country music, they all decided to move back to Fort Payne. Now they travel all over the country playing to sellout audiences and come back home to the source of their success to rest and relax before the next tour.

They have brought fame and recognition to our great State by taking the name "Alabama" for their band and by writing such songs as, "My Home's In Alabama," "Tennessee River," and others.

Jeff, Randy, and Teddy have not forgotten the home folk, as they recently did a benefit concert for Fort

Payne High School. They reportedly plan a benefit concert for underprivileged children every year in Fort Payne.

Mr. Speaker, Alabama, the State, is indeed proud of Alabama, the band. On August 12, the nearby city of Scottsboro will honor the Alabama band with an appreciation luncheon at Goosepond Civic Center, sponsored by Central Bank. Mayor Roy Owen will present each member of the Alabama band with a key to the city.

Recently, the Fort Payne Times Journal paid tribute to the group with a 12-page supplement in its May 31 edition. I would like to include one article from that supplement entitled, "Alabama Has Weathered The Storm."

Blood is thicker than water, especially when it flows in the music business. More than 11 years ago, cousins Randy Owen, Jeff Cook and Teddy Gentry, known collectively as Alabama, decided that the recording studio was where they belonged, and they have been on a musical roller coaster ride ever since. There have been at least three times over those 11 years the group has been totally resigned to giving it all up. From personnel changes to injuries to utter disillusionment, Alabama has faced and weathered the storms that rocked other's boats and forced them to turn back.

Alabama first met musically in Ft. Payne, Alabama, where Jeff was working for Western Electric, Randy going to school and Teddy laying carpet. Randy (the youngest of the three cousins) and Teddy grew up on adjacent farms in the shadows of Lookout Mountain, showing each other chords and singing when the families got together, the two formed a band with Jeff not only for his local renown as a player, but also because he was the only one around with good equipment—an important consideration at that point in a band's evolution.

Around Christmas of 1969, Randy, Teddy and Jeff assembled to jam for the first time. They gathered several more times over the course of the ensuing year, but it took that long and a job offer at a nearby tourist park, Canyonland, to fuse them into an organized unit.

Every weekend, Canyonland brought in an established star which Alabama would back up then follow with a one-hour dance set. It exposed them to the influence of stars like Bobby Bare, Jerry Wallace and Cal Smith and formed their first thoughts of cracking Nashville.

Though Randy was still in school and the others at nowhere jobs, the direction was clear and the dedication soul-deep. "There just was nothing else," Randy states candidly. "We all set goals for ourselves and fully intend to make them. We never considered them easy but we never expected less."

In the early 70's, Jeff took a government job in Anniston, Alabama, when there seemed to be no fire left in the dream of the cousins finding the musical brass ring together. Wanting to keep the band intact, Randy and Teddy moved to Anniston where

Teddy resumed his career as a carpet layer and brought Randy (fresh out of high school) into the profession as his assistant. "I told them Randy was my helper. He'd never laid carpet in his life," Teddy recalls.

But there was more to Anniston than the government and carpeting. The three became roommates and assembled every night after work to practice music, concentrating on harmonies. They pushed all their beds into the biggest room in the house so they could continue singing until they went to sleep. According to Jeff, "Even with the lights off we'd lay there in the dark and sing until one by one we'd drift off to sleep."

Alabama continued playing weekend dates and working day jobs until March of '73 when they decided it was all or nothing. They quit the government and carpeting, packed up and headed for Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, and started playing six nights a week in clubs there, making as much as the audience offered in tips. Although they had been writing songs all along, the move was the impetus to begin incorporating original material into the show and concentrate on perfecting it.

The stage success of their own songs prompted them to begin recording and pressing their own records which they personally distributed to regional radio stations.

After being turned down by nearly every label in Nashville, they were signed to GRT Records in 1977. They released "I Want To Be With You" which bottomed out at 77 in the national charts, lost in the excitement over fellow GRT releases "The Telephone Man" and "The King Is Gone." From the buzz created with the first records, Dallas-based MDJ Records and Larry McBride became interested in 1979. Owner Larry McBride signed them and took them to Nashville producer Harold Shedd, with whom he had been working on several projects. "I was very impressed with the group," Shedd states. "They were doing some of the things I wanted to do when I was playing."

With the ball in their court and things finally going their way, Alabama's drummer abruptly quit, and once more it appeared as though their efforts were all for naught. But after a month of searching, Mark Herndon entered the picture. He was the catalyst that tied it all together and put them in high gear.

The Alabama-Shedd collaboration resulted in the single "I Wanna Come Over." Although it peaked at 32, it spread the regional buzz into a national stir and laid the groundwork for "My Home's In Alabama" which reached into the top 20 in early 1980.

The stir cranked to a roar, and, as "My Home's In Alabama" climbed the national charts, the same Nashville labels that had initially turned Alabama down were turning their heads and noticing the success and potential.

In April 1980, the band signed with RCA, releasing the single "Tennessee River" and "Why Lady Why" from the album "My Home's In Alabama"—both Number One Country singles for the now-rising superstars. The debut LP was followed in February 1981 with the release of Feels So Right

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

which has spawned another hit single for the group from Ft. Payne, "Old Flame."

Reflecting on the rewards of success, Randy notes, "We really never thought we'd be here today. One year ago we were about as low as you can get, but, instead of giving up, we decided the only way was up and started over again." Teddy concurs, "We spent years to get to this point, and it's only taken months for it all to fall into place. I guess we made the right decision."

They may be from Alabama but they're at home everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, Alabama's dedication and hard work in the face of years of frustration have proven once again that the American dream is very much alive. If one works long enough and hard enough and really believes in himself, one can reach the top.

I commend Alabama to the Nation and offer my heartiest congratulations.●

THE PLIGHT OF RAISA RUDENKO

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1981

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to express anger over another example of the flagrant disregard of the Soviet Government for human rights and the tenets of the Helsinki accords which our Nation is a party to with the Soviets.

The arrest of Raisa Rudenko by officials of the Soviet Government has been made known only recently. Apparently out of fear of negative international public opinion, Communist agents arrested Mrs. Rudenko in April and refused to admit to any knowledge of her whereabouts. Information has now come from the Ukraine indicating that she is being detained somewhere in the Soviet Union.

Raisa Rudenko is the wife of Mykola Rudenko, a highly decorated veteran of World War II and a highly acclaimed writer and philosopher. He has been imprisoned since 1977 for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." The charges against his wife have not been announced.

It is obvious that the Soviet Government has no intentions of fulfilling its commitment to human rights. The activities of the Rudenkos in the Ukrainian group established to monitor the Helsinki accords are the sole reason for their persecution and imprisonment.

Our duty as Americans is to continue to demand Soviet compliance with the Helsinki accords and use every possible peaceful means to obtain that compliance. The tide of international opinion and the indomitable spirits of the Rudenkos and others will someday bring about the respect for freedom and human rights which has been

sought for so long. I ask that all Members of this body continue to work and pray for that day.●

CALIFORNIA CONDOR RECOVERY PROGRAM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I have worked long and hard to insure funds for the preservation and habitat protection of the dying California condor.

There are only about 25 of these majestic birds left, but since 1975, we have begun a condor recovery program. For fiscal year 1982, we have earmarked \$250,000 for this plan.

The major thrust of this recovery effort is a 3-year program with two major provisions. The first provision is the capturing of nine condors for breeding purposes, and the second provision is the tagging of 12 condors with radio transmitters in order to more closely "track" their habits and flight patterns. A Federal permit by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has already been granted, but the California Fish and Game Commission must grant a State permit as well.

Last Tuesday, the California Fish and Game Commission held a public hearing on whether to approve that State permit. A decision is expected this Friday, August 7. If approved, the plan would begin September 1.

Of course, there are those who will object to our attempts at saving the condor by radio telemetry and captive breeding. Some believe man should leave the condor alone, and preserve its habitat instead. The problem with this approach, however, is that we just do not know that much about the condor's habitat to preserve it. A condor can fly 300 miles in 24 hours, making scientific observation extremely difficult; hopefully, this well-prepared recovery program will give us that knowledge.

Recently, there have been successful results from the capturing of Andean condors in South America. Furthermore, Andean condors born in captivity and later released into the wild have adapted to their new habitat remarkably well, and experts believe similar results can be achieved by the California condor.

Mr. Speaker, we are desperately trying to save the remaining California condors. It would be inexcusable for us to preside over their extinction. I urge California's Fish and Game Commission to approve the State permit.●

OPPOSITION VIEWS ON EL SALVADOR

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the twin issues of negotiations and elections have come to the forefront in recent weeks with respect to the ongoing civil struggle in the small Central American nation of El Salvador.

On July 16, Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Enders delivered a speech in Washington which outlined in some detail the U.S. position on these questions. More recently, the Political-Diplomatic Commission of the united opposition groups in El Salvador issued a statement providing their own views on these vital issues.

The Enders speech received wide publicity, and was excerpted in several major American newspapers. Although I do not by any means agree fully with the positions put forward by the Salvadoran opposition—just as I do not fully agree with those put forward by Secretary Enders—I believe that a full airing of the views on all sides is needed. Accordingly, I include the following statement in the RECORD, with the hope that it will be of interest to my colleagues:

POSITION OF THE FDR-FMLN'S POLITICAL- DIPLOMATIC COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS AND POLITICAL SOLUTION

On July 16, 1981, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Thomas O. Enders, defined U.S. government policy toward El Salvador in his speech delivered before the World Affairs Council.

The Political-Diplomatic Commission of the FDR-FMLN hereby makes the following statements in regards to this policy.

1. We acknowledge that there is a change in tone in Mr. Enders' presentation with respect to the Salvadorean situation and the parties involved in the conflict. Missing from Mr. Enders' speech is the extremist rhetoric characteristic of the present Administration, a rhetoric full of anti-communist slogans intended to conceal the lack of a consistent and defined foreign policy.

2. We acknowledge that a positive step has been taken by beginning to recognize that the Salvadorean conflict is "deeply rooted in domestic Salvadorean political and socio-economic problems," thus abandoning the simplistic approach of Secretary of State Alexander Haig and the Reagan Administration which portrays the war in El Salvador as a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

3. However, it is important to discover the real U.S. policy toward El Salvador under the veil of the new language and analysis. Mr. Enders' closing statements clearly express this policy: The Reagan Administration will a) continue with its program of military and economic assistance to the Junta, and b) it will support and contribute to a "democratic solution" by means of elections.

4. The political solution the State Department proposes is that all parties that re-

nounce to violence should be encouraged to participate in the electoral process. For the American people choosing their representatives through elections is a normal and obvious process, but our historical experience in El Salvador is different. In our country elections have been used by all military dictatorships during the last fifty years to deceive the people. The most recent example took place in 1979: General Romero, confronted with the imminent collapse of his government, offered "free elections, with international supervision." The Christian Democratic Party, however, rejected that offer by declaring that as long as the fundamental political problems were not solved (i.e. political prisoners, dismantling the para-military organizations, halting repression, etc.), it was senseless to participate in elections. The Christian Democratic Party expressed this position in a manifesto entitled "Elections Are Not the Solution."

The Salvadoran people have been struggling against the military dictatorship, with arms in hand and through civil disobedience, for many years. This is so because peaceful channels have been systematically closed by the military. If the present prescription from the State Department is that we all peacefully return to elections, the least we can do is examine the real conditions under which the offer of elections is being made:

The same military officers who now offer "free elections," are those responsible for the systematic repression against all popular opposition to the regime. Proof of this are the thousands of murders that have been committed by the Army and Security Forces since January 1980. The MNR (Movimiento Nacional Revolucionario), the political party Mr. Enders is inviting to participate in elections, has had many of its members and leaders assassinated in the last eighteen months, two of its leaders are now in prison and its headquarters have been broken into and looted by the Security Forces.

Fundamental civil liberties are inexistent. For more than sixteen months the "state of siege" decrees have suspended all constitutional rights and since January of this year the government has imposed martial law. News media has been subjected to censorship and those who have been more critical of the government have been physically destroyed by government forces, and their staffs have been assassinated, imprisoned, or exiled. This is the case of the newspapers *El Independiente*, *Orientacion*, *La Cronica del Pueblo*, and *Voz Popular*. Finally, almost the entire leadership of the opposition has been sentenced to death by the Armed Forces, and their names have been published in a hit list in Salvadoran newspapers.

Colonel Garcia, the strong man in the government who is also the Minister of Defense, is the man who in 1972 was president of the national communications system through which one of the most blatant electoral frauds in our history was implemented; proof of this fraud can be found in the U.S. Congressional Record.

The absence of fair conditions for elections is so evident that even the Electoral Council has advised the eventual candidates to campaign through "paid advertisements in the press, radio and T.V., and remain outside the country." (*El Diario de Hoy*, July 16, 1981).

The FDR-FMLN is not alone in confirming the lack of minimum conditions for the electoral process. It has also been affirmed

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

19571

by acting archbishop Rivera y Damas, the Salvadoran Bar Association, the Junta's ambassador to the U.S., and foreign observers such as Cardinal Arns, Mr. Ed Broadbent (leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada), members of the European Parliament, etc.

5. But if elections are not a viable political solution, what then remains in U.S. foreign policy toward El Salvador? The answer is simple: Economic and military aid. In practice the State Department's policy is reduced to its true essence: The search for the Junta's military victory over the Salvadoran people.

The State Department wishes to believe in elections because it is not willing to face the fundamental problem of its policy toward El Salvador. The military aid provided to the Junta, instead of helping to achieve a political solution is strengthening the High Command of the Armed Forces which is responsible for the indiscriminate killings and abuses against the people; it is increasing the suffering of the Salvadoran people and it is prolonging the war. We have to ask ourselves, how is it possible for the U.S. government to curb the violence of the Armed Forces if at the same time it provides them with training and arms to carry out the killing?

6. The FDR-FMLN believes that the rational method to bring an end to war and achieve a "genuinely pluralistic" democracy and social change in our homeland is to attack the fundamental problems through a process of discussions in which we, the Salvadorans, will elaborate our own solutions. In order to achieve this objective the FDR-FMLN proposes the following:

a. A comprehensive process of political negotiations involving the FDR-FMLN and the Salvadoran government.

b. Discussions must cover all fundamental problems based on an agenda to be agreed upon by both sides.

c. In order to guarantee a serious discussion and propitiate an understanding among the two parties, negotiations must take place with the participation of a group of mediators to be selected by both parties.

d. As a guarantee of the mediation process, both parties must have access to the mass media with the objective of explaining the process of mediation to the Salvadoran people.

e. Elections could be discussed as part of the comprehensive solution and within the process of mediation. The FDR-FMLN does not reject the electoral process, but it feels that minimum conditions must be created so that the people can freely express their sovereign will.

f. All agreements made by both parties will be consulted with the Salvadoran people who will be their sole and ultimate judge.

We make this proposal because we are convinced that the FDR-FMLN has developed enough military and political strength and we have the support and confidence of our people in defending their interests both in the battlefield and in the discussion table.

7. Finally, the FDR-FMLN wants to make clear that it rejects the Reagan Administration's policy toward El Salvador not out of anti-American feelings or because we believe that everything that originates in the U.S. government is evil in principle, but because the State Department's proposal does not address the fundamental problems of our country and does not offer realistic and viable solutions. The cause of peace and de-

mocracy could be served better if the State Department abandoned its old illusions and stopped deceiving itself through wishful thinking. The great North American people and the heroic Salvadoran people deserve, and are asking for, a more serious and realistic policy. ●

A CALL FOR THE RELEASE OF MYKOLA AND RAISA RUDENKO

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1981

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 6 years since the United States, the Soviet Union, and many other nations of the world signed the Helsinki accords. This monument agreement affirms the universal rights of men to liberty, freedom, and self-determination. Since that time, there have been a multitude of violations of the accords, both documented and undocumented, by the Soviet Union. It deeply saddens me to hear of yet another usurpation of basic freedoms in the Ukraine—the imprisonment of Mykola Rudenko.

Mr. Rudenko's sole crime is that he has publicly endorsed the provisions of the Helsinki accords and the human rights standards it establishes. In addition, Mr. Rudenko was a founding member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group, which has worked to make known the abusive treatment of Ukrainian dissenters. Because of his unwavering convictions, Mr. Rudenko is serving out a 12-year prison sentence.

Although reports indicate that Mr. Rudenko's health is deteriorating, to sustain his protest against his oppressors he is partaking in a hunger strike. Shortly after he began, the distressing news came that Mr. Rudenko's wife, Raisa, had disappeared. She has not arrived at scheduled appointments and neither friends or relatives have been able to locate her. Evidence would seem to substantiate speculation that she is being held against her will in retaliation for her husband's bold actions.

Truly, we must not stand by and allow these flagrant violations of the Helsinki accords to go unnoticed. Those of us who are fortunate enough to live in a free and just society must speak out against this repression.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, I appeal to my colleagues and all freedom-loving people of the world to urge the high-ranking officials of the Soviet Government to make known the whereabouts of Mrs. Rudenko, and, in compliance with the Helsinki accords, allow them their freedom. ●

HAPPY BIRTHDAY SRI CHINMOY

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to join my colleagues today in honoring Sri Chinmoy on his 50th birthday, August 27. This remarkable individual is a creative dynamo who has forged his accomplishments from marathoning to directing the meditation group at the United Nations, from scores of concerts across the Nation to creating a major cross-country bicycling route from New York to San Francisco, from his prize winning poetry to his hundreds of thousands of dynamic and colorful paintings. Through his Sri Chinmoy Centres across the Nation, Sri Chinmoy has inspired thousands of individuals through his outpouring in painting, music, composing, poetry, athletics, and as a dedicated public servant.

Sri Chinmoy's philosophy has much to do with the inner life, but parallel with this emphasis on contemplative experience is a strong affirmation of the value of material existence, and of the need to develop and transform every aspect of life through work and action. This view of reality is dynamic and also his profoundly positive view of human potential leads Sri Chinmoy to stress the transcendence of previously attained goals and the pressing of limits.

Through his remarkable life he is illustrating that there is no end to our capacities for excellence as individuals or as a nation.●

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON
FOREIGN LANGUAGES

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have proposed a bill to establish a National Commission to preserve our non-English language resources. The Education and Labor Committee held hearings on my proposal in the 1970's which resulted in a provision being added to the Higher Education Act of 1975 that touched somewhat on my idea that we should preserve this Nation's heritage of language resources and utilize these resources in today's world.

However, I am convinced that our country still needs a National Commission to focus on the important role foreign languages play in our Nation and today I am again proposing a bill based on my original proposal. My bill calls for establishing a National Com-

mission for the Utilization and Expansion of Language Resources. The purpose of the Commission would be to develop a national policy for identifying, preserving, and improving our language resources as well as a program to encourage the development of language skills for use in nontraditional areas such as commerce, trade, and defense.

I believe that the reintroduction of my bill is particularly timely in view of the recent studies within the Government that show the need for foreign languages. For example, the intelligence/defense community has recently testified regarding their severe shortage of language personnel. On July 15, 1981, Adm. Bobby R. Inman, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency testified before the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee with regard to the declining foreign language ability of its employees and how this has impacted on the Agency's operations. During Admiral Inman's testimony it was brought out that it is becoming increasingly difficult to recruit personnel adequately trained in a foreign language because many colleges and universities no longer have foreign language requirements as part of their mandatory curriculum.

A GAO study showed that of the roughly 17,000 Federal overseas positions which require a competency in a foreign language, around 3,400 of these were vacant in 1979. The study also showed that the foreign language competency of the U.S. personnel assigned to these positions abroad is less than that required for maximum effectiveness and efficiency. Based on these statistics and Admiral Inman's comment that the intelligence community is especially vulnerable when it comes to the more exotic languages such as Arabic and Farsi, it is difficult not to wonder if some of the situations that have developed in the last few years in Iran and Afghanistan could have been mitigated by a better understanding and appreciation of their language and culture.

A third study known as the Perkins Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies stated that the presence of bilingual minority groups in the United States constitutes an as yet untapped reservoir of linguistic and cultural expertise which our Nation so desperately lacks, and I could not agree more.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are all coming to realize that proficiency in a foreign language is vital to the efficient and effective operation in many areas of our Government. The Perkins Commission pointed out that our national incompetence in foreign languages is evidence of a very weak link in our efforts to develop an internationally competitive defense system, and that foreign languages, which are

important to the political, economic, and intellectual security of the United States have been overlooked and allowed to deteriorate.

From all of these studies the conclusion, unfortunately, is that we are wasting much of our national language resources by not utilizing the more than 28 million people in our Nation who speak foreign languages and we are minimizing the importance of foreign languages by not making any effort on the national level to sustain and support foreign language education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is important to point out that my bill in no way attempts to disestablish English as the common language of American unity, but rather to reinforce and maintain the other languages spoken in our country to be used to the benefit of our Nation.

While our Nation might not be abundantly rich in oil resources, we are rich with diverse peoples and cultures, yet to date there is no agency or branch of Government in charge of a full-scale incentive program to encourage social, educational and political associations, educational institutions, and educational systems at the State and local level to develop programs to preserve and expand our foreign language resources.

I am hopeful that this Congress will seriously consider my proposal to establish the Commission provided for in my bill. Study after study shows that the understanding of another language and culture is vitally important in communication with those across our borders and oceans, as well as within our own Nation. Let us not waste the resources we have but utilize them in the best interests of our Nation.●

ATHLETIC ACHIEVEMENTS OF
BISHOP GALLAGHER CATHOLIC
HIGH SCHOOL

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of two high school coaches whose dedication to their jobs has given Bishop Gallagher Catholic High School in Harper Woods, Mich., some fine athletic achievements over the past two decades.

Women's basketball coach Joanne Shirkey has been at Gallagher for 18 years. During this period her teams have won seven divisional championships, one Catholic League championship and a State class B championship. In 1977 she was awarded the Detroit Free Press Basketball Coach of the

Year and the Detroit News All-Metro Basketball Coach.

Coach Shirkey has a B.S. in physical education and a M Ed. in guidance and counseling from Wayne State University. She has served as dean of students since 1963, women's athletic director since 1961 and physical education department chairperson since 1964.

Likewise, James Bresciami, head coach of Bishop Gallagher's baseball team has an outstanding record of 406 wins and 118 losses. Over the 17 years he has coached at Gallagher his teams have won 10 league championships, 3 Catholic championships and 2 States class A championships.

As a coach he has won many distinguished awards including: Detroit News Coach of the Year, 1971; Michigan Baseball Coaches Association Coach of the Year, 1973; Michigan High School Coaches Association Baseball Coach of the Year, 1979; Catholic League Coach of the Year, 1973; and he was inducted into the Catholic Coaches Hall of Fame, 1981.

Coaches Shirkey and Bresciami have maintained good, solid athletic teams over the years and have been an inspiration to their students and the community. ●

THE STORY OF A DREAM HOUSE

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was very touched by an article I read in the Chicago Tribune recently about the efforts of Charles and Gay Marino to help establish a home away from home for parents whose children were patients at Children's Memorial Hospital. They wanted to help found a home near the hospital for the families of sick children who wanted to be—and needed to be—close to their children.

I believe the history of this special home which started as a dream of one man and became a reality through a concerted effort, is extraordinary. Charles and Gay Marino, Dr. Edward S. Baum, the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago and John Cardinal Cody, McDonald's Corp. and the Children's Oncology Services of Illinois, Inc., all deserve special recognition and thanks.

I am pleased to share this inspiring article with my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 30, 1981]

"MIRACLE" LEADS TO DREAM "HOME"

(By Vicki Kemper)

Charlie Marino believes a miracle saved his daughter's life six years ago, and he has been paying back her good luck with his gratitude ever since.

He doesn't say much about the hundreds of children with cancer or leukemia and

their families he has helped; they simply are other miracles that happened because he was willing to dream and to invest himself in his dream.

Life was not always this way for the 47-year-old Loop lawyer.

"We were just a normal family of six," Marino said. "We were busy living life like everyone else; doing a lot of nothing, frankly, but not realizing it."

Then Marino's youngest child and only daughter, Gage, was diagnosed as having leukemia. She was 5 years old.

"It was absolutely terrifying," Marino recalled.

Gage's pediatrician referred the family to Children's Memorial Hospital, and life for Marino and his wife, Gay, became a cycle of hospital visits, chemotherapy, and anxiety.

When Gage developed a serious side effect from the chemotherapy, she was hospitalized in intensive care, and Marino and his wife spent 24 hours a day in the hospital. They slept on chairs and benches and took turns going home for showers and to change clothing. They shared their grief with other parents.

Gage's condition worsened until she eventually was put on a respirator.

"We were terrified of losing her," Marino said. "We were praying and hoping for a miracle and we received one. On July 21, 1975, she turned the corner and started coming back."

Gage, now 12 years old, receives treatments once every four months.

When it became clear that his daughter was going to pull through, Marino began thinking of how to help other parents whose children were hospitalized. He wanted to help parents who had no place to stay when they brought their children to the hospital for treatment.

"I started dreaming about whether it might be possible to have a place where families could go and stay. It was a fantasy," Marino said.

"You might think we had enough trouble with our own daughter recovering, but we felt it was miraculous and wanted to do something to pay it back. But how do you pay God back? You can't. So we just followed our dream. We wanted to start a parent group."

Marino first went to Dr. Edward S. Baum, his daughter's physician at Children's Memorial. Baum encouraged Marino and told him of a similar house in Philadelphia that had been started with the help of the Philadelphia Eagles football team and McDonald's Corp.

Marino and his wife flew to Philadelphia for a day and found a house much like they had envisioned.

"Again, it was almost miraculous," he said. After several months of searching, bargaining, and a few more "miracles," Marino and Dr. Baum, with the help of McDonald's, signed a contract for a three-story Victorian mansion at 622 W. Deming Pl., the former convent of St. Clement's Catholic Church.

The house has 7,800 square feet of living space and is on a half-acre lot. It was purchased from the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago. John Cardinal Cody guaranteed the \$150,000 mortgage.

About 70 parent attended the organizational meeting on April 28, 1976, of Marino's parent group, now called Children's Oncology Services of Illinois, Inc. One year later the Ronald McDonald House opened.

The purchase price, renovation, and furnishing of the house totaled \$450,000. It was provided by the Association of Chicagoland

McDonald's Restaurants, several organizations that heard of the project and wanted to contribute, a minitelethon broadcast during the half-time of a Chicago Bears game, and donated labor materials and furnishings.

The \$150,000 mortgage was paid off within two years. The annual costs of running the house are about \$30,000.

Marino attributes the success of the project to miracles.

"We felt like we were on a track with the Lord leading us," he said. "All these things were happening and falling into place and I had no control over them."

Marino said that more than once he worried about what he had gotten himself into, but the people and the money kept coming.

Today the 18-bedroom house is almost always full. Families staying in the house pay \$5 a night, if they can afford it. Some food is donated, but usually the families bring their own and cook in one of two kitchens. They are responsible for doing light cleaning work around the house.

"We try not only to give them a place to stay but moral support," Marino said. "We try to make it as much like a home as possible. They are not really guests. They're involved in the house. They have responsibilities. It gives them something else to do each day besides worry about their children, which they spend enough time doing anyway."

Marino and Dr. Baum also set out to do something for the children themselves. Dr. Baum heard of a summer camp for children with cancer or leukemia in Florida, and Marino investigated the idea of setting up one in Illinois or Wisconsin.

They secured a site at the Lake Geneva, Wis., campus of George Williams College and distributed brochures at area clinics, but they knew it wouldn't be easy for parents to let their children go to camp.

"When you've got a parent with a child who has cancer, the thought of separation is not something that comes easy," Marino said. "You get very overprotective of those children. You don't know how long you're going to have them and you want to spend all your time with them. But we realized it would be good for the kids."

In the summer of 1978, 100 children attended the "One Step at a Time" camp, where they could swim, canoe, run, play baseball, and participate in arts and crafts. Doctors and nurses volunteered to serve at the camp clinic, and family members volunteered as counselors.

Marino had been involved with Boy Scouts with his three sons, so he proposed to Dr. Baum that for the second year of the camp they let some of the children cook outdoors and sleep in tents rather than cabins. Marino thought there might be 10 interested children. Twenty-seven signed up.

When Marino overheard the children talking about how they wouldn't be able to see one another for a whole year, he tried to think of a way to get them together sooner.

So last summer he chartered Explorer Post No. 9012, under the handicapped scouting program. The 25 members go on outings such as horseback riding, camping, bowling, skating, and roller skating once a month.

"These kids enjoy being together," Marino said. "They all have cancer. Many of them have licked it. They perceive themselves as normal kids who had a special problem. They can't relate completely to kids who haven't had cancer."

Gay Marino said that providing the children with the opportunity of going to camp or on other outings "helps them get over the hump of losing their hair or their friends. It gives them something to grasp onto because they've moved into another world."

Oncology Services currently is raising money to renovate the Hematology Clinic at Children's Memorial. Marino also is working on ways to expand activities and programs for youngsters who are reaching college age.

"I don't know what's next," he said, "but there will always be something."

Marino admitted he spent a lot of time each week working with his different programs, "but we all have much more time than we realize," he said. "I've found something to invest in. It's a way of paying back what we have gotten."●

BLOOD DONORS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the wonderful efforts of 15 of my constituents in the Central Texas Regional Blood Center who have each donated a minimum of 80 pints of blood during their lifetime—over 10 gallons a piece of the priceless gift of life to so many of their fellowmen:

Mr. M. H. Crockett, Jr. (138 pints); Mr. A. L. Paul (137 pints); Mr. Hubert Kotrla (133 pints); Mr. Melvin Rutt (122 pints); Mr. C. Baynard Roberts (102 pints); Dr. Edward Marquis (96 pints); Mr. Roy Lancaster (87 pints); and Mr. Rueben Mathias (86 pints).

Mr. Charles Walker (86 pints); Mr. A. J. Paul (85 pints); Mr. Hubert Kelley (84 pints); Mr. Ray Boekhorn (82 pints); Mr. R. G. Parker (82 pints); Mr. Lawrence Brown, Jr. (81 pints); and Mr. John G. Perkins (81 pints).

I personally know several of these good men, and know that they lead full and active lives. For them to take the time to make the contribution shows they really care about others, and it shows what we can all do to help others.

All these men deserve our respect for giving the most precious of gifts, for their gifts of blood are indeed the gift of life. As volunteer donors, they stand as symbols of all those who recognize the need to give blood to sustain the life of patients who would otherwise die. Theirs is truly the gift of love.●

HONORING JOHN DALTON

HON. TOM LOEFFLER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. LOEFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to recognize a friend, fellow Texan and dedicated public servant who has distinguished himself

in his community and his profession and has given of his time and talents on occasions too numerous to mention.

I speak this morning of John Dalton, who is the former chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

John Dalton now lives in San Antonio, Tex., where he has joined the Gill Savings Association of that city. He resigned his chairmanship of the savings and loan regulation agency last December to make way for an appointee of President Reagan.

John Dalton and I have served together as officers and board members of the Texas State Society, of which he is the current president.

He has been honored in the past, as I honor him today, in his service to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. I would now at this time like to submit the following resolution of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Committee which advises the Bank Board on the whole range of issues concerning the thrift industry and housing finance.

The advisory committee commends John Dalton for his work as a member and as chairman of the board, as I do now:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Whereas, the Honorable John Dalton has served as a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in a distinguished manner since February of 1980, and

Whereas, Mr. Dalton assumed the role of Chairman of the Board during an extremely critical period for the S&L Industry, and under his leadership, the Board continued to pursue solutions to the challenges facing the industry during this critical period, and

Whereas, as a result of Mr. Dalton's advice, assistance, support and gracious manner the transition of the Bank Board's Chairmanship took place with a minimum of disruption and no less of leadership for the thrift industry, and

Whereas, Mr. Dalton has left a lasting legacy to the S&L Industry and to the American Public that the Industry serves, particularly in making financing for home ownership available to the widest possible spectrum of the American Public,

Be it Resolved that (1) the membership of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council express their gratitude for Mr. Dalton's outstanding efforts in behalf of the nations' public good, and (2) the Council membership wishes Mr. Dalton unlimited success on his return to the private sector.●

SOCIAL SECURITY MINIMUM BENEFITS

HON. EUGENE V. ATKINSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be placed on record as opposing the elimination of the social security minimum benefit program. The future of our social security system is of vital importance to me and we must act quickly but carefully in establishing our priorities to

remedy the troubles the system has incurred. We cannot, although, subject our Nation's citizens to needless suffering by retracting promised benefit programs.

The modest advantage provided by social security benefits, such as the minimum benefit, are for some individuals a sole source of income support. Eliminating the social security minimum benefit would be unthinkable for persons who have no alternative means of making up such an income loss.

In my home district of Pennsylvania, people work hard all their lives to insure a comfortable, but sometimes modest, retirement income. Programs aimed to ease the hardships of elderly life are suddenly pulled out from under them. I am in favor of reduced Government spending, but there must be a more justified way to resolve the problems of the social security system without harming the backbone of the country, the elderly.

The full support of H.R. 4331, to restore the minimum benefit, will prove to our elderly citizens of this Nation that they need not fear for their future existence, and that they need not fear that their elected representatives will act in haste again by making further reductions in the area of social security benefits. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation and provide our senior citizens with not a feeling of abandonment, but a knowledge of effective leadership.

Thank you.●

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF WOMEN IN MIDLIFE AND LATER LIFE

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, major changes have occurred in our society concerning the family and the roles of women.

The traditional role of women as homemakers has undergone major changes in the past four decades. Only about one out of seven married women actually worked in 1940. In 1970, one out of every two married women was employed.

Today one out of every three marriages ends in a divorce, compared to one in seven in 1940.

Many women in midlife are discovering that they are ill equipped to adjust to their changing roles, particularly those who have not worked for a long time and are forced to enter or reenter the job market because of a divorce or the death of a spouse.

The net impact is that a whole new generation of women in midlife has emerged in recent years. They have

often been victimized by rapidly changing social values, family patterns, and economic developments.

These women—particularly those who are widowed, divorced, or separated homemakers with young children—may find themselves thrust into multiple roles as breadwinners, heads of households, and mothers. They often times are unable to fulfill all these responsibilities adequately, as they attempt to move from their prior full-time homemaker status.

Economic problems for women in midlife typically produce deprivation in later life. In fact, women represent about 70 percent of all poor persons 65 years or older. They typically suffer from greater extremes of poverty than older men.

Widowhood also creates major problems for older women, economically as well as emotionally. The death of a spouse is generally regarded as the most traumatizing event in a person's life.

Most elderly women are widowed. The likelihood of being a widow increases directly with advancing age. Only 22 percent of all women 75 or older are married.

Older black women who live alone are perhaps the most economically deprived group in our entire society. More than five out of every eight who are 65 years or older live in poverty. And four out of five are either poor or marginally poor.

The harsh reality is that almost three out of four married women today can expect to be widowed at some point in their lives. They will survive their deceased spouses, on the average, by 18 years.

The problems of middle aged and older women are real and serious. They demand attention by the Congress, the administration, and other policymakers.

Dr. Dolores Davis-Wong, the president of the National Caucus and Center on Black Aged, recently described these problems as well as recommendations to improve the economic well-being of older women when she addressed the North American Regional Technical Meeting on Aging.

In addition, she provided fresh perspectives on the economic situation for older Americans and the impact of the administration's proposed cutbacks in social security for elderly blacks.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the remarks of Dr. Davis for my colleagues to read:

STATEMENT BY DOLORES A. DAVIS-WONG, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CAUCUS AND CENTER ON BLACK AGED

Congressman Pepper and other distinguished members, the National Caucus and Center on Black Aged appreciates the opportunity to testify today at the American Regional Technical Meeting on Aging.

This meeting takes on an added dimension of timeliness because our Nation will hold its third White House Conference on Aging

in less than six months. In addition, the United States will be a leading participant at the World Assembly on the elderly in Vienna, Austria next year. For the first time in UN history, a U.S. citizen—William Kerigan, the former General Secretary of the International Federation on Aging—will be named as the Secretary General for a World Assembly. This is a well deserved honor for Bill and our Nation.

This conference today also provides an added opportunity for stock taking of the economic situation of older Americans as well as to chart out a blueprint for future actions.

ECONOMIC SITUATION OF OLDER AMERICANS AND AGED BLACKS

Our Nation has made considerable progress in improving the economic well-being of the elderly since the first White House Conference on Aging in 1961. But in many respects today, we seem to be going backwards.

In some vital economic areas, the income position of older Black Americans—as well as other older Americans—has deteriorated markedly. Poverty, for example, increased by almost 400,000 for persons 65 or older from 1978 to 1979, from 2.3 million to 3.6 million. This represented the largest increase for the elderly since poverty statistics were first tabulated about 20 years ago.

Poverty data are not yet available for 1980. However, most experts expect another increase—perhaps of the same record-breaking magnitude that occurred in 1979. The bottom line is that we may see nearly 500,000 to 800,000 elderly persons added to the poverty rolls from 1978 to 1980.

It is ironic, though, that articles have surfaced in recent months in newspapers and magazines, implying that the elderly are living quite well. One example is a February 18, 1980 article on "The Old Folks" in Fortune magazine. The author had this to say about older Americans: "The myth is that they're sunk in poverty. The reality is that they're living well. The trouble is there are too many of them—God bless 'em".

As far as I am concerned, older Americans are not living well when 3.6 million—one out of every seven persons 65 or older—are classified as poor. They are certainly not living well when about 25 percent—one out of every four older Americans—is considered poor or marginally poor under the government's own bare bones definition.

The economic deprivation which affects senior citizens can generally be multiplied two or three times for older Black Americans because they suffer from multiple jeopardy since they are old, Black and quite often poor. In fact, aged Blacks are almost three times as likely to be poor as elderly Whites. About 36 percent of all Blacks 65 years or older live in poverty, compared to 13 percent for older Whites. In 1979, 55,000 elderly Blacks were added to the poverty rolls, raising the total from 662,000 to 717,000. This represents the highest number of impoverished older Black Americans since 1966, when 722,000 were poor. In addition, almost 300,000 aged Blacks had income not more than 25 percent above the poverty line in 1979.

This means that 1 million Blacks 65 years or older are either poor or marginally poor. The net impact is that one out of every two older Blacks (49 percent) either lives in poverty or so close to it that he or she really cannot appreciate the difference.

Older Black women who live alone or with nonrelatives are among the most economically deprived groups in our society today. A

shocking 65 percent of those 65 or older live in poverty. And 80 percent are either poor or marginally poor.

I have provided these gloomy figures about the economic position of elderly Blacks and other older Americans to emphasize that a retirement income crisis affects millions of persons 65 or older and threatens to engulf many more. NCBA strongly believes that the number one issue confronting delegates at the 1981 White House Conference on Aging is to assure older Americans have an adequate income.

One of the first orders of business—and now more than ever—is to prevent cutbacks in Social Security, which is the elderly's primary source of income. In fact, Social Security, provides at least one-half of the total support for almost three out of four aged individuals who receive Social Security and more than one out of two similarly situated elderly couples. In one form or another, Social Security touches the lives of almost every American family.

A strong and healthy Social Security system and an effective Supplemental Security program are vital for older Black Americans because these two sources constitute the bulk of their income. Most older Americans have income from assets—such as interest from savings accounts and dividends from stocks—but not older Blacks. Elderly Whites are three to four times more likely to have income from assets than Blacks. Approximately 63 percent of White males 65 or older and 40 percent of elderly White women receive asset income—in contrast to 16 percent of Black aged males and 12 percent for Black older women.

NCBA opposes the Administration's proposal to slash Social Security by 25 percent for persons claiming benefits at age 62. Under present law, people retiring at age 62 receive 80 percent of the benefit that would be payable at age 65. The Administration would cut this back to 55 percent.

This penalty for early retirement would work a great hardship for (1) persons who are forced to retire because they are unable to locate employment or (2) those individuals with a disabling condition but not sufficiently severe to meet Social Security's strict definition.

The Administration's proposed cutbacks in disability protection would perhaps impose a greater hardship than the reductions recommended for older Americans. They would greatly erode disability protection for workers and their families by:

Substantially increasing the "recency of work" test to qualify for disability benefits;

Removing vocational consideration in determining disability for older persons and relying instead solely upon medical determinations;

Increasing the waiting period from five to six months to qualify for disability benefits; and

Requiring a disability prognosis to last for at least 24 months, instead of 12 months as under present law. These measures would have a substantial impact upon older persons because more than one-half of all disabled workers are 55 to 64 years old. Older Blacks would be among the major casualties if these proposed changes become law. Blacks account for almost 17 percent of all disabled workers and dependents because:

Blacks run a much greater risk of being disabled than Whites because we are much more likely to work in dangerous occupations; and

Economic deprivation increases the likelihood of poor health and deteriorating physical condition.

NCBA also opposes measures to raise the eligibility age for full Social Security benefits from 65 to 68 because older Blacks and other minorities would be most adversely affected by this proposal since they have a shorter life expectancy than Whites. NCBA strongly believes that our national policies should promote employment opportunities for all Americans, including older Americans. But raising the eligibility age for full Social Security benefits is not the way to achieve this objective. There are clearly preferable and more equitable alternatives to implement this objective. For example, the delayed retirement credit may be increased—perhaps from 3 percent to 6 percent beginning in 1982—to make it more attractive for persons to continue working after age 65, rather than retiring. Another alternative is to abolish mandatory retirement completely for individuals in the private sector. And, the earnings limitation could be increased immediately.

If our Nation should decide that it is necessary or desirable to reduce Social Security protection in the future—and NCBA hopes that will not be the case—there are better options than to force persons who cannot work because of physical limitations to absorb the brunt of these cutbacks. These individuals are least likely to have pensions, savings, or other income to supplement their Social Security. They are the people who can least afford a reduction in benefit protection.

I would now like to turn to measures that NCBA supports. First and foremost, our Nation should make it national policy to abolish poverty for all older Americans. We have the resources to allow all older persons to live in dignity and self respect. What is needed is the commitment. NCBA believes that the most cost effective way to implement this objective is to elevate the Supplemental Security Income standards to a level to eliminate poverty for older Americans.

Efforts must also be made to remove the anti-family provisions in SSI. One example is the one-third reduction in the benefit standard for SSI recipients who live in the household of another. This provision penalizes elderly people who are helped by their children or grandchildren. In the long run, it may cost the government more because some of these older persons may wind up in institutions at a much higher public cost than would be the case if they had been maintained in a relative's home.

NCBA urges that the one-third reduction provision be repealed because it discourages families from providing a home for SSI recipients. In some cases, it may actually encourage them to place their relatives in institutions.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF OLDER BLACK WOMEN

The U.S. population is becoming increasingly older and decidedly more feminine. More than 25 million persons are 65 years or older, or one out of every nine Americans. Older women outnumber men by almost three to two.

NCBA strongly believes that our Nation should develop special policies to focus on the unique and growing problems of aged women, and particularly older Black women. Nearly 70 percent of all poor persons 65 years or older are women. Most older women are widowed. Marriage is the exception, rather than the rule, for elderly women. About 52 percent of all women 65 years or older are widowed. Widowhood in-

creases markedly with age because (1) women have a longer life expectancy than men and (2) men generally marry younger women. In fact only 22 percent of all women 75 or older are married.

Women in mid-life are also discovering that they are ill-equipped to adjust to their changing roles, particularly those who are forced to enter or re-enter the job market after being channeled into marriage and homemaking during their earlier years.

Women have been discriminated against throughout their lives in our society. They are typically paid less than men for the same type of work. Several federal programs view women generally as dependents rather than wage earners. Employers often consider a woman's earnings as "pin money".

These problems are intensified for middle-aged and older minority women. They typically suffer a form of "triple jeopardy" because of their age, race, and sex. They are oftentimes channeled into low-paying, sex-related and race-related occupations, such as domestics, clerical workers and other low status occupations. Their earnings are frequently at the minimum wage or just barely above it.

NCBA is nearing completion of a monograph that summarizes major findings of a one-year study concerning employment problems confronting middle-aged and older women. The report develops several recommendations to maximize employment opportunities for women 45 and above, including:

Funding for the Title V Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) should be increased to provide more jobs for low-income persons 55 or older. Special efforts should be undertaken to respond to the unemployment problems confronting older women, with major attention to aged Black and other minority females.

The existing Social Security earnings test should be liberalized to encourage more people to work after 65.

Innovative employment arrangements, such as part-time employment, flexi-time, phased retirement, and others, should be promoted to accommodate a worker's preference and family responsibilities.

Displaced homemaker programs should be continued and expanded.

Counseling services should be made readily available to enable mature minority women to enter the labor market, particularly displaced homemakers who have not been employed for several years.

Social Security should assure long-term employees with average lifetime earnings at or somewhat below the federal minimum wage a special minimum monthly benefit above the poverty line.

SOCIAL SERVICES

An effective income strategy alone, though, is not going to solve all the problems of the elderly. Older Americans also need services. Consequently, it is imperative that we have a well thought out social services strategy to complement an effective income strategy.

It is especially important now to develop a broad continuum of care because the "at risk" population—those persons 75 and above who run a much greater risk of being institutionalized—is expected to increase markedly in the years ahead. The Bureau of the Census estimates that the total U.S. population will increase by 21 percent from 1976 to 2000, from 215.1 million to 260.4 million. The 65-plus population, however, is expected to increase almost 39 percent. The sharpest growth will occur, by far and away, among the elderly aged, those people 75 and

above. And, the overall rate will be even higher among older Blacks.

For example, the number of Blacks in the 75-84 age bracket will increase by nearly 78 percent from 1976 to 2000, in contrast to 54 percent among Whites in this age group. The Black and White 85-plus population will nearly double during the final quarter of this century, increasing 89 percent.

One positive step to develop a broad continuum of care is to enact the Pepper-Waxman Community Care proposal which would provide a wide range of home- and community-based services for "at risk" persons who can continue to remain in their communities.

SERVING THE ELDERLY WITH THE GREATEST ECONOMIC OR SOCIAL NEED

NCBA believes that social services should be directed at older persons with the greatest economic or social need. The Congress included this requirement in the Older Americans Act because that legislation simply does not have sufficient funds to serve all persons 60 or older. This requirement takes on added meaning now because poverty increased precipitously for the elderly in 1979. NCBA believes that it is essential that this mandate be fully and effectively implemented.

CONCLUSION

The field of aging is entering a new era. The legislation of the 1960's and 1970's produced major gains for older Americans. It also improved their economic well-being considerably. Quite clearly, we are in a more austere era today. However, I do not believe that people—especially older Americans—want to see years of progress wiped out by hasty or ill-conceived proposals.

The White House Conference on Aging and the 1982 World Assembly on the Elderly can help assure that progress continues in the field of aging nationally and internationally. President Kennedy once remarked that it is not enough to add new years to life. Our goal must also be to add new life to those years. We, as advocates, should work to make this objective a reality. ●

THE REAGAN PARADOX

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in scoring his startling victories over the last weeks, President Reagan has demonstrated an extraordinary talent for communicating with the American public and for using the power of the Presidency to achieve his legislative goals. Not unreasonably, he has been compared by many with F.D.R.

The paradox is that he has used that power to reduce "the power of Government to act for the common good."

In a truly distinguished editorial analyzing the significance of the Reagan victories, the New York Times (August 2, 1981) predicts that "one day soon" the American people will not be pleased with what their duly elected President hath wrought:

THE REAGAN PARADOX

One thing is surely settled: the Presidency is no feeble office. Let a shrewd President single-mindedly pursue a policy broadly grounded in his election mandate, and he can put it across.

It does not follow that Mr. Reagan's economic program is therefore wise or efficient, or that a different program, without tax cuts, could have fared so well. But conservatives did not invent the technique of buying votes with Federal monies; democracy tilts toward gratifying private wants. It is plainly untrue, however, as many have complained, that the democracy of Congress is bound to frustrate the democratic will that elects Presidents.

Nor is it true that Presidential power requires a telegenic face. Rest in peace, Lyndon Johnson. Power lies in circumstance and in the skill with which it is exploited. The Democrats who opposed Mr. Reagan's budget and tax bills played weak hands, but they played them badly. By turning for help to special-interest lobbies, they only challenged the President to outbid them. By forcing a showdown when they lacked decisive strength, they only magnified the drama of his victory.

But is this President's paradoxical triumph also the nation's? He gathers power for the purpose of denigrating its value in shaping America. He does not say the nation is overextended financially. He does not say guns are momentarily more important than butter. He does not rerank the nation's needs or argue against assorted remedies. He denounces all Federal government as oppressive, as the cause of economic distress and a threat to liberty.

So Mr. Reagan has arranged to shrink annual Federal spending by 1984 by about \$150 billion and cut taxes to let individuals and businesses spend that sum instead. Economically, that is mostly a transfer of purchasing power which cannot much reduce inflation or unemployment, the Federal deficit or debt. On the contrary, a big increase in military spending will enlarge the deficit unless the President finds further huge savings in civilian programs. And the pressure to find them—wherever—is what he values most about his accomplishment.

But why does the President boast that he has thus improved economic prospects? Because he holds, as a matter of faith, that a dollar spent privately creates more wealth than a dollar spent by Government.

That is surely sometimes true: a Government-run railroad that is politically beholden to its unions will tolerate more waste than a private bus company. But it surely also is sometimes untrue: a Government investment in a student or road or depressed community can stimulate more productive activity than the same sum spent by private citizens on diamonds or cameras. Government may be incompetent to achieve some of its social goals. But uncoordinated private spending is notoriously inefficient in meeting large public needs.

Take the obvious, urgent need to cool inflation. Mr. Reagan's answer is a tortuous chain of incentives: cut a family's taxes by \$500 and the money goes to banks and merchants who invest in more businesses and machines which will be more efficient and hold down prices. Also: reduce a citizen's tax on the next earned dollar from 29 to 25 cents and he'll work harder longer and thus reduce costs.

But if it were primarily interested in economic results, Government has surer ways to achieve those results—as even Mr. Rea-

gan's plan recognizes. For it aims large tax reductions directly at businesses that buy cost-reducing machines or job-producing plants. A still more efficient plan would have aimed more precisely at the most wanted machines and at workers who hold down wages or communities that reduce sales taxes.

The unavoidable conclusion is that Mr. Reagan wants to use his power primarily to diminish Government—even where that dilutes economic recovery and prevents efficient allocation of resources.

That the President's plan will revive the economy remains to be proved. What is no longer in doubt is that his economic remedies mask an assault on the very idea that free people can solve their collective problems through representative Government. One day soon Americans will rediscover that their general welfare depends on national as well as parochial actions. And then they will want not just a powerful President but one who cherishes the power of Government to act for the common good.●

TRIBUTE FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take this opportunity to commend Philip Morris, Inc., and its operating companies for its active participation on behalf of the Hispanic community during the past year. On behalf of the members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I would like to thank them for their support in completing the "National Directory of Hispanic Elected and Appointed Officials," and also for the Philip Morris USA's publication of "A Guide to National Hispanic Organizations."

For decades, the Hispanic organizations and elected officials of the United States have taken the lead in the continuing struggle for social, economic, and political opportunity. In communities across the land, they have made a powerful contribution to the well-being of the people they serve.

Yet, many of these organizations and elected leaders have had to work in isolation. They have lacked the information that would enable them to communicate with other Hispanic organizations in order to share experiences, establish a continuing dialog, and provide mutual assistance in matters of mutual concern.

That is why these publications are such an important achievement. With these publications the Hispanic community has a comprehensive list of its national, State, and regional organizations and locally elected officials. We congratulate the Philip Morris organization on its active involvement and hope it will continue this level of community activity in years to come.●

A BILL TO AMEND THE SHIPPING LAWS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill that will amend the regulatory aspects of our national shipping policy that are embodied in the Shipping Act of 1916. The purpose of this bill is to clarify and amend the shipping laws so as to provide for greater recognition of commercial maritime standards when approving agreements between common carriers by water, to authorize the formation of shippers' councils, to provide for expeditious procedures for the approval of agreements and the handling of complaints, to provide for a simplified method of civil penalty assessment, and for the bonding of freight forwarders and nonvessel operating common carriers. The bill will, in effect, eliminate the controversial public interest test when approving agreements, thereby reducing the effect of the antitrust laws. It will, however, continue to provide safeguards against agreements and practices of ocean common carriers serving the United States that would be detrimental to the commercial interests of our Nation.

To that end, this legislation is aimed at preserving competition by continuing the regulation of services, rates, practices, and agreements of common carriers engaged in the foreign waterborne commerce of the United States through tariff filing, investigatory, and decisionmaking procedures of the Federal Maritime Commission. All carriers, whether U.S.-flag or foreign-flag, whether subsidized or not, whether a member of a conference or acting independently, must adhere to these procedures and controls so as to permit all of them to compete under the same rules.

In this era of deregulation, one might ask why do we still pursue a regulatory program for our foreign waterborne commerce? The reasons lie in the historical development of our shipping and antitrust laws, their relationship to international shipping and trading policies, and the realities of competition in the international maritime marketplace.

For many years, all of the nations engaged in foreign waterborne commerce—including the United States—have recognized the violent and unpredictable competitive nature of this commerce and the problems it creates. Invariably, the monopolistic and discriminatory nature of rate-war competition destroys the requisite dependability and regularity of service and the nondiscriminatory nature of the

ocean common carrier—all of which acts to the detriment of the exporter and importer and the consumer in general. Nearly all the maritime nations justify the formation of controls, agreements, and conferences so that these carriers may limit or regulate competition between or among themselves. Only the United States imposes regulatory controls over these agreements and conferences in return for a grant of antitrust immunity.

As common carriers, shipping lines that are members of a conference hold themselves out to serve the public in a nondiscriminatory manner and on a previously announced regularly scheduled basis, regardless of the types of cargo offered. The businessman, the importer or exporter, and all others engaged in the movement of goods in foreign waterborne commerce must be reasonably assured that they will be provided with regular, dependable, and predictable ocean common carriage at relatively stable rates. It is especially important to them that they be assured their competitors are not paying a lower rate or getting undue preferential treatment. The Federal Maritime Commission through its regulatory authority attempts to provide these assurances. The history of this internationalized industry, however, does not provide any such assurance and, in fact, indicates that there seldom is an open competitive system for any reasonable length of time.

During the last Congress, I was involved in the consideration of a voluminous bill that contained major alterations to national maritime policy including a major revision of maritime regulatory policy. It also included major revisions in subsidy policies, taxation, and governmental reorganization. This so-called omnibus maritime bill met with considerable resistance from major maritime interests and the administration, primarily, I believe, because it attempted to do too much at one time. However, the hearings on this bill did provide an insight into the interrelationships and mechanisms of our foreign waterborne commerce, its effect upon international trade and our balance of payments, its effect upon the national defense posture of our Nation, and its effect on our domestic economy.

While some continue to advocate an omnibus approach, I have come to the conclusion that a piecemeal approach is more practical. I have also concluded that a complete revision and rewrite of the 1916 Shipping Act—as was proposed by title II of the omnibus bill—is not necessary. That law and the regulations and procedures implementing it are understood by all interested parties and by our competing trading partners. It only requires minor modifications. The modifications this bill proposes will provide for greater regulatory flexibility so as to

make our laws and procedures consistent with those that have been generally accepted in international trade. This is mandatory if we are to effectively compete within the international maritime marketplace and at the same time limit the potential for monopolistic abuse.

Recently, we decisively acted upon the administration's proposal to transfer the Maritime Administration to the Department of Transportation to facilitate the development of a coherent maritime program. In the near future, I hope we can also act expeditiously upon any specific recommendations the administration might have to resolve the serious problems of our maritime industry. In the interim, I believe it is important that we go forward with these revisions that will make some much-needed improvements in our shipping laws.●

SHERMAN BIRDWELL, A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently we laid to rest in the Texas State Cemetery our good friend Sherman Birdwell.

Mr. Birdwell was a man whose imprint has been very prominent in our society today. When Lyndon Johnson was elected to the U.S. Congress he selected Mr. Birdwell as his first Administrative Assistant. In those early days he helped our President mold and advance the programs that launched Mr. Johnson on a national career resulting in his achievement of being elected President of the United States. Throughout the years Mr. Birdwell continued his work in good government, particularly in the National Youth Administration, which helped so very effectively the young men and women of our State and Nation. He served as district director of the N.Y.A. and has always felt a sense of great pride in helping disadvantaged youth. He served prominently in World War II as an officer in the U.S. Navy and returned to Austin to engage in both the radio field and in the business world. He was a tireless civic worker, particularly to the Kiwanis Club, and gave to his city of Austin much effort and time in advancing good causes of government.

I have been associated with Mr. Birdwell all my life as a co-N.Y.A. worker, and as a civic worker, as a business associate, and as a personal friend. I join the many thousands of friends this good man has in pointing out to my colleagues that we have all lost one of the best men who lived. I

extend my sympathy to his family and friends.●

JOHN S. KNIGHT

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in noting and mourning the passage of John S. Knight, Pulitzer Prize winning editor emeritus of Knight-Ridder newspapers. Knight helped build a \$1-billion-a-year newspaper empire of 33 newspapers in 24 cities, including the Akron Beacon Journal, Miami Herald, and the Detroit Free Press. His newspapers won 26 Pulitzer Prizes, including the one Knight won for his columns opposing the Vietnam war.

Mr. Knight had a very diversified career in journalism; he worked as reporter, editor, businessman, and publisher, but he was always proudest of being editor. Knight received many distinguished awards for writing, his best work being a signed column, "The Editor's Notebook," which he wrote for nearly 40 years and for which he won a Pulitzer Prize in 1968.

Jack Knight felt that a newspaper's duty was to get the truth and print it. His newspapers followed that philosophy, always striving to meet the highest standards of journalism.

We are all saddened by John Knight's passing, but his newspapers continue to reflect his thoughts and ideas and will continue to be a real asset to this great country, informing the citizens, commending and criticizing the issues of the day and a constant reminder of the freedom on which this country is based. In this way, let us memorialize John Knight, the brilliant and reflective man, the distinguished editor, and the inspirational publisher.●

THE BIRTHDAY OF RAOUL WALLENBERG IS A DAY OF REMEMBRANCE AND ACTION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, August 4, 1981, marks the 69th birthday of Raoul Wallenberg, Swedish diplomat who rescued 100,000 Hungarian Jews from the holocaust and who, for 36 years, has been held without explanation in Soviet prisons.

The courage and heroism of Raoul Wallenberg was unmatched by any other person in the closing days of World War II. The story of his bravery and sacrifice have become known

to the American public after more than 30 years of silence. The fact that his mission in Budapest was sponsored, directed, and financed by the American War Refugee Board is no longer kept secret.

In fact, many steps to recognize and honor Raoul Wallenberg are underway. Today, on his birthday, the cities of San Francisco and Washington, D.C., have proclaimed Wallenberg an honorary citizen of each city. In a unique action, San Francisco today renamed Green Street for 1 hour, changing its name to Raoul Wallenberg Street. This is the thoroughfare on which the Soviet consulate stands.

On March 26, 1981, I introduced House Joint Resolution 220 in the House of Representatives. This bill, granting honorary citizenship to Raoul Wallenberg (with the bipartisan support of now 280 cosponsors) has passed unanimously the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. Chairman **RODINO**, of Judiciary, has generously agreed to place the resolution on the committee agenda for consideration early in the fall.

I am confident that when this resolution reaches the floor of the House my colleagues will join me in an unanimous vote for its passage. Yesterday, the Senate of the United States passed unanimously the companion Senate bill awarding honorary U.S. citizenship to Raoul Wallenberg. The timing of the Senate action, on the day before Wallenberg's birthday, is appropriate and I commend them for it.

I anticipate the administration will continue its unwavering support of this international and national human rights issue. I am optimistic that House action will occur early in the fall, permitting the President to arrange an appropriate ceremony to celebrate the signing into law of this historic bill sometime in October. ●

PEOPLE FOR THE AMERICAN WAY?

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite journalists is John D. Lofton, Jr., editor, Conservative Digest. He combines wit and tenacity with a unique style and two examples of his work deal with a new group called People for the American Way. This group is supposed to be an antidote to the burgeoning Moral Majority which so terrorizes the trendy left.

I share Mr. Lofton's articles with my colleagues:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Conservative Digest, July 1981]
PEOPLE FOR AMERICAN WAY AD CAMPAIGN
MORE PROOF OF FAILURE OF LIBERAL IDEAS

(By John Lofton, Jr.)

Anyone searching for additional evidence further demonstrating the bankruptcy of what passes for liberal thought in this country (and I hasten to add that I can't imagine who might need more evidence) should watch closely a series of so-called public service TV ads being offered by an outfit called People for the American Way (PAW).

For the uninitiated, PAW is a new coalition of such ultra-liberals as the Rev. M. William Howard, president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, Norman Lear, the writer and producer, and the ex-mayor of New York, John Lindsay. It is seeking to counter what is called "the intolerant messages and antidemocratic actions of moral majoritarians"—that is, the New Right, specifically the religious New Right.

Here's the complete text of a 30-second PAW spot bearing the provocative title "Eggs." The ad shows a variety of individuals saying the following:

"What kind of eggs do I like? I'll tell you what I like. I love Western omelettes."

"Eggs with onion in 'em. That's a horrible thought."

"I like eggs with cream cheese."

"That's kind of disgusting."

"I can't eat eggs."

"They're loaded with cholesterol."

"I still prefer my omelette."

"O.K., you could, but I still like 'em sunny side up and I'm not going to change."

The tagline on this ad is a voice saying: "the right to have and express your own opinions. Freedom of thought. That's the American way."

Ugh. Talk about disgusting horrible thoughts.

One can say what one likes about the religious New Right, but at least they're talking about real issues that touch the lives of tens of millions of Americans: abortion, homosexuality, voluntary school prayer, busing, the family, sex education, drugs, reverse discrimination, etc. And, just for the record, there's not one New Rightist I know who favors any kind of law prescribing the way people ought to eat their eggs.

At a PAW press conference in Washington, D.C., when I asked Norman Lear why his group wasn't taking the religious New Right head on and debating their issues with them, he ducked the question, deferring to the Rev. Howard, president of the NCC. Said Howard:

"Our ads make one feel good. There is a spirit developing in the country that it's not okay to differ. And when you pile on that a rather nonhistorical religious conviction, it really stifles the human spirit." Howard says that the idea that it is legally correct and fun to disagree and debate is an old American notion.

Indeed. But, this is my point: The PAW bunch is not debating the issues with the religious New Right. They are ducking these issues, choosing instead to wrap themselves in the phony banner of some sort of absolute pluralism which has truly become the last refuge of the scoundrel. The PAW is not debating; it is merely calling its opponents names.

In a fundraising letter, Lear accuses the religious New Right of labeling those with whom they disagree as "un-American," "un-Godly" and "immoral." But when I asked Lear specifically who in the religious New Right he is talking about, he was unable to

give me a name. I pressed my point, asking Lear if he had been poorly briefed, if his memory was poor or if perhaps he never knew such a name in the first place. He promised me names if I'd call his office. You can't give me just one? I asked. Says Lear: "I feel no shame telling you I can't remember just one."

This is very strange. When Lear and his PAW colleagues speak of the leaders of the religious New Right (they currently threaten "the very essence of individuality" and are "helping to tear our already-splintered society apart"), they are talked about as if they are the spiritual descendants of Hitler or Stalin or Mao. One would think that this dishonor roll of archfiends would forever be seared into the psyche of Norman Lear. But it isn't. Or, at least, that's what he tells me.

The disagreements between PAW and the religious New Right are about something far more tangible than the right of free expression or free thought. This is a battle about whose thoughts or expressions will prevail. This is a fight about whether it should be legal to kill innocent, unborn children; whether those kids who want to should be allowed to pray in the public schools; whether children should be forcibly bused to schools not of their choosing; whether parents should have any say at all about their kids' sex education.

By all means, let's freely discuss and debate these issues. But the PAW crowd should take a stand and let us know where they come down on these matters. As G. K. Chesterton observed, the individual who admires only choice, fails to choose.

AMERICAN WAY PERSON DOES VERY POORLY IN DEBATE ON ABORTION

In the following exchange, admittedly with mixed results, CD editor John Lofton Jr., attempted to discuss a real issue, abortion, with a member of the advisory board of People for the American Way, the Rev. Charles Bergstrom, executive director, office of governmental affairs, Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. This conversation began when Bergstrom maintained that he is "just as concerned" about unborn children as is the Rev. Jerry Falwell, head of the Moral Majority.

Lofton: You mean, like Falwell, you favor legal protection for the unborn?

Bergstrom: What is your question?

L: I repeat the question.

B: I'm against any law that would impose any religious view of abortion on the whole country.

L: But you said you were just as concerned about the unborn as Falwell is, didn't you? And Falwell favors legal protection for the unborn.

B: The terminology on abortion is very difficult these days.

L: But we both know what the word "unborn" means, don't we?

B: No, I don't—

L: It means a baby that hasn't yet been born.

B: The fetus is a future human being, a form of human life. It is not a person.

L: A lower form of human life?

B: A form. We don't make a judgment.

L: Is the fetus a form of human life worthy of any legal protection?

B: All life has protection.

L: Even the unborn?

B: I don't know what the "unborn" means.

L: Okay, the fetus. What is the legal protection for the fetus, as you understand it? How is the life of the fetus presently protected?

B: By the judgment of the individual parents—

L: Legal means, is there a law protecting the fetus? Is there such a law now protecting the fetus at any stage of development?

B: Well, what you would call a law to protect the fetus, I would call an oppressive law to force one religious viewpoint on the rest of us.

L: But before we argue this, I want to clearly understand your position. You've already said the fetus is a different form of human life—

B: Not a different form. It's not a person.

L: Is it human life like you and me?

B: It's human life but not a person.

L: Is it a different form of human life than you and me, or is the fetus as alive as you and me?

B: Well, life is a relationship to God.

L: I thought life is God-given.

B: Right, but we have something to do with it.

L: So, even fetal life is God-given?

B: Right.

L: Then should the law protect this God-given fetal life? Is this form of life worthy of some kind of legal protection?

B: See, every one of your questions has a pejorative term like, is it "worthy"?

At this point, the Rev. Bergstrom wisely attempts to shift the discussion to my views on birth control. But, as a former fetus, I am not deterred.

L: Do you support the Supreme Court's 1973 Roe vs. Wade abortion decision?

B: What I support is the Lutheran Church's decision made in democratic convention.

L: Does the church support the court's 1973 decision?

B: Yes, the Lutheran Church in America does.

For the record: The Supreme Court's 1973 Roe vs. Wade decision legalizes abortion-on-demand—a view the precise opposite of that held by Jerry Falwell.

Talking with the Rev. Charles Bergstrom about abortion, one understands why the People for the American Way would rather discuss freedom of choice as regards music, sports and how one likes one's eggs cooked.●

THE PRESTIGE PRESS AND THE CHRISTMAS BOMBING, 1972: IMAGES AND REALITY IN VIETNAM

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, after losing the Battle of Waterloo, one of the field officers to Napoleon Bonaparte inquired of him, "What will history say of us now?" Reputedly, Napoleon responded "What is history, but a lie agreed upon?"

According to a new book by Martin F. Herz, Napoleon's sentiments could have been accurately directed toward much of the reporting that filled America's newsprint and airways during the Vietnam conflict. Mr. Herz is the distinguished former ambassador who is now director of studies at Georgetown University's Institute for the Study of Diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing into the RECORD a review of Mr. Herz's book, "The Prestige Press and the Christmas Bombing, 1972: Images and Reality in Vietnam." The review is written by Peter W. Rodman, a former member of the National Security Council staff. I expect that this review will entice my colleagues to read this book and others like it, and thereby discover that the Janet Cooks of our day have a substantial genealogy.

[From the American Spectator, August 1981]

A REVIEW OF "THE PRESTIGE PRESS AND THE CHRISTMAS BOMBING, 1972: IMAGES AND REALITY IN VIETNAM"

(By Peter W. Rodman)

Not long ago, a friend of mine teaching at a well-known northeastern university was discussing Vietnam with a group of freshmen and referred to the Christmas bombing. One of the students asked an amazing question: "What was the Christmas bombing?"—amazing because it betrayed not so much the freshman's ignorance as his age. For a new generation is indeed emerging that has no personal memory of these events. They might as well have been discussing the Treaty of Versailles.

Frankly I find this hopeful. The next generation of Americans may yet be able to consider the Vietnam war with some semblance of objectivity, with minds unpoisoned by the passions, the peer pressure radicalism, or the journalistic distortions of the period. And if much of the junior faculty is still, as it undoubtedly is, the entrenched remnant of the 1960s enraged, perhaps the exuberant skepticism of youth will find even their smug antiwar orthodoxy a natural and juicy target.

But make no mistake about it, the battle for the minds of the young has already begun in earnest. At the end of April the New York Times Book Review informed us of two new brief histories of the Vietnam war written for teenagers. The reviewer chastised one of them for being insufficiently explicit about the lies, deceptions, atrocities, and general criminality of the United States government. The other book he praised. One can imagine what it must be like.

Fortunately there is a growing library of scholarly work of a more balanced character, interested not in waging ideological warfare but in pursuing historical truth. A few years ago, journalist Peter Braestrup, in "Big Story," did a monumental study of how the American press and television reported and interpreted the Tet offensive of 1968; he overwhelmed skeptics with two volumes of irrefutable evidence that media coverage of the event was a distortion of reality. Guenter Lewy, in "America in Vietnam," has done a meticulous analysis of the military conduct of the war, critical in many respects, but in the process knocking down canards about American war crimes and atrocities. Now comes a first-rate book answering the puzzled freshman's question: What was the Christmas bombing? The author is Martin F. Herz, a distinguished former ambassador who is now director of studies at Georgetown University's Institute for the Study of Diplomacy. His answer may be even illuminating to many who remember the period, because most of the new coverage of the time—as the book shows—bore little resemblance to what really happened.

On October 26, 1972, North Vietnam and the United States both acknowledged pub-

licly for the first time that they were close to an agreement on a cease-fire, release of prisoners of war, and American withdrawal; Henry Kissinger declared (a bit prematurely) that peace was "at hand." Negotiations resumed in November, settling many remaining issues, but ran aground in mid-December. After several days of frustration, the United States concluded that Hanoi had made a strategic decision not to complete the agreement. The impatient new Congress convening in January could be expected to force the United States out of the war on terms far worse than those embodied in the stone-walled agreement. Richard Nixon thereupon lifted restriction on the bombing of North Vietnam, and for twelve days, from December 18 to 29, 1972, U.S. B-52s and fighter-bombers assaulted military targets in and around Hanoi and Haiphong. At the same time, General Alexander Haig visited Saigon to bring around our South Vietnamese ally, who was also balking at the cease-fire. Kissinger's negotiations with Le Duc Tho resumed in early January and quickly resulted in a completed agreement.

The bombing clearly caught the American public by surprise, and was perhaps as much of a shock at home as in Hanoi. The antiwar movement, up to that point demoralized by George McGovern's defeat and disarmed by Nixon's apparent near-achievement of peace, erupted in a cathartic last orgy of vicious attacks on Nixon's Vietnam policy. The United States was accused of indiscriminate carpet-bombing of civilian populations. Analogies with the four-day fire-bombing of Dresden were common; Hiroshima was called to mind. "Terror Bombing in the Name of Peace," howled the Washington Post; "Shame on Earth," lamented Tom Wicker in the New York Times. Editorials predicted that the bombing would only harden the hearts of the North Vietnamese and make a negotiated settlement impossible. And Nixon was much berated for callously remaining silent throughout the period, never fully explaining to the American public what was happening and why.

Ambassador Herz and his research assistant Leslie Rider have collected the available evidence on the bombing, its background, and its effects. And, methodically and at length, they have examined and analyzed the contemporary news coverage by five leading "prestige" news organizations: the New York Times, the Washington Post, Time, Newsweek, and the CBS-TV "Evening News." They found the media treatment to be unbalanced, misleading, and emotional in its revulsion at the bombing—not only in editorial columns but in one-sided news reports, not only in light of what is known now but in terms of information available then. Charges of U.S. responsibility for the breakdown of the talks, of reckless use of B-52s, of massive civilian damage, of unanimous foreign criticism, of the futility of bombing as an instrument of pressure—these themes dominated the reporting. Much less space was given to the contrary evidence and opinion which demonstrably existed: "The news was largely generated by opponents, and the U.S. prestige media copiously reported as news (with full attribution) the propaganda given out by the enemy and his allies."

The charges of gross urban destruction and massive civilian casualties were belied by Hanoi's own published casualty figures—about 1,300 over twelve days, which, as the Economist later pointed out, was the same number of civilians killed earlier in the year by deliberate North Vietnamese artillery

fire on a refugee column fleeing Quang Tri in South Vietnam. (Deaths at Dresden and Hiroshima numbered in the hundreds of thousands.) Other journalists who visited Hanoi soon afterwards reported, to their credit, that civilian destruction was minimal and clearly not deliberate. Hanoi's population had already been largely evacuated months earlier; the new U.S. "smart bombs" had effectively zeroed in on military targets. The claim that Hanoi would never negotiate under pressure was disproved by events when, almost immediately, the talks resumed. Herz considers it likely (though not conclusively provable) that the Christmas bombing brought North Vietnam back to the conference table. This, of course, was exactly what the U.S. government had intended.

Herz is highly critical, however, of the Nixon administration's failure to explain its case to the American public. Kissinger had described the breakdown of the negotiations in a news conference two days before the bombing began, but the administration's subsequent aloof silence left the field to its ideological opponents and is thus partly responsible for the one-sidedness of the press treatment. It does not excuse the prestige media; Herz shows that, with few exceptions, they made little effort to present a balanced picture and in fact tailored their news reportage to their editorial position. The administration seems to have been resigned to constant vilification at this stage of the war, and hoped to be vindicated by the outcome. Nevertheless Herz makes a valid point—really a moral point—that a government owes its people an effort to explain an unpopular action, and to keep on presenting its reasons and arguments even in the face of seemingly endless and hysterical criticism. Otherwise the public discourse of a democracy is inevitably dragged down to the level of the most demagogic.

Herz and Rider deserve enormous credit for a fair-minded book that documents its conclusions and is honest in its judgments. It is an essential addition to the growing body of research on the Vietnam war. The nation's hope of having an undistorted historical memory will depend on such contributions. ●

THE NATURE OF DEATH IN A COAL MINE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, death in an underground coal mine has the lightning bolt arbitrariness of violent death anywhere, but it strikes more often and goes by other names—black damp, roof fall, face fall, rib roll.

Black damp is a term from the early days of mining that describes air so foul that it has no oxygen, and those who die of black damp suffocate.

Three miners died together of black damp this June, and in the matter-of-fact phrases of the Mine Safety and Health Administration's fatality reports, here is what happened:

The continuous miner penetrated an abandoned section * * * mined in 1966; an in-rush of pressurized black damp filled the

entire section and the three victims were overcome.

They were fatalities 47, 48, and 49 for 1981. There was no warning; there was only black damp and death.

Fatalities 23 through 37—"A coal mine gas explosion occurred * * * resulting in the death of 15 miners * * *."

Death finds miners in groups and alone and makes no distinction between the 20-year journeyman and the 20-day apprentice.

Fatality No. 52—"* * * cutter bits engaged with mine machine and walked across the face catching the victim in rotating auger."

Fatality No. 38—"* * * scoop traveled through a check curtain and struck partially removed brattice, crushing victim against frame."

Fatality No. 10—"While * * * transporting eight employees to the working section * * * the scoop hung up between a crossbar and the mine floor * * * while trying to free it, the victim's head was crushed between the crossbar and the scoop."

Fatality No. 15—"The dust collector became stopped up * * * victim went between the face and the bolting machine * * * draw rock fell between the bolts, crushing his head against the canopy boom."

Fatality No. 16—"The victim was crushed by a section of roof—625 square feet—that fell due to inadequate roof support."

Fatality No. 17—"The victim was removing a prior rib roll from the continuous miner when additional rock and coal rolled from the rib, pinning his head and upper body against the machine."

The toll is grim.

Nevertheless, we have evidence it would have been grimmer still without the Mine Safety and Health Administration and Safety regulation.

The General Accounting Office, in a recent study of coal, concluded MSHA has "dramatically" reduced coal mining deaths.

In other words, MSHA is one agency that is doing what Congress wanted it to do.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks on mining have been made as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety to highlight how mining is important and what the Mine Safety and Health Administration has done to make safer one of the most dangerous occupations in the country.

My next, and last, remarks in this series will discuss the related nature of all forms of mining and point out the clear need for centralized and coherent safety regulation. ●

THE CONGRESSIONAL HISPANIC CAUCUS FELLOWSHIP ANNOUNCED

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus has realized one of its many goals. Beginning in September, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus will offer four graduate fellowship awards to four students currently enrolled in graduate programs in the public policy area or policy related fields. We would like to take this opportunity to thank the R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc., for helping to make this dream a reality.

The Congressional Hispanic Caucus fellowship program is designed for Hispanic graduate students or students for whom that heritage has been an integral part of their academic studies. This program will enable students to gain insight into the legislative process at the national level and advance the nonpartisan preparation of Hispanics for involvement in the political process at State and local levels.

The four students chosen in early July to begin their study in Washington on September 1 are: Michelle Jimenez of Minnesota, Nitza Escalera of New York, Jose Garzon of California, and Amalio Madueno also of California. We wish these students much success during their stay in Washington, D.C. We congratulate the R. J. Reynolds Industries, Inc. on its active participation on behalf of the Hispanic community and hope that it will continue this level of community activity in years to come. ●

THE OLYMPIC COIN ACT OF 1981

HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the opportunity of the United States to host the 1981 Olympic summer games in Los Angeles, as well as a need to devise a realistic, permanent means to help support both the games and the American athletes involved in them, I would like to urge my colleagues to support the Olympic Coin Act, H.R. 3958.

This bill will provide for the minting of commemorative coins for the 1984 Olympic games without requiring the financial support of either the American taxpayer or the U.S. Government. It is only fitting that we recognize the 1984 games and its participants with a coin that will be in line with our historic tradition and demonstrate our

patriotic support. The revenue that will result from the sale of these coins will provide important and much needed funding for three important groups associated with these games: the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, the U.S. Olympic Committee, and amateur athletes from the United States who will be participating. Since the 1968 games in Mexico City, every country holding an Olympic which has minted a commemorative coin has raised large amounts of money for their teams. For example, in the 1976 Montreal games, the Canadians were able to collect approximately \$200 million in Canadian sales alone.

Because this coin program has been designed for both international and national markets, it will provide the greatest possible appeal to both coin collectors and to individuals interested in supporting the Olympic games. These coins, issued in four denominations that will include \$1 copper-nickel coins, \$10 silver coins, and \$50 and \$100 gold coins, will provide the coin collector with a wider variety of what will truly become a collector's item. In addition, several series with different designs will be minted. Again, all of these advantages will occur without any expense to taxpayers or to the Government.

Both the U.S. Olympic Committee and the U.S. Training Center are located in Colorado, so I am especially aware of their efforts to promote excellence in amateur athletics while contending with significant financial problems. With the boycott of the 1980 Moscow games, the U.S. Olympic Committee was deprived of badly needed public contributions because many believed that they no longer needed them. However, the Olympic Committee needs to maintain a \$71.2 million budget over the next 4 years to continue their present programs. Unlike many other countries, our Olympic Committee allows not only the world-class athletes, but all classes of amateur athletes to compete in our programs. To continue and expand these programs, as well as carry out the responsibility that Congress gave them in 1978 with the Amateur Sports Act, the Olympic Committee must develop a funding approach that will achieve financial self-sufficiency. This bill would not only do this, but would also promote the Olympic games and recognize the endeavors of those who are involved in the success of these games.

Because of the demonstrated success of this type of program by those countries who have issued commemorative coins, and because of its appeal to such a large segment of the coin market, I have cosponsored H.R. 3958 and wish to urge all my colleagues to lend their full support to this worthwhile legislation. ●

FUTURE OF HEALTH CARE

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in last Tuesday's Washington Star discusses the future of health care as a result of the budget cuts.

I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues:

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, July 21, 1981]

BUDGETS AND THE LATE BABY DOWNING (Larry S. Gage)

Sometimes it takes a tragic, emotional incident like the death of a premature baby to open our eyes to the damage our budget-cutting mania may do to the national health.

Two pounds, six ounces, "baby boy Downing" died of respiratory failure in a rural Florida hospital earlier this month. He had been denied admission, because of recent budget cuts, to a public hospital neonatal intensive care unit just 40 miles away. In the scant few hours he lived, he taught us several valuable lessons about the remarkable past and uncertain future of our nation's health-care system.

Perhaps "baby boy Downing" would not have been saved in any event by his transfer to the neonatal unit, but he'd have had a chance. Prior to 1950, his chances would have been zero in any hospital. In even the best-equipped facility in 1965 his chances of survival would have been closer to 7 in 100 than the current estimate of 7 in ten. Recent technological advances in emergency transportation and patient care for these infants, as in many other areas of medicine, have been nothing short of astonishing.

AVAILABLE TO NEARLY ALL

Because this technology has been costly, it is perhaps equally astonishing that we have in many areas made it available to all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay. Despite some noticeable gaps, and notwithstanding our consistent failure to enact universal national health insurance, our patchwork crazy-quilt of federal, state, local, and private support has enabled us—at least until now—to provide this care in many parts of the country to almost everybody who needs it.

The federal government, through Medicaid, Medicare, and other health-care programs, is a major partner in this system—but by no means the only one. Many services are directly funded by state and local governments, through publicly owned hospitals, clinics, and other institutions. These subsidized public services are often far more extensive than people realize—ranging from state-wide emergency transportation systems, to shock-trauma centers, burn units, well-baby clinics, poison centers, renal dialysis, and neonatal intensive care. The neonatal unit in this case, for example, was in a county-owned institution: Tampa General Hospital.

Highly specialized services like neonatal units are expensive. Babies often must stay for a long time, at prohibitive cost. In a public institution, government must ultimately agree to pick up the tab.

In a state like Florida, where Medicaid eligibility is extremely restrictive, a public hospital must find other sources of income if

such care is to be provided for those who cannot afford to pay. For the most part such hospitals must rely on direct state or local operating subsidies, which often comprise a major portion of a hospital's budget.

When state or local governments cut back on their contribution, however, a public hospital may have no choice but to slash available services. And despite the special tragedy associated with the death of a child, it is only logical that costly, high-technology services which benefit only a few will be early budget-cutting targets.

Baby boy Downing was refused admission to Tampa General for precisely this reason. The state of Florida has cut direct subsidies for neonatal care nearly in half. The Tampa General governing board responded by insisting that the number of available beds be reduced from 33 to 18.

HOLES IN THE NET

At other public hospitals faced with other budget cuts, the services reduced might be different—but the net result will be the same: people denied necessary medical attention, perhaps even in life-threatening situations. In fact, cities and counties are going through similar fiscal crises all over the country, even before the current wave of federal budget cuts goes into effect.

This story is being heard in public hospitals—our system's institutional "safety nets"—all over the country. Denver, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Boston, Chicago, Atlanta, and New Orleans, are among those already struggling with funding shortfalls.

There is clear cause for alarm as Congress works to complete the budget reconciliation process. While neither house accepted the president's proposed 5 per cent cap on federal Medicaid increases, for example, the Senate adopted Medicaid cuts of considerably greater magnitude than the House, primarily by reducing the minimum federal share from 50 per cent to 40 per cent, and indexing federal Medicaid increases in later years to the GNP deflator.

ESCALATING COSTS

Reducing the minimum federal match will have a cruel impact on a small handful of states—California, Michigan, Illinois, and New Jersey will lose over half a billion dollars among them in 1982 alone. Tying the rate of later increases to the GNP deflator will also result in severe disruptions for "safety net" institutions. For without major structural changes in health-care systems as a whole, overall health costs will continue to increase at a rate 3 to 5 per cent faster than general inflation—due in no small measure to new developments in areas such as neonatal care.

Fortunately, the House adopted a more moderate and equitable set of health-care budget cuts, especially for later years, and it is thus up to the Reconciliation Act conferees meeting this week to learn the final lesson from "baby boy Downing": That unless they act with utmost caution in fashioning a final list of health-care budget cuts from the House and Senate proposals, there will be many more like him to come. ●

TRIBUTE TO U.S. DELEGATION
TO THE INTERNATIONAL
WHALING COMMISSION

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. delegation to the International Whaling Commission deserve the thanks and commendations of the Members of the House and the entire wildlife conservation community for their participation at the annual IWC meeting in Brighton last week.

The U.S. delegation led successful efforts to impose a virtual prohibition on the killing of sperm whales. In addition, the IWC agreed to ban the use of nonexplosive harpoons starting in 1982.

Tom Garrett, acting U.S. Whaling Commissioner, led the U.S. delegation. As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have had the opportunity to work with Tom during the past several years. He is a principled, dedicated conservationist, whom I greatly respect and I want to add a personal note of thanks for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an editorial from the Washington Post of July 28, 1981, in the RECORD, along with an account of the IWC negotiations, as reported in the August 3 issue of Time magazine. It offers a well-deserved tribute to the IWC.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1981]

PROGRESS ON THE WHALING FRONT

The good news is that the International Whaling Commission last weekend approved what amounts to a ban on the killing of sperm whales. The bad news is that it once again defeated a proposal for an indefinite moratorium on all commercial whaling. To its credit, the Reagan administration continued the U.S. support for the moratorium that now extends through four presidencies. Interior Secretary Watt was responsible for appointing and backing a dedicated conservationist and whale expert to head the U.S. delegation.

Since the IWC began setting quotas for commercial whaling, the allowed worldwide catch has fallen from near 50,000 to below 15,000. Whaling from immense factory ships has been banned. A sanctuary has been established in the Indian Ocean where whales may not be killed for 10 years. These are significant achievements requiring, as they do, the cooperation of many nations. But whaling is still allowed for several species that are on the international endangered species list. Of what were once the many species of the world's largest—and, don't forget it, largest-brained—creature, only the small minke whale has not been hunted by man to the point of scarcity or near extinction.

Now that there are inexpensive substitutes for all whale products, including the use of whale meat for human consumption, there is little excuse left for continued commercial killing. Yet endangered industries die hard. Despite the fact that sperm whales cannot be eaten because of their

dangerously high levels of mercury, and despite their precariously small numbers, Japan fought hard against the complete ban on killing sperm whales that was recommended by the IWC's scientific advisers. The partial ban that was finally adopted included an exemption for the western Pacific and an offsetting increase in Japan's quota of minke whales. Yet the Japanese delegation made no secret of its dissatisfaction with the outcome.

Little by little the pressure of international opinion is eroding the now unnecessary whale trade. Only the Japanese market keeps it alive. Ultimately a ban seems inevitable. The danger is that it will come too late. Among all animal species, the whale's survival seems to be peculiarly chancy. Once a decline in the numbers of a particular type of whale can be documented, the process often seems to be irreversible. Many whale species—including the largest, the Great Blue—have not yet been recovered after decades of protection. The reasons for this unusual behavior are not known. It may have to do with the small number of whale offspring, their long infancy, and the whales' wide range.

Until the answers are known, a moratorium, not the let's-wait-and-see-what-happens justification for annual quotas, is the only responsible policy. Perhaps next year the IWC will take the last needed step.

[From Time magazine, Aug. 3, 1981]

BATTLING FOR THE LEVIATHANS

To environmentalists, Interior Secretary James Watt sometimes seems to be an avenging Ahab, citing the Bible and warring against nature. But that image may be unfair. Last week, with the Secretary's blessing, the U.S. came to the help of Watt's surprising friends, the whales.

The occasion was the annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) in the English seaside resort of Brighton. On the street, save-the-whales demonstrators waved placards, chanted slogans and even floated a 110-ft. inflatable whale named Big Flo. Inside the Victorian-style Brighton Metropole Hotel, the delegates from 31 member nations pondered the fate of the leviathans. The commission, formed after World War II to regulate whaling, has been setting annual quotas ever since. For this season the permissible commercial take had dwindled to 13,851 whales, 80% of them small minke. That was less than a third of the total eight years ago. Hunting of such endangered species as the blue, bowhead, right and humpback is now forbidden altogether, except by or on behalf of Eskimos and other native peoples, while sperms may be taken only by coastal-based ships.

Still, marine biologists worry about the whale's future. Chief U.S. Delegate Tom Garrett, a childhood friend of Watt's and longtime defender of the whales, who was appointed at his urging, said that far too little is known about the populations of various species or their reproductive habits to permit the slaughter to go on, even at reduced levels. He backed a British proposal for a moratorium on all commercial whaling.

The Japanese, who along with the Soviets operate the only large ocean going whaling fleets, insisted that enough is known to set safe limits that will ensure the animals' survival. Whaling, they added, was important to their economy and food supply; they felt no legal or moral obligation to accept a ban.

Conservationist groups replied that the Japanese estimates were grossly overstated.

But on the issue of the moratorium, their words, including President Reagan's plea to save "these magnificent creatures," were to no avail. It failed to get a required three-fourths majority. So did another proposal to stop all whaling in the North Atlantic.

But at week's end the antiwhaling forces won two significant victories. Over Japan's objections, the conference set a "zero quota" on all sperm whaling in the Southern Hemisphere and the North Atlantic. As a gesture to the Japanese, a decision on the North Pacific was deferred until the spring. Said Garrett: "This might be the final curtain for sperm whaling."

The delegates also agreed to outlaw "cold" (or nonexplosive) harpoons on minke whales, starting with the 1982-83 season. Conservationists claim these weapons prolong the animal's final agony, but the Japanese insist that faster-killing grenade-tipped harpoons damage too much of the flesh and are dangerous to the hunters. The decision gives them time to develop a less damaging, safer explosive harpoon.

The antiwhalers were not so successful on the issue of next year's overall quotas. The total number of whales that can be legally taken was reduced by only about 500. Still, if this trend continues, whaling may eventually become so uneconomical that even the persistent Japanese will be forced to drop it. ●

LEGAL SERVICES FOR MEMBERS
OF THE ARMED FORCES

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with a good thing, I wish to introduce a revised version of legislation I introduced last session providing legal services for members of our Armed Forces. Please allow me to also insert into the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Subparagraph (a) is designed to insure the continuation and permanency of the provision of legal assistance to military personnel and their dependents. The intent of this section is not to alter the existing discretion of the Secretary of each Department to direct how legal assistance will be provided within that Department, but rather to assure that each Secretary require the continued provision of legal assistance to active duty personnel. Each Secretary also has full authority to continue to provide legal assistance to retired personnel and dependents of active duty and retired personnel subject only to the availability of resources within each Department.

Subparagraph (b) clearly places upon the Judge Advocates General the responsibility for the creation and operation of the legal assistance programs. The reference to 10 USC 801 is necessary so as to include the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard has no "Judge Advocate General" and the only place in the law where the term "Judge Advocate General" is made applicable to the Coast Guard is in the definitional section of the Uniform Code of Military Justice wherein it is stated that the term "Judge Advocate General" shall include the Gener-

al Counsel of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating. The language "by the Secretary concerned" refers, in this case, to the Secretary of Transportation.

Subparagraph (c) is designed specifically to indicate that this legislation is not authority for the expansion of the legal assistance program to include the representation in court of those presently able to pay legal fees—i.e. to continue the present expanded legal assistance program to the military indigent, but not provide any requirement or authority for expansion to others than the military indigent. If the client can afford legal fees without undue hardship or if the case is one in which attorney can recover a reasonable fee out of the judgment, then the legal assistance program, insofar as presentation in court is concerned, may not be expanded under the authority of this legislation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT MILITARY LEGAL ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

Question. Who will be entitled to legal services under this bill?

Answer. Except as limited by subparagraph (c), it is the intent of the bill to provide legal services to active duty personnel and others as prescribed in the regulations of each military department authorizing legal assistance. As with other military benefits, legal assistance has been made available to all grades and ranks, but the overwhelming share of legal services are provided to low and middle income service members who, like their civilian counterparts, are least able to afford the services of an attorney. It is expected that full legal assistance will continue to be a high priority for retired personnel and dependents of active duty and retired personnel.

Question. Who may provide legal services to service personnel and their dependents?

Answer. Active duty military lawyers, civil service attorneys employed by the military departments, civilian attorneys retained under contract and reserve military lawyers are authorized to provide legal assistance under the regulations of the military departments authorizing legal assistance. The bill presumes that the same regulations will apply after its enactment.

Question. Will the delivery of legal services to Armed Forces personnel at the level contemplated by this bill be detrimental to members of the local bar?

Answer. During the seven years that the American Bar Association has worked with representatives of the military services in observing legal assistance programs in operation and in visiting with numerous civilian bar leaders and practitioners, the Committee has found no evidence of any abuse of the civil process or injury to the civilian bar at any location where these programs have been established. On the contrary, the ABA has found an expanded awareness of legal rights and needs in each community. Where the local bar association has encouraged and participated in these programs, there has developed a professional rapport between the military and civilian bar members, and between the military services and the local judiciary and law enforcement authorities in a manner which has ultimately resulted in the improvement of legal assistance. Where the state and local bar associations have worked with the military lawyer community, the legal assistance program has produced a higher quality representation, has reduced the areas of confrontation between military and local authorities, and has increased the level and quality of civilian bar legal services.

Question. What legal services are included in "personal affairs" in Section 2 of this bill?

Answer. "Personal affairs" is intended to mean only those types of cases authorized by the regulations governing the provision of legal assistance issued by the military departments. Those regulations include assistance in and/or preparation of wills, powers of attorney, tax matters, domestic relations matters, consumer protection matters, landlord-tenant matters, and others. The regulations do not allow (some in fact prohibit), nor does the bill contemplate, providing legal services for the purpose of assisting a service member in any commercial endeavor, for the purpose of instituting a class action (which might be a fairly attractive fee-generating case for a civilian attorney) or for the purpose of suing the Federal government (legal assistance officers are prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 205 and implementing regulations from instituting such suits against the United States).

Question. Will this bill require the additional expenditure of public funds (including personnel)?

Answer. No. The bill does not (and is not intended to) mandate a specific level of legal assistance programs of any kind; rather, the bill merely recognizes and protects by statute a long-standing practice of the services, leaving the implementation to the best judgment of the military departments. The only cost factor is an indeterminate but perhaps identifiable continuing cost of maintaining the present program with no new costs. As a practical matter, the bill closes off the possibility of the total discontinuance of the existing practice of providing legal assistance to service members. ●

EL SALVADOR

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the recess of this current session of Congress, I would like to remind this distinguished House of Representatives of some unfinished business—the bodies of four courageous women, brutally murdered last December, and thrown in a ditch to rot—an unsolved crime, and criminals not yet brought to justice.

Meanwhile, another crime is in progress: Our continued support of a regime that implicitly tolerates and is manipulated by militaristic Fascists who use American aid to dominate and decimate the people of El Salvador.

What has been accomplished in the intervening months since our military advisors and \$35.5 million in military assistance were sent to El Salvador?

Not a reduction in violence, but an escalation of it: 2 weeks ago, 28 bodies, most of them mutilated, found under a bridge; this past weekend, 44 bodies dumped into a pool—mostly civilians and a handful of guerrillas. These massacres generally take place during curfew hours when only military and security personnel are free to move about. In the past 18 months at least

22,000 people have been slaughtered—in a country of 4.5 million; at least 150,000 Salvadorans have fled across the Honduran border seeking safety. What has happened since we went to El Salvador? A more sadistic and sophisticated terrorism of the population. An increase in the number of victims who are children. More torture: People dumped into battery acid, sawed in half, sexually mutilated, disemboweled. Helicopters used as roving machinegun nests to ravage whole villages. Military hit lists labeling respected teachers, priests, religious, lawyers, and doctors as psychopaths and traitors. Mail is arbitrarily opened and inspected; people are detained and disappear.

What has happened since we announced the eclipse of the U.S. human rights policy? One Salvadoran puts it well:

When your State Department makes friends with Chile and Argentina, our army gets the idea that if they act like Chileans and Argentines, they too will be rewarded.

The corrupt military power structure has grown so powerful that it reportedly now controls the nationalized banks of El Salvador, all export-import activities, and is implicated in colluding with former landowners to threaten, evict, and even kill peasants who are attempting to register their plots of land.

Thirty years ago, we began training Salvadoran military officers. Today, there are over 2,000 American-trained Salvadoran officers in control of the security forces of El Salvador. What has been the result?

In testimony before our own House Appropriations Committee, a former Salvadoran army captain admitted that the security forces who prowl the nights as death squads, performing acts of terrorism, murder and torture are actually carrying out orders given by high-ranking military officers.

The four women missionaries killed last December were singled out. The Salvadorans know who killed them. They know the orders came from higher up. Why have no charges been filed in a court of law? The answer should be obvious. Twenty-two thousand Salvadorans have also met the same fate.

We dishonor ourselves as Americans by allowing our citizens and our resources to be used in support of such continuous horror. The Reagan policy has had no impact on the reign of terror in El Salvador. As one witness, a former chief advisor to the land reform program, told a House subcommittee:

What your policy tells the army is that it can kill at will. Your administration has in effect said that it agrees that the army has the right to destroy all those organizations and people who want the army to share power.

I propose a five-point solution to this disaster of El Salvador that threatens to decimate the Salvadoran population and render it even more vulnerable to both communism and a right-wing coup. We are at a critical point. We have a unique opportunity to win, in the true sense of the word. We should:

First, demand that the Salvadoran courts bring charges on the basis of the evidence in the case of the murdered American women. Demand that the court invite lawyers from a neutral country, Mexico, to serve as counsel for the families and kin of the murdered women.

Second, call for a cessation of all military assistance to El Salvador and withdraw our advisers. Limit all U.S. aid to that which fulfills basic human needs, where the recipients can be credibly certified.

Third, insist that the Salvadoran Government establish a neutral electoral commission to register voters and supervise elections.

Fourth, commission a 2,000-man international peace-keeping force to insure that Salvadoran Armed Forces remain in their barracks and that guerrillas remain in assigned areas.

Fifth, actively promote multilateral negotiations with neutral intervenors, and insist that the Government of El Salvador cooperate in return for our continued economic assistance. ●

LIBRARIES IN THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, Jane Fonda once told an audience, "If you really understood what communism is, you would hope, you would pray that one day we would all be Communists."

How did comrade Fonda arrive at such a state of philosophical illumination? Perhaps she did her vast background research on comparative sociopolitical systems at the Moscow State Library.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a brief article by Matthew Conroy which gives us a better understanding of why the worker's paradise is not the reader's paradise; and why the use of Soviet libraries could turn Miss Fonda into comrade Fonda.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, the illusions and promises of Communist propaganda melt away before the bright light of reality.

SOVIET UNION'S LIBRARIES MIRROR A LOW-QUALITY SOCIETY

(By Matthew Conroy)

My neighbor recently presented me with Carl Sagan's book, "Cosmos." Perhaps it was meant as a hint: Normally, I am immersed in current political, economic and cultural affairs, and it does one good to be

reminded of the awesome vastness and splendor of the universe.

However, Sagan's book is more than astronomy; it has philosophical content as well. Chapters are preceded with quotations that remind us that the universe is more than galaxies, stars, suns and planets, that there is the glory of man's thought. Sagan quotes from Pascal's "Pensees":

"It is not from space that I must seek my dignity, but from the government of my thought. I shall have no more if I possess worlds. By space the universe encompasses and swallows me up like an atom, by thought I comprehend the world."

To browse through "Cosmos," I had to temporarily put aside another fascinating book, a work dealing with the tribulations of a top Jewish scientist in Russia who inevitably realizes that escape from the totalitarian hell takes precedence over everything. The book is by Mark Azbel and is called "Refusenik," subtitled, "Trapped in the Soviet Union."

What struck me about the book almost immediately was precisely what Sagan tries to impart in his book: the absolute need of a cultivated mind to be exposed to and allowed to explore all aspects of knowledge. It is implicit in Azbel's book, while Sagan quotes T. H. Huxley to get his point across:

"The known is finite, the unknown infinite; intellectually we stand on an islet in the midst of an illimitable ocean of inexplicability. Our business in every generation is to reclaim a little more land."

LIBRARIES AND FREEDOM

To reclaim that land, one must have access to books. This is the legacy upon which every succeeding generation builds. To that end, one of the marks of a civilized country is its libraries and the freedom of the people to use them freely.

Consider, then, these contrasts.

In "Cosmos," Sagan writes of the great library of Alexandria, the city founded by Alexander the Great that flourished for some 600 years beginning around 300 B.C. The library, deliberately destroyed at some point in that past, must have been a true wonder of the times. The civilization that fostered it went to enormous lengths to expand it. "The organizers," writes Sagan "combed all the cultures and languages of the world. They sent agents abroad to buy up libraries. Commercial ships docking in Alexandria were searched by the police—not for contraband but for books. The scrolls were borrowed, copied and then returned to their owners."

The estimated half million books the library contained were open to all.

A CLOSED SYSTEM

In the Soviet Union and throughout the entire Russian empire, there are libraries, but the books, journals and other reading material they contain are definitely not available to all. Ever since the Russian revolution, the communist rulers have preemptorily decided what the people under their domination have the right to read. The Bible, for example, is neither available in bookstores nor in libraries. There is a list of officially approved literature, and the works of those authors of whom the communist rulers disapprove are simply nonexistent.

Azbel, in this book, writes about his school years: "Dostoevski was nonexistent, except to be condemned. Tolstoi was a very doubtful writer; we were given almost nothing of his to read. Homer was unknown. The great Russian writers Nabokov, Bunin, Kuprin, Bulgakov, were not even mentioned. They

simply did not exist. Even Gogol, even Chekhov, were heavily cut. . . . And I had to suppress from my consciousness the fact that there were such poets as Blok, Akhmatova, Pasternak and many others."

FIRST, FOUR SIGNATURES

Even more restricted to the Soviet public are technical journals, no matter how innocuous. Azbel relates of his efforts to obtain permission to read an issue of Physical Review, a purely scientific journal published by the American Physical Society. Underneath Azbel's application to peruse the journal, the chairman of the Department of Theoretical Physics of Azbel's school had to write, "I attest that the above-mentioned volume of the Physical Review is required for the preparation of a talk at the Science Seminar, and I herewith request that student Azbel be permitted access to it." The dean of the faculty then had to co-sign "I endorse this application." The deputy director of the university then had to sign, "I also support this application." Finally, the director of the library had to write, "I hereby permit student Azbel access to this journal, to be read only on the library premises."

A time span of some 23 centuries or more separates the Great Library of Alexandria from the libraries of the Soviet Union. Is there any doubt where the evidence of greater civilized thought and behavior is to be found? ●

A FRESH OUTLOOK—BY RALPH NADER

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Nader addressed the class of 1981 Harvard graduates on June 3. His speech was articulate and perceptive. It focused on the vital issues society has been and continues to struggle with in this decade. His comments reflected a well-grounded fear about the direction this administration is heading. The young graduates were encouraged to explore an abundance of work options and to strive to better society through citizen work. Mr. Nader urged them to use all their skills, stamina, and creativity to help resolve pressing social, economic, and energy problems.

Ralph Nader's vision of America is one that embodies the pursuits of peace, justice, liberty, and opportunity for all.

For both a keen and insightful view of modern problems and some positive answers, I recommend Ralph Nader's speech to my colleagues in Congress and to the public.

The text of his speech appears below.

REMARKS BY RALPH NADER, CLASS DAY EXERCISES, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, JUNE 3, 1981

Proud parents, patient mothers and fathers, daughters and sons of the Class of 1981, relatives, friends, members of the society of Harvard University and rulers of the Harvard Corporation.

As you, citizens of the class of 1981, prepare to graduate into various graduate schools, occupations, national service and other activities, it may be worth some of your time to look backward as a way of looking forward. What did you derive from your four years at Harvard? What did Harvard derive from four years of you? Indeed, what is Harvard, or as educator Robert Hutchins used to pose the question at his guest lectures here: what is the justification for Harvard University? "Sui generis," whispered back an irreverent law student at one of Hutchins' lectures. Although a cute reply, typical of the Law School's ability to make its students sharp by making them narrow, it is not helpful.

Harvard is first and foremost a practice of power—the power of knowledge within an academy linked to many sinews of power near and far from the campus. Much of this knowledge is generated by imagination, but much more is shaped and applied by the power of the material world. The patterns of influence which press upon a university decide its range of inhibition, shape its internal governance and evoke the standards by which its consumers—the students—are measured and, indeed, measure themselves.

So large is this institution and so overconfident is its tradition that one can become engulfed by waves of ethnocentrism.

I recall my early weeks at Harvard Law School in 1955, when I asked a law professor why, given the abundance of courses and seminars in the catalog, there was no course on "food and the law." Nonplussed for an instant, he blurted "Food?" Recovering his composure he allowed that the reason was simply that the subject had not developed to a suitable intensity to qualify as an adequate intellectual challenge at the School. Searching for a frame of reference, I asked him what course would so qualify. He looked up at the sky and then a definite glow crossed his face as he responded: "Taxation."

I want to believe that you did not have similar experiences with the curriculum during your years here. We are told that the atmosphere has changed, that your sophistication extends to the involvement of education with the development of major life skills. Right? You perfected your citizen skills by developing a pre-eminent model of student government that changed the governance of the University from an autocracy hostile to the concept of students organizing as a community to one where initiative, community purposes and reasonable self-determination thrive under an overall institutional discipline. Correct? You sharpened your consumer skills by intelligent examination of annual tuition and other price increases—a process resulting in parent/student reviews of the University budget, its determinants and alternatives. You have viewed the world as a social laboratory for your education, linking knowledge to your behavior in a way that organized your thoughts without being too remote either from fact or principle. Or, so we would like to believe.

However, you are not without any deprivations; few of you are old enough to remember when the President of Harvard University used to matter to the country beyond Harvard Yard.

Given a background of Harvard educational pride, how do you view yourself as a citizen? "Justice," said Daniel Webster. " * * * is the great interest of man on Earth." "Duty," wrote Alfred North Whitehead, "arises from our potential control over the

course of events." And, he added, "Where attainable knowledge could have changed the issue, ignorance has the guilt of vice." What do these words mean for Harvard graduates?

Taken together, these observations can illuminate the pathways of citizenship at the workplace and in the community at large. How many of you want to become leaders in the achievement of greater justice on earth? If not, why not? Could it be that the nation is suffering from an excess of leadership? Or is it more likely that our times reflect a massive escape from leadership responsibilities? With so much human activity conducted within and between larger and larger private and public bureaucracies, is it any wonder that the "I only work here" syndrome has become an epidemic?

Yet, if we pause for a moment and reflect on the blessings of liberty and progress in our country since 1776, they were not brought about by people who got along by getting along. Consider civil liberties, civil rights, workers' rights, women's rights. * * * Consider the stalwart Americans who first broke the bonds of injustice and advanced the enlightenment for so many of their fellow citizens. These leaders overcame, to some degree, raw power or brute force through the compelling advocacy of humane values under the rule of law. These values possessed stamina precisely because they reflected deep survival meanings. The pursuits of peace, justice, liberty, and opportunity transcend different cultures because they spell survival for people, progeny, culture, and environment.

Our constitution and political traditions do permit, however imperfectly, a greater scope than in most countries for pursuing these values under protected rights. In several countries today students are on the ramparts opposing despotisms in order to achieve the rights in their country that you already have in your country but utilize too infrequently. Can we diminish or lose our rights if we do not use them with some degree of constancy? The current Administration in Washington seems determined to test this question.

If you ever require an overt challenge to citizenship, you need go no further than contemporary Washington. The current Administration is largely a nihilistic, virulent, extremist brand of Republicanism that is likely to make its Nixon and Ford predecessors appear benign by comparison. Now that the assumption of power has replaced the soothing stream of last year's campaign rhetoric, the policy directions are unmistakably clear.

The Reagan Administration is working feverishly to lift the rule of law from unsafe, corrupt, fraudulent and anticompetitive behavior of Big Business. A modest sensitivity to consumer and environmental values, developed under both Democratic and Republican Administrations in the past twenty years, is in serious jeopardy.

Anti-trust law enforcement is being severely narrowed during a period of accelerating mergers, cartels and conglomerates. The present White House has declared war on the successful national legal services program for the poor, the fledgling National Consumer Cooperative Bank which encourages economic self-help, infant nutrition programs that have lowered our country's infant mortality rate, the excellent Freedom of Information law which many citizens have invoked against government secrecy and abuse. Information is the currency of democracy but to the current Adminis-

tration that is a currency to be diminished rapidly. Basic scientific research efforts, important data collection projects and programs for solar energy and energy conservation are among the future hopes of our political economy which are to be dashed.

The horizons are not bright for civil liberties, a competitive economy, open, accessible government, human rights abroad, effective help for the poor, the elderly, the handicapped and the ill. This is a government of reactionary ideologues who do not even make a pretense of compassion; their only concession to public opinion is to mask their ideological cruelty with a jovial demeanor and the usual political buzzwords.

You have read about or heard these phrases. Secretary of Transportation Drew Lewis does not say that hundreds of thousands of Americans will be killed or injured on the highways because, as he told a Congressional Committee, there will be no safety standards issued during his four year tenure. But the death or maiming of Americans are empirical consequences of his nullification of the safety laws. He ignores the spectacular and practical availability of very cost-effective crash protection engineering remedies, long ready for adoption. Instead, his explanation is that he wants to reduce red tape, not "nit-pick an auto industry" and be supportive of the concerns of auto companies. These companies meet regularly in his large office, but the victims of his indifference have no voice, no presence, no power to persuade him to respect the sanctity of human life under the law he swore to uphold four months ago.

The list could go on—the scuttling of nutritional programs at the Department of Agriculture as an economy move, or the big push by Secretary of Interior James Watt to give away or lease for a pittance to "rip and run" multinational corporations, with few environmental safeguards, the federal lands which earlier Republicans in our nation's history strove to secure for future generations of Americans. As coming months and budgets will reveal, this Administration is not really economy-minded nor citizen-minded; it is instead an ambitious architect of the corporate state, a transferer of more power and more resources and more claims on the future from the many to the few and privileged. The Reagan Administration is a government of the Exxons, by the Dow Chemicals, and for the General Dynamics. Social Darwinism is back in the seat of government. Only the "fittest" are outfitted with heavy federal subsidies, tax preferences, inflated government contracts, monopolistic licenses and broad exemption from proper regulatory attentions.

What is your role to be in this decade of the Eighties? One approach is easy—just slide off the Ivy and into the waiting professions and positions where your time and talents are amply rewarding as long as you keep your conscience at home. These are the places that measure almost everything by the dollar, where crass commercial values control the most hallowed precepts of American society, where the bosses, as the saying goes, know the price of everything and the value of nothing. These are the upwardly mobile jobs full of more "know who" than "know how," elite jobs that are associated with increasing isolation from the anguish, pains and needs of a tormented humanity around the world, jobs where dissent is taboo and obeisance to the Organization is the totem.

If that is your definition of work, you will have little trouble fitting in place. However,

at this time in your life, near the peak of your idealism and possibly as free to experiment, question, pioneer as you may ever be again, many of you may be ready to explore a different kind of work—a work where you bring your conscience and time and talent altogether to work every day to improve your society. This is the meaning of citizenship. It may come as a surprise to some people to learn that citizen work makes possible traditional employment and much economic activity. Citizen work built a nation where rights—constitutional to contractual—make possible greater economic prosperity. Police states are almost never prosperous economies, no matter what their natural resource endowment may be. Monopoly capitalism never is much good for people and for equitable economic development. The history of Brazil is instructive on this point.

Citizen work produced the land grant colleges and the private colleges which provided multiple points of entry of millions of Americans seeking self-improvement and fulfillment. Citizen work enacted the Homestead law in the eighteen sixties which gave one hundred and sixty acres to individuals who worked them and thereby assured that much of the greatest agricultural breadbasket of the world would not quickly become a collection of giant plantations. Instead, this law encouraged a spread of millions of small, productive farmers who loved their land and who, in turn, nourished the main political economic reforms of the past century.

More recently, citizen work has been responsible for the principal advances in American justice. Four black freshmen engineering students with their now historic sit-in at that North Carolina lunch counter twenty-one years ago were engaging in constitutionally protected citizen work. At least the Supreme Court of the United States thought so. Other citizens, individually and in groups, took on the silent violence of pollution and environmental wreckage from the lead-afflicted ghetto children to the poisonous spills in the air and water. Still others stood tall at their place of work to become ethical whistleblowers against corruption, crime, fraud, and waste. They were the trustees for millions of affected consumers, taxpayers, and workers.

These domestic patriots had everything material to lose and everything noble to win. What was that courageous impetus to their intellect that guided their actions? A sense of communion with the most widely shared value of humankind—a golden rule applied to their daily experience. The quality control inspector at GM who, after numerous reports to his foreman were ignored, put his job on the line in the mid-sixties by exposing risks of carbon monoxide leakage in the company's cars was asked why he did what he did. His reply was too simple for the reporters: It was the shopfloor version of the golden rule.

The opportunities for citizen work, on and off the job, have never been more demanding in a world where tragedy, peril, and risk are found side by side with brilliant but unused scientific, engineering, and organizational solutions. These opportunities beckon you. They invite all the skills, stamina and creativity that you possess. No academic discipline is irrelevant. Problems to be resolved are like bodies of knowledge; they are a seamless web demanding the varied best that human minds can offer. Over time a pollution crisis, for example, needs to draw on almost every discipline which your Uni-

versity embraces—from the physical sciences to the social sciences to the traditional professions and, yes, most definitely, to the humanities.

How, you may ask, after some sixteen years of an institutional education largely indifferent to learning about and engaging in citizen work—an education whose primary thrust flows from memorization to regurgitation to vegetation—can one acquire the desire? There is no single entrance. Try viewing these United States as an exporter of humane democratic examples. Try seeing citizen work, not as a necessary chore, but as a delight, a joy, a counterpoint to alienation, powerlessness and boredom, a way to stretch your analytic and normative skills. Try etching out a future America where most citizens would feel a personal obligation to spend at least 10 percent of their time working on the problem or challenge of their choice in order to improve their community or world, where most citizens would reject the "what will be, will be" attitude of never fighting City Hall, nor Goliath, Incorporated, where most citizens would reject the facile cynicism of hating "the government" but would rather make it their government and their way of accomplishing community objectives.

These are self-actuating determinations; no laws, budgets, elixirs are required. But, once actuated, solutions begin to be applied to what hitherto were seen as intractable problems. A functioning democracy permits people to always build power behind their quest for fair treatment and opportunity. It permits people to use directly the modern communications systems now controlled by a few firms. It permits people to shape the investment direction of more than a trillion dollars of pension funds and bank deposits which they already own. People gaining control of the wealth that they already own for themselves or as trustees for their descendants—from the public air waves to the public lands, from shares in companies to the pension funds—forges the link between responsible owners and a responsive political economy. Never have the separations between ownership and control, as illuminated in the early Thirties by Berle and Means, been so diverse, so pervasive throughout the economy and so consequential for the future of economic and political democracy.

It is well to keep in mind that, unlike past generations, our generation worldwide has created two risks—nuclear armaments and penetrating masses of pollution—which could destroy life on Earth. These two mounting risks place a particularly strenuous set of moral imperatives on our public citizen roles.

So ask yourself: what kind of work would you really like to do in life after Harvard, if money were no object? Then start cranking in the dollars and see at what dollar level your ideal choice of work becomes overwhelmed by your instrumental choice of work. From there, proceed to adjust your available time so that you do not have either to suffer your satisfaction or satisfy your suffering. There are many hours in the day for diversifying your interests. Whether you choose to develop consumer-side businesses like cable TV coops or neighborhood-based legal, health or repair services, or whether you choose to enlarge or build problem-solving civic groups—to suggest just two directions—do keep in mind that the highest practice of citizenship is to defend the political rights of those who may disagree with you as well as those who concur with your pursuits. That is truly the golden rule of a democracy.

Congratulations to you and your parents, to your teachers who persevered, and to the country that is entitled to receive your wisest contributions.

Thank you for your invitation. May your 50th Reunion in the year 2031 find you all back here in good health and better spirits. ●

UNITED STATES CHANGING HUMAN RIGHTS POLICIES

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Detroit Free Press discusses the United States changing human rights policies.

I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues:

[From the Detroit Free Press, July 25, 1981]

HUMAN RIGHTS: THE U.S. AGAIN VOTES ON THE SIDE OF REPRESSION AND TORTURE

For the first time in four years, U.S. representatives to the World Bank have voted in favor of development loans for Argentina, one of the nations targeted by the Carter administration as a gross violator of human rights. The vote was largely symbolic, since the \$300 million in loans for energy development would have gone through with or without American backing, but it marks a significant change in U.S. policy.

The four-year practice of opposing loans to nations with abysmal records on human rights was itself more symbolic than effective in preventing international development aid from reaching them. During the Carter years, U.S. representatives to the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank voted no or abstained on 122 loans to 16 countries, most of which were approved by the multinational lending agencies anyway.

The U.S. position was, however, a rebuke and an embarrassment to nations branded as human rights violators. It was a public reminder that states like Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay were places where people disappeared or were jailed by the hundreds; where torture and kidnapping and killing were chillingly routine police activities; where journalists, labor leaders, intellectuals and political opponents of the regime risked their lives to dissent.

Now the Reagan administration has reversed the Carter policy as it applies to those four Latin American nations. U.S. delegates to the two development banks will support some \$480 million in loans to the four countries this month. The administration has also asked Congress to lift an embargo on military aid, sales and training to Argentina. Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr. says the change is justified because the four nations have improved dramatically in the area of human rights.

It is true, if you look at the raw numbers compiled by organizations such as Amnesty International, that fewer people are being snatched off the street in Argentina and Chile or jailed in Uruguay and Paraguay. But political and labor activity is still illegal in Argentina, and perhaps 10,000 people spirited away by the quasi-official death squads are still unaccounted for.

There has been a wave of new detentions in Chile, a nation that steadfastly refuses to extradite the accused killers of Orlando Letelier, a critic of the regime who was assassinated five years ago in Washington. Uruguay has more political prisoners per capita than any other country in the world. And Paraguay has emptied some of its cells but remains one of the hemisphere's more enduring and implacable dictatorships.

Conditions may have improved somewhat in the four nations, but they are still the most repressive in the hemisphere, with the possible exception of Cuba. If the U.S. embraces this quartet of dictatorships too warmly now, the message will be that a few temporary adjustments—a brief vacation for the torturer and a little cleaning out of the jails—are all that is necessary to regain respectability and access to aid. The resumption of military aid to Argentina, in particular, implies that there is no need for further liberalization, and suggests the U.S. is once more a firm ally of military dictators.

The Carter human rights policy was mocked as ineffective and as a policy that punished our allies more than our enemies. But the whole point was to use American influence where we actually had some. Mr. Carter used the promise of aid and the threat of censure to urge some client nations toward political decency and minimal reform, and when it worked—as it sometimes did—it was a good exchange. Ask the hundreds of people freed from the jails of Santiago, Montevideo or Buenos Aires—not to mention those who still languish as political prisoners—if it is not a policy worth keeping. ●

THE NATIONAL WATER UTILITIES BANK BILL

HON. WES WATKINS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I introduced H.R. 4366, a bill to create a joint private/Government-owned Water Utilities Bank. This bank would provide loans and loan guarantees for the construction and improvement of water utility systems. To create an efficient secondary market for private loans to water utilities, the bank could buy and package private loans to water utilities for resale to investors.

The Water Utilities Bank is modeled after the successful Farm Credit Banks and the Rural Telephone Bank which have greatly benefited my district. Just as the Farm Credit Banks have become entirely private entities, Government capital in the Water Utilities Bank would be gradually replaced by private capital until no Government interest remained.

This bill is very similar to H.R. 7781, which I introduced last year. In the intervening year, the case for the bank has become even stronger. This past year brought unprecedented droughts in many parts of the Nation. Water tables and reservoirs have been dropping and wells have been running dry at alarming rates.

The capital needs of America's water systems are enormous. EPA projects that for normal replacement, maintenance and system expansion, water system capital expenditures during the period 1980-83 will exceed \$10.4 billion—more than \$2.6 billion per year. During the same 1980-83 period, compliance with existing EPA drinking water regulations will require more than \$2.3 billion in additional capital expenditure, according to EPA's own figures. The cost of compliance with these Federal regulations bears most heavily on small, rural systems. New regulations that EPA plans to propose to control synthetic organic contaminants in drinking water will cost billions more. Moreover, much of the expense of compliance with the Dam Safety Act will fall on water suppliers. The Federal task force on urban water supply estimates that over the next 20 years, urban systems alone—that is, those serving over 50,000 people—will need to finance capital investments of between \$80 billion and \$113 billion.

Usually, no help in meeting these demands is available from State or Federal governments. In the past, the Farmers Home Administration has provided needed capital to publicly owned or nonprofit systems in rural areas like my district. But this year, it appears this program will be reduced because of fiscal concerns.

For the most part then, water utilities must compete with other industries for needed capital in highly competitive capital markets where interest rates are higher than ever before in U.S. history. Many of the competitors with water utilities for capital enjoy substantial direct or indirect Federal subsidies unavailable to water utilities. For instance, rural telephone utilities have long had access to low interest loans through the Rural Telephone Bank. Small electric utilities have received subsidies from the Rural Electrification Administration. The sewage treatment industry has received about \$4 billion per year in direct grants.

This bill would not attempt to remedy this critical capital shortage by creating another cumbersome and expensive grant program. Instead, my bill would set up a Water Utilities Bank, modeled after the Farm Credit Banks, the Rural Telephone Bank and the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, to supply capital to water utilities at reasonable rates while minimizing cost and risk to the Government.

The Water Utilities Bank would initially be capitalized jointly by Government and private sources. Stock would be issued to the Government, to utilities that are bank customers, and to water utilities eligible to become bank customers. Government financial participation would be eliminated beginning in 1991 or earlier if practical. As the Government stock was gradually redeemed, the bank would, like the

banks in the farm credit system, become an entirely private entity. The bank could obtain debt financing in private capital markets or, with the consent of Congress—through the appropriations process—and the Secretary of the Treasury, from the Government at the average yield at which the Government is selling securities of comparable maturity.

Past programs have been criticized because they circumvent the appropriation process. All Government loans to the Water Utilities Bank and all Government purchases of stock in the bank would, however, come entirely within the appropriation process. The Treasury should actually make a reasonable profit from the Water Utilities Bank. While the Government is entitled to a 2-percent return on its investment in the Rural Telephone Bank, the return on Government Water Utilities Bank stock is to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into account the average market yield of U.S. Government securities of comparable maturity.

To minimize any risk to the Government, this bill contains several provisions that carefully protect its investment from loss. The Government would not be liable for obligations of the bank. As long as the Government retained any equity, it would have substantial rights to participate in the management and control of the bank. In fact, all directors would initially be governmentally appointed and gradually replaced by shareholder-elected directors as the Government's share of equity decreased. The Government's stock would be preferred, and entitled to a cumulative dividend and interest on unpaid dividends. The bank's debt-to-equity ratio could not exceed 20 to 1. Finally, as long as the Government retained an equity interest, the bank would be subject to an annual audit and required to make an annual report to Congress.

This year's bill follows the same framework as last year's bill but a few changes and refinements have been made. These changes reduce the bank's authorization level, narrow the activities eligible for bank financing, and carefully refine the categories of utilities entitled to preferred status in receiving bank financing, as well as making certain technical changes.

The authorization level requested in last year's bill was \$2 billion per year for 5 years. The bill that I am introducing today requests an open authorization of \$1 billion, with no more than \$200 million to be appropriated in the first year. This reduction in authorization level does not reflect that the dimensions of the problem have diminished; if anything, the problem has grown. Rather, I have requested less in recognition of the serious budgetary problems facing this country.

The bank can start on a smaller scale, on a trial basis.

In a further effort to limit the cost of the bank, the new bill has narrowed the scope of activities eligible for bank financing. Utilities would no longer be eligible under section 9(b)(1) to receive bank loans or guarantees to finance ordinary maintenance such as fixing leaks. Under the bill, bank financing would be available only for "extraordinary and nonrecurring" maintenance, such as unusual maintenance procedures needed in the wake of a disaster.

The new bill also prohibits bank financing of the acquisition of a water system by another system unless the acquired system is small—that is, unless the acquired system serves a population of less than 1,000. The purpose of the Water Utilities Bank is to finance projects that will extend service or improve the cost and quality of service, not to finance changes of ownership. The small system exception provides for cases where, due to economies of scale, acquisition of a very small system is likely to improve the cost and quality of service.

The categories of systems entitled to be preferred in receiving bank financing has been changed in two ways. First, while last year's bill called for preferring systems "ineligible for" other Government assistance, section 9(2)(a) of the new bill favors systems "otherwise unable to obtain" Government assistance. This change would make it easier for municipal systems that may be eligible by law for certain programs but that in practice cannot obtain this assistance, to use the bank. It would also make it easier for small companies technically eligible for a program yet unable to participate due to high administrative costs, to use the bank.

Second, section 9(b)(2)(c) was changed to make it clear that systems simply refinancing outstanding indebtedness should not be afforded any preference in obtaining bank financing. On the other hand, if a system needs a new source of capital because of maturing indebtedness, access to the bank should remain a higher priority.

A safe, adequate supply of drinking water is absolutely essential for human existence. It is not a luxury. I believe that this new, scaled down bill would provide a proven, nonintrusive means for assuring that our drinking water systems have access to adequate capital. Please join with me in supporting this workable means of meeting the escalating needs of our water supply system.●

LOYALTY OATHS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD and exchange that Hon. PATRICIA SCHROEDER of Colorado and I have had concerning loyalty oaths and the rights of free speech of Government employees. I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress:

PROPOSED COLLOQUY

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee in a discussion of the budget for the Office of Personnel Management. When OPM was created it took over most of the functions of the old Civil Service Commission. Among other functions it took over were security investigations and employment applications. Up until about 1975, the old Commission used to ask applicants about their membership in organizations to see if somehow they were communists or subversive. The Commission had files on a variety of organizations and a name index so it could check out the prior political affiliations of each applicant and employee. After losing a number of court battles, both on Privacy Act and on First Amendment grounds, the Commission revised the 171 application form to remove the offensive language and changed its investigation procedures to avoid interference with the free speech rights of Federal employees and applicants for Federal employment. Now, I understand, the new director of OPM, Donald Devine, has suggested that loyalty oaths and political affiliation questions be restored. I think this is a bad idea, both because of its First Amendment implications and because of its budgetary impact. So, let me ask, did OPM propose that any of its Fiscal Year 1982 appropriation be used for a change in the security programs?

Mr. ROYBAL. No, they never mentioned any change in that program.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. So, am I correct in assuming that there is no money in this appropriation for an expansion of the security program or the reprinting of Standard Form 171 to add new loyalty questions?

Mr. ROYBAL. That is correct. The appropriation does not assume any new activity in this area. I would consider it an improper use of funds for OPM to use money to change its security and loyalty oath programs.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman. I can assure my colleagues that my Subcommittee on Civil Service will keep a close watch on this area to make sure that no changes are made which affect the rights of citizens or which waste appropriated money.●

THE ARROGANT IMMIGRATION OFFICERS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nelson Lavergne, chief executive officer of the Command Broadcast Associates, recently sent me a copy of an editorial broadcast on radio station WADO in New York. The editorial is concerned with the mistreatment of a Puerto Rican man by U.S. immigration officials. Mr. Lavergne, who has long been a friend of Hispanics, sent me the editorial to point out some of the problems Hispanics encounter in this country because of their ethnicity. The United States does need a new immigration policy, one that is effective and equitable. But a new and more positive attitude toward Hispanics is also needed. I would like to share with you the poignant commentary sent to me by Mr. Lavergne.

At this time I wish to insert into the RECORD the editorial sent to me by Mr. Lavergne.

THE ARROGANT IMMIGRATION OFFICERS

On February 12, 1951, General Douglas MacArthur said that the Puerto Ricans forming the ranks of the gallant 65th Infantry on the battlefields of Korea were writing a brilliant record of achievement in battle and he was proud to have them in his command. He added that he wished that he had many more like them. In that war, the men of the 65th Infantry won 125 silver stars and four distinguished crosses.

On the day that President Reagan was shot this year, one of the first men to help him when he was taken to George Washington University Hospital was a paramedic called Roberto Hernandez—another Puerto Rican.

There are thousands of us here doing our jobs well and contributing to this society, yet we are living in a country where the government persists in calling us citizens, but violating the rights that are inherent with citizenship.

Take, for instance, the case of Salvador Caban: Salvador is a man born in Las Marias, Puerto Rico, in 1944, and he has 11 other brothers and sisters. As it was for many Puerto Ricans, his early years were difficult, mostly spent on a farm helping his father and obtaining a minimal education that only took him to the third grade. We talked to Salvador Caban and found him to be a quiet, respectful man, obviously endowed with a sincere, beautiful humility that is such a common trait of Puerto Ricans raised in the small towns of the island—indeed, a trait that seems to permeate throughout the "campesinos" of all Latin countries.

Again, like many of the rest of us, when he was about 19, he came to the United States, a place that he believed to be his country as well, to do something for himself and escape the yoke of poverty and the humiliating existence of the poor. And, considering his humble beginnings Salvador has done well. He has lived in the same apart-

ment in the Bronx for a number of years and has held the same job for seven years.

But Salvador made one little mistake—after working in his present job four years and saving a little money, he decided to visit his family in Puerto Rico during the month of December 1977 and from there, he went to visit some friends in Santo Domingo. Then, he came home on an Air Dominica flight on January 5, 1978 and when he got off the plane he met a girl who believes herself to be more American than anybody else and who works for the United States Immigration Department as an officer—her name is Beverly Gordon. Trying to prove that he was an American citizen, born in Puerto Rico, he showed a New York State Driver's license, gave his address and phone number, showed a membership card from the International Union of Electrical Workers, a social security card, and answered whatever other questions he could, in addition to showing his birth certificate obtained in 1977. But officer Gordon did not believe him. She was interrogating him through an interpreter. Then she went to her superior officer who recommended that Salvador Caban be detained and then another one of those who believes himself to be more American than anyone else (an arrogant immigration officer). Assistant Officer in Charge, Douglas Farrell, gave permission to detain Salvador Caban and he was taken to the detention center in Brooklyn, where he continued to be held for six consecutive days!

The sad part of this story is that, in spite of the fact that Salvador gave the names and addresses of his brothers and sisters, in spite of the fact that he provided the name and address of his landlady, in spite of the fact that he gave the name and address of his employer, those arrogant immigration officers decided that this man, this American citizen was not important enough for them to bother calling anyone. Worse yet, when 3 or 4 of his brothers and sisters went to look for him, the arrogant immigration officers would not let them see him and his family obtained a lawyer immediately. But when the lawyer went to the arrogant immigration authorities, they couldn't find his file!

In the meantime, the arrogant immigration officers in Puerto Rico called the Caban family in Las Marias and told them that Salvador was in a lot of trouble, could go to jail for a long time and they'd better get to San Juan fast to identify a picture of Salvador. They went and they identified him. We wonder, of course, why the arrogant immigration officers couldn't have called his brothers and sisters in New York.

You see, the problem was that Caban was detained on Thursday and we guess that Thursday is too close to the weekend for those arrogant immigration officers to do any work, so they just let him sit in a detention center jail until Tuesday, six days later, which is when they began to think that maybe they were wrong and, to add insult to injury, Salvador's family had to put up a \$1,000 appearance bond before being released!

Through the good graces of a lady to whom Salvador told this story, he got an immigration lawyer, a suit for damages was started against the United States government. Salvador has lost the first round. Some judge decided it was perfectly in order for those arrogant immigration officers to do what they did to Salvador Caban. But, the case is being appealed and, if necessary, will go to the Supreme Court of the land.

In a separate case, on June 9th of this year, arrogant immigration officers raided the Ben Foreman and Sons factory in Brooklyn and arrested, handcuffs and all, 72 people. The only problem was, that out of the 72, 10 are citizens and another 30 were either legal residents or had work permits. But the arrogant immigration officers did not even allow those that were legal residents to take their green cards out of their wallets before handcuffing them.

What sin did Salvador Caban and all the other victims of the arrogant immigration officers commit? Only one—they spoke Spanish and were a little bit darker than some other people. We wonder if those arrogant immigration officers would have detained an English speaking, light skinned, blue eyed, red blooded, Canadian, who is an illegal alien.

In the name of God, when are we going to stop these abuses to our dignity and our rights? When are you going to decide this government must stop these Gestapo-type tactics? The rest of America has to know about this because the arrogant immigration officers are doing it to us now, but sooner or later they'll decide that they don't like green eyes or red hair and before long they'll be the storm troopers of this country for everybody.

Flying to Puerto Rico, U.S.A. is like flying to Los Angeles and back—it's all supposed to be American land. We are supposed to be able to go back and forth at will without showing papers, like all other Americans do. But, when are we going to raise our voices against that ridiculous, insulting, and diminishing counter where more often than not, some arrogant immigration officers asks, "What is your citizenship", before we can get on a plane to come home?

Next September 10th we have some important elections in New York. During the next few weeks you will be hearing some politicians telling you why you should vote for them—WADO is giving them the time. We want to know from them what they are going to do about these arrogant immigration abusers and what they think of arrogant immigration tactics. After they talk, we will be able to separate the hypocrites from the honest ones and we'll be able to tell who to vote for and who to vote against and this time, let's come out to vote en masse.

And its time too for our representatives who are not running in this election to speak out against this outrage in a loud voice. We want to hear our Assemblymen, State Senators, Congressmen, and Senators protest loudly against this outrage; we particularly want to hear from those elected officials who asked for our votes because they too are Hispanics. And we want to hear from our President too. We want to know whether he condones this or not and we want to hear and read about their protests in every radio and television station and in every newspaper in the land.

We want to know now whether those distinguished crosses and silver stars that they gave our men who died for this country mean something or not. And we want to know if those words on the Statue of Liberty that invites the "tired, poor, and huddled masses" of the world mean something or whether they are just a sham. We will demand that those arrogant immigration despots stop treating us like criminals and start respecting us with the same dignity and care that they accord all other Americans.

In the meantime, we are establishing a Hispanic-American Defense Fund to help

Salvador Caban take his case to the Supreme Court if he has to. The fund will be held in trust by an impartial attorney and audited each year to provide you with a report. A board will be established to decide which cases are serious and needy enough to use the fund money for legal defenses. Hopefully, the fund will grow throughout the years and will be able to help Hispanics in this country. WADO will start the fund by pledging \$2,000 annually.

If we were able to raise hundreds of thousands of dollars to aid Cuban refugees last year, how about doing the same thing to save our rights and our dignity. Sit down right now and send whatever amount you can afford in check or money order made to: Fund For Hispanic American Defense, Metro Credit Union, Metro Coop, 725 Calle Exterior, Bronx, New York 10451. Please do not send money to WADO and do not send cash. Send only a check or money order made out to the "Fund For Hispanic American Defense" to the address I have just given you. Whatever you send may help you, one of your family, a friend or any poor Hispanic that is being abused by arrogant immigration officers.●

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO IMPROVE THE REGULATION OF OCEAN TRANSPORTATION BY THE UNITED STATES

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join today in the introduction of legislation which will amend the 1916 Shipping Act, the law which governs the way our international ocean shipping is regulated.

For too long now we have seen U.S. liner operators become less and less effective in the way they can compete with foreign-flag operators, many of whom are completely unburdened by regulation or antitrust concepts. Over the past several congresses, the finger of blame has been pointed at the 1916 Shipping Act, particularly at the difficulties current interpretation of this act imposes on those who must comply with its provisions. The bill which is introduced today is directed at overcoming those difficulties.

In the 96th Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries considered legislation which would have completely rewritten the basic regulatory ocean shipping laws of the United States. This measure, which was known as title II of the omnibus maritime bill of 1980, while substantially supported by many in and out of Government, did not receive the endorsement of the Carter administration. The failure to enact this needed regulatory reform measure was, in large part, due to the prior administration's neglect.

I had hoped that the Reagan administration could have, by this time, given Congress some indication of the

direction to be taken in reforming our archaic maritime laws. Since assuming the chairmanship of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have indicated a willingness to cooperate with the administration to formulate its maritime policy and maritime legislative program. Maritime policy has never been, nor should it ever become, a partisan issue; by the same token, maritime policy and its accompanying legislative program cannot be the function of one branch of Government if it is to come to fruition.

The bill we introduce today is not an effort to have Congress do it alone. We are, however, aware that in the regulatory area other specific legislative proposals are being advanced. I personally feel that until the administration is able to speak to this issue, it would be best to have more than one proposal available for study and consideration. Therefore, we present an alternative solution to what everyone recognizes to be a most pressing problem—an alternative which is more modest than efforts of the recent past, but one which combines all the essential remedial elements.

I commend to my colleagues in and out of the Congress this bill and invite all to use this legislation as a tool, as an outline, as a basis for action which must be taken, and taken soon, if we are to responsibly address the 1980's maritime needs of this country. ●

ARAFAT OFFERS ALTERNATIVE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 26 Yasser Arafat, chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, was interviewed on ABC's "Issues and Answers." It was a fascinating exchange. Once again Arafat sent out a tentative signal that he is willing to talk about an overall Mideast settlement that would provide the basis for a lasting peace for all parties, including Israel.

The reporter pointed out that:

It remains in the Palestine National Charter that you want to create a Democratic secular state throughout all of Palestine. That has been interpreted in the United States as a means of driving the Jews into the sea.

Arafat quickly replied:

No. In 1974 I said we are ready to establish our independent state on any part from which the Israelis will withdraw or to be liberated. And in 1969 I said we want to establish a democratic state where Jews, Christians and Moslems can live all together, all the Jews in Palestine together. I am giving—we the victims have offered two solutions, two solutions, whereas the other side didn't offer anything but annihilation * * * And so, this is their resolution—annihilation, while we are offering two solutions. So, I

didn't mention, and nobody mentioned, that we are going to throw anybody in the sea. But we are offering options while the other side are offering nothing but more annihilation, more oppression, and new slavery to my people.

Chairman Arafat has offered a unique formulation which the United States should quickly explore. He has posited two options—first, the familiar and unacceptable democratic secular state, and second, "to establish our independent state on any part from which the Israelis will withdraw." Obviously, the two options are different from each other, and those who genuinely want peace in the Middle East must now ask what Arafat means when he suggests establishments of an independent state.

Would that state recognize Israel?

Would it agree to live at peace with Israel?

Would it pledge to respect Israel's borders?

Would that state be demilitarized so that it could not present a threat to its neighbors?

If Arafat would answer all these questions "yes," then permanent peace in the Middle East is possible.

But someone in authority must ask these questions, preferably an official of Israel—next best, an official of the United States.

Nothing would be lost by asking. If the answers are unsatisfactory, or if they lead nowhere, then the tension and conflict and violence of recent years will be resumed.

But if the answers are positive—as I believe they will be—then they may open discussions that will lead to a settlement of outstanding differences, a modus vivendi that will mean a better life for Palestinians and an end to the constant state of military alert which keeps a cloud over the lives of all Israeli citizens.

Only those with something to fear will fail to talk. Perhaps Prime Minister Begin may fear to talk to the PLO, because talks might lead to a Palestinian state in the West Bank—and an end to Mr. Begin's dream of expanding the permanent borders of Israel to encompass the West Bank. Mr. Begin keeps insisting that this area is a part of historic Israel—Eretz Israel. Israel has kept this area, including more than 1 million Palestinians living there, under military rule since 1967.

The reluctance of U.S. officials to talk to the PLO is more difficult to understand. We do not support Israel's claim to the West Bank. We have great national interests to protect throughout the Middle East. There the PLO is a political force of great importance. It will not drift away or disappear. Nor can it be bombed into extinction.

U.S. reluctance to talk to the PLO, of course, relates mainly to Israeli opposition to the PLO. Israeli officials, and their supporters in the United

States, are wont to use the term PLO and terrorist interchangeably. And this stereotype is so widely held, and not just among American Jews, that the PLO is considered by many people to be untouchable. Now that Begin has ordered the Israeli version of terrorism in Lebanon, perhaps the stereotype will change.

And usually overlooked by U.S. officials, as well as others, is the fact that many American Jews strongly oppose Begin's policies.

If U.S. officials have until now held back from talking with the PLO for fear of domestic political reaction, they should put these fears behind them. Many American Jews are outraged by the Israeli attack on Beirut and the Begin program of expanding settlements in the West Bank. Many of them favor negotiations with the PLO if the Palestinians will accept the right of Israel to exist.

Most Americans, including at least half of American Jews, now believe that peace between Palestinians and Israelis is possible, indeed is a necessity.

A Lou Harris poll taken in July 1980, and commissioned by Edgar G. Bronfman, acting chairman of the World Jewish Congress, showed that by a margin of 66 to 13 percent, Americans believe that "if the PLO would recognize the right of Israel to exist instead of pledging to destroy Israel, then they should be able to join the peace talks about the future of the West Bank." And by a margin of 53 to 34 percent, a majority of American Jews agree with this statement. Americans also believe by a 71 to 12 percent margin that "the Palestinian people are now homeless and deserve their own independent state, just as much as the Jews deserved their own homeland after World War II." And by a similar margin Americans are convinced "there must be a way to guarantee Israel's security and also give the Palestinians an independent state on the West Bank."

It is time for American policymakers and politicians to move the Palestinian issue to the front burner and to begin looking seriously for a solution to the problem that will insure a lasting peace.

Excerpts from Lou Harris survey follow:

CURRENT AMERICAN ATTITUDES TOWARD ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

(A Lou Harris poll taken in July 1980, and commissioned by Edgar G. Bronfman, Acting Chairman of the World Jewish Congress)

By a margin of 66 to 13 percent Americans believe "if the PLO would recognize the right of Israel to exist instead of pledging to destroy Israel, then they should be able to join the peace talks about the future of the West Bank." (By 53 to 34 percent a majority of American Jews agree with this statement.)

By a margin of 71 to 12 percent Americans believe "the Palestinian people are now homeless and deserve their own independent state, just as much as the Jews deserved their own homeland after World War II."

By a margin of 39 to 29 percent Americans believe "Israel has mistreated the Palestinian refugees, and that is wrong."

By a margin of 72 to 11 percent Americans believe "there must be a way to guarantee Israel's security and also give the Palestinians and independent state on the West Bank."

By a margin of 50 to 26 percent Americans believe "by refusing to come up with a plan to give back parts of the West Bank to let the Palestinians have a homeland, Israel makes peace impossible in the Middle East."

By a margin of 56 to 16 percent Americans believe "if Israel can be assured of its security from attack, then it ought to agree to let Palestinian Arabs set up an independent state on the West Bank." (By a slight margin, 41 to 39 percent, American Jews reject this proposition.)

By a margin of 48 to 22 percent Americans believe "[Begin] has made peace more difficult by announcing he is moving his office of prime minister to the Arab part of Jerusalem." (By a slight margin, 43 to 42 percent, American Jews are also critical of this Begin decision.)

By a margin of 54 to 19 percent Americans believe "by advocating and allowing more Jewish settlements on the West Bank, [Begin] is making it almost impossible to get a peace settlement."

By a margin of 44 to 28 percent Americans believe "Israel is wrong to think that the Jewish lobby in the U.S. is so powerful that it can keep them from making the compromises necessary to achieve peace."

By a margin of 48 to 38 percent Americans believe "Israel seems to feel the U.S. will back them, no matter what they do."

"No more than 38 percent of the public as a whole expresses a great deal of confidence in Begin, compared with 54 percent who feel that way about Sadat." ●

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROBERT MOSES

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday morning, July 29, Robert Moses, 92, the man responsible for facelifting the New York area for close to half a century through public works, passed away. He has been described by many as one of the great builders of our time.

It would be impossible to mention all that Mr. Moses accomplished during his most distinguished tenure as a public servant. Highlights of his career include the building of tunnels, bridges, and miles of highway throughout New York State, and many other projects not limited to mass transportation. He gave birth to Lincoln Center, New York Coliseum, the United Nations building, Shea Stadium, zoos, civic centers, the 1964-5 World's Fair, and 75 parks, including Jones Beach. Mr. Moses also had chil-

dren in mind, increasing the number of playgrounds in New York City from 119 to 658.

Mr. Moses, a Yale graduate and Rhodes scholar, first came to power in 1924 when he was named chairman of the New York State Council of Parks. But he reached the apex of his career as the head of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority. In Mr. Moses' vision of a city, the structures, roads, and buildings were paramount. He transformed wastelands into parks, created new land on the edge of the ocean and built hundreds of miles of highways. The impact of his work affects all of New York and the way its citizens live. He saw the city as a place for people to work, shop, and live in style.

As the New York Times most appropriately put it:

And thus quietly, the active career of one of the nation's most powerful public officials came to an end. Mr. Moses' name was virtually a household word, not only in New York but also around the nation, first as a fighter for parks and open space and later as a name that had come to symbolize the sweeping, total approach to urban renewal that he favored.

I know that all Members join me in extending our most heartfelt sympathy to his wife, the former Mary A. Grady, and two children, Barbara Olds and James Moses Collins. ●

HEAD OF PLO POLITICAL DEPARTMENT PLEDGES MORE TERRORISM AND A WAR TO DESTROY ISRAEL; RULES OUT COMPROMISE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Faruq Kaddoumi, the head of the political department of the Palestine Liberation Organization gave an interview to the respected West German magazine Stern last week in which he discussed the strategy of the PLO.

Kaddoumi, who is Yasir Arafat's closest adviser, declared:

First. That the PLO will never accept Israel's right to exist;

Second. That a Palestinian state on the West Bank and in Gaza will not satisfy the PLO's ambitions which require the complete destruction of Israel;

Third. That guerrilla warfare aimed at Israeli civilians will remain a key element in the PLO strategy;

Fourth. That in a war between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies, the PLO would fight alongside the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, I know that public rhetoric often overblows what is said privately but these on-record statements cannot be ignored or explained

away. Once again we see that the Palestinians have yet to develop a reasonable and mature political leadership, a leadership capable of accepting Israel's right to exist within secure and recognized borders.

One essential ingredient of successful international diplomacy is the ability to take the world as it is, and moderate one's goals to fit the available space. Israeli diplomacy, and more recently Egyptian diplomacy have contained large measures of the conciliatory and compromising spirit. The next steps in the peace process require that the other parties to the conflict adopt a like posture.

I am grateful to the Congressional Research Service for its prompt translation of this interview:

[From Stern, July 30, 1981]

WE WILL ALLOW ISRAEL NO SECURITY

Despite last Friday's ceasefire agreement between Israel and Lebanon the fighting continues. Arafat's closest adviser, Faruq Kaddoumi, spoke with Stern correspondent Wibke Bruhns about the strategy of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

Stern. Menachem Begin—

KADDOUMI. Terrorist Begin.

Stern [continuing]. Justifies his attacks on Lebanon with success. For more than a year, until this missile war, there had been no Palestinian attack on Israel.

KADDOUMI. That's correct.

Stern. Begin argues that if the Israel attacks on Palestinian targets in Lebanon were not so frequent and so strong, more numerous and more successful commandos would come across the border.

KADDOUMI. Does he say this?

Stern. At this moment, it does not appear that there is any Arab country or any other country ready to go to war with you against Israel. If these sporadic undertakings of the commandos provoke such terrible preventive and retaliatory strikes by Israel, why do you continue them?

KADDOUMI. We must continue the military operations in the occupied areas. It is better to have a small candle in one's hand than to constantly curse the darkness.

Stern. Militarily this does not change anything and politically this does not create friends for you, such as in Europe. What is your goal?

KADDOUMI. A counter-question. How does a pearl develop? A strange matter penetrates into the mussel. It irritates the creature, which rubs it and causes it pain. This is exactly what we are doing. In the end we will find the pearl in the mussel.

Stern. As long as it is not opened, the mussels survive.

KADDOUMI. We will never allow Israel to live in peace. We will never grant it complete security. Every Israeli must feel that behind each wall there is a guerrilla standing and aiming at him.

Stern. You cannot expect Israel to accept this situation without doing anything about it.

KADDOUMI. The most important thing is that Israel began it. Israel is responsible for the dead on both sides. We have no alternative except to give up. And the operations in the occupied areas are the signs that we are not giving up.

Stern. Another possibility would be to speak with the Israeli government.

KADDOUMI. With the Zionists? Because Zionism means the colonization of Palestine.

STERN. Then you do the same things as the Israelis, who say there is no question of recognizing the PLO as the representative of the Palestinians. How will this then continue?

KADDOUMI. Israel has had our country under occupation for 33 years. The first condition is that it withdraw from the occupied areas. Then we will be ready to negotiate the solution of the Near East crisis at an international conference.

STERN. When you say "occupied territories," what do you mean?

KADDOUMI. First of all, the West Bank, the Golan Heights and the Gaza strip.

STERN. That means thus: first withdrawal, then negotiation.

KADDOUMI. First unconditional withdrawal. We have a vested right to a part of Palestine. There was a UN partition plan which foresaw two states in 1947.

STERN. Which the Arabs rejected.

KADDOUMI. We were like the mother who went before King Solomon with another woman fighting for her son. He proposed to cut the child in two. But the true mother said, "Let him live. He should not be divided."

STERN. The true mother gave the child to the other woman. In Palestine instead of this there was war. Should you get an independent Palestinian state on the West Bank and in Gaza, what happens then to the remaining part, with Israel within the 1948 borders?

KADDOUMI. We will never recognize Israel, never the usurper, the colonialist, the imperialist.

STERN. Then what?

KADDOUMI. We will fight for our rights, for the return to our land.

STERN. By doing so you will bind the hands of your friends.

KADDOUMI. Why?

STERN. Your idea means the destruction of the State of Israel.

KADDOUMI. Yes. The enemy who occupied my fatherland, who murdered my parents, my brothers and sisters—I will destroy him. But we are not murderers. We don't want to throw Israelis into prison, as they do with us. We welcomed hundreds of thousands of them in our countries and sheltered them during and after the Second World War.

STERN. That is not quite so. There were enormous tensions and terrible armed conflicts.

KADDOUMI. We are ready to live with the Jews in a democratic state.

STERN. Which would be ruled by you because you would have the majority.

KADDOUMI. Of course.

STERN. There is a difference between political reality and dreams.

KADDOUMI. Dreams sometimes turn into reality.

STERN. You have condemned the United States as an aggressor and said that the Soviet Union is your most reliable friend. One of the arguments with which Menachem Begin tries to take away any potential support of you is the statement that a future Palestinian State would be a Soviet satellite.

KADDOUMI. We are a national movement. Whoever helps us is welcomed. Syrians are helping us, Iraqis, Libyans, Chinese—

STERN. With weapons?

KADDOUMI. The Chinese were the first. They provided training and weapons to us. The Soviets as well as the other socialist countries stand on our side with political and military assistance.

STERN. And what do they ask in return?

KADDOUMI. What could the Palestinians offer them?

STERN. In the future probably something nevertheless?

KADDOUMI. We are now speaking about the present. Who knows what our relations with the Soviet Union will be in the future?

STERN. Your Arab friends are a bit more cautious toward the Soviet Union.

KADDOUMI. This might apply to Saudi Arabia. But King Hussein of Jordan was in Moscow recently, where he and his hosts understood each other well.

STERN. But if it became serious, it would appear less probable that he would fight on the side of the Soviet Union.

KADDOUMI. If it really came to a comprehensive war, the Soviet Union would be our ally. Because we would rather be friends of the Communists than victims of Zionist and imperialist occupation power.

STERN. The Communists can also be an occupation power, we know.

KADDOUMI. They are not in the Arab world.●

MR. WILBUR COHEN ON SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● **Mr. HERTEL.** Mr. Speaker, the proposed changes in the social security benefits is an important issue that affects nearly every American. In a recent Detroit News article Mr. Wilbur Cohen, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and expert on the social security system, comments on this matter. I would like to share his views with my colleagues:

[From the Detroit News, July 27, 1981]

CAPITOL CONNECTIONS (By Richard A. Ryan)

WASHINGTON.—When Wilbur Cohen gets excited, his voice becomes high-pitched, almost squeaky. Talk to Cohen about Social Security and his voice starts to go up. Talk to him further about President Reagan's proposed Social Security cuts and the voice jumps several octaves.

Cohen, retired dean of the University of Michigan's School of Education, is spending a lot of time these days talking about President Reagan and Social Security.

He is chairman of SOS—Save our Security—a coalition of some 100 groups representing an estimated 35 million Americans. About six days a month he leaves the University of Michigan's Ann Arbor campus, where he teaches summer classes, to come to Washington to lead the opposition to the proposed Social Security cuts.

"This is a labor of love for me," he says. "I have spent 47 years working on these problems and now Ronald Reagan and David Stockman (who has ice water in his veins) are trying to tear it all down."

Cohen, 68, obviously is no newcomer to the issue. As part of his graduate study program at the University of Wisconsin in 1934 he worked with President Roosevelt's Cabinet committee that wrote the Social Security legislation. When Roosevelt signed the bill Aug. 14, 1935, Cohen was the first em-

ploye hired by the Social Security Administration, where he worked for 21 years.

And as assistant secretary, under-secretary and eventually secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now Health and Human Services) in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, Cohen had jurisdiction over all Social Security programs.

"People are really upset by the Reagan proposals," Cohen says, his voice picking up both volume and tone. "The anxiety level is way up there. It is the biggest mistake Reagan has made to date."

SOS is not a new organization. It was formed during the Carter administration to combat Social Security changes proposed by Mr. Carter. "But nothing ever happened," Cohen recalls. "We had a letterhead and that's about it."

But then President Reagan made his proposals and the group was revived. Several labor organizations made hefty contributions. "All of a sudden this thing came to life," Cohen says. "Instead of being chairman of an organization with a name and a letterhead, I found myself with an army behind me."

Cohen is an idealist. He would like to defeat all of President Reagan's proposed cuts. But he's a realist, too. "We are not going to win 100 percent," he concedes. But he thinks he can hold the cuts to 50 percent of what Mr. Reagan has asked.

"You have to understand my position," he says. "I'm against every cut. With me it's a matter of principle. But if you ask me if we're successful, I'd say this is the only area where Reagan will be beaten to that extent." (While he is over 65, Cohen does not receive Social Security benefits because his teaching salary is above the \$5,500 limit. At age 72, however, he will be able to receive full benefits no matter what his outside income.)

Cohen doesn't deny the Social Security trust fund is temporarily short of cash. But he thinks that problem can be worked out by borrowing money from the general fund. There is sufficient time to study ways out of the long-term problem caused by fewer workers paying for more retirees, he says.

Whatever the solution, Cohen admits it will cost money. "My theory is there is no free lunch," he says. "If we want it, I'm willing to stand up and tell people they have to pay for it. I'm not advocating something for nothing."

But the important thing, Cohen says, is for the government to maintain its commitments and pay recipients what they were promised. "To me it is a moral issue," he says.

"Seven presidents and 22 Congresses have made these promises to us for over 45 years. Now along come Stockman and Reagan and they say that doesn't mean a thing to us. Well, I think that is breaking faith.

"I've lived for 68 years in this country. I've paid taxes. I have three children. I have three grandchildren. I want to leave a country that keeps its promises, that keeps its faith with people."●

PRESIDENT REAGAN AND
MINORITY PROSPERITY

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's recent address before the 5,000 delegates to the NAACP convention in Denver elicited much attention and comment in the public press.

President Reagan's message to the black community is that his economic programs are designed to clear the way for continued and accelerated upward economic and social movement. Minority citizens in Houston, Tex., and all across this Nation have the talents and ambitions to succeed in the private sector of our national economy—many already have, and many more will once the opportunities of a robust and growing economy are open before them. Such opportunities are the goal of the administration's program.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD three articles supportive of the President's approach to the long-term prosperity for our Nation's minority citizens. One article is by the noted political commentator, William Rusher; the other two are by Tony Brown, a black journalist.

WILL BLACKS ACHIEVE PROSPERITY THROUGH
REAGAN'S PROPOSALS?

What do most American blacks want, for themselves and their children? Do they genuinely want to participate in the efforts and rewards of American life, or would they rather be spared the necessity for effort and settle instead for a condition of permanent mendicancy, tactfully defined as compensation for the discriminations they have suffered?

Personally, I have no doubt at all that most of our black citizens are eager for full participation, and willing to accept as enough whatever they can achieve on those terms. They know more than the most compassionate white can ever know about discrimination; but they also know that discrimination can be used as a crutch as well as a yoke. They have seen, moreover how the money poured by the federal government into programs to aid blacks can tempt a person to spurn honest effort and specialize in hustling the system.

SUPPORTED BY GOVERNMENT

Many blacks, therefore, are more than ready to accept President Reagan's invitation, extended in his address to the NAACP convention, to share in a revived national prosperity, rather than concentrate on lobbying for ever-larger handouts. "Many"—but not all, by a long shot. And therein lies the rub.

Partly because so many doors to advancement in the private economy were closed to them, and no doubt partly out of an idealistic desire to help the less fortunate members of their own race, many of the ablest blacks in the last three or four decades have concentrated in the fields of government or charitable work. Some went directly into politics; others entered the civil service, and gravitated toward the social welfare agen-

cies; still others went to work for private charitable institutions such as the NAACP, the Urban League, and the church-affiliated charities. Practically everything that every such organization does is financed, largely or exclusively, by government. (I know, for example, of one church-founded private hospital, specializing in the care of unwed mothers and their children, 90 percent of whose support is today provided by one or another level of government.)

These able blacks are now the bureaucratic backbone of the system of governmental aid that almost totally dominates the black community. There is power in such a role, for those who seek it; there is at the very least a sense of satisfaction for everybody else; and there is—no small point!—financial compensation for everyone involved, for politicians, bureaucrats and social workers have to eat, too.

Is it any wonder, then, that when President Reagan rose before the NAACP convention to present his plan for cutting back on federal welfare expenditures and encouraging black employment in private industry he was greeted with only "polite applause"? The wonder is that there was any applause at all. He was telling these earnest and able people, virtually all of whom had spent their entire adult lives wiring their fellow blacks into the welfare system, that he has an altogether different plan for America's black citizens: full participation in a prosperous private-sector economy.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN?

It is by no means irrelevant to ask what is to become of the whole superstructure of black welfare—a superstructure itself so largely black—if the emphasis in the black community shifts sharply and suddenly to employment in the private sector. Business, and particularly big business, will be well-advised to turn to this pool of talented people for help in adjusting new black workers to their jobs.

Will the Reagan plan work? To argue that it won't amounts, for all practical purposes, to a contention that black Americans as a group are simply unable to compete successfully in our society, and that our obligation, in the historical circumstances, is to carry them on our backs forever. Such a philosophy might provide a good living for the members of a welfare bureaucracy, and a benumbed and marginal existence for most other blacks; but it is not a viewpoint that commends itself to Ronald Reagan—or to most Americans, whether black or white.

CAN U.S. BLACKS SUPPORT THEMSELVES?

Although most blacks want to be self-sufficient, the media image and perception of the black community by most whites and many other blacks is to the contrary.

The recent NAACP convention in Denver is a case in point. The news that the leaders of the colored people's group tried to use the media to get across was that they were in the forefront of a struggle to save blacks and the poor from the wrath of a racist president. But the point that was actually made was quite different.

The news that surfaced was not that Ronald Reagan is not going to save blacks with more poverty programs, but that blacks are not willing to save themselves from poverty programs. The stereotype of lazy blacks interested only in their own selfish interests, angry and disinterested in the country's future was reinforced once again.

"If some sneering white man had said that blacks can only exist off the surplus of wealth produced by white people, his charge

could be safely dismissed as racist. But that, in essence, is what the NAACP implied by its adamant resistance to Reagan's message. It suggests that the self-image of American blacks is terribly feeble and uncertain," wrote Joseph Sobran in the New York Post.

Delicately, President Reagan told the 5,000 NAACP delegates that they were spending their \$140 billion non-productively outside of their communities, namely with white people.

"In most neighborhoods what really brings prosperity is when the income of that neighborhood is then multiplied by turning over several times within that community.

MUST CHARGE SPENDING

"I must tell you that in the black communities in America the turnover is less than once before the dollars, those \$140 billion, go out into the community at large. And that has to be changed."

But Benjamin Hooks, NAACP director, and Margaret Bush Wilson, NAACP chairman, were too busy insulting President Reagan to pay any attention to helping themselves.

"Executive director Hooks is a seasoned farceur at these performances," wrote R. Emmett Tyrrell Jr. in The Washington Post. If the future of black America was not hanging in the balance, I, too, might enjoy the farce and the joker's stage acting.

Somebody needs to tell blacks to stop begging and help themselves. And I'm glad that Ronald Reagan did so. The black leaders of racial integration are always proposing another room addition to the welfare estate and their grants from the federal government top the list.

Moreover, the NAACP spent \$3 million with whites in Denver and avoided the black neighborhood and businesses of Five Points. The "civil rights" group did the same thing to the black community in Liberty City in Miami last year.

"Much of the black leadership is not in the business of leading blacks, but of extracting what they can from whites, and their strategies and rhetoric reflect that orientation" Dr. Thomas Sowell, a black economist noted.

Just how bad is the damage caused by years of government dependency and charlatan leadership? In a television special we asked the Qube two-way opinion poll: "Can Blacks Support Themselves?"

EMPHASIZE RACISM

An overwhelming 86 percent of a television opinion poll conducted did not feel that blacks place enough emphasis on self help and too much on racism. And both guests, professional blacks, agreed that the black organizational ego and how some black leaders put personal achievement above the concerns of the organizations hurt black development. In light of these problems, can blacks help themselves?

Projected figures for 1984 show a black population of over 35 million people earning \$150 billion, with a gross national product that will support an economy of \$300 billion. And the figures just keep growing and growing.

The bigger the American Dream, the bigger the black reality. Blacks have done a lot of things in 400 years when it comes to dollars and cents, going backwards, however, hasn't been one of them.

Blacks make it and they spend it. They buy Cadillac cars, more wine, more caps and hats, more cologne and mouthwash than whites do for comparable size. They're only 11 percent of the population, but 20 percent

of the heavy users in the rice market, 16 percent of the total market in orange juice, 20 percent of the total market in Scotch whiskey. Blacks account for 32 percent of all sales in malt liquor. They account for 40 percent of record purchases, of a \$3.5 billion market and they're here to stay. Fifty-six percent own their own homes.

As President Reagan pointed out, they make it, but they spend it—not with blacks—but with the wrong people. That's why Hooks and Wilson were in Denver crying racism.

NAACP STABBING OF REAGAN: BLACKS LOST MOST

If a curve is the longest distance between two points, that's what the National NAACP leaders threw President Ronald Reagan at their 72nd annual meeting in Denver recently.

The philosophical difference in social spending between President Reagan and the NAACP heads was generally understood, as was the thrust of his speech, prior to the president's appearance. NAACP Chairman Margaret Bush Wilson and Executive Director Benjamin Hooks had met amicably with the president at the White House the week before.

But on the day of the president's appearance, Hooks gave the first hint of a surprising hardball attitude when he predicted that Reagan would not get a standing ovation. Mrs. Wilson, in the ultimate condemnation, said that Reagan was reviving "war, pestilence, famine and death" with his budget cuts. Then Mrs. Wilson primed the crowd of 5,000 with more uncivil behavior and something more than a wrist slap when she introduced Reagan with a disclaimer: "The NAACP does not necessarily subscribe to the views which are about to be expressed."

Although the president grinned and waved to the crowd, his face reddened. Nancy Reagan stared straight ahead in unmistakable displeasure as the crowd guffawed. Media's projection of this ordeal of a rejected president and an insulted First Lady made, even before Reagan spoke, a loser of the cause of the minority poor. And the extent to which America perceives the leaders of the NAACP as representing all black people is the extent to which the cause of black people has been harmed.

In a furious view, a young black woman questioned why they kept zinging the president: "Why did they invite him if they were going to treat him like that?" Without this raucous overkill, however, it is a fact that the majority of black America either disapproves of or is skeptical of Reagan's budget cuts and the lack of specific proposals to help blacks who will lose benefits because of cutbacks.

His administration's attitude towards affirmative action, his developing policy toward apartheid in South Africa and his reluctance to support an extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act are liabilities with the nation's blacks.

It's my guess that the violently rude staging of the president's speech was not precipitated so much out of a genuine and absolute concern for those policy areas, but out of the strong emotional bond that the NAACP leaders have with the philosophy of integration or social-racial engineering. Reagan will only succeed with this group if he uses the federal treasury to promote racial assimilation.

Reagan's stunned advisers had overlooked these facts and assumed that a rational

attack on racism, an explanation of the heavy price that inflation extracts from the poor, a promise of 3 million new jobs by 1986 and aid to black businesses would communicate an acceptable policy toward black America. But two miscalculations were inherent in the White House thinking.

The NAACP does not provide, as anticipated, a representative cross-section, but an ideologically segmented group, and the leadership is far to the left of the fundamentalism of the nation's 30 million blacks. The victim of the failed strategy was the pragmatic dialogue with black America envisioned by Reagan's people.

However, on two occasions in his speech—and in a general philosophical sense—the president was more in step with most of the 5,000 NAACP delegates, their 400,000 members and the 29,600,000 black Americans who do not belong, such as myself, than were the national leaders of the host group. Reagan got his soundest applause when he rejected the inherent superiority of white children and the premise of mandatory busing, and extolled the necessity of black colleges.

The NAACP has been the strongest advocate of forced busing—the issue that has estranged it from the majority of blacks it professes to speak for. It had been cool to the continued existence of black colleges.

The president recognized the value of the source of over 50 percent of all black college graduates each year, 80 percent of black professionals and the undergraduate source of over 75 percent of blacks who receive their Ph.D.'s from white universities. He acknowledges the fact that blacks attend black colleges because of a rich heritage and free choice.

By contrast, the NAACP's director of Research, Policy and Plans, Michael Meyers, a Negro, wrote earlier: "No matter what else is taught or how it is taught, the fact that a school is segregated teaches there is a qualitative difference between students in 'black' and 'white' colleges."

Therefore, the Denver clash between the NAACP national leaders and Ronald Reagan was not racial, but philosophical. The president urged blacks, as Booker T. Washington did at the turn of the century, to recognize themselves as a nation within a nation, to develop their own economy and to "turn over" the \$140 billion they spend with other blacks.

"In most neighborhoods, what really brings prosperity is when the income of that neighborhood is then multiplied by turning over several times within that community * * * in the black communities in America the turnover is less than once before the dollars, those \$140 billion, go out into the community at large. And that has to be changed," the president said.

This advice and common sense notwithstanding, the so-called civil rights leaders will march thousands of blacks into conventions in major hotels this summer to unload millions of dollars into the coffers of the white establishment "enemy" while blaming Reagan for the economic ills of black people.

For all of their protestations of injured innocence and fair-sounding rhetoric about programs to help poor blacks, the NAACP's leadership spent more than \$3 million with Denver's white business community to protest white racism and black poverty. Residents of the Five Points area of Denver, a black neighborhood, complained that the NAACP delegates were instructed to avoid that part of the city. The small black busi-

nesses and restaurants found their welcome signs to be of little use in attracting any of the money from the NAACP's "affluent poor."

If any of the noble rhetoric of the civil rights groups is going to have meaning, they will have to recognize that the black underclass is hurt more by class segregation from middle-class blacks than from separation from whites by race. The government is obligated to share the tax resources with this impoverished community and the middle class is needed to pry them loose.

But even if the federal government wanted to economically emancipate black ghettos, it lacks the expertise to do so. Help for the new black underclass—including 32 percent of unemployed black teens who have succumbed to drug addiction—will come from one source only; the black middle class. And the so-called civil rights leaders fail to grasp that fact or understand their true role.

The \$140 billion the president referred to is equal to the Gross National Product (GNP) of Canada or Australia and equal to the GNP of the ninth-largest nation in the Free World. Delicately, he told them that blacks were spending their money in a 180 degree angle—in a straight line directly away from themselves—instead of in a 360 degree angle with one another as do other ethnic and religious groups.

Ironically, Reagan's philosophy of a sound economic power base for black America is more compatible with past black leaders such as Marcus Garvey, Booker T. Washington, Elijah Muhammad and Frederick Douglass than are the modern-day disciples of the black establishment.

In announcing a withdrawal of the federal "draft horse," Reagan was suggesting to blacks a return to the fundamental nationalism of their past and asked the NAACP to come to this "realization." Today's black leaders of integration have surrendered the very virtues of thrift, diligence, group cohesion and optimism that are the basic linchpins of black survival.

As a result, the racial misery-index, the gap between black and white achievement, has remained constant and in some cases widened. However, the "new kind of bondage" Reagan warned of isn't too much government help, as he sees it, but a bankrupt policy of too much dependence on the wrong source. ●

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO IMPROVE THE REGULATION OF OCEAN TRANSPORTATION BY THE UNITED STATES

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join today in the introduction of legislation which will amend the 1916 Shipping Act, the law which governs the way our international ocean shipping is regulated.

For too long now we have seen U.S. liner operators become less and less effective in the way they can compete with foreign-flag operators, many of whom are completely unburdened by regulation of antitrust concepts. Over

the past several Congresses, the finger of blame has been pointed at the 1916 Shipping Act, particularly at the difficulties current interpretation of this act imposes on those who must comply with its provisions. The bill which is introduced today is directed at overcoming those difficulties.

In the 96th Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries considered legislation which would have completely rewritten the basic regulatory ocean shipping laws of the United States. This measure, which was known as title II of the omnibus maritime bill of 1980, while substantially supported by many in and out of Government, did not receive the endorsement of the Carter administration. The failure to enact this needed regulatory reform measure was, in large part, due to the prior administration's neglect.

I had hoped that the Reagan administration could have, by this time, given Congress some indication of the direction to be taken in reforming our archaic maritime laws. Since assuming the chairmanship of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have indicated a willingness to cooperate with the administration to formulate its maritime policy and maritime legislative program. Maritime policy has never been, nor should it ever become, a partisan issue; by the same token, maritime policy and its accompanying legislative program cannot be the function of one branch of government if it is to come to fruition.

The bill we introduce today is not an effort to have Congress "do it alone." We are, however, aware that in the regulatory area other specific legislative proposals are being advanced. I personally feel that until the administration is able to speak to this issue, it would be best to have more than one proposal available for study and consideration. Therefore, we present an alternative solution to what everyone recognizes to be a most pressing problem—an alternative which is more modest than efforts of the recent past, but one which combines all the essential remedial elements.

I comment to my colleagues in an out of the Congress this bill and invite all to use this legislation as a tool, as an outline, as a basis for action which must be taken, and taken soon, if we are to responsibly address the 1980's maritime needs of this country.●

MONOPOLY BY FTC FIAT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the war which the Federal Trade Commission has been waging for 9

years against cereal manufacturers can only be viewed as a travesty of justice. For almost a decade now, the FTC has attempted to prove that Kellogg, General Mills, General Foods, and Quaker Oats are engaging in a so-called shared monopoly. Despite all its attempts, the FTC has not unearthed any substantiating evidence to support this claim. Although the FTC charges that the cereal companies are engaging in tacit price collusions, fluctuations in their pricing policies, and the prices of their products differ noticeably.

More important than the lack of incriminating evidence, however, is the nature of the charge itself. The idea of a shared monopoly is not based on any antitrust standard established by Congress, but is merely concocted by a handful of economists at the FTC. According to this theory, a few firms may violate the antitrust laws simply by possessing substantial market shares—no proof of illegal collusive practices is necessary. Even the chief economist at the FTC concedes that one-third of the U.S. economy could be declared an antitrust violation under this theory. The fallacy of this theory is that the market structure called a shared monopoly is actually a highly competitive market in which firms have taken advantage of economies of scale, utilized managerial expertise built on years of experience, and enjoyed widespread consumer acceptance through the production of quality goods.

Furthermore, the remedies which the FTC seeks to correct this supposed wrongdoing are drastic; they include massive industry restructuring through divestment, royalty-free licensing of trademarks, and expropriation of technical know-how without compensation. Obviously, these measures would result in widespread economic disruption by increasing consumer costs while simultaneously eliminating jobs in the cereal industry.

The editorial which appeared in the June 4 edition of the Detroit News describes the fallacies of the FTC argument in further detail. For the benefit of my colleagues I submit it in its original, unedited form.

[From the Detroit News, June 4, 1981]

TWO ANTI-TRUST AGENCIES?

Michigan businesses have not fared well at the hands of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

The FTC's five-year anti-trust investigation of the auto industry was recently canceled, but not before it cost the auto makers hundreds of thousands of dollars. At one point in the auto case, a senior FTC lawyer conceded that the agency was engaged in a "fishing expedition," but maintained it was nevertheless a "good faith" fishing expedition.

But the FTC reserved what some scholars believe is its most innovative approach to anti-trust enforcement for Battle Creek's Kellogg Co. and its competitors in the ready-to-eat breakfast cereal market.

The Commission's case began in 1972 on the theory that Kellogg, General Mills, General Foods, and Quaker Oats were engaged in unfair competition by operating a "shared monopoly." This was a novel charge, to say the least, as there is no statutory discussion or definition of a "shared monopoly."

The companies are not accused of having actively agreed to fix prices, but only of having failed to compete aggressively enough for the FTC, thereby engaging in a form of *de facto* price collusion. But even this allegation was contradicted by testimony that price increases among the competitors were uneven.

Subsequently, the company with the smallest portion of the market, Quaker Oats, was successful in having charges against it dropped, even though it had increased its market share (interesting in light of the FTC's theory of tacit agreement among the alleged co-monopolists of the breakfast table).

Nine years later, the case is still pending. Much of the testimony was heard by an administrative law judge who, because of unique circumstances, was under a personal contract to the FTC. In general, administrative law judges are created and have their pay and tenure determined by the federal Office of Personnel Management rather than the federal regulatory agencies whose cases they hear. But Tom Bethell, in a recent article for Policy Review, a journal of opinion published by the Heritage Foundation, notes that the regulatory agencies may still select their administrative judges. At one time recently, according to Mr. Bethell, almost all of the judges hearing FTC cases were former FTC attorneys.

This is an old problem with administrative hearings, and a troubling one. As the late Federal Judge Fred Kaess observed while hearing arguments in which the auto companies sought to move their case from the FTC to Federal Court: "How can you have a prosecutor, a judge, and a jury all in the same body?"

Kellogg estimates its expenses for the FTC case at \$1 million per year. The cost to the consumers of the defendants' alleged economic crime: one-tenth of a cent per breakfast.

Both the cereal and auto cases seem to be the product of an anti-trust agency in desperate search of work. William Baxter, the Stanford University law professor who is now head of the Justice Department's anti-trust division, was asked at his confirmation hearing if the nation needs two anti-trust units. "With only a little effort," he replied, "I can imagine life going on without the anti-trust enforcement efforts" of the FTC.

Based on the commission's record with Michigan firms, so can we.●

PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN NUCLEAR FUEL REPROCESSING

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to insert the following paper prepared for an April 23 meeting between Secretary Edwards and industry representatives on reviewing the prospects of future private invest-

ment in nuclear fuel reprocessing during my remarks on July 24 on page H4869. I do so now for the RECORD:

To assist the Department in this review, the owners of the Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant (BNFP) in South Carolina¹ have prepared this paper to summarize their views on the five topics the Secretary has indicated that he would like to discuss during the course of the meeting:

- (1) Industry views on the need and timing for the establishment of commercial nuclear fuel reprocessing capability in the United States;
- (2) The extent of existing private investment in nuclear fuel reprocessing;
- (3) Prospects for future investment in the back-end of the fuel cycle, particularly nuclear fuel reprocessing;
- (4) Review of policy and regulatory issues that are obstacles to private industry;
- (5) Other resources which would encourage private investment in nuclear fuel reprocessing operations.

INDUSTRY VIEWS ON THE NEED AND TIMING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMERCIAL NUCLEAR FUEL REPROCESSING CAPABILITY IN THE UNITED STATES

The need for nuclear fuel reprocessing is urgent if the United States is to deal with the escalating build-up of spent nuclear fuel and to have a viable breeder reactor program.

Implementation of a breeder reactor program in the United States for production of electric energy will require large quantities of plutonium. Present DOE planning has the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR) coming on line about 1990 and construction of a larger breeder reactor is being considered for operation in the 1990s. Reprocessing of LWR spent fuel at Barnwell beginning in 1987 is essential to satisfy plutonium feed requirements for this program.

In the long term, reprocessing of breeder reactor spent fuels will be essential to recover the valuable plutonium that is generated. Together, reprocessing and breeders can extend our probable uranium reserves indefinitely, compared to tens of years without them.

Finally, reprocessing provides many significant benefits to the management of radioactive wastes. Reprocessing places the high-level wastes in a chemically stable form (such as glass), with a seven-fold volume reduction compared to storing spent fuel. Also, because of the removal of most of the plutonium, the high-level wastes from reprocessing would be far safer to store than spent fuel rods.

According to recent DOE estimates, Away-From-Reactor (AFR) storage capacity for spent nuclear fuel will initially be required by 1986, and 6480 tons of such capacity are estimated to be needed by 1995. Because essential decisions have not been made, and because of lead times involved, the goal of having AFR storage on line by 1986 is already jeopardized. There is general agreement that it would take at least nine years to design, construct, and license a new AFR facility. With respect to existing facilities, like Barnwell and Morris, the first decision concerning government acquisition must be made this year if they are to be on line for regional interim storage in the 1986-1990 period.

¹ Allied Chemical Nuclear Products, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Allied Chemical Corp. and General Atomic Co., a partnership of Gulf Oil Corp. and Scallop Nuclear, Inc. (a company of the Royal Dutch/Shell group).

THE EXTENT OF EXISTING PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN NUCLEAR FUEL REPROCESSING

In the belief that nuclear fuel reprocessing offered a good business opportunity, Allied Chemical Corporation applied for a permit on November 7, 1968, to build a reprocessing facility in Barnwell, South Carolina. The Atomic Energy Commission, after public hearings, issued a construction permit for the separations facility on December 18, 1970, and work got underway the following month.

Late in 1969, Gulf Oil Corporation, through its subsidiary Gulf Energy and Environmental Systems, Inc., approached Allied and expressed an interest in entering the spent fuel reprocessing business. Subsequent negotiations led, in February, 1970, to the formation of Allied-Gulf Nuclear Services (AGNS), a 50-50 partnership. In 1974, with the formation of General Atomic Company as a partnership of Gulf Oil Corporation and Scallop Nuclear, Inc. (a Company of the Royal Dutch/Shell Group), the AGNS partnership name was changed to Allied-General Nuclear Services.

The initial cost estimate for the Barnwell plant was about \$90 million with commercial operation scheduled for 1974. Construction of the fuel receiving and storage, separations, and UF, facilities was completed in 1975. Continued regulatory changes and fundamental governmental uncertainties related to plutonium recycle, safety, safeguards, waste packaging, waste form, and ultimate waste disposal made it impossible for AGNS to continue with the design of the plutonium processing facility and waste solidification facility. By 1975 design of the waste and plutonium facilities was halted pending resolution of regulatory and policy issues.

In 1975, a proposal was submitted by AGNS to the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) to have these additional facilities constructed by the Government as first of a kind demonstration facilities.

With President Carter's indefinite deferral of commercial reprocessing in 1977, any chance of proceeding on a commercial basis was precluded. Since this deferral, Congress has supported a modest R. & D. effort at Barnwell with a view to maintaining the option of using the facility productively in the future.

What exists at Barnwell today is the largest modern spent fuel reprocessing facility in the world. The spent fuel pool is completed and can be available for storage with the installation of new racks, a security system, and other minor modifications. It is often overlooked that the plant is presently capable of performing the same reprocessing functions as are currently in operation at all the foreign and U.S. Government reprocessing plants, including the neighboring Savannah River Plant, which has operated successfully and safely for over 25 years.

On April 7, 1981, Allied Chairman Edward L. Hennessy, Jr., wrote to Secretary Edwards and advised the Secretary that: "As of December, 1978, we and our partners had invested over \$362 million in this project. We have had no return on that very large investment because the Government has prevented us from operating the plant."

PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE INVESTMENT IN THE BACKEND OF THE FUEL CYCLE, PARTICULARLY NUCLEAR FUEL REPROCESSING

Prospects for further private investment in nuclear fuel reprocessing are so bleak as to be non-existent. The uncertainties are simply too great. The first major uncertain-

ty for the future of commercial reprocessing and the utilization of plutonium was introduced by the 1974 decision of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to require a Generic Environmental Statement on Mixed Oxide fuel (GESMO) before allowing the widespread use of mixed oxide plutonium fuel. While this decision did not necessarily foreclose licensing of commercial reprocessing plants, it turned out (after court review) that the practical effect has been to make licensing contingent on completing GESMO.

On October 28, 1976, a new deterrent to commercial reprocessing occurred when President Ford issued a Nuclear Policy Statement. In this statement President Ford concluded that:

"I have decided that the United States should no longer regard reprocessing of used nuclear fuel to produce plutonium as a necessary and inevitable step in the nuclear fuel cycle, and that we should pursue reprocessing and recycling in the future only if they are found to be consistent with our international objectives."

Up until this point, commercial reprocessing had been regarded as an expected step in the nuclear fuel cycle. The Ford statement questioned this presumption, but did not constitute a definitive judgment against reprocessing, and the GESMO proceeding continued.

On April 7, 1977, President Carter's policy statement on nuclear power terminated future prospects for commercial reprocessing. In his policy, President Carter stated that: "... We will defer indefinitely the commercial reprocessing and recycling of the plutonium produced in U.S. nuclear power programs."

Furthermore, he stated: "From my own experience, we have concluded that a viable and adequate economic nuclear program can be maintained without such reprocessing and recycling of plutonium. The plant at Barnwell, South Carolina, for instance, will receive neither Federal encouragement nor funding from us for its completion as a reprocessing facility."

In implementing the Carter administration's policy of indefinite deferral of commercial reprocessing, the NRC, on December 23, 1977, issued an order which terminated its GESMO proceedings as well as the specific licensing proceedings on the Barnwell reprocessing plant. In connection with this order, the NRC Commissioners noted that future licensing of the BNFP would require reversal of the Carter Administration policy following completion of the two-year International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCE) and subsequent licensing hearings estimated to require an additional two years. The INFCE concluded in March 1980 and the consensus of the nations involved was that reprocessing development is essential for waste management and to support breeder reactor programs.

In addition to these major uncertainties raised by governmental policy decision, the economic viability of reprocessing plants for the private sector has been jeopardized by delays in bringing light water reactors on line and uncertainties about when commercial breeder reactors will be introduced.

While the Reagan administration supports reprocessing, the political and economic uncertainties demand government ownership of reprocessing facilities. Other nations reached this conclusion long ago.

REVIEW OF POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES
THAT ARE OBSTACLES TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The backend of the nuclear fuel cycle has become so entwined with state, national and international jurisdictions and environmental, energy, and security policies that no realistic combination of circumstances could make private reprocessing practicable.

Above all, Federal interests and policies with respect to reprocessing are dominant and clearly override any private investment potential.

The government is, first and foremost, the regulator and licensor with the power to change the rules every Congress and every administration. President Carter changed the rules in 1977 and put the private sector out of the reprocessing business. The same thing can happen again.

Even before the Carter decision to halt reprocessing, it was apparent that the inability of the government to develop a regulatory framework for solidifying and shipping plutonium and wastes was a major impediment to the BNFP's operation. The same impediments still exist today. In the absence of criteria which must be developed by the government, it would be impossible for any private company to be licensed for plutonium or waste solidification. Resolving the GESMO issues alone would take at least several years if the GESMO proceedings were to be reactivated. And the absence of tested licensing criteria could add more years during the normal six-year design and construction time for the additional facilities. The simple fact is that no private investor can possibly predict whether, or when and under what conditions, licensing of a reprocessing facility would be allowed to proceed. Certainly the process would span several Congresses and administrations and probably several Nuclear Regulatory Commissions with all the opportunities for policy and regulatory changes inherent in such exposure.

The incentive for private investment in reprocessing is even further reduced by the fact that the government will be the only customer for the plutonium recovered through reprocessing in the foreseeable future. Originally, it was planned that plutonium from Barnwell would be recycled in light water reactors. With the uncertainty created by the GESMO, this option is not available at the present time. A higher priority is to provide plutonium fuel for breeder reactors.

The decision to fund Clinch River makes reprocessing at Barnwell essential, unless the Administration intends to import plutonium. Reprocessing of LWR spent fuel at Barnwell is essential to satisfy plutonium feed requirements for this program. There is no other source for the feed and the feed should be ready in advance. The entire output of the Barnwell Plant for the first several years would be required to fuel the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF), the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR), and a followon larger demonstration breeder reactor now being planned. Since these are all to be government programs, the government is the only near-term customer for the plutonium to be recovered at the Barnwell Plant.

In addition, the government's dominant role in national security and non-proliferation concerns which increasingly affect reprocessing plants creates additional profound doubt about a private role in reprocessing. There is a growing consensus that reprocessing plants require extraordinary safeguards against proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 has already underscored the

Federal government's virtually total control over reprocessing and this trend will probably continue. While the need for governmental control is understandable, this is one more circumstance which makes private investment commercially impracticable. It is not surprising that reprocessing plants abroad are all owned by government authorities.

OTHER RESOURCES WHICH WOULD ENCOURAGE
PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN NUCLEAR FUEL RE-
PROCESSING OPERATIONS

The owners of the BNFP cannot envision any form of government support which would remedy the effects of existing prohibitions against private reprocessing.

There is no way that the government can make a private business out of what is a public business.

Furthermore, there is no way that the government can guarantee against new policy changes.

There is no way that any administration can guarantee a continuing regulatory environment which will bring a reprocessing facility into operation within a reasonable period. Moreover, the widespread skepticism and lack of confidence in the regulatory process have introduced additional uncertainties of major proportions.

This is not a situation where devices for government support like loan guarantees or price supports will be effective. The necessity for Federal regulation and control is so great that the traditional forms of government support for private ventures would not be sufficient to attract private capital to reprocessing.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that President Carter's 1977 decision to defer commercial reprocessing and the administrative and judicial implementation of that decision effectively terminated the prospects for private investment in reprocessing. Consequently, the owners of the BNFP cannot in fairness to their shareholders provide any additional funding to maintain the current R&D program, to invest in additional facilities at the site or to attempt to operate the BNFP on a commercial basis. Furthermore, there is no foreseeable combination of regulatory reform and Federal policy initiatives which would be sufficient to remedy the commercially impracticable aspects of the presently existing situation.

This paper has described the many risks and uncertainties facing any private investor in the back end of the nuclear fuel cycle. Although Federal ownership of the BNFP is essential under these circumstances, it does not follow that the costs of developing and operating the BNFP must be borne solely by the Federal government. To the extent that the government might decide to use the BNFP for services to utilities, like reprocessing and spent fuel storage, appropriate fees would be charged to utilities to recover the cost of these services.

There are many advantages to the government once the BNFP is acquired. For example, the facility can be used as an international fuel cycle center, as a safeguards research, development and training center, as a regional site for interim spent fuel storage or possibly even as an integral part of the defense materials production program. These uses can only occur under government ownership.

Despite the best efforts of the owners the Barnwell facility has been in a holding pattern for six years. The facility has received modest government support for research and development activities, but such support is

presently to expire on September 30, 1981. Unless a decision on government acquisition is made very soon, the most likely result is that the Barnwell facility will have to be shut down: an irretrievable step which would represent the permanent loss of a unique and valuable facility. ●

INEFFECTIVE WORKER
IDENTIFICATION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Attorney General William French Smith succinctly described the severity of one of our Nation's gravest problems when he announced the administration's new immigration policy. "We have lost control of our borders," he said. "We have pursued unrealistic policies. We have failed to enforce our laws effectively."

Ironically though, the fatal flaw of past immigration policies—the absence of an effective worker identification system for distinguishing illegal aliens from employees who are working here legally—is left unchanged by the administration's plan. Without such a system, no sanctions against employers who hire those illegal aliens can possibly work; and without effective employer sanctions, the job magnet that pulled more than a million illegal aliens to our shores last year will continue to overpower our best efforts to make those borders real.

To be sure, the administration's plan calls for penalties against employers of illegal aliens; but in order to protect themselves from sanctions, employers would merely be required to check for any two of the following forms of identification before satisfying themselves of the legal status of prospective workers: a driver's license, a social security card, a birth certificate or a draft card.

Mr. Speaker, a package containing each of these forms of identification, along with several years of rent receipts, can be bought in any town on either side of the Mexican border for something in the neighborhood of \$50.

The administration plans to build a house of forgeable identity cards that is certain to collapse of its own weight. Simply put, employer sanctions are a vital element of an effective program to check the flow of illegal immigration; and employer sanctions are a paper tiger unless we establish a forgery-resistant identification system to make them meaningful.

Several options are possible.

We could set up a system of computer-stored worker identification numbers. Every worker in America would be assigned a number. Employers could then phone a central computer terminal to verify the authenticity of a worker's number.

Alternatively, each worker could be issued a forgery-resistant identification card bearing a magnetic code similar to those that appear on credit cards. Employers could then verify the authenticity of such cards just as merchants now do in the course of credit card sales transactions.

It has been estimated that such a card system would cost about \$300 million—\$3 per card for each of our country's 100 million workers. That is a significant investment; but in light of the billions of dollars that illegal immigration costs our country, and in light of the untold social, economic, and political strains that the growing flood of illegal immigration imposes on our society, this would be a very wise investment indeed.

There are those who have reservations concerning the civil liberties implications of such a system; but why would a forgery-resistant card pose any greater threat to civil liberties than the easily counterfeited social security card we already require our workers to hold? Other Western democracies such as France and West Germany, already have such systems in place with no adverse effects on the rights and liberties of the card holders.

Moreover, it would not be necessary to establish an identification system for all of our citizens and legal aliens. We need only identify workers—not the elderly, not the infirm, not the very young, not women who do not work outside the home—just workers.

Only with such a reliable worker identification program in place can we hope to control the influx of millions of illegal aliens whom we have been unable to assimilate or absorb into the mainstream of American life. The alternative is a continued strain of huge proportions on our job market, on social services, and on the scarce resources which we have a moral obligation to employ for the benefit of our own poor and disadvantaged citizens.

This Nation is indeed a nation of immigrants. Over the centuries, new waves of immigrants have sustained and enriched our national life. A reasonable, measured, and carefully controlled program of legal immigration continues to be in the best interests of our country and in the best traditions of our society; but the current flood of illegal immigration is simply intolerable.

The President's new immigration policy contains elements which are a major improvement over existing policy. Chief among these is its emphasis on hardening our borders and making them real. Unfortunately, that border-hardening effort is doomed to failure unless we accompany it with an employer sanction program tough enough and effective enough to shut off the job magnet and thus to lessen the attractiveness of illegal immigra-

tion into the United States. As long as those jobs continue to lure the developing countries' poor, only the Berlin Wall would suffice as a barrier.

I applaud the administration's determination to regain control of our borders; but until we face up to what it will take to accomplish that mission, appealing rhetoric will continue to bear a hollow ring.●

CONGRESS SHOULD SUPPORT THE CONTINENTAL ESOP

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. Au COIN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate version of the tax bill contained a number of provisions designed to encourage the formation of employee stock ownership plans (ESOP's). Among them was an amendment specifically relating to the ESOP of Continental Airlines. Unfortunately, in the give and take of the conference, the amendment was lost. However, Congress may have another opportunity to consider this matter and I rise today to urge that it do so favorably and as soon as possible after the August district work period.

Continental has been seeking to implement an ESOP since March as a way of improving productivity, addressing serious problems of capital formation and meeting the challenge of airline deregulation. The plan has survived challenges before the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, as well as U.S. District Court in Los Angeles, the U.S. Court of Appeals and the Superior Court for the State of California. Most recently, however, the California corporations commissioner blocked implementation of this plan in spite of overwhelming support for it by the company's directors and 11,000 employees. The Senate amendment seeks to overcome this obstacle by making clear that the statute regulating such plans, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, supersedes State laws.

My interest in this effort is shared by the 42 Members of the House who signed a letter from the House Task Force on Industrial Innovation and Productivity to the CAB in April endorsing the plan. I ask unanimous consent to insert that letter in the RECORD at this point.

HOUSE TASK FORCE ON INDUSTRIAL
INNOVATION AND PRODUCTIVITY,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1981.

HON. MARVIN S. COHEN,
HON. GLORIA SCHAFFER,
HON. GEORGE A. DALLEY,

HON. ELIZABETH BAILEY,
HON. JAMES SMITH,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD: The employees of Continental Airlines have just voted by an overwhelming margin—8,932 to 359—to establish an Employee Stock Ownership Plan which would buy a controlling interest in the airline. We believe that the plan of Continental's employees is a significant milestone in the renewal of American business through increased productivity and capital formation.

Earlier this year, Texas International Airlines sought permission from the Civil Aeronautics Board to purchase 48.5% of the common stock of Continental Airlines contingent on placing the stock in a voting trust. The CAB granted permission on the terms requested, and Texas International purchased the stock. Now Texas International has filed a petition to modify the CAB's order, entered at its own request, for no apparent reason other than to kill the Continental Employee Stock Ownership Plan.

We are writing as members of the House Task Force on Industrial Innovation and Productivity to urge that the Board deny Texas International's petition and allow the employees to buy control of Continental.

During the 1970's Americans reduced the amount of savings which they devoted to business capital formation. The Congressional Budget Office has pointed this out as a major factor in declining productivity.

The Continental Employee Stock Ownership Plan would counter this trend with a practical demonstration of supply-side economics: Continental's workers propose to allocate \$185 million—15 percent of their pay over the next four or five years—to doubling the airline's capital stock. The employees' investment would leave the company in an excellent position to buy more efficient, innovative equipment at the appropriate time. (To date, Texas International has not proposed to add anything to Continental's capital stock. Rather, it proposes adding \$93 million in debt to finance the cost of its takeover.)

Efficient workers are as important to productivity as capital formation. The American airline industry can take one of two courses in order to make more efficient use of labor. Texas International has effectively pursued one course—spinning off the assets of its parent corporation to start New York Air, a new carrier with less restrictive work rules and lower wages.

If the airline industry as a whole pursues this course, the nation will have to bear substantial costs—in the short run, unemployment compensation and other payments (potentially billions of dollars under Section 43 of the Airline Deregulation Act) to the employees of existing carriers; in the long run, a costly series of futile strikes by unions alarmed at their shrinking share of the industry base (see example of the United Mine Workers).

Employee ownership of Continental would offer the airline industry a second course toward a more efficient work force, at less cost to the nation than Texas International's course. The President's Commission for a National Agenda for the 1980's has singled out Employee Stock Ownership Plans as an important incentive to worker cooperation with management and greater productivity.

Everyone involved in the debate on airline deregulation—proponents and opponents

alike—agreed that deregulation must be effected by a period of transition. Everyone agreed that the carriers and their employees, nurtured in a hothouse of government regulation for forty years, could not be expected to adjust overnight. For example, the Senate Commerce Committee reported that:

A crucial element of the present bill is the gradual phasing in of its key provisions. The Committee accepted without controversy the principle that a transition period should be provided to airline companies in order to allow them time for adjustment before the full force of the new regulatory system is felt. . . . The Committee believes that Congress, having acted to prevent the normal free market evolution of the industry, now has a duty to the industry and its employees which would not exist if such action had not been taken. In order for Congress responsibly to change its policy now and require the industry to move forward to much more competitive market oriented environment, Congress should attempt to minimize the dislocations caused by the change. The change in policy and the temporary dislocations it may cause would not be necessary if Congress had not left in place so long a regulatory framework designed for the conditions that existed in the 1930's. (Amending the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, Senate Report 96-631, 95th Congress, 2nd Session, February 6, 1978.)

The employees of Continental have developed a plan pursuant to which they are willing to sacrifice 15% of their earnings and will commit to working harder and smarter to increase their productivity to insure their airline's successful transition. Fairness demands that they be given the chance to try.

We ask that the Civil Aeronautics Board give Continental's employees a chance to succeed by refusing to dissolve a standard voting trust which it has required in other merger cases—denying special treatment to Texas International.

Sincerely,

Pat Schroeder, Robert Dornan, Norm Dicks, Thomas J. Downey, Robert Lagomarsino, Don Bailey, Gerald Solomon, Morris Udall, Berkley Bedell, Tom Lantos, John Conyers, Jr., Stanley N. Lundine, Anthony Toby Moffett, Ron Wyden, Les AuCoin, George Brown, Joel Pritchard, Harold Hollenbeck, Cecil Heftel, Eugene Atkinson, Don Clausen, Clair Burgener, Dan Glickman, Ray Kogovsek, Ed Jenkins, Tom Harkin, Bob Edgar, Richard A. Gephardt, John Seiberling, Edward J. Markey, Richard Ottinger, Michael Lowry, Barry Goldwater, Jr., Wes Watkins, Trent Lott, William Brodhead, Martin O. Sabo, Bob Stump, James J. Howard, Al Swift, Don Edwards, Robert A. Young.

As you see, the signers of this letter believe the Continental plan is a significant milestone in the renewal of American business, an opportunity for dedicated people to show the country that by themselves they can solve their company's problems of productivity and capital formation.

The Senate amendment would have allowed this effort to move forward by making clear that the Continental ESOP has satisfied all relevant requirements of Federal law and could not be killed by the imposition of an

endless series of possibly conflicting State regulations. It would reaffirm Congress traditionally strong support for the ESOP concept. I regret that the amendment was not agreed to; but I remain hopeful that other efforts by the employees of Continental will be successful and stand ready to support them.●

A NATIONAL POLICY ON FOREIGN STUDENTS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as the administration proposes a new immigration policy, it is vital that we include a policy concerning foreign students. They are a part of our problem and, recently, Journalist Georgie Anne Geyer wrote an incisive article on this issue. I commend it to my colleagues:

NEEDED: NATIONAL POLICY ON FOREIGN STUDENTS

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

WASHINGTON.—The world's tired and hungry and those "yearning to be free" still are struggling to the United States. Among them is a new group whose presence is creating myriad new problems for America.

It consists of the 300,000 foreign students now in the United States, a number that soon could soar to half a million. In Southern California community colleges, 15 to 30 percent of the students now are foreigners.

Thirty-five percent of the total are from OPEC countries and 24 percent are from Iran and Taiwan, two countries we do not even have official relations with.

Indeed, a new Iranian problem is coming to the fore as federal officials investigate thousands of Iranians here on counterfeit study and work documents.

Though there is a prevalent idea in the Third World that America owes these students an education and should take them tuition-free, the massive influx of foreign students actually brings in about \$2 billion a year. Nevertheless, these students pay only about 60 percent of their costs; taxpayers are subsidizing almost all of them, particularly at state schools.

It is time, then, that we forge some national policy on foreign students. And a group of leading educators is trying to do just that.

"We have to ask, what is our national policy?" says Richard Berendzen, the dynamic young president of American University. "I think we have to develop a global concern."

"The immigration situation and the foreign student situation are intimately linked. I don't know if the American people really understand the momentum of what is happening here. We are becoming a global village."

Berendzen heads the National Commission on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy, an adjunct of the American Council on Education. The commission is trying to hammer out policy directives for the future. But what should they be?

In formulating these directives we should keep in mind these risks:

The first danger is that we let the influx of foreign students add a further disintegrative note to an American society already divided by other immigration difficulties. Any responsible nation should know who is actually in that nation, and where and why.

The second danger lies in accepting students as if we were a kind of technology drugstore and nothing more. Every foreign student should be required to know or study English (something many, ironically, now complain about) and to take an appropriate amount of American Studies courses. It is crucial that this country not be perceived as a country without pride in its institutions and ideas; it is crucial that foreign students know what we stand for.

Third, we must clean up the misleading "come-ons" of colleges needing students, not to speak of such outright corrupt practices as issuing false documents to being foreign students here.

Given these long-overdue clarifications, we should welcome foreign students even more generously than before—and learn from them while they are here.

Berendzen's "global village" is indeed upon us. We need to be clear about the law and principles that allow us to live sanely and with civility within that global village.●

SPEECH BY THOMAS KEEFE

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the text of the commencement speech delivered by Thomas Keefe, Sr., at St. Martin's College earlier this summer.

St. Martin's, located adjacent to the capitol of Washington State, Olympia, provides the type of atmosphere that allows students to develop a philosophy of life as well as the technical skills necessary to earn a living. Mr. Keefe inspires those graduating seniors to review and analyze the rhetoric of the time, applying the lessons of history so they may avoid the errors and transgressions of the past. As he states in his address, our system will survive and flourish if our young people become active participants in it.

OUR SYSTEM WILL SURVIVE AND FLOURISH—
COMMENCEMENT SPEECH BY THOMAS KEEFE

Abbott Adrian Parcher, Dr. John Ishii, Sister Katherine Gray, members of the faculty, parents, relatives, and friends of St. Martin's College, graduating seniors: I am deeply honored at being asked to address the graduating class of 1981. In looking for prospective material, I came across the address that Art Buchwald, nationally syndicated humorist, gave at the commencement at Georgetown University in 1980. And I quote: "No one remembers a year later what the commencement speaker said and only a few remember who it was. I only hope that when you're asked who gave your commencement address, you'll remember that it was a short, fat fellow who made you laugh."

Anatomically, I don't fit the physical description, and I've been warned by my children, including my youngest daughter, Molly, who is a freshman here, not to attempt any jokes. So, I'm on my own.

This is a time to be Glad and a time to be Sad.

For the parents and relatives of the graduating seniors, it's particularly a time of joy. This day represents the achievement of a goal in which they are vicarious participants. A goal which has been achieved by your efforts and by considerable sacrifice on their part. In many instances, by sacrifices of which you are unaware. Like when they bit their lips in silence when you came home at the end of your sophomore year, the self-proclaimed possessor of all worldly knowledge, which you freely distributed without request, but without reservation. Today they justifiably take pride in your accomplishments. You have reached one of your major objectives and the future is yours.

For you graduates the joy of completion is tempered with the sorrow of parting. It is extremely unlikely that you will ever again all be together as a group. Yet each of you will carry a common bond indelibly imprinted by your association with each other and your participation as a member in the Benedictine community with its 1,500-year-old heritage.

A Benedictine college offers the student something that no secular college can—a way of life. It's not enough to merely equip the student with the technical tools to earn a living. The student must receive a philosophy of life in which concepts of social justice, moral responsibility and charity have meanings and purpose. This is where the Benedictine Abbey and the lay faculty who, at considerable personal sacrifice, join that community, and give meaning and purpose to St. Martin's College.

This is my *Quadragesimo Anno*. Forty years ago, I was a member of the second graduating class of St. Martin's College. Since then, I have attended four universities located in widely separated geographic locations in the United States, and have been associated with hundreds of individuals who have attended practically all of the major universities in this country. As a result of that experience, and using that great gift of hindsight, I can say without equivocation that if I had it to do over, I would choose St. Martin's College for my undergraduate work. There is a personal relationship here that exists between the faculty and student that fosters the fullest development of both. It is a relationship that cannot exist in larger institutions because of their size, and does not exist in secular institutions because of their failure to seek the development of the spiritual side of the student. At some point in everyone's life there occurs an event, an awakening, or the influence of another person which in retrospect they regard as the key point in shaping or directing their life's career. Looking back, I find that Father Thomas Hanley, who was the head of the Political Science Department here at St. Martin's, was that factor in my life. When I asked my eldest son Rob, who practices with me, that person or event in his life, he immediately named Dr. Mike Contris. In like manner, my son Tom named Father Jerome Toner and my daughter Joanne, who transferred after two years so she could pursue a nursing education, named Father Killien Malvey. I am certain that other faculty members both in the past and present have had similar effect on former students and on many of you here today.

In leaving St. Martin's, what does the future hold in store for you? What can you do? What should you do? Last week, the front page of an issue of the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* demonstrated how little times have changed in the last forty years. One headline read—"Draft Board Being Set Up", another—"Wider Military Role is Outlined for U.S." Forty years ago, members of my graduating class of '41 were registering for the draft and witnessing the military buildup of America.

This is a time to reflect: What can you do to improve the social order?

The two greatest threats to the continuation of our form of government is not foreign intervention—nor internal disruption by persons or parties espousing an anti-American philosophy. We have had these two scapegoats used by both major political parties over the last fifty years as a matter of political expediency. These myths, when confronted and exposed to the scrutiny of objective analysis, have vaporized.

Today once again we are being told that bombs, not butter, must be our chief priority. We are being asked to tighten our belt in order to support a defense budget of \$136 billion dollars. We are told of the great waste in our social programs to aid the underprivileged, aged and handicapped, yet not one word is uttered about the waste and inefficiency rampant in our military-industrial complex.

However, the greatest threat that is daily growing larger on the horizon is the return to McCarthyism in the name of national security. Dissent cannot and must not be equated with disloyalty. Fundamental constitutional rights of the individual must not be infringed upon. Our Constitution is probably the greatest political document ever drafted. Yet we cannot close our eyes to the weaknesses and shortcomings of our government and its leaders when they fail to live up to the high ideals set forth by the founding fathers. In the early 1940's, my generation and its leaders, with hardly a word of protest, by two separate acts, forfeited America's right to sit as unbiased, impartial judges of international morality. They first summarily rounded up and interned loyal Americans because by birth they were of Japanese descent. In April, 1945, one bomb in a time span of minutes killed over 50,000 civilians at Hiroshima, the Christian center of Japan. Contrast that with the handful of civilians killed in the attack on Pearl Harbor. We opened the Pandora's box of nuclear power and now humanity is paying the price. It's little wonder that other nations sometimes question or suspect our motives.

Peaceful protest and opposition to government programs or edicts when indicated is not only proper, but makes for a more healthy political system. It also can occasionally cause personal inconvenience. Four years ago, on my return home in the late evening hours from the annual Washington State Bar Convention in Spokane, my wife Anne and I were greeted by my second daughter Laurie, and I routinely inquired:

Q. "How are you?"

A. Fine.

Q. Where are your sisters?

A. In jail.

Q. Oh, that's nice——WHAT?!"

It's true you can turn white not only in a single night, but immediately.

Then the story unfolded—my remaining four daughters, ranging in age from Molly, 13, to Joanne, 23, had participated in the protest at the Trident Base and had been

arrested for trespassing and were then housed in the Federal jail in Tacoma. During my midnight drive over to obtain their release, I kept wondering why they couldn't protest at a more convenient time or hour. Unfortunately, meaningful protest cannot always choose the desired time or place.

Our right to know so that we can make our voices heard is a very precious and valuable right. The Freedom of Information Act of 1966 makes federal agencies' files—subject to certain guidelines and exceptions—available to the public. That right of access has been limited by a recent executive order.

Our form of government is not perfect, nor will it ever be, since its operation depends on human beings. However, it is far superior to any other form of government in the world today. The threat to its continuance comes not from without, nor from political activity from within, it comes from too much apathy and too little accountability. Your generation is particularly subject to indictment. Only 35 percent of the eligible voters in the 18 to 20 age group voted in 1980. Unless you graduates revitalize our political process, both on the local and national level, we are going to witness further erosions of our system.

Overall, in 1980, only 53.95 percent of the eligible voters in the U.S. cast their ballot, resulting in President Reagan being elected by a mere 27.38 percent of those eligible to vote. Contrast that with last Sunday's election in France where 86 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls. Regardless of your political affiliation, you have a duty to participate. I'm sure that a show of hands as to who participated in their precinct caucus to choose their candidate for the presidency would draw little response. Yet while we do nothing, single issue power groups can and do determine our political programs. Moneyed interests from outside our state have even effected who represents us in Congress. A recent member of Congress from this state, not presently serving, was elected with campaign contributions from outside our state, of over \$250,000. Single issue organizations, when they join forces with other similar groups in support of a candidate or a cause, are a potent and dangerous political force. The problem is as prevalent on the state level as it is on the national. Congress will soon be faced with the continuation or scrapping of such key legislative enactments as the Clean Air Act and the Voting Rights Act, both of which will have major long-run impact on our society. You cannot afford to sit silently by. You must actively participate in our political system. Your voice must be heard.

On the national level, the present catch phrase is: "Get Government Off the Back of Business"

Shall we do away with:

Child labor laws?

The minimum wage?

The Flammable Garment Act (which has saved untold hundreds of infants from painful deaths)?

Miners Safety Act?

Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)?

Federal Trade Commission?

and I could go on endlessly. All were government enactments to regulate and police areas where private industry either failed or refused to act.

Last week, after three years of periodic work, I settled a case for a 22-year-old quadriplegic. His accident could have been pre-

vented by an expenditure of \$.68 for a covered limit switch on a machine which cost \$196,668.00. Our present OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) regulations, which are now under attack, would have required this switch had they been in effect at the time of the accident. Certainly, there are abuses of overregulation in many areas, and there should be changes or modifications where there has been demonstrable harm. But to scrap a social philosophy which aims at protecting the uninformed consumer, or those unable to protect themselves, under the generality of "Getting Government Off the Back of Business", is unconscionable.

In addition to becoming activists, you must demand accountability. It is not enough to elect a qualified candidate; you must examine the voting record. How many know the voting record of their legislative representative during the last session in Olympia on such issues as interest rate increase, care for the elderly, environmental impact, a constitutional convention, to name a few? Yet without holding those elected accountable, we either vote for them again because of name association or party affiliation or, worse yet, fail to vote.

Neither major party has a monopoly on virtue nor is it the sole offender. Watergate, Abscam, and Gamscom should not be "put behind us", as some politicians have suggested. Rather, they should be reviewed and reshaped so that the lessons we learned of dishonesty, lying, cheating, and immorality will not be repeated by our elected representatives.

Our system will survive and flourish if you graduating seniors become active participants in it. We must get rid of apathy and demand accountability. St. Martin's has provided you the educational foundation. Now it's up to you to act. The future of America is in your hands.●

ANOTHER STEP TOWARD THE ELIMINATION OF SEX BIAS IN THE UNITED STATES CODE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, which is being cosponsored by the chairmen of the committees and subcommittees that will be considering the bill (Messrs. JAMES J. HOWARD, GLENN M. ANDERSON, and JAMES J. FLORIO), to eliminate various gender-slanted words from the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill, originally prepared by the Interstate Commerce Commission, will make the legislative revisions needed to implement the recommendations by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its 1977 report ("Sex Bias in the United States Code"), and subsequently in a Presidential memorandum issued on August 26, 1977, to the heads of all executive departments and agencies.

Congress has enacted various laws in the past several years which included many of the revisions recommended by the Commission on Civil Rights.

However, there are still many provisions in the United States Code with gender-slanted language that produce discrimination on the basis of sex, sometimes against women, and sometimes against men.

We commend the Interstate Commerce Commission for reviewing the laws it administers and recommending revisions to eliminate gender-slanted words in the Interstate Commerce Act. We urge other agencies of the Federal Government to do likewise, regarding the laws each of them administers. The Congress will be glad to do its share in this task of cleansing sex bias out of the United States Code.●

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1981

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 1981

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues which could not be resolved in the reconciliation conference (H. Rept. 97-208) was the extension of the authorization for appropriations for the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). Section 1137 of the Senate version of the reconciliation bill (H.R. 3982) contained an extension of authorization for appropriations for LSC for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 at \$100 million for each year. The House version of the reconciliation bill was silent on LSC. As a result of the conference, the Senate receded to the House on this issue, which was contained in miniconference No. 45.

There is some confusion by at least one Member of this body as to the effect of this conference agreement. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) in a colloquy on July 30 with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) on the subject of House Resolution 188 erroneously claimed that the reconciliation package had a zero amount for LSC. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) corrected him by noting that the reconciliation bill was silent on the subject, and did not zero fund the Corporation. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) on that point.

Legislation to extend the authorization for appropriations for LSC for future years is very much alive. This body spent 3 days considering a reauthorization bill (H.R. 3480) which was passed on June 18 with strong bipartisan support, 245 to 137. That bill contained over 20 new restrictions to the Legal Services Corporation Act.

It is expected that the other body will process H.R. 3480 or in its stead its own reauthorization bill (S. 1533) in September. A report on S. 1533 was filed on July 29 (S. Rept. 97-171), and

indicates a strong commitment by the other body to process S. 1533 in order to preserve the Corporation. The ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources in the other body (Mr. KENNEDY) has publicly stated this commitment today. Differences between the House and Senate authorization bills would be resolved in conference.

In some ways it is unfortunate that the authorization bill could not have been incorporated into the reconciliation bill. On the other hand, the normal course is to handle such legislation as a distinct bill. Separate consideration will allow the committees of jurisdiction time to work out their differences carefully.

One final point should be made on the interaction of H.R. 3480 and the budget process. H.R. 3480 extends the authorization for appropriations for LSC for 2 more years at \$241 million for each year. This represents a 25-percent reduction in funding. An appropriation bill in this body (H.R. 4169) would appropriate \$241 million for fiscal year 1982. Both bills are within the budget allocation totals under 302(b) of the Budget Act which were filed by the Committee on Appropriations on June 11, 1981 (H. Rept. 97-139). In the early warning report filed by the Committee on the Budget on July 28, 1981, it was noted that H.R. 4169 was equal to the 302(b) target for the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary in budget authority and \$18 million below in outlays. That subcommittee has assumed a \$241 million appropriation for LSC in its budget allocation of \$8.7 billion—budget authority—and \$9.9 billion—outlays. It is these budget allocation targets which are binding, not the original assumptions in the first budget resolution. Thus, both H.R. 3480 and H.R. 4169 are consistent with the budget process.●

INCREASED PENALTIES FOR MARIHUANA SMUGGLERS

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to increase the penalties for persons convicted of smuggling large amounts of marihuana. This legislation is needed to close a loophole created last year when Congress raised the penalties for large-scale domestic marihuana dealers but inadvertently failed to provide similar treatment for marihuana smugglers operating off the coasts of our country.

Congress enacted two important measures last year that have given our law enforcement agencies significant

new weapons in the fight to control the multibillion-dollar illicit drug trade. First, a provision in the Infant Formula Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-359) raised the penalties for trafficking in more than 1,000 pounds of marijuana from a maximum prison term of 5 years, a maximum fine of \$15,000, or both, to maximum penalties of 15 years imprisonment, a \$125,000 fine, or both (double for subsequent offenses). Prior to this act, highly organized, well-financed traffickers moving tons of marijuana were subject to the same low penalties as the street-level pushers dealing in small quantities of the drug.

Unfortunately, this measure amended only the Controlled Substances Act which applies only to domestic marijuana traffickers. It did not provide for similar increased penalties under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act which reaches offshore smuggling operations.

Second, Congress enacted legislation to facilitate increased enforcement by the Coast Guard of laws relating to the importation of controlled substances (Public Law 96-350). This authority has enhanced greatly the Coast Guard's ability to seize and arrest traffickers on the high seas. The penalty provisions of this law, however, incorporate by reference the penalties provided under the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act. Thus, large-scale marijuana smugglers convicted under the Coast Guard Act are also subject only to the lower 5 year/\$15,000 penalties.

My bill amends the penalty provisions of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act so that first-time violators convicted for trafficking in more than 1,000 pounds of marijuana under either that act or the Coast Guard law will be subject to the same 15 year/\$125,000 penalties that now apply to large-scale domestic marijuana dealers. By operation of existing provisions of both laws, these penalties would be doubled for repeat drug offenders.

On July 27, Senator CHILES introduced similar legislation (S. 1522) in the Senate. His bill amends the Coast Guard law passed last year but not the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act. While the increased penalties under the gentleman's bill undoubtedly will apply to most cases of large-scale marijuana smuggling, I believe the approach incorporated in my bill is preferable because it establishes consistent penalties for this crime regardless of the statute under which a violator is convicted.

We are all acutely aware of the menaces created by the massive and lucrative trade in marijuana including increased crime, violence, and corruption. The abuse of marijuana also poses serious threats to the health and well-being of our children, the Na-

tion's most important resource. To stem the tide of marijuana flooding our country, we must give law enforcement the most effective tools available. The legislation enacted last year and the measures approved so far in this Congress to permit increased military support for drug enforcement agencies and remove restrictions on U.S. funding for paraquat eradication programs abroad are all important steps. My amendment will close existing loopholes that allow large-scale marijuana smugglers to escape with substantially lighter sentences than they would get if they were apprehended within the United States. I urge the House to support this legislation. ●

ALAN EMORY'S "CHINA DIARY"

HON. DAVID O'B. MARTIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into today's RECORD the final three articles of "China Diary" a series by Alan Emory, Washington correspondent of the Watertown, N.Y., Daily Times and dean of the New York correspondents covering Washington. Once again, I recommend this series to all who wish to know more about the People's Republic of China.

[From the Watertown Daily Times, July 18, 1981]

TOUR GUIDES VARY IN FLUENCY, SHARE CONCERN FOR CHARGES (By Alan Emory)

PEKING.—To the guides of the China International Travel Service (CITS), telling visitors about situations that will "drive you up the wall" just as they are about to show them the Great Wall sends them into gales of laughter.

One refers to himself proudly in American slang as a "greenhorn."

They love to joke, particularly in slang. A woman guide in Datong tried out the phrase "big hit" and seemed greatly relieved when her audience chuckled.

One told how he had once confused the two words concubine and cucumber. That seemed pretty funny until it developed that another guide had told another group the same story of confusion. It was obviously a CITS staple.

The success or failure of a tour of a city or landmark often depends on the guide's fluency in English—that varies widely—or in the language of the home country of the group being escorted. In Xian one guide's French for her clients seemed impeccable. Another appeared proficient in Spanish.

But another, who had just been on the job 10 days, was struggling with his English and could barely make himself understood.

The guides always ply tourists with candy, peanuts or white raisins during a trip on a bus or plane. The candy varies from haw flakes, made from a Chinese berry that is also the source of a fruit drink, to chocolate bars, to chocolate-covered malt balls, to semi-hard candies and preserved pieces of

fruit. In Canton the bus fare was fresh li-chees.

CITS provides one guide who stays with his group throughout the China tour, plus separate guides for each city. In Peking and Xian we had two city guides.

Our all-China guide had three years of foreign language college under his belt. Only four to five per cent of middle-school graduates go on to higher education, and Chinese blame extremely difficult examinations for the relatively few persons who enter college.

Although the hours on tour are not strictly regulated, CITS guides, like other Chinese workers, normally work eight hours a day six days a week, getting Sunday off in most cases.

Also, like other workers, they are entitled to 20 days of vacation a year to visit their families if they are separated from them most of the year. They can choose their vacation time, and the work unit pays their expenses.

Pay averages \$36 a month.

The guides are not hesitant about answering personal questions, nor do they hang back in asking questions about the United States.

One guide lives with his parents and three sisters in a three-bedroom apartment with kitchen. He rode a bicycle to class about 12½ miles away.

He is not a Communist Party member—he explains that by saying he has not "done enough" to warrant being admitted—but he says he aspires to belong and to "serve" his country and the tourists better through party membership.

Sometimes they are surprising with their wry remarks, although, in a country as tightly controlled as China, there is a suspicion some of their observations have been approved in advance.

In Taiyuan, for example, our guide disclosed that there were three new hotels under construction, then added drily he did not know why because the city of 2 million inhabitants only had about 100 tourists a day in town.

At one point the same guide pointed to a factory spewing colored smoke into the air and said it had been required to pay fines for air pollution, but they did not do any good because the plant was state-owned.

"It was just taking from one pocket and putting in another," he commented.

When it comes to history, the guides faithfully take the party line. They refer sarcastically to Chiang Kaishek as one who preferred to fight the Communists among his own countrymen, rather than battle the invading Japanese armies.

They take great delight in describing Chiang's flight to escape capture in Xian, leaving behind his false teeth and most clothes, and how he was caught trying to hide in a cave in the hills that was too small for his body, so his exposed derriere gave him away.

They provide a straight propaganda line about how the cultural revolution was led by a bunch of "crazies," but even though Mao Zedong was in power at that time they still refuse to blame him outright and insist he had not done a bad job.

"Without Mao there is no New China," one guide said firmly.

They perform tasks like explaining the plots of opera, helping to recover items left behind by forgetful tourists, expanding the limited Chinese vocabulary of visitors, interpreting in stores, hotels and places of historical interest.

And, at the end, each country guide feels he has made a group of new friends.

Friends is the key word.

Almost every time a guide addresses his group he starts, "Friends. . ."

And it did not take the magnificent picture book that Luo Wei Xien's group gave him to make it sound like he meant it.

[From the Watertown Daily Times, July 20, 1981]

HONG KONG A BUSTLING CONTRAST TO CHINA (By Alan Emory)

HONG KONG.—Hong Kong is a hustle set in the midst of a traffic jam.

Or vice versa.

When a tourist leaves China he can exchange his excess Chinese money—but only into Hong Kong dollars—about five Hong Kong dollars to one American.

The change from China is visible almost immediately. As the train crosses the border into the New Territories the picture is one of construction activity. Where automobiles are something of a rarity in China, they are a regular sight in the New Territories.

There are actually three sections to what is popularly called Hong Kong. One is Kowloon, the arrival point for air passengers from Japan or Hawaii and for those taking the train from Canton.

Kowloon is home to many of the newest hotels, some of the best shopping and the most popular point for separating the tourist from his money, the famed Nathan's Road. It has a population of about 1.8 million.

Hong Kong is an island reached by ferry from Kowloon, home to the colonial government, the Aberdeen dock area, Victoria Peak and the popular Repulse Beach—so named because it was where pirates were beaten back—and has a population of 1.2 million.

The largest section of the British Crown Colony is the New Territories, a complex of 1,500 islands, with half of "Hong Kong's" 6 million residents.

The lease on Kowloon and the New Territories from China to Great Britain expires in 1997, and China, which ceded the area to Britain following the opium war of the mid-1800s, may take it back.

Hong Kong's teeming population is packed into a tiny area, much of it a shopper's paradise, for the wary, and hell, for the daring. Jewelry is a good buy for the careful, and so is a watch, but most photographic equipment, calculators and tape recorders sell for about the same prices quoted by New York City discount houses, and they are more reliable than most Hong Kong merchants.

The best buy in Hong Kong is clothing, usually made to order. The visitor picks out the material, style and color of dress, suit, blazer, slacks, shirt or blouse and the finished product, after two fittings, is ready in 36 to 48 hours. A merchant will often come to the customer's hotel for the final fitting.

Other good values include sports clothes by European designers, often one-third to one-half the cost in the United States.

There is a Hong Kong Merchants' Association of about 300 members whose seal is displayed in shop windows, but that guarantee often is accompanied by higher prices, and association member stores are heavily outnumbered.

An unwary stroller can be suddenly taken in tow by an eager hustler and steered to a side street shop where prices are low and the goods usually shoddy.

Tourists looking for jade and silk shirts should be particularly careful. Both are

widely imitated. A good made-to-order silk shirt runs about \$30.

Curiously, tennis rackets are a pretty good buy in Hong Kong.

Kowloon and Hong Kong streets are consistently clogged with massive traffic jams. There is a new subway in Kowloon, with only one line so far, which is mobbed at rush hour.

It operates with the same type of fare card as the Washington subway, with cards purchased from machines, the fare varying with the distance traveled. An average fare is about 44 cents a ride, and the passenger needs the card to leave the station as well as to enter.

Buyers can use credit cards easily, but a credit card purchase automatically boosts the price by the fee the merchant pays to the card company.

Prices can be negotiated with merchants, and some stores will make out fake purchase sheets to enable the tourists to get home under the \$300-per-person duty-free limit.

Most of Hong Kong's newer hotels have large shopping malls inside.

Aberdeen is the home of the "boat people." They live on their craft, closely packed together in an oily, garbage-strewn harbor. Incredibly, the children use the harbor as a swimming hole.

Aberdeen also is home to a couple of popular floating restaurants.

One of the nicest points in Hong Kong is Ocean Park, with a children's zoo, macaws that ride miniature bicycles and do other tricks, a breathtaking cable car ride over the mountains and a building housing a spectacular coral reef with every kind of tropical fish imaginable, sharks and a moray eel, all of which can be viewed from above and at two levels below the water line. The entry fee for the whole works is \$5.

[From the Watertown Daily Times, July 21, 1981]

CHINA'S NUMEROUS WALLS DO NOT KEEP RESIDENTS IN OR VISITORS OUT

(By Alan Emory)

PEKING.—China is a country of walls, around communities, around homes.

A country where cyclists carry infants in little baskets resting on handlebars.

Where, in early morning hours, old and young alike move out into parks, squares and playgrounds to do martial arts exercises with the grace of ballet performers, their hand movements as smooth as those of hula dancers; participate in team or individual sports, including basketball and soccer, and run.

Where young men wearing white or navy gym shorts or warm-up suits appear in excellent physical shape.

Where only over-the-counter street-front stores show prices on window display items and people carry leatherette or string shopping bags.

Where crowded and well-stocked department stores sell a Sanyo television set for \$350, a blouse for \$5, and prices are not out of line with those in the United States.

The difference is the longer time it takes the average Chinese to save to buy a TV set.

China is Inner Mongolia, where residents buy fried bread on street corners, some collect water in buckets hanging from yokes they carry across their shoulders, while others cycle along with pails of human waste for fertilizer.

Much of the clothing is unisex, white shirts and black pants, blue or green shirt-and-pant outfits, rain ponchos with at-

tached caps and clear visors. Girls wear dresses, women shirts and pants.

When it gets really hot men often roll up their trouser legs to the knees for relief.

Footwear is mostly sandals and soft shoes.

The Chinese people are extremely friendly, anxious to help a visitor, regardless of language barrier, and eager to practice their few words of English. The friendliness is evident from the moment a youngster brings a tourist's luggage to his hotel room and welcomes him in English.

The Chinese are also meticulous about scouring hotel rooms when a visitor leaves. Any item left behind is returned before the visitor can leave the city. It finds him in a restaurant, train station or airport.

People wave at trains and buses filled with easily recognizable westerners. Mothers take their children's hands and wave for them. Some youngsters call out, "Bye, bye," when tourists leave a school or community.

Except for guides, hotel staffers and a few children people shy away from gifts, even a small cake of perfumed soap and even when the gift is explained in Chinese.

There is general delight when a tourist tries out a few words of Chinese, and if the local dialect is different the residents imitate the visitor with a broad grin, rather than try to correct him.

Pay is minimal by American standards—\$60 a month for a six-day week, for example, with Sundays off. Unless the worker is separated from his family, which merits a 20-day vacation, the only "vacation" is on national holidays.

A worker can earn enough in a year for a TV set, but it often takes that long to save for the all-important \$100 bicycle. Professors are among the best-paid individuals.

Factories and farm operations authorize 56 days of maternity leave with pay for the first child. New mothers, however, may take up to a year off, the rest of the time at 70 per cent of normal pay.

For the second child another 56 days are authorized, but that is the extent of maternity leave. The government pays a bonus to couples who have only one child, but they penalize those who go beyond two.

Families are proud to live together despite a lack of space.

Youngsters are fascinated by digital watches and cameras, and an offer to demonstrate either causes a rush and crowding around.

Men smoke cigarets, very few women. Older men occasionally sport beards, but very few young men wear them.

The basic Chinese currency is a yuan, worth about 60 cents. There are 100 fen in a yuan. There are notes of 10 fen, one, five, 10 and 50 yuan in what is called "script," with English writing, and of one, five and 10 yuan and two and five jiao (often pronounced like Mao) of old Chinese money. A jiao is equivalent to 10 fen.

The Chinese say that the old money cannot be taken out of the country, and they discourage attempts to turn it back into western money. Visitors must keep receipts they get whenever they obtain Chinese currency to be eligible for exchanges the other way when they leave.

Agriculture is a serious business in China. Every square inch of available land is cultivated. Crops are sold twice a year, after the summer harvest and at a two-week-long spring festival, at which time farm families gather in reunions for a long feast.

China is apartment buildings in big cities and rows of homes resembling sandstone igloos in the countryside. Some people live

in houses of mud and brick with tile roofs. Cows may be tethered outside the front doorway, while goats, pigs and chickens run around the yards.

China is trees planted alongside railroad tracks, many of them 15 years old or less.

Lush greenery contrasts with great stretches of desolate arid land.

Although China has geared up for a rush of tourism, there is still a dearth of hotel rooms in some cities, and visitors often have to double and triple up.

China is a country where only visitors travel freely. The Chinese are sharply restricted and there is no chance to change jobs from country to city or the other way around.

The people seize on conversation with visitors to stress what they see as national defects. One teacher asked an American couple, "How do you like China?" and when they answered they liked it very much replied, "I don't think so."

"We have many shortcomings," he said, describing the visitors' hotel as "dirty" and having too many mosquitoes, when they had found it surprisingly clean and insect-free.

The man, who teaches Russian, which he learned from television, and listens to English-language radio broadcasts, argued that China was making progress until the Gang of Four took over, and it had only been since their ouster that things had started moving again.

This is the line used everywhere, by travel service guides and man in the street alike.

Guides refer to the "crazy" people who led the cultural revolution, but still insist that Mao Zedong, who was in charge then, was not bad.

American experts say the Chinese legal system is relatively new and from 1963 to 1978 there was no real criminal law. Instead, the country employed a kind of frontier justice.

Only for taxes, divorce and minor civil matters was there any defined legal system.

In China men are permitted to retire at 60, women at 55.

There is great respect for old people. If they have children it is the responsibility of those children to look after them. The childless aged are provided with five guarantees: Housing, clothing, food, medical care and burial.

The guides are reluctant to show a visitor Peking's Democracy Wall, where, for a short time, Chinese citizens were permitted to express their opinions in wall posters. Some of those opinions did not follow the Communist Party line.

Eventually the practice was stopped, and inquiring visitors are now told that the thoughts the posters expressed were simply "rumors."

Despite the leap in tourism in China, the people's curiosity about western visitors and the friendliness demonstrated in casual contact is genuine. A tourist gets on a crowded bus and the Chinese, men and women of all ages, rise to give her a seat.

A young man comes up to an American on a street in Xian on a warm evening and greets her with, of all things the Gettysburg Address.

The walls may be everywhere, but they do not keep the people in or the visitors out.

This is China in the summer of 1981.●

TAX INCENTIVE ACT OF 1981

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I, like all other Congressmen, have received a number of communications from my constituents concerning the tax package before the House. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I naturally favor our proposal. Not only did I personally participate in writing H.R. 4242, but I sincerely believe that the major differences between it and H.R. 4260—the Reagan bill—are highly significant.

In short, the Ways and Means measure will mean less inflation, because it unquestionably will not produce the deficit in the outyears that the Reagan measure clearly shall.

The Ways and Means measure also focuses more attention on savings and investment, not only through use of Keogh and individual retirement account mechanisms, but by providing personal income tax cuts in those areas where Americans who save in capital-forming investment pools will be most encouraged.

The personal income tax cuts also seem to be more fair in that they are aimed more at middle- and low-income working Americans who, because they are unable to shelter their income, have been most affected by inflation. The Ways and Means measure, therefore, it also more just and fair.

But even more importantly, perhaps, the Ways and Means measure channels more revenue resources to small business, as well as America's capital intensive basic industries so necessary to our economic freedom. The comparison of figures is obvious. The Ways and Means measure means \$28 billion as opposed to \$8 billion in cuts to small business in the Reagan bill. It means reinvestment opportunities for productivity-improving investments, that is, section 38 tangible personal property investments that have qualified for investment tax credits that are the lifeblood of the country's basic industry.

The so-called leasing provisions which parody the sincere Ways and Means proposal, which I authored, will not efficiently direct moneys to these distressed industries for these purposes.

The President, however, is to be commended. He has abandoned his original 10-10-10 proposal in favor of now this—his third substitute—as a response to what is an obviously superior Ways and Means tax measure.

But along the way a good deal has been lost, and even more misinformation disseminated. In not one single piece of correspondence that I have received from across the country, is con-

tained one single correct reason for preferring the Reagan tax plan. People apparently think that the Reagan bill is the only measure before the Congress, or erroneously think that it contains solely the ideas expressed by the administration, or more sadly think that the Reagan administration originated many provisions they copied from the Rostenkowski proposal. For example, I have received telegrams from major corporations, including one in my district, who are not even aware that the research and development bills which I have cosponsored with Congressman JIM SHANNON of Massachusetts were provisions written into the Ways and Means bill, and only copied by the administration.

In short, the measures are the same in both bills, but were being flaunted by these corporate executives as reasons for preferring the administration's bill. Examples of misinformation run on and on. People who think they are going to get a 25-percent cut—people who think that the President's bill is more than technically a 3-year program, since of course the President's bill is not.

The role of television on the eve of an important vote, the pressures applied to many Members on anything from reapportionment to the intensive lobbying from corporate headquarters, raises serious questions about our political process. Added to this was the unique use of the Republican National Committee to buy radio and television time for the purposes of advertisements to create impressions, none of which were accurate, none of which clarified issues for the public, none of which addressed alternatives or substantive matters.

We, of course, have a job to do here in the Congress that places great burdens upon our desires to be popular and to fulfill the whims and wishes of faddish forces that seem to ripple through the contemporary wisdom. Our function is to deliberate, revise, and produce carefully investigated policy alternatives. I hope that we shall continue to do so and I am sure that we shall, but the last few days we have partaken somewhat of a major diversion.

Generally, the feelings expressed are very partisan, or simply proclaim an allegiance or faith in the President, in many cases regardless of what he wants to do. Although these are feelings with which I do not agree, they are feelings which I very much respect, because unlike the information from individuals and companies who purport to reflect distinctions between the measures, every one of which so far has been inaccurate, my heart does go out to those who very simply and very sincerely and honestly proclaim their faith in our President.

While I do not agree with him, because I see our reinvestment needs as much greater and in a different way, I do admire the way he has been able to very effectively get his point across. But at the same time I wonder if we are not into a frightful age of not examining and debating important policy considerations, but instead are into an age of promoting for personality purposes, simplistic and often-times incorrect information for the sake of political victory. ●

**IRVIN R. TCHON HONORED BY
ILLINOIS STATE SENATE**

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of Illinois' outstanding citizens has been honored by the passage of a State Senate resolution commending him for his distinguished public service and leadership to the Polish American community. I am very pleased to share an article on Mr. Irvin R. Tchon which appeared in several newspapers that serve the Polish community, and the resolution which passed the State Senate:

**IRVIN R. TCHON RECEIVES ILLINOIS SENATE
COMMENDATION**

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—Irvin R. Tchon, one of the organizers of the Copernicus Senior Citizen Center in Logan Square and very active in numerous drug awareness and educational programs, was recently honored by the Illinois State Senate for his twenty five years of "outstanding leadership and distinguished service to the Polish American community."

A resolution presented in the eighty-first general assembly offered by some 58 senators pointed out Mr. Tchon's active interest in programs designed health care being provided to the Polish American community.

Tchon, a Chicago retail druggist, is an active member of the Polish American Pharmacist Association, Polish American Political League, Polish National Alliance and a consulting nursing home pharmacist.

Irvin Tchon, is also a member of SS. Cyril and Methodius Society 145 and from a 100 percent PRCUA family. His parents, Joseph and Catherine Tchon, were long time activists in the PRCUA and the recipients of various awards for their efforts in PRCUA activities.

The Senate resolution concluded, "we express the hope that he will continue to serve his community with vision and enthusiasm." We strongly concur.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 81ST GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
SENATE

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 729

Offered by Senator Nash, Senator Rock, President of the Senate, Senator Egan; and Senators Becker, Berman, Berning, Bloom, Bowers, Bruce, Buzbee, Carroll, Chew, Coffey, Collins, D'Arco, Daley, Davidson, DeAngellis, Demuzio, Donnewald, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Gitz, Grotberg, Hall, Johns, Jeremiah Joyce, Jerome Joyce, Keats, Lemke, Maitland, Maragos, Martin, McLen-

don, McMillan, Merlo, Mitchler, Moore, Nedza, Nega, Netsch, Newhouse, Nimrod, Ozinga, Phillip, Regner, Rhoads, Rupp, Sangmeister, Savickas, Schaffer, Shapiro, Sommer, Vadalabene, Walsh, Washington, Weaver and Wooten.

Whereas, Irvin R. Tchon, registered pharmacist, is an active community and civic leader; and

Whereas, The Senate recognizes his outstanding efforts and achievements in pursuit of excellence in the Polish-American Community, in community consciousness, affirmative action, political education and human relations programs; and

Whereas, Mr. Tchon has an active interest and has participated in special drug awareness and educational programs designed to enhance community preparation, professional competence and quality of geriatric health care being provided to the Polish-American Community; and

Whereas, His distinguished public service has strengthened the democratic form of government, has served to exhibit the finest ideals of those of American heritage and has benefited all Americans; and

Whereas, He has given many years of unselfish service to the ethnic and minority people of Illinois, and has been honorary president of the Drug Abuse and Education Committee and Nursing Home and Geriatric Health Committee of the Polish-American Political League of Illinois; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we commend and congratulate Irvin R. Tchon for his outstanding leadership and distinguished service to the Polish-American Community; that we express the hope that he will continue to serve his community with vision and enthusiasm; and that a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Mr. Tchon.

Adopted by the Senate, December 5, 1980. ●

**ROBERT MOSES—BUILDER OF
CITIES**

SPEECH OF

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1981

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Rome was not built in a day. Neither was New York City, but if you were going to try to build a city in a day, Robert Moses would have been the man to put in charge.

On July 29, at the age of 92 and after 50 years of service to the people of New York City and New York State, Robert Moses died. Over the course of that half century, he remade the face of New York City, creating hundreds of parks, building miles of major arteries, constructing many of the buildings that define the city today.

It is awesome to consider the number of New York City landmarks that were born of the energy and industry of Robert Moses. Lincoln Center, Jones Beach State Park, the United Nations, Shea Stadium, the 1964-65 World's Fair grounds, and the New York Coliseum are all his cre-

ations. And without the bridges and highways he designed and built, New York City would not today be the premier metropolitan center in the world.

I am proud to join my colleagues in offering condolences to the Moses family and in mourning the passing of this remarkable man. ●

**JUSTICE DEPARTMENT
BETRAYING CONSERVATIVES?**

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that on this historic day of final deliberation on President Reagan's tax reduction measure that there is absolute evidence that the President does indeed have a mandate from more than a majority of the American people. If that is a fact, then we wonder if not that mandate does extend to all areas of the President's political and moral philosophy.

It appears from slowly, but steadily mounting evidence that the President's promises to the American people are not extending to one of the most critical Departments in the executive branch—that of the Justice Department.

Today, I would like to share with my colleagues an item from the front page of the Wanderer, the most influential conservative Catholic weekly in America. The article which quotes a source that I am thoroughly familiar with, and a most reliable one, indicates that the Justice Department is consistently taking positions in both domestic and foreign affairs areas that are totally alien to what was promised the American people in the election of 1980. It appears from this article that the activist leftists are still with us in the Justice Department. It also appears that the President at best is being tendered misinformation that is causing deep consternation among that majority of the American constituency that elected him.

We are seeing the Reagan mandate being manifested both in the Senate and the House. We hope that the word will be passed to the President that indeed the mandate will not continue if the leadership from the White House does not continue. The item from the July 30, 1981, issue of the Wanderer follows:

[From the Wanderer, July 30, 1981]

**MEMO CHARGES . . . JUSTICE DEPARTMENT
"BETRAYING" CONSERVATIVES**

(By Paula A. Fisher)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A memorandum prepared by a knowledgeable Capitol Hill conservative, that is not for attribution, charges that the nomination of Sandra O'Connor to be Justice of the Supreme Court is one of

many "major substantive betrayals of conservatives by the Justice Department."

The document dated July 8th, states that "sources within the Administration" emphasize the central role of the attorney general and deputy attorney general in the selection process (of Judicial appointments).

"Beyond that, when conservatives raised objections to O'Connor, it was the attorney general who rallied to her defense with a three-page memo full of incomplete or misleading information," the memorandum states.

The "three-page memo" referred to is the one written by Kenneth Starr, counselor to the attorney general, which has been widely cited as the source of data on which the President supposedly made his decision to nominate Judge O'Connor (see *The Wanderer*, July 16th, p. 8).

The July 8th Capitol Hill memorandum continues:

"The (Starr) memo states that O'Connor 'has never had any disputes or controversies with (Arizona pro-life leader Dr. Carolyn Gerster).' In fact, Gerster has been adamantly opposed to the O'Connor nomination, stating: 'I'm simply stunned. I still trust the President. I think he must have gotten some extremely bad counsel.'"

The document goes on to note that the Starr memorandum conveniently overlooked some glaring discrepancies in O'Connor's record.

"Obviously, O'Connor made some misleading statements in order to secure her nomination," the July 8th Capitol Hill memorandum asserts. It continues:

"Equally obviously, the Justice Department, which had either done a very sloppy job of background investigation or had considered O'Connor's positions on key social issues inconsequential, did its best to cover up for its earlier inadequacies. It did this by forwarding the (Starr) memo to the President without checking into the accuracy of the statements made therein."

Other Justice Department actions that the Capitol Hill memo considers "disastrous" are the following:

An opinion prepared by the Office of Legal Counsel declaring the legislative veto to be unconstitutional. "That opinion quoted from a similar opinion issued by the Carter Justice Department."

A Justice Department opinion that held an anti-affirmative action amendment in the House to be "unlawful," because it constituted legislation on an appropriations bill.

"Robert McConnell, assistant attorney general for legislative affairs, had to be prohibited from actively lobbying against the (Helms anti-busing amendment) by the White House."

"Ted Olson, the legal counsel, has prepared an opinion holding that Congress cannot constitutionally divest the courts of jurisdiction over busing, prayer, and abortion under Article III. This would render unconstitutional a substantial number of conservative bills which seek to remedy court decisions in these areas short of constitutional amendment."

"The Justice Department has forced the Washington Legal Foundation and 16 conservative senators out of a suit by liberal representatives challenging U.S. aid to El Salvador."

The Capitol Hill memorandum continues: "These positions are not aberrations, but rather a sample of what we can expect for the next four years, given the composition of Reagan appointees to the Department (of Justice).

"With regard to (Attorney General) Smith himself, at least one conservative senator has suggested that Smith has no ideology, and has allowed a liberal bureaucracy to continue business as usual.

"Deputy Attorney General Schmultz has reportedly stated that he doesn't want 'ideologues' (read 'conservatives') in policy making spots within the department. . . .

With the exception of Rex Lee no nominee to the department has an identifiable conservative background."

The source of this Capitol Hill memorandum is known to this writer, and is well-placed and well known among key conservatives in Washington.●

A BIRTHDAY DEDICATION

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 27 Sri Chinmoy will celebrate his 50th birthday. Sri Chinmoy is a man of many accomplishments. Along with 11 years of dedicated service to the United Nations furthering the cause of international understanding, Sri Chinmoy has enriched the world with his esteemed art work, dynamic musical accomplishments, and insightful writings. His work clearly demonstrates his profound sense of quietude and inner peace, qualities respected by us all.

Sri Chinmoy's work has enhanced the quality of life not only for residents of Massachusetts, but in every area of this country. On behalf of my constituents I wish Sri Chinmoy a very happy birthday. His life represents an inspiration to us all and we wish him continued inner peace, fulfillment and happiness.●

OTA IN THE PUBLIC LIGHT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, there are still many Members of the House who are not fully aware of the fine work that is done by the Office of Technology Assessment in their role as a research arm of Congress. In the last few months, a number of valuable assessments have been completed, making our job as legislators much easier in determining positions on issues which involve new and emerging technologies.

An indicator of the quality of OTA's assessments and other studies is the recognition that this work receives outside of Congress. Many of OTA's publications are reprinted by private publishing companies. Many of OTA's staff people are asked to appear at meetings of scientific and technical organizations, or are sought by the

media for expert opinions. Each time that this happens, the public becomes better informed on complex technological issues and the image of Congress is enhanced because of its foresight in establishing OTA.

An example of this public attention which OTA receives is the inclusion of Dr. John Gibbons, OTA's Executive Director, on NBC's show, "Second Sunday," hosted by Peter Hackes. While the entire transcript is too long to be reprinted here, I would like to excerpt Dr. Gibbons' and Mr. Hackes' interactions to show my colleagues the type of attention that Congress is getting through OTA. The edited transcript follows:

HACKES. Welcome to another edition of Second Sunday, I'm Peter Hackes in Washington. Our report on coal as you have heard from four coal energy experts carries with it considerable optimism on the part of those who mine it. But there are some important questions and challenges for those who would burn it. Coal, backbone of the industrial revolution was a prime source of power until World War II when cleaner burning oil and gas took over. But today with new combustion technology coal can be burned far more cleanly. It's cheaper and it's here not in some far off politically unstable Middle East Shiekdom. 38% of the oil we use is imported; not only is that supply unreliable it's ruining our balance of trade. This year we'll be sending abroad 95 billion American dollars to pay for imported oil. That hurts the U.S. dollar badly and fuels more inflation. The office of Technology Assessment a Congressional study group have issued a detailed report on how coal might be one way to reduce oil imports. Dr. John Gibbons, Director of OTA says he foresees a coal boom in the near future.

GIBBONS. I think probably we'll see a coal boom based on the following assumptions. That OPEC and World oil prices are not going to go down. That other, as it were, magical deliverances from our energy issues are just not going to be there. And that our demand for energy will at least hold level if not 10 to 1 increase. Now if these assumptions are the case then the number of options we have to feed our energy demand are unfortunately very limited. Coal is one of our few options it has its problems but it's gonna have to help fill a very important gap over the next two decades.

HACKES. If things go as some are expecting, Deputy Secretary of Energy, John Sawhill predicts that by the year 2,000 US coal exports will have re-established a positive balance of trade with coal surpassing grain as the single most valuable US export commodity. For years coal transportation exports have been working on what's called a cold slurry pipeline to transport coal the way oil and gas are transported thru a pipe. The coal is pulverized at the mine and the tiny coal pieces are mixed with water. That mixture is sent thru a large underground pipeline to a regional center where the water is drained off and the dry coals sent on to where its to be burned. Dr. Gibbons says the slurry pipes big advantage is that its much cheaper to transport huge amounts of coal over long distances thru a pipe. But Slurry pipes do have problems. Dr. Gibbons.

GIBBONS. There are plans to move coal from the western coal fields on down to

Texas in order to get it from the west to Texas you gotta cross a batch of railroads and the argument with the railroads have been why should we give you the right away if you're taking our business away from us. Another argument against the slurry pipeline is it takes water to move that coal. If you're moving coal out of, say, West Virginia, water's not that much of a problem. But if you're moving it out of Wyoming water's a very scarce commodity and it means you're taking it away from somebody's wheat field.

HACKES. Still another important factor in the predicted rosey future of demand for coal is in the area of synthetic fuels. But not for at least a decade. Dr. Gibbons of the Office of Technology Assessment.

GIBBONS. To me the largest sleeper in this area is the turning of coal into liquids. Liquids to replace the distillates from petroleum. Liquids which can take the form of either alcohol, methanol or even gasoline in competition with shale oil and other forms of liquids to fuel or transportation system and other needs for liquids.

HACKES. In addition another synthetic fuel made from coal. Dr. Gibbons explains.

GIBBONS. A big gas production facility is just getting underway out in the western states to turn some of the Northwestern coal into gas to go into pipelines which in turn will feed either . . . make either electricity for use in homes, in industry. I think a lot of coal gasification will occur in the '80s as our lower cost sources of natural gas continue to be depleted.

HACKES. Even assuming we can push technology to the point where immediate coal problems can be overcome, coal won't be around forever. It's being used up just as other fossil fuels gas and oil are being used up. So how long do we have before we'll have to switch to something else? We asked Dr. Gibbons:

GIBBONS. Coal was built up over 100 million years or more of earth's history. We now use coal and gas and oil at a rate every year that corresponds to a million years worth of production. So as I see it, we have less than a century left of good fossil resources to use. That 100 million years of production is gonna be used up in the next 50-75 maybe 100 years. So we don't have that much time in terms of civilization to make our conversion to truly long lasting sources.

HACKES. Truly long lasting sources? What are they? After we reach the 21st century, where do we turn? Nuclear . . . yes for a few more years. Solar, yes for many more years. Perhaps other renewable energy sources, such as the heat of the earth. Experts seem to agree on a few major items as we approach coal as an interim energy benefactor. The United States must continue to increase its research and development, to find acceptable alternate energy sources. Meantime, they also agree, that the country must continue to increase its research into the future consequences. The risks connected with the use of not only coal and other fossil fuels, but the uncertain impact of alternate energy sources. And they also agree that there must be stepped up research and development of protective technology to keep the world from committing environmental suicide. If that ever begins it could become irreversible permanent. At that point even discovery of a new super-source of clean, unlimited energy might come too late. Meantime, even as we wrestle with future energy unknowns and as prices and sources of imported oil get more critical the

careful use of additional US coal may make good sense.●

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, ever since its inception, the guaranteed student loan program has been administered in an extremely lax fashion. The defaults on these loans have been tremendous and efforts to obtain this money by the Federal Government minimal. In a misguided effort to straighten this problem out, the Department of Education is inflicting unreasonable expectations on banks that provide these loans.

For instance, in my district, the intercity offices of the First National Bank of Florida have meticulously worked within the regulatory guidelines set by the Department and have worked with the Department's staff to insure that they work within the regulations. In fact, the bank was assured that they were complying with the regulations. However, the Department has now suggested that the Government may refuse to honor its guarantee on the loans.

I have been a longtime critic of Government waste, but I do not think the solution is to punish those who have worked hard to obey the regulations. The solution is to punish those who break the law, not to punish the law-abiding citizens through unreasonable regulations.

I would like to share with my colleagues the letter I received from my constituent, Mr. Lloyd W. Geiger, the senior vice president of the intercity offices of the First National Bank of Florida, regarding this problem. The letter is below:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF FLORIDA,
Bradenton, Fla., July 17, 1981.

MARION D. WATKINS,
Program Officer, U.S. Department of Education, Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MRS. WATKINS: Thank you for your recent visit and review of our Guaranteed Student Loan Program. It was the first we have received from the Government since we agreed to extend student loans under the program approximately 15 years ago.

We were frankly shocked by your suggestion that the Government may refuse to honor its guarantee of some of these loans. Our bank entered into the program in a spirit of cooperation and good faith, when very few banks in this area were willing to do so.

We have always made every effort to adhere to the guidelines given us, and the number of past-due student loans which appeared on our past-due loan lists for the last fifteen years concerned us. We have repeatedly been assured by Government employees through the years that we have been following the guidelines set forth, and had no cause for concern.

In particular, you and I discussed those loans which were in default on or about January 1981; and I related to you my conversations with Ms. Rene Simons of the Claims Section. We followed her instructions to the letter, capitalizing the accrued and unpaid interest, refinancing the entire loan and are servicing the loans for the additional 120 days. Ms. Simons assured me that the claims would then be honored for the entire amount, including the capitalized interest.

It seems to me a breach of faith by the Government to entice lenders into a program by promulgating very broad guidelines, and then altering the rules in mid-stream, and threatening to renege on its guarantee. Unlike the Government, we had no intention of making grants-in-aid to these students.

Our Advisory Board has asked me to convey to you and to the Guaranteed Student Loan Program officials, its strongest protest against this possible breach of faith.

We will appreciate your favorable response to the questions posed concerning the status of insurance coverage on these re-financed loans.

Sincerely,

LLOYD W. GEIGER,
Senior Vice President,
Inter City Offices.●

RETIREMENT OF JUDGE H. T. HADER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, this past week, Judge H. T. Hader, associate circuit judge, division III, retired. I did not want this occasion to pass without an appropriate comment commemorating Judge Hader's legal career and contributions to his community.

Long active in youth organizations, Judge Hader is the first person who ever received the rank of Eagle Scout from Lafayette County. His interest in Scouting continued throughout the years. In 1978, he was selected to be the Eagle Scout Court of Honor sponsor for the council. He also serves on the executive board of the Kansas City Heart of America Council.

Judge Hader began his legal career in 1939 in Lexington with the office of Judge Charles Lyons. After serving in World War II in the Army, European theater, he returned to private practice and was elected prosecuting attorney for Lafayette County. In 1966, he and two other attorneys formed the law-firm of Aull, Hader, and Sherman. He was named to the bench in 1974, where he has served with honor and distinction. Judge Hader has contributed to the legal system, to Scouting, and to the community. I congratulate him on his many years of service and wish him and his lovely wife all the best in the days ahead.●

NEED FOR BETTER PERSPECTIVE ON POTENTIAL HAZARDS

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that I have been promoting since I came to the Congress 3 years ago. An issue that encouraged me to give up the private sector and academia for elected office. The issue is bringing a better scientific basis to regulation and ultimately regulatory reform.

We all face risks to our health and safety in daily life which we try to reduce. The public wants the benefits of a cleaner, safer environment while the subject of regulatory reform enjoys an ever wider appeal. People are also concerned about counterproductive regulation and its effect on inflation, their jobs and the well-being of their communities. It is evident that regulatory reform must include targeting of scarce regulatory dollars into the areas of greatest risk or dangers to people. With finite tax dollars, regulating risks that turn out to be negligible or very small, means real dangers may go unattended while economic damage is great. In an age very much dependent on technology, we need to put hazards in perspective. We need to draw on all our communications abilities to bring that perspective to the public. Then, take the most intelligent actions within that perspective to support our regulatory efforts.

From the scientific standpoint, we must understand what we are dealing with. A scientist does not claim to understand something like a "potential" hazard until he has objectively assessed it and its effects. Too often, in the past, we have not been objective in our assessment of potential hazards. Politics enters the fray early on and scientific logic is readily surpassed by sensationalism and the rhetoric of scare. I was reminded of this fact when I read an article in the Bethlehem, Pa., newspaper, the Globe Times, which reviewed some of our recent knee jerks which have caused unnecessary anxiety for the public. The article makes the point that calm, reasonably objective evaluations of a technical-regulatory situation seldom makes news headlines. The article is a compelling argument to give risk assessment its due. I believe that risk assessment will contribute to giving some perspective to the health, safety, and environment regulatory tangle we are in. Legislation I have introduced, I hope will add to the efforts to better the technique and the use of risk assessment as a factor in our regulatory process. I have introduced my revised bill, The Risk Analysis Research and Demonstration Act of 1981, this year

after some productive hearings last year. In addition to developing the methods, this bill offers to organize and give some direction to risk assessing actions already going on in our Federal agencies. Risk assessment needs to be understood more fully, both its strengths and its limitations as we seek the goal of putting hazards in perspective for the public.

For the benefit of my colleagues the Globe Times article follows:

[From the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Times, July 24, 1981]

RELAXED SKEPTICISM ANTIDOTE TO FOOD HEALTH SCARES

(By Louis Rukeyser)

NEW YORK.—It's a cliché of journalism—unfortunately, still all too true—that those who make violent and irresponsible charges will tend to capture bigger headlines than those who come along later and attempt, calmly and objectively, to set things right.

Today I'd like to take a few moments of your time to observe how this phenomenon has been operating lately in an area that affects every one of us emotionally, physically and economically: the effects, real and alleged, of chemicals and food additives on our personal well-being.

To some, it's all simple—and simplistic. All chemicals and additives are bad, existing only because of rapacious corporate greed. Back to the forest primeval!

Alluring—and nonsense. As one with three children of his own, I'm as concerned as anyone with protecting them from needless risk. But the notion that giving free rein to anti-corporate paranoia is the route to a healthier and happier America has now gotten so far out of hand that it deserves to be brought to account. Consider:

(1) In case you missed it (and it wouldn't be surprising if you did), a careful study by the New York State Department of Health—published after painstaking review by the highly respected magazine *Science*—shows that people living near Love Canal don't get cancer at a faster rate than any of New York's citizens.

This highly publicized industrial-waste site near Niagara Falls has been the cause of near-panic for area residents for some time now. The very name "Love Canal" has become an inflammatory symbol, to many, of grievous harm to a hapless population. Now comes this little-noticed investigative report on what actually happened; it isn't likely to be the last word on this controversy, to be sure, but it's worth emphasizing that the first word, at least, is surprisingly reassuring.

(2) A much-ballyhooed 1978 study done at MIT for the Food and Drug Administration indicated that rats fed sodium nitrite showed an increased rate of lymphatic cancer. Fears were fanned of still another horrible carcinogen in our daily food.

Yet last year, after further study, the FDA and the Department of Agriculture admitted—ever so quietly—that there really wasn't sufficient evidence linking sodium nitrite to cancer.

(3) The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which consistently has been among Washington's most conspicuous over-reachers, was characteristically quick on the trigger in promulgating rules for exposure to the solvent benzene.

In July 1980, the Supreme Court voided these rules—on grounds that OSHA simply

couldn't justify its speculation with scientific facts.

(4) Perhaps the loudest brouhaha of all was over saccharin, the artificial sweetener that raised such havoc when fed in massive doses to rats. This column was an early voice raising serious, pointed questions about the hysteria being promulgated over saccharin; in this case, fortunately, the public resisted panic, and Congress moved to prevent a precipitate ban.

Now, guess what? Long after the furor had subsided, the American Health Foundation, the National Cancer Institute and Harvard University's School of Public Health all reported that clinical studies on 4,000 humans led to the conclusion that absolutely no tie could be established between normal use of saccharin and bladder cancer.

The point is not to reject all charges blindly nor to discourage those carrying on legitimate and desirable research. But we ought to recognize (a) that the "publish or perish" syndrome sometimes leads academicians to hype their findings and rush to go public; (b) that ideologues are always anxious for new ammunition, however flimsy, with which to attack an economic-growth system they deplore; and (c) that bureaucrats are notoriously quick to issue regulations but slow to admit error in the light of new facts.

Zero risk is unattainable in this vale, but it is natural for all of us to seek a healthier world. There is no conflict between that goal and a calmer, less paranoid reaction to the next scare headline. Too often the truth, when it catches up, is far less terrifying—and far less publicized. A dose of relaxed skepticism has frequently proved the best medicine of all. ●

WASHINGTON COLLEGE,
CHESTERTOWN, MD.

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce a House resolution honoring the 200th anniversary of Washington College, in Chestertown, Md.

The college will celebrate its anniversary next May, as it was on May 24, 1782, that the bill granting its charter was enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland.

I introduce this bill today so that it will be available for the college's bicentennial convocation ceremony, to be held on October 10 of this year.

Washington College is a small school, but its place within the educational history of Maryland and of the Nation endows this occasion with a special importance. It is, after all, the college first chartered in the State of Maryland, and the 10th in this country. It was named, its charter states, in order to serve "in honorable and perpetual memory" of His Excellency George Washington. Washington himself contributed the "helping sum" of 50 guineas to the school, as "an earnest" of his wishes for its prosperity,

and visited the school in 1784, to sign his name as a member of the governing board.

In these ensuing 200 years many notable persons have graduated from Washington College: Thomas Ward Veasy, class of 1795, served three consecutive terms as Governor of Maryland; William Holland Wilmer, class of 1802, founded Virginia Theological Seminary, and was elected president of William and Mary College; and John Emory, class of 1805, assisted in the organization of New York University, Wesleyan University, and Dickinson College. These are but three of the numerous Washington College alumni and alumnae who have made significant contributions to the development of this country. I will not list them further, but I do recommend to you an excellent history of the school entitled "Washington College," written by Fred W. Dumschott, which describes in vibrant detail the long history and extensive contributions of Washington College and its graduates.

Washington College has served well the State of Maryland and the United States of America for two centuries. Today in anticipation of the advent of its bicentennial year, I send to all those who are, and have been, a part of Washington College my congratulations. They have much to be proud of. ●

THE SMALL AND INDEPENDENT
BUSINESS PROTECTION ACT
OF 1981

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the business world is currently experiencing a phenomenon that I believe to be partly responsible for some of the Nation's economic woes—the accelerated activity in corporate takeovers, or the so-called merger mania.

The recent growth in this activity has been record setting. As reported in the Wall Street Journal earlier this month, W. T. Grimm & Co., of Chicago, a merger broker that keeps tabs on acquisition announcements, says 1981 second quarter merger activity kept pace with the first quarter, when corporate purchases totaled \$17.5 billion, an increase of \$7.2 billion over 1980's first quarter. It has even been predicted that by the end of the third quarter, the 1981 total will surpass the 1980, full-year record total of \$44.3 billion.

This trend is worrisome, to say the least. Beyond traditional antitrust concerns, such as those posed by a possible merger between Conoco and Mobil, there are problems related to national productivity. The resources

that companies devote to acquisitions could better be spent on plant modernization and other capital improvements, or innovative research and new product development. I am afraid that what we are seeing instead is a pattern of short-sighted profit maximization and empire building.

Productivity is already in a severe slump. Our economy is crying out for new investment in modernized plants and equipment, in new technology, new products, in new ideas and for aggressive management. But rather than using capital in this manner to create new jobs and increase productivity, too many U.S. corporations are looking to mergers for paper gains. They are buying, not building. And, this may well cause, at least in the short term, a further rise in interest rates.

Another problem accompanying the merger movement is the transfer of control of local businesses to distant cities. Absentee corporations do not have the sense of commitment and community pride that home-grown enterprises do. Important decisions concerning subsidiaries made in distant headquarters are more likely to be made without regard to the needs of the subsidiary's local community or the concerns of local officials, civic leaders or union members. This often results in more job layoffs, plant closures and the loss of local support services and industries.

Increasing size generally brings with it increasing influence, and this describes another danger posed by the merger movement. As corporate entities grow, their voices in the political arena get louder, drowning out the voices of individual American citizens whose wealth and power cannot approach that of huge corporations. Allowing uncontrolled growth of concentrated economic power can only take Government further away from the people.

Another consequence of enormous mergers is that the American tradition of free competition is jeopardized by unbridled economic concentration. Cross subsidization and reciprocal selling are abilities unique to large profit-centered conglomerates which can, if exercised, do harm to the vigor of competition.

These are just a few of the obstacles I see which uncontrolled conglomerate merger movement presents to our traditional interests and values. Simply stated, if huge multibusiness domains are allowed to continue freely consolidating, growing in size and wealth but decreasing in number, we will face the real threat that the entire American economy and way of life will someday be dominated and manipulated by a minute handful of powerful corporate overlords. The threat to our democracy, as well as our free enterprise system, is obvious.

For these reasons, I am today re-introducing a bill I sponsored during the 96th Congress—the Small and Independent Business Protection Act. Specifically, the bill prohibits mergers between companies with assets or sales exceeding \$2 billion. It also prohibits mergers between companies with assets or sales over \$350 million unless the companies can prove that the transactions would enhance competition or result in substantial efficiencies, or unless the acquiring company divests itself of part of its business equal to that gained in the merger.

I was pleased to learn recently that Representative PETER RODINO has scheduled hearings before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law on the merger movement in general. The first day of hearings is scheduled for August 26. I look forward to discussing at these hearings the Small and Independent Business Protection Act and also the antitrust policy of the current administration. I am concerned that this policy may be too lenient. Antitrust enforcement is a very important role which our Government plays in securing the health of the economy. In a climate of effective antitrust enforcement, the market is better able to regulate itself—far better than Government could ever regulate it. An administration that proclaims greater reliance on the marketplace as a regulator should be more, rather than less, active in enforcing antitrust law to make sure that the public will receive the full benefits of unfettered competition. ●

JACOBO TIMERMAN

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, in an advertisement in today's Washington Post, the attorneys for Jacobo Timerman, explain why they have withdrawn from his case.

I commend it to my colleagues:

JACOBO TIMERMAN—AS SEEN BY HIS LAWYERS

(We reproduce textually the letter attorneys Ignacio Oclander and Emilio Perliner, prominent members of the Argentine Jewish community, on Oct. 20, 1980 sent to their client, Jacobo Timerman. The letter speaks for itself).

"As of today, our office has notified Argentina's Supreme Court that we have renounced the mandate you gave us in defense of your financial interests.

"We assumed your defense during the most critical moments of the war against subversion, when fear created distances between you and others, including family and strangers. We undertook your defense as a humanitarian duty, ignoring all political considerations.

"We believe one's every act should serve one's homeland with dignity. And as Argen-

tines we would have felt ashamed if, at a time when everyone turned his back on you, we too had been deaf to your plea for professional help concerning your property.

"We repeat: we did so as a humanitarian duty, without asking or accepting any remuneration—a principle we uphold now that we withdraw from your defense, rejecting any honorarium, past or future, for our intense professional efforts.

"With this background, it is obvious that we vehemently protest your initial statements abroad which affect our nation. At that time, we advised your family of our intention to drop your case. We were then assured that the information had been twisted or mis-interpreted, and that henceforth you would carefully avoid what we were told were incorrect reports.

"Now, after your voluntary and spontaneous statements to the SIP (Inter-American Press Assn.), explanations are superfluous. We feel completely incompatible in continuing to represent you. This decision is irreversible. And it emanates from us alone. We particularly stress this so that the provocateurs who today envelope you cannot dare claim that we have been subjected to official pressures. We insist: this is our own decision; the only pressure we feel is that of our own conscience as descendants of the noble Jewish gauchos of our native Entre Rios Province. Here in our Fatherland our grandparents are buried, and here our grandchildren flourish.

"Our Argentinism cannot be conferred on us by anyone; nor can anyone, no matter how powerful, deprive us of it. That is the heritage with which we were born, and which we will honor beyond death, through the generations, which follow us.

"Obviously, you think and act in a very different way.

"You also think and act differently as a Jew. You have presented the perfidious anti-Semites with an image and an argument the racist beasts have tried vainly to find for a long time: an excuse for irresponsible and resentful hatred.

THE ARGENTINE PATRIOTIC
ASSOCIATION,
Buenos Aires, Argentina. ●

THE WINNERS AND THE LOSERS

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the tax bill was the final ingredient in President Reagan's economic package. The program is now firmly in place. We all now share his hope that the economy makes a sharp and rapid turnaround—because with victory comes responsibility. If we see interest rates and inflation come down, his economic formula will have proven true. If we do not, there is a lot of suffering ahead for a lot of people. I think Ellen Goodman describes the situation very well in this column:

RICH MAN, POOR MAN
(By Ellen Goodman)

BOSTON.—It is done. Signed, sealed and delivered. Budget cuts and tax cuts. Guns over butter. Rich over poor. We are following the faith of the president.

In the next three years, the big money and big business community will, to put it succinctly, get more.

But there are strings attached to this shifting of wealth. Though they are unwritten, they are common knowledge: a list of ethical and moral promises to be fulfilled.

The cynical, and I have been among them, may simply believe that Reagan and his rich men have done what they always wanted to do: allowed those who make the most money to keep the most. Allowed a few to buy bigger yachts while the majority struggle to keep afloat.

But the glossy presentation to middle-class and working-class American people contained a more saleable visual package. It was a sponsor's dream of what the rich individuals and the big companies could do if only they were given the chance.

If we believed, if we bought the deal, they could replace the failing public "largess" with the private. If we allowed individuals rather than governments to make decisions about money, we would get the economy to work better for all of us.

If there is any truth in advertising, then we are not merely allowing the rich to keep more of the money, to do with it as they will. We are, in effect, giving them our money to use. In return, we expect investments and winnings, and we expect the winnings to be shared.

This is not a wing and a prayer on the part of the working class, the poor, the unemployed. It's a moral obligation on the part of the rich and the big.

So, there are strings and a cost-accounting to be done on the ethics of these economics and on the morality of the moneyed. We will tally up the ethical balance sheet in at least two human ways: in jobs and charity.

These are not new ideas, but they are measures of decency. As we shift our faith from the public sector to the private sector, we also shift our needs and our hopes. The burden of proof is on those who have promised to be responsible.

There are whole families waiting who have been hit by the buzz bombs of state and federal budget cuts. Some of them have seen a lifetime of public work suddenly dubbed "unessential," a lifetime status changed to "unemployed."

They are now on the losing side of this transfer of wealth.

Others, the poor, whose security has been patched fragily out of federal programs, have worried less about the government on their backs than the wolf at the door. They are also losers.

The winners in this national gamble have to perform as promised: to invest in growth, in the creation of jobs for the unemployed, especially those people whose rugs have been pulled out from under them. To behave as advertised, by improving the common wealth.

They will also be judged for charity, for their efforts to replace public support with private. Again and again, Reagan has said that private citizens can and will do what the government has done: care for their own communities. He referred more than once to the Mormon Church, where tithing is common.

The president is himself a poor role model in the annals of private charities. Less than one percent of his own income was given away.

Yet those who have joined in his marketing campaign banded about these slogans behind the budget cuts and the tax cuts. Now, the \$100,000-a-year people will have

\$2,137 extra in 1982, \$4,648 in 1983, \$5,822 more in 1984.

They must also join the supply side of fundraising. The most modest supporter of the Reagan philosophy can pay back with the labor of the volunteer.

If all this sounds harsh, full of shoulds, obligations, responsibilities, well, I feel that way. I have had little confidence in the sincerity of the ad campaign. I have seen crude self-interest under a veneer of common sense.

But we bought it, and we bought it with these invisible strings attached. It's up to the winners now to live up to their side of the deal.

We had all better hope it works. ●

OMNIBUS RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1981

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday morning, conferees completed action on the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981. The conferees resolved differences pending in the 17 standing House Committees and saved over \$35 billion for fiscal year 1982.

The reality of this action is that the conferees agreed upon a compromise on the food stamp program which resulted in a \$200 million reduction which was greater than what the House passed on June 26, 1981.

The reality is that in the telecommunications area, the conferees extended radio licenses from their current 3 years to 7 years. The House prior to this had no comparable position. Deregulation rode high in this policy arena.

Earlier the House Ways and Means recommended that child welfare and title XX were to be kept out of block grants. The reality is that the conferees agreed to a title XX block grant and a community services block grant.

Instead of encouraging the establishment of small business which have helped make this country what it is today. The conferees agreed to considerable reductions in small business loans.

The reality is that the conferees agreed to limit those who can rescue the VA funeral allowance of \$300, limited class II dental benefits and restricted reimbursements for correspondence training.

The reality is that the conferees let stand the repeal of the 122 monthly minimum social security benefit, action which will undoubtedly impact millions of our retired citizens.

The reality is that the conferees reduced Federal funding for Medicaid in fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984.

The stark reality of the reconciliation conference report is that in nu-

merous instances, the safety nets which the President promised would save those programs designed to aid the truly needy are either rendered so irrevocably impotent or else they are no longer intact.

Yes; we have a commitment to the Head Start program, section 312 rehabilitation loans, and have removed the restriction on housing assistance for communities with rent control, have agreed to increase authorizations for public housing operating subsidies and retained family planning as a categorical program. We have also paved the way for program infighting on the State and local levels, because many of the block grant proposals which consist of programs to make our citizen lives better are not targeted or directed. Hence, there will be chaos at the expense of the truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to share with my colleagues a line from the Bible which says that "You reap what you sow." By voting for the conference report to the reconciliation package we will be sowing seeds which do not contain safety nets but death traps. I only hope that Americans reap the full impact of this report before it is too late.●

THE 21ST ANNUAL UNITED STATES-MEXICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—PART I

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the 21st Annual United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference was held from the 11th to the 15th of June in Manzanillo, Mexico. That important conference brought together legislators from both nations to discuss issues of mutual concern, seek a better understanding of each other's point of view and to help improve our bilateral relations.

This year's conference came on the heels of the highly successful Camp David meeting between President Reagan and Mexico's President Jose Lopez Portillo. These important discussions set the tone and the mood for the conference that followed. In recognition of the major role that the legislative branches play in our respected political institutions, President Lopez Portillo attended this year's meeting in Manzanillo to personally express his support for its success.

The U.S. delegation to this, the oldest interparliamentary exchange, was headed by Congressman KIKI DE LA GARZA, of Texas, representing the House, and Senator CHARLES PERCY of Illinois, from the Senate. The Mexican delegation was ably led by Deputy Luis M. Farias from the Mexican

Chamber of Deputies and Senator Morelas Jaime Canseco from the Mexican Senate. The leaders of both delegations deserve special recognition for their important contributions to the success of this year's meetings.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have followed United States-Mexico relations closely for some time and was once again honored to serve as a member of the U.S. delegation for the fifth consecutive year. In this capacity, I was privileged to lead the discussion on the subject of the law of the sea. For the benefit of my colleagues, I submit the full text of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS (26TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK) BEFORE THE 21ST MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE HELD IN MANZANILLO, MEXICO, JUNE 12, 1981

WORKING TOWARD A LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to discuss briefly the situation with regard to the United States participation in the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea, which I have followed with considerable interest for several years as a member of the U.S. Department of State's Public Advisory Committee on the Law of the Sea, as a congressional advisor to the U.S. Delegation to the Conference and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Before the 10th session of the Conference that convened in New York last March, the Department of State announced that the new Administration would conduct a full fledged policy review of U.S. participation in the Conference, and several high-level personnel changes were made in the U.S. Delegation.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has held several hearings following the conclusion of the New York session, with the new head of the delegation, Assistant Secretary of State, James Malone and, with Ambassador Elliot Richardson, former delegation chairman and president of the U.S. Public Advisory Committee on the Law of the Sea.

Permit me to note two points in this regard: first, the rationale for the policy review; and second, certain problems that the U.S. has identified in the text of the draft convention.

Why a policy review?

Any new administration has the inherent right to review policy on foreign affairs matters. Indeed, the review of U.S. policy in the Conference is considered necessary if the draft convention and, ultimately, the treaty is to obtain the advice and consent of the Senate. It would be unfortunate to conclude the negotiations after years of difficult and delicate work only to have the United States not ratify the treaty. The new administration aims to study the convention in order to make its own imprint on the treaty process and thus legitimize what I hope will be its support for the conclusion of a comprehensive Law of the Sea treaty.

Extent of review

With respect to the policy review—In testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the new head of the U.S. Delegation,

Assistant Secretary Malone has indicated that the policy review is to be thorough and to cover all aspects of the draft convention including U.S. interests and objectives. He also indicated that the review would not be complete until late summer or early fall of 1981. Some of my colleagues and I believe that the U.S. should conclude its policy review promptly and be prepared to return to the resumed session of the conference on August 3. Indeed, I have personally raised this issue with Assistant Secretary Malone and in the recent meeting of the Public Advisory Committee on the Law of the Sea.

Besides the problem of the time-frame, the Administration in its review thus far has identified several problems with the text of the draft convention. These mainly relate to the provisions on the international Seabed Authority, some of which had been identified by the previous administration for review. In brief, let me enumerate some of these problems:

First, access by miners to the international seabed—the draft convention provides that applications of mining companies are to be granted by the Authority upon the approval of the Legal and Technical Commission. Such approval can be reversed only by consensus. However, the industry is concerned that there may be an arbitrary delay or disapproval by the Legal and Technical Commission of an application. To provide assurance to miners, it would be useful to provide a provision calling for prompt commercial arbitration in the event of the Commission's failure to approve an application to mine.

Second, the composition of the 36-member council is a concern—In particular, the U.S. government is concerned that the draft convention assures the Soviet Union a guaranteed seat, but it does not guarantee the U.S. a seat. While the U.S. is likely to be able to obtain a seat either as a major investor or net importer of seabed minerals, the Administration and the industry, considering the huge investments involved, believe that there is a need for the U.S. to clearly have a seat on the Council.

Third, the Administration is quite concerned with the provisions for the transfer of technology—The "Enterprise," as an entity established by the treaty, will parallel the development of the seabed by private companies. The draft convention requires the seabed miner to sell the technology it owns to the Enterprise, if the Enterprise is unable to purchase suitable technology on the open market. It must also provide assurances for the transfer of third-party technology which he is using. The same requirements apply for transfer to developing countries. Some changes in the draft convention are needed which would eliminate the complications of transferring technology used by third parties to the Enterprise and the mandatory sale of technology to parties other than the Enterprise.

Fourth, the preparatory commission and the protection of prior investments—The industry requires that the investments that they are now making in seabed mining be protected under the draft convention. The preparatory commission, which should be responsible for preparing rules and regulations for the authority and the mining system, should also have authority to approve applications of miners that have made major investments over a prior period, thus allowing them to proceed with their mining capability upon receiving assurance of a

suitable mining site and contract terms. This would protect their prior investments.

I very much hope that these problems can be worked out in the near future. It is my belief that these matters should and can be ironed out within the context of the present negotiations on the draft convention. The Law of the Sea Treaty is a milestone for international relations and represents a most unique opportunity. Never before has such an international agreement on matters of mutual concern to so many states of the world been attempted. One can not underestimate the importance of concluding a comprehensive treaty on the Law of the Sea. Such a treaty would promote a high degree of international order; it would establish rules by which potential conflicts could be resolved by peaceful means. In this respect the U.S. and Mexico could look to such a treaty as a guide for bilateral maritime relations.

As we know, there has been a lingering disagreement between our two nations concerning our mutual fishing rights within our 200 mile zones. For several years there have been unsuccessful negotiations to resolve these disagreements. Just this past week, as part of the Camp David discussions between President Reagan and President Portillo, it was agreed that these negotiations would be resumed in order to resolve this issue. Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Everett Briggs, assured our House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee that the State Department will move expeditiously to activate these negotiations.

Neither U.S. nor Mexican interests are served if we cannot come to some agreement on the regulation of highly migratory species such as tuna. Our governments have had differences in the past over the issue of allocating tuna; however, I hope very much that we can reach agreement soon. Efforts to resolve these issues would be in accord with the general principles of the draft convention on the Law of the Sea that provides that states should engage in international cooperative arrangements concerning living resources of the sea.

I would finally like to relate my vigorous endorsement of the guiding principle on which the Law of the Sea Treaty is based. The oceans of the world, and the seabed underneath, represent the resources of the future. I believe all states should share the benefits and the administration of the international seabed area. It is my hope that the path of negotiations will not stray from the universal goal of using this "common heritage of mankind" to the utmost of man's capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to building a cooperative spirit between our two nations as we address these important issues of mutual concern.●

COMPULSORY CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS REFORM ACT

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, despite all of the Federal legislation enacted in recent years to regulate the election process in the United States, Congress has failed to limit one of the most blatant abuses of the American political system—the use of compulso-

ry union dues for political purposes. As a result, millions of American voters are forced to support political candidates and causes which they might otherwise oppose.

Of all private organizations in this country, only labor unions can require a person to pay money as a condition of getting and keeping a job. Under this unique special privilege, unions collect about \$3 billion a year from individuals who have to pay up or be fired. The Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended in 1976, prohibits the use of compulsory dues for direct cash contributions to candidates. This appears to restrict the use of compulsory union dues for political purposes. However, the law specifically permits union officials to use money, taken from workers as a condition of employment, to finance the operations of union PAC's and provide extensive "in-kind" political services such as mass mailing, phone banks, precinct visits, and voter registration drives. This in-kind spending is neither documented nor reported to the FEC.

On July 31, I introduced legislation, the Compulsory Campaign Contributions Reform Act, which would guarantee the right of voluntary participation in the election process. This bill would close the current loophole in the FEC law by requiring that all moneys used for political purposes—not just direct contribution—be derived from voluntary contributions. It will protect the political freedom of the working man and woman.

We must not permit any man or organization to force any person to make political contributions against his beliefs or convictions. I hope that every one of my colleagues who share that view will actively support my bill, and I invite your cosponsorship.●

BRAC INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT FRED J. KROLL

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1981, BRAC president Fred J. Kroll lost his fight against leukemia. His death at the young age of 45 is a great loss to his family, his union, and this country.

For us who knew Fred Kroll, the thought of him losing any battle came as something of a surprise even though the opponent was leukemia. Fred Kroll was a hard working man whose determination and drive afforded him a personal success story which in the end benefited every one of his union's members.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to insert a biography of Mr. Kroll in the RECORD. This biography

was prepared by those who knew Fred Kroll, and were fortunate enough to share in his life on a daily basis, the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

FRED J. KROLL, 1935-1981

A courageously-fought five-year battle with leukemia ended on July 30, 1981 when BRAC International President Fred J. Kroll died at the age of 45.

Death came in a Philadelphia hospital where he had been undergoing treatment and where, characteristically, he continued to chart the union's course and to develop programs and strategies for future collective bargaining and legislative campaigns.

Kroll first became president of BRAC in 1976 when he was chosen by the union's Executive Council to complete an unexpired term of office. He was reelected president by acclamation at BRAC's 1979 Toronto Convention.

When he was elected a member of the AFL-CIO's Executive Council in 1978, he became the youngest person ever to be named a federation vice president.

Assuming a leadership position within the ranks of rail labor, Kroll was elected chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association in February 1980. Composed of leaders of 20 unions with membership in the railroad industry, the RLEA is a policy-making group dealing with legislative and regulatory issues involving railway workers and the industry of which they are a vital part.

EARLY CAREER

No stranger to literally thousands of BRAC members, Kroll was an active and dedicated member of the Brotherhood for 28 years.

Born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on October 29, 1935, he came from a trade union family. His father was a long-time member of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

BRAC's leader launched his rail career in 1953 as an IBM machine operator on the former Pennsylvania Railroad. Quickly becoming involved in Quaker City Lodge 587, he served as vice president, president, and local chairman.

In 1970, he was elected general secretary-treasurer of the Penn-Central System Board. The next year he was elected general chairman.

Unanimously returned to office as general chairman in 1973, he continued to head BRAC's largest system board until January 1975 when the Executive Council elected him an international vice president. He was reelected at the union's May 1975 Convention in Washington, DC.

During the period of his general chairmanship and later his vice presidency, his leadership abilities were successfully tested while meeting the challenge of protecting workers' rights when the northeast railroads (including the giant Penn-Central) plunged into bankruptcy. He played a key role in shaping the legislation that led to the creation of Conrail.

From his earliest days as a trade unionist, Kroll was widely recognized as a skilled and determined negotiator.

An equally skilled and forceful spokesman on behalf of his own members and all of rail labor, Kroll spearheaded the April 29 Rail Labor Rally in Washington that drew 20,000 railroaders to protest the Reagan Administration's budget-cutting policies with regard

to Conrail and Amtrak. Throughout March and April, he worked tirelessly in testifying before Congress to urge restoration of adequate funding for both railroads.

And, shortly before his death, congressional conferees adopted legislation to insure the continuation of Conrail and Amtrak and to provide a solution to the financially ailing Railroad Retirement System.

FROM "REASONABLE MILITANT" TO "MAVERICK LEADER"

Once describing himself as a "reasonable militant," Kroll quickly captured the attention of the media after his election as BRAC president and was frequently profiled in major news magazines and newspapers.

The Norfolk and Western strike, which he launched in July 1978 and which lasted for 82 days, tested his mettle, and his masterful handling of it led to the eventual elimination of both the rail industry's mutual aid pact and one existing in the airline industry. Business Week magazine called him "the maverick leader who bested the N&W."

Kroll himself described that precedent-setting strike as one that "let the railroads know we are an aggressive union, that we mean business and that we have the support of our people."

A cover story in the August 1979 issue of Time Magazine on "Fifty Faces for the Future" cited BRAC's president as one of those who possessed "the sense of boldness that remains the prime prerequisite for leadership." The article described Kroll's efforts to make the labor movement more attractive for younger workers by encouraging greater initiative at the local level.

As Next Magazine phrased it in an April 1981 profile, Fred J. Kroll was one of the "five-score Americans who has the potential to achieve substantial power over the minds and lives of their fellow citizens during this decade."

That potential ended tragically on July 30, 1981 but his legacy of bold leadership and dedication to economic justice and dignity for workers will endure.

A devoted family man, he leaves his wife Hildegard; three daughters—Karen, Anita and Michele; his parents—Fred and Catherine; and three brothers—Albert, John and Joseph.●

DEDICATION TO REV. HUGH
MCHENRY MILLER

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago, Rev. Hugh McHenry Miller came to Dover as pastor of the First Memorial Presbyterian Church. A benign man of religious devotion and knowledge, Reverend Miller took a great deal of interest in the welfare of his congregation and the residents of Dover and Morris Counties.

He participated in and promoted many community service programs, such as the drug and alcohol abuse council, the recreation commission, the library board, and the Dover Volunteer Fire Department. He served as finance chairman of the Dover Child Care Center and the president of the Rotary Club.

Reverend Miller donated his time to other organizations as a member of the health planning council, as chairman of the Morris County Welfare Board, and as director of the Morris County Legal Aid Society where countless people were helped thanks to his unselfish concern for his fellow man.

A minister of the Presbyterian faith, Reverend Miller was equally involved in church affairs in the local community and on the State level. The First Memorial Presbyterian Church of Dover was cited for ministry to military personnel and families by the U.S. Army Munitions Command at Picatinny Arsenal in Dover. He furthered the cause of interdenominational organizations as well when he served as chairman of the General Commission on Chaplains and Armed Forces Personnel in Washington, D.C., and as a member of the Commission on Ministry to Service Personnel in East Asia of the National Council of Churches of Christ.

Reverend Miller has offered guidance and counsel to many troubled souls, compassion to those in times of need, and spiritual uplifting and peace to many in today's hectic world.

I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to recognize the many accomplishments of Rev. Hugh Miller during his 35 years of service to the secular and religious communities in Dover and Morris Counties. And on behalf of the many people whose lives he has touched in some small way, I would like to offer my most sincere gratitude. I wish the reverend and his family much happiness in the years ahead.●

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE UNITED
STATES

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a particularly thoughtful article that recently appeared in the Washington Star entitled "Uneasy Eye on the Anti-Semitic Fringe." Phil Baum, the author of this piece and an associate executive director of the American Jewish Congress, has long been recognized as one of the outstanding leaders of the American Jewish community.

Mr. Baum makes two important points in his article. First, he notes that, despite media reports of intensified anti-Semitic vandalism and violence in the United States, there is considerable evidence that anti-Semitism is not on the rise here. In fact, Mr. Baum concludes that anti-Semitism "has become shabby, disreputable, and abhorrent" in the eyes of the

American people at large. But he also warns that there is still cause for concern about a revival of anti-Semitism, particularly at a time when the economy is declining and social opportunities are narrowing.

I urge my colleagues to read this article, the text of which follows:

UNEASY EYE ON THE ANTI-SEMITIC FRINGE
(By Phil Baum)

In one sense the Jewish community can never properly be accused of overreacting to signs of anti-Semitic activity. The trauma of the Hitler period does not allow us to feel entirely secure even in free and apparently enlightened societies. The history of Western culture is burdened by a tragic legacy of anti-Semitic prejudice. We sense that this predilection, quiescent from period to period, lurks beneath the skin of our civilization.

At the same time, it is imperative to perceive accurately the situation we currently confront. In recent months, reports of intensified anti-Semitic vandalism and violence have filled the media. These attacks have, for the most part, taken the form of scurrilous graffiti scrawled on the walls of houses and schools, the defacement and looting of synagogues and other public Jewish buildings and demonstrations, rallies and marches by neo-Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan.

Viewed against the vastness of our country, the complexity and heterogeneity of our society and the general increase in crime in America, however, the problem of anti-Semitic vandalism cannot be said to be in imminent danger of getting out of control. This judgment is confirmed by the latest Gallup Poll, which shows that positive attitudes toward Jews have increased in recent years.

There is no evidence that any of the reported acts of anti-Semitism were carried out in concert or pursuant to any common design, purpose or arrangement. In the overwhelming of the cases in which the perpetrators have been found, they have been teenagers under the age of 17, and in virtually all cases they acted independently. There is no evidence of conspiracy.

The principal basis for the persistent belief that there is a resurgent, organized effort to promote anti-Semitism in the United States derives from reports of a re-viving Ku Klux Klan and American Nazi party. And, indeed, both government reports and the findings of private investigators tend to confirm that there are significantly more Klan members today than there were a year ago. Yet it seems fair to say that the Klan does not appear on the verge of a breakthrough in terms of public support.

IMPOTENCE DEMONSTRATED

Similarly the various neo-Nazi parties in the last year have captured a larger share of media notice—but with no evidence of concomitant growth in their influence, standing or numbers. On the contrary, American Nazi rallies and demonstrations during the past several years have proved the impotence of these fringe groups and demonstrated their marginality and the total contempt and hostility in which they are held.

Moreover, the results of last November's elections (even though members of the Klan and Nazi party were able to attract enough votes to win two or three primary election contests) attest unmistakably to

the sharp, almost historic, decline of anti-Semitism as a factor in American elections. Jews continue to hold public office in numbers disproportionate to their percentage in the population. In fact, Jewish candidates were elected to high position not only in districts in which there was a large Jewish constituency but also in places in which Jewish voters were few. Here, too, the Gallup Poll confirms the facts. In 1937, 46 percent of Americans responding to the poll said they would vote for a Jewish presidential candidate; by 1978, the figure had risen to 82 percent.

All the social indices measuring anti-Semitism over the years converge in this same direction. Jews are not significantly discriminated against in employment or housing. Jews confront no special encumbrances in gaining admission to the most prestigious universities and professional schools. More critically, there is not a single public personality or molder of public opinion, not a single influential publication, not a single important radio or television commentator who has not expressed complete and total abhorrence and revulsion over anti-Semitism in all of its manifestations.

Finally, there are no significant denominations or church bodies in this country which espouse or condone anti-Semitism, although there are certainly individual religious leaders who come close. When they do, they are invariably repudiated by their own colleagues and their own churches and find it necessary or at least prudent, to attempt to explain away their comments and to disavow any anti-Semitic intent.

LEGACY OF THE SIX MILLION

The fact is that anti-Semitism has become shabby, disreputable and abhorrent since the slaughter of the Six Million by the Nazis. To be sure, this is an intolerable price for our acceptance. We would rather have back the Six Million and take our chances with the world, as we have done throughout our history. But this at least is the legacy left to us by those martyred by the Nazis.

Why then, the persistent, pervasive sense of unease? Because despite these indicators, we still intuit a certain potential for instability at the heart of public life.

Most Jews believe that the well-being and security of our own community is intimately and ultimately bound up with the manner and intelligence with which our country collectively confronts the challenge of national life. At a time of a declining economy and narrowing social opportunity, no one can dismiss a pronounced societal trend toward irrationality, a susceptibility to absolute and simple solutions, a dangerous and increasing impatience with the tensions and ambiguities that inhere in freedom.

The social and psychological mechanisms that produced cults and inspired mystical fads have more recently encouraged a proliferation of extremist political groups that do not flinch at claiming moral rectitude as well as political panaceas. It is not inconceivable that the yearning for certainty and simplicity in a complex world may become further corrupted and induce some to revive the mythology of anti-Semitism.

As Jews, neither our past nor our present allow us to relax into smugness. But neither must we mount the barricades or erect fences around our community. It is in helping to make a better world that the Jewish community acts truest to its prophetic tradition and its own self-interest. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ALL MINERS WORK IN A DANGEROUS LEAGUE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, debating whether metal, nonmetal, and other mining are less dangerous than coal mining is like debating whether to stop is more sudden in falling from 300 yards or 300 meters—distinctions can be found, but they make very little difference in the result.

All forms of mining are dangerous. Distinctions make very little difference when it comes to result.

On these results the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) keeps statistics and arranges them in a formal fashion so they can be properly introduced to the Congress as data.

And the data for the first 9 months of 1980 show us:

A death rate underground of 0.08 per 200,000 mine hours among coal miners.

A death rate underground of 0.07 underground for all other forms of mining.

A death rate of 0.03 for surface coal miners.

A death rate of 0.05 for all other surface miners.

If the 97th Congress is like Congresses past, bills will be passed to exempt certain forms of surface mining from MSHA jurisdiction on the supposition they are less dangerous or somehow different.

But the data show:

A death rate of 0.06 for those who work in surface stone pits and quarries.

A death rate of 0.05 for surface sand and gravel pits.

A death rate of 0.05 in surface non-metal mines.

A death rate of 0.04 in surface metal mines.

Remember, this is matched against a surface coal mine death rate of 0.03 and an underground rate of 0.08

Clearly some forms of mining for which exemption is sought—on the supposition of difference—approach underground coal mining in danger.

In addition, surface miners of stone and sand and gravel accounted for 47 percent of all surface mining fatalities in the United States.

Stone mining alone accounted for 28 percent.

And those who tear stone and sand and gravel from the earth represent only 21 percent of all surface miners, but take 47 percent of the deaths.

The data seem to show that anybody who mines at the surface is playing in the same league, a fast and dangerous one.

Mining in any manifestation is very dangerous, and there may be small dis-

tinctions, but there are very few differences.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, preliminary MSHA figures for last year indicate that mining deaths in 1980 were below mining deaths in 1979.

In MSHA we have an effective agency that pays attention to miner safety and health and only miner safety and health. There is concentration, focus and knowledge. These are things Congress should reinforce rather than disturb. ●

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week received a new spirit from the strong support it received from events held across the country. Such active support for the cause of freedom will provide the spark to effective year-long efforts in the unending struggle for a triumph over communism. This is the inspiration of Captive Nations Week.

I would like to insert several news articles and reports of observances of the week as evidence of this new spirit. These reports follow:

INVOCATION BY THE VERY REVEREND STEPHEN SHAWEL, C.S.S.R., BEFORE THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK LUNCHEON OF JULY 15

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit:

Merciful God, as we gathered here today to mark the 22nd anniversary of the Week of Captive Nations and the 40th anniversary of the renewed statehood of Ukraine, we ask Thee, shed Your grace upon all those subjugated nations enslaved by godless communism and free them from captivity.

We especially pray for all those proud people who stand up and demand their God given freedom for their nations, and for this they are committed to forced labor camps, exile, mental institutions, and even subjected to a mandate famine.

Bless, O Father, our President Ronald Reagan, the Members of the Senate, and House of Representatives. Grant them the strength and courage to stand without compromise in the defense of human and national rights for all oppressed people in the whole world.

We ask this in Thy name in the hope that our prayers will be answered, Amen.

[From the Washington Inquirer, July 17, 1981]

REAGAN REVIVES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

An indication that the recent change of administrations brought with it a hard-nosed stance on what poses the greatest threat to human rights in the world appears in the contrast between President Ronald Reagan's Captive Nations Week proclamation issued on July 1 and those of his predecessor.

Reagan's proclamation denounces "the denial of the most elementary forms of personal freedom and human dignity," with

specific indictments of Marxism-Leninism and other forms of de-humanizing statism. Former President Jimmy Carter's Captive Nations Week proclamations were for the most part bland, cryptic memos whispering praise for the ideal of self-determination.

On July 17, 1959, a joint resolution of the Eighty-sixth Congress provided for the President to proclaim the third week of every July as Captive Nations Week. In Carter's first year in office, the week was half over before he woke up and belatedly commemorated the occasion.

Carter was better prepared in 1978; his proclamation of July 11 preceded Captive Nations Week by five days.

Carter's proclamation on June 22, 1979 designated July 15 as the start of Captive Nations Week. In this same timeframe, another captive nation was born. The Sandinista guerrillas, whose dedication to the ideals of Fidel Castro serves as inspiration to others, completed their conquest of Nicaragua—Anastasio Somoza Debayle resigned as President on July 16 and the interim government collapsed two days later.

In 1980, Carter issued the Captive Nations Week proclamation far in advance of the July 13 commencement date: May 19, the day before the Michigan and Oregon primaries. After the 1979 fiasco over the Soviet infantry brigade in Cuba, Carter may have been inspired to demonstrate that he wasn't "soft on Communism," for in a notable departure from his previous proclamations, he singled out an oppressor—a nation which had betrayed his trust and taught him much about its true nature the previous December. "Our ideal has remained that of our founding fathers: governments derive their legitimacy from the consent of the peoples they govern. Soviet aggression against Afghanistan is the latest stark reminder that this ideal is not universally respected," Carter growled.

Soviet aggression proceeded unchecked throughout 1980's Captive Nations Week, and while Soviet heavy weaponry reduced Afghan villages to rubble, the Olympic Games opened in Moscow with many Free World teams competing in spite of Carter's call for a boycott. There was one consolation for the year 1980: on July 20, the first day of the following week, 12-year-old Walter Polovchak asked for political asylum in the U.S. when his disenchanted parents prepared for the family to return to the Soviet Union.

Common to all four Carter proclamations—with the exception of the single reference to Soviet aggression—is the banality of the texts. These seemingly half-hearted proclamations are weak reeds to lean on when critics of the Reagan administration ballyhoo Carter's human rights principles.

From the language of his proclamation designating July 19 as Captive Nations Week, President Reagan appears to have a leg-up on eclipsing the Carter record. In length alone, it is two-thirds of the sum for Carter's prim releases: in vigor and feeling, it is a passionate sermon from the "bully pulpit" in condemnation of oppression.

**CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1981—BY THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
A PROCLAMATION**

Twenty-two years ago, by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the Congress authorized and requested the President to proclaim the third week in July as Captive Nations Week.

Last January 20 saw again a change in Administration under our Constitution, the

oldest written document of its type in continuous force in the world. The peaceful and orderly transfer of power in response to the sovereign will of our people is sometimes taken for granted by Americans. Yet events in some other areas of the world should remind us all of the vital, revolutionary ideal of our Founding Fathers: that governments derive their legitimacy from the consent of the peoples they govern.

During Captive Nations Week, Americans should realize our devotion to the ideal of government by consent, a devotion that is shared by millions who live in nations dominated today by a foreign military power and an alien Marxist-Leninist ideology.

This week, Americans should recall the series of historical tragedies—beginning with the broken promises of the Yalta Conference—that led to the denial of the most elementary forms of personal freedom and human dignity to millions in Eastern Europe and Asia.

In recent years, we have seen successful attempts to extend this oppression to Africa, Latin America and Asia—most recently in the brutal suppression of national sovereignty in Afghanistan and attempts to intimidate Poland.

During Captive Nations Week, we Americans must reaffirm our own tradition of self-rule and extend to the peoples of the Captive Nations a message of hope—hope founded in our belief that free men and women will ultimately prevail over those who deny individual rights and preach the supremacy of the state; hope in our conviction that the human spirit will ultimately triumph over the cult of the state.

While we can be justly proud of a government that is responsive to our people, we cannot be complacent. Captive Nations Week provides us with an opportunity to reaffirm publicly our commitment to the ideals of freedom and by so doing maintain a beacon of hope for oppressed peoples everywhere.

Now, therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning on July 19, 1981, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities and to reaffirm their dedication to the ideals which unite us and inspire others.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirtieth day of June, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-one, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fifth.

RONALD REAGAN.

OPENING REMARKS GIVEN BY HORST A. UHLICH, CHAIRMAN OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK, ON SUNDAY, JULY 12, 1981, THE OPENING DAY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, AT THE CENTRAL PARK MALL IN MANHATTAN

Senator D'Amato, Mayor Koch, Congressman Biaggi, Congressman Green, Honorable Bruce Caputo, Dr. Garcia—President of the World Anti-Communist Action Front—, Honorary Chairman Dr. Docheff, Distinguished Guests and all our Friends:

On behalf of the Captive Nations Committee of New York, I welcome you to the 23rd Annual Captive Nations Rally. We are very happy that you are all here with us today, because every one of you represents a forceful symbol of freedom. Your spirit proves that you care deeply about our work. Your very attendance at this important rally for

freedom—in these worsening times—tells the world that you have not forgotten your homelands, and you have not forgotten those who still suffer under Communist domination over these homelands. It also proves that you care very much about your adopted country, the United States. The history of this great country sets a perfect example for us. Certainly, if our Founding Fathers had sat back in their chairs, just waiting for things to happen instead of working hard, this country as we know it today would not exist.

The struggle, beginning in 1776, for freedom of the American Colonies from English tyranny, looked hopeless. To all observers, it looked like a foolish dream. But a handful of determined and courageous men risked their lives against that tyranny.

When we think of English tyranny, we cannot help but sympathize with the suffering population of Northern Ireland. And going back only a few decades, we remember with contempt the diabolical Anthony Eden, Foreign Minister of Great Britain, who was such a worshipper of the criminal Josef Stalin that he ordered hundreds of thousands of freedom fighters from the many Captive Nations—numbering many of our Slavic brothers—back to their deaths at the hands of the bloodthirsty regime in Moscow. This brutal plan, hatched in London, has become known in history as "Operation Keelhaul." On top of this, we are reminded of that product of the English political intelligence—the expulsion of 17 million East Germans from their homelands during the years 1945 to 1947. The hordes of Bolshevism were invited to overrun Eastern and Central Germany, subjecting over 3 million helpless women and children to rape and massacre while the British government rejoiced and applauded. And, of course, there were entire nations, such as the Cosacks, which were entirely exterminated—and Eastern and Central Europe were delivered to the Commies.

The United States was founded as a haven of refuge for oppressed peoples from all nations; and as such, it should be the foremost enemy of the Communist Party International. Our Founding Fathers would have wanted it that way. However, there are those who represent the Devil who, since 1917, has had only one thing in mind—to deliver more and more nations of people into the hands of the Communist Party International. We see it in the work of the *New York Times*, which devoted every column to the defeat of our heroic soldiers and sailors in Vietnam. And now, the same newspaper—assisted by the rest of the mass media that has always leaned toward the Communist dictators—is hard at work checkmating American efforts in Central and South America, with Cuba in between. And their sympathies have been with all the Red movements on the continent of Africa—even as they leaned toward Mao Tse-tung in his brutal career in the Far East.

We must get to work to overthrow this force of pro-Communist propaganda that is hiding the truth of history from the American people—especially our youth. These propagandists have no right to use the airwaves that belong to the American people, for the promotion of ideas that are leading to the destruction of American freedom, American morality—and America itself.

Now, as far as our organization and our activities are concerned: you may rest assured that the more successful we become in our efforts, the more danger there is of attack against us through negative attitudes

and undermining rumors. We must be on the alert that no one and nothing succeeds in undercutting and dividing our common front against the Communist enemy. We must go forward, as we have always done, undivided and always expanding our organization and increasing our activities.

Thus, we will carry on toward our objective of total success in freeing the Captive Nations:

Afghanistan, Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Cambodia, China, Croatia, Crimean Tatars, Cossackia, Cuba, Czechia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel Ural, Karatchays, Laos, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, North Caucasus, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Vietnam, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine.

We can and we must stop the advance of the Communist Party International. Let's stand united. And God bless us all.

FIFTH AVENUE MARCH STARTS SPECIAL WEEK FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Joachim C. Becker)

Captive Nations Week in the United States got off to a colorful start in the City as flags of 35 communist-ruled countries fluttered in yesterday's breeze during a march up Fifth Avenue to a rally at the 72nd Street bandshell in Central Park.

The parade, which began with a mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral, featured an estimated 1,000 ethnic Americans dressed in their native folk costumes and clutching national flags, an all-girl Croatian marching band and placards urging freedom for the peoples in captive nations from Afghanistan to Vietnam.

Sen. Alfonse D'Amato, the grand marshal; Rep. Bill Green, parade marshal; Horst Uhlich, chairman of the Captive Nations Committee, and other committee officials marched from parade start at 51st Street to the bandshell.

"Our nation must be second to none to thwart Soviet aggression at home and abroad. We must put the Soviets on notice that the United States has the will to oppose them and encourage the rest of the world to stand firm against them," D'Amato told the assembly gathered at the bandshell.

"God has entrusted this nation with a special mission, it has the absolute obligation to the peoples of this world to remain strong and steadfast with a commitment to peace and justice. Freedom is everyone's right," the Republican junior senator from New York concluded to cheers and applause.

Rep. Mario Biaggi, D-Bronx and Queens, joined officials at the bandshell and called attention to the important principles involved in the meaning of the week, which was established by Congress in 1959.

"This handful of committed individuals continues year after year to give hope to those people behind the Iron Curtain that some day they will have the freedom they once knew," Biaggi said.

When the paraders had filed into the bandstand area, an Israeli tourist who saw the red flags carried by the Polish contingent asked if they were a communist demonstration.

"No they are anti-communists," someone replied.

The Israeli clapped. Then he read their signs saying they were from captive nations. "Only they know what communism means and what it really means to be without a nation, like we were once," he said.

The parade had earlier passed the Yugoslavian mission to the United Nations at 66th Street, where 10 police officers watched the flags and chanters pass on the other side of the street.

"This is not a difficult detail," one patrolman remarked.

Before the parade had started, marchers talked about the situation in their enslaved homelands.

"We have to be careful what we say in our letters to my brother who is in Afghanistan. We can only say social things," said Abdullah Kwaja, who was dressed in a chapan (robe of many colors) and dopou (cap), the traditional native costume.

"We can't open our heart to them," said his wife, Sabahat.

THEY'D PUNISH OUR FAMILY

Kwaja added: "There is no freedom to send letters, it is just too dangerous. They'd punish our family, relatives, even friends."

Estonians waiting next to the people from Turkistan agreed with the Afghan refugees.

"The Soviets took the snap shots out of letters to our relatives, and we know they never got them," said Hilga Holpus, who lives in Suffolk County with her parents, who fled Estonia after World War II.

Miss Holpus, wearing a "rahva riided" or folk costume of a rust-colored skirt, white blouse and muetz (headress) said all her relatives still lived in Estonia.

"When they write us, they ask for clothes, materials, shoes and nylon stockings," she said.

At the bandshell, Uhlich assailed The New York Times for defending communism and trying to defeat "our heroic soldiers and sailors in Vietnam." He also criticized the media in general for working to "checkmate the U.S. and freedom in Central and South America."

Uhlich further warned that "media-supported communist propaganda is hiding the truth from America, especially our youth. Something has to be done against the use of U.S. air waves which are being used to destroy American young people, their morality and spirit and America herself," he said.

During the ceremony, a deeply tanned youth on rollerskates, wearing earphones, rolled to a brief stop in front of the bandshell. He listened, then skated rhythmically away.

Catholic War Veterans and Ladies Auxiliary will observe Captive Nations Week July 26, 1981 with a Rosary Service at St. Dominic's Church, 630 E Street S.W., Washington, D.C. Various nationality groups have been invited to recite the decades of the rosary in their respective languages as a means of emphasizing the plight of the people behind the iron, the bamboo, and the sugar cane curtains. All will assemble outside the church at 11:45 am. After the mass there will be a reception in the Assembly Rooms. All invited.

INSIGHTS ON CONGRESS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the July 13, 1981, issue of

Newsweek magazine. Its author, Mr. Norman J. Ornstein, has observed the deliberations of the Congress for more than a dozen years. I am sure that you will find his insights to be of interest.

DON'T BE BEASTLY TO CONGRESS

(By Norman J. Ornstein)

America's second favorite indoor sport is knocking politicians. True, this has long been the case—it goes back well before Mark Twain referred to Congress as America's only native criminal class, or Will Rogers said we have the best politicians money can buy. But lately, the criticism of our government and our leaders has been at almost a fever pitch. If the news on Congress doesn't focus on Abscam, sex scandals or alcoholism, it features tales of overseas junkets, overgenerous political perks or oversized Congressional office buildings. Political cynicism and public bitterness over our politicians' venality are rising at an even faster rate than the national debt.

None of the news stories are made up, but they tell only a small part of the story. I have watched Congress and Washington closely for more than a dozen years, most of it from the outside, and I can add with total confidence the following startling assertions:

1. Congress is clean and honest. I would bet a lot of money that the proportion of alcoholics, drug abusers, homosexuals, bribe takers and sex maniacs is no greater in Congress than it is among any other group of people with similar high-pressured jobs, whether they be doctors, lawyers, dentists, journalists, bankers or industrialists. In fact, it is probably less. But a congressman sleeping with a lobbyist or even his own wife (if it's on the Capitol steps) is news, while a businessman's affair is not—and even if the latter makes the headlines, it's not generalized in the same way. The plain fact is, however, that the overwhelming majority of people in Congress are of the basic, dull, family-oriented variety.

2. Congress works hard. The average member of Congress works 70 to 80 hours a week in public business, ranging from committee hearings to floor debate to meetings with constituents. The workweek is usually seven days, four or five in Washington and the weekend back in the district—a nomadic existence that strains family life and physical well-being. Everyone derides congressional recesses, including the President, and newsmen are especially fond of poking fun at the Congress's own term for them "district work periods." In fact, they are district work periods. Most legislators go back to their districts and work long hours—meeting with individuals, visiting senior-citizen homes or community centers. We all try to have it both ways: we accuse the member of Congress of "losing touch" if he doesn't spend a lot of time back home, and of "laziness" if he misses a vote or a meeting in Washington—but then we deride him when he tries to meet all our demands.

3. Most Congressional "junkets" are in the public interest. It is the rare trip that is taken for pleasure alone. Most congressional travel is brief, with as much time in the air as on the ground, and involves far more work than play. Our domestic and foreign policies are shaped by Congress; we need to have congressmen travel. We would be in a fine mess if we forced our legislators to become insulated from the outside world. We cannot possibly set the best policies for the United States in agriculture, arms sales,

energy or any other area without seeing how our key allies in Europe do things or how they feel about our policies. We also need direct contact with the Russians, the Chinese, the Salvadorans and every other nation. Congressional trips inform and educate, and an informed and educated Congress is in everyone's interest.

4. Congress's working conditions should be improved. Capitol Hill is filled with uncomfortable offices. It may be hard to believe—for those who read about expensive, posh office buildings (and the cost overruns are inexcusable)—but, despite the odd exception, legislators and their staffs do not luxuriate in plush offices with fancy furniture. They sweat and strain in overcrowded offices with too many people and too much noise. Few if any businesses would tolerate such a setup. Congress should have better office arrangements.

5. Members of Congress are underpaid. Every attempt to increase Federal pay results in a cacophony of screams of outrage. Of course, it is hard for the average citizen to feel sorry for a poor congressman trying to get by on "only" \$60,000 a year. But the fact is that in Washington—where a truly modest family home in a decent location goes for \$200,000 and up—\$60,000 does not go very far. This is especially true for a member of Congress, who must maintain two residences, including one in the district. Moreover, for most members, serving in Congress means a substantial financial sacrifice; their "peers"—lawyers, lobbyists and consultants—command anywhere from two to five times a Congressional salary. Our best public servants regularly receive lucrative opportunities out of government. We should keep Congressional pay at a level where legislators like Sen. Pete V. Domenici (with eight kids waiting to go through college) are not forced out of public life because they can't afford it.

I am well aware that many people will greet my claims about Congress with disbelief and outrage. But many others—including, I suspect, some who make their living reporting on Congressional scandal and sloth—will recognize their truth. I hope the latter group will start to echo my themes, or at least to counter some of the worst negative excesses. I hope that people and organizations with some clout and prestige will apply some resources to recognizing and rewarding our best public servants, instead of publicizing and emphasizing our worst.

For the foreseeable future we will be living in a political system where citizen demands exceed public supplies, where government services are cut back and redistributed, taking more from some than from others. There is no better way to commit societal suicide than to reinforce the erroneous belief that Congress is a collection of corrupt, venal, greedy and hypocritical characters who, by extension, make unfair and illegitimate decisions. I for one would rather have Congress making tough decisions than any other legislature on earth, or than any other collection of people I could name.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on July 31, 1981, I stood

with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL, in his position on minimum social security benefits, that the needy are not deprived by its elimination.

I therefore should have voted the other way.●

OLD PROBLEMS OF BUREAUCRACY GET ATTENTION

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I comment to the attention of my colleagues a recent column which appeared in the Washington Star, discussing the progress of Office of Personnel Management Director Donald Devine. Philip Shandler, the Star's columnist on Federal Government affairs, discusses Mr. Devine's efforts to improve OPM operations, in the interest of better serving Federal employees and taxpayers as well.

The article follows:

OLD PROBLEMS OF BUREAUCRACY GET ATTENTION

The new man at the helm of the federal bureaucracy is moving to untangle it from some costly and frustrating procedural seaweed that has accumulated over the years.

One mess is possible classification. It's been estimated that as many as 100,000 federal white-collar jobs are classified at too high a grade—meaning they're overcompensated, to the tune of about \$500 million a year.

Another morass is a backlog of retirement applications. As recently as January, it was about double the 30,000 cases a year that the government itself considers normal. Processing time averaged 98 days per application—in the face of a 35-day work standard. The situation has been demoralizing.

Both classification and retirement are overseen by the Office of Personnel Management, the government's central personnel agency.

In March, at a confirmation hearing, Donald J. Devine, President Reagan's nominee to head OPM, listed the retirement claim backlog as his top concern. He noted that OPM has had more complaints from Congress about this in recent years than about anything else.

Actually, the retirement backlog has been a target of OPM efforts for several years. By the time Devine came aboard, the agency, under the leadership of Gary R. Nelson, its associate director for compensation, already had streamlined its procedures and was beefing up its processing staff.

Devine kept up the momentum, and last week was able to report that the backlog was down to about 41,000 cases, that processing time had been sharply cut and that OPM expected to meet its work standards—processing fully documented applications in 35 days, for example—by Oct. 1.

Devine's report was made to members of Congress who in 1979 had asked the General Accounting Office to look into the backlog. GAO recently came up with some outdated findings and recommendations. But Devine said he welcomed GAO's "helpful suggestions."

The classification problem was laid before Devine in April, in a report by an OPM task force that had made the first major analysis of the situation in a decade. The report said that about 11 percent of the government's nearly one million white-collar positions were over-graded and about 3 percent were undergraded—a net over-grading of about 8 percent.

To deal with the over-grading problem, the report urged a \$3 million, two-year crash effort to develop new position classification standards, many of which were a decade or more old and virtually meaningless.

Devine said in an interview recently that OPM didn't have the resources for a crash reclassification program. But he said the agency is stepping up the pace of an ongoing overhaul of job standards by contracting out some of the work. It hopes to contemplate the work "over the next few years," he said.

In a speech recently, Devine also promised to resist mis-classification by federal agencies. He said he had been told that some OPM evaluators feared they wouldn't be supported if they objected to irregular classification. But Devine said he would "back anyone who reports abusive practices . . . I will go all the way up to the president, if that is what is necessary . . ."

As with reclassification, Devine cited a lack of resources for not accepting a staff recommendation that OPM review all conversions by agencies, after Jimmy Carter had lost the White House to Ronald Reagan, of political appointees to career positions (from which these people can be dislodged only with considerable difficulty).

During the transition this winter, OPM had investigated reports of impropriety in 43 conversions, had found that 13 had been improper and had reversed them, GAO reported in June GAO endorsed an OPM staff recommendation for a review of the conversions—a proposal that the Carter White House had rejected, as it was disclosed here.

But Devine said recently that he was satisfied that in investigating allegations of impropriety during the transition, OPM had "caught the real problems." In any case, he said, OPM couldn't spare the staff to go back over all of the conversions.

Devine said he has under study a recommendation from one of his own appointees to deal with a simmering career executive problem. The executives resent the fact that Congress last year cut from 50 percent to 25 percent the number of them who could be given bonuses (which at their level are in place of raises) and the fact that OPM later cut the number to 20 percent.

Devine has been urged by George Neztterzuk, associate director for executive personnel, to go back up to the 25 percent level to help offset a brain drain—an unprecedented exodus of unhappy veteran careerists.

And Devine said he would like to encourage more bonuses. But he said Congress still is touchy on the issue and "I want to make sure we don't endanger the whole bonus process."●

A FIGHTER WHO WILL KEEP
GOING

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of Mrs. Marnesba Tackett.

Marnesba Tackett recently retired as executive director for Southern Christian Leadership Conference serving Los Angeles. At 73, she has not abandoned the civil rights struggle and will continue to direct a project promoting greater participation in elementary and secondary education. Twenty schools and 5,000 parents in the Los Angeles area have come together in this effort, guided by Mrs. Tackett's enthusiasm and leadership.

To many, retirement is a time of relaxation, but Marnesba has chosen to seek her dream; the realization of equal educational opportunity for black and other minority children. In her words, she "will hang in there until the last."

Marnesba Tackett easily recalls the days when separate was the prevailing mode of equal. Separate pay counters in dime stores, restaurants, and sections on public transports scar both her child and adult memories. But not even separate classrooms with only "white" text books could shake her determination to attain a college education. And after a joyful delay, caused by the birth of her daughter, she attended the Negro Branch of Kansas City College, graduating cum laude 2 years later.

As a child and then an adult, the dual system of education greatly disturbed Mrs. Tackett, causing her to believe "the whole thing is engineered to keeping a certain group of people in an inferior place."

Raised in Kansas, Mrs. Tackett's lifetime involvement with civil rights began when she joined the NAACP while still in high school. After moving to Fort Valley, Ga., where her husband, a minister served the Trinity Baptist Church, the Tacketts moved to Los Angeles. It was in southern California, while looking for a job, that she had her first taste of discrimination on account of both her sex and race. This reconfirmed her convictions about our color-conscious society and rekindled her activity in the NAACP. Marnesba's meeting of Dr. Martin Luther King in 1953, only further resolved her dedication to the cause of equal educational opportunity.

Mrs. Tackett's philosophy regarding education has kept pace with the times, and in many an instance, is a few steps ahead. Many in the Los Angeles area know Mrs. Tackett for her tireless activity in the school board.

Though never a candidate herself, she has been a key figure in many local campaigns, seeking to insure that her ideas are well represented.

Mrs. Tackett has also been instrumental in breaking down discrimination in housing in the Los Angeles area and is in fact a licensed real estate broker.

Her recent retirement dinner supplies a touching and telling story about this indefatigable woman. She arrived at her dinner, which at her request was held in a restaurant operated by a black businesswoman, with a small doll in hand. A gift from old college friends, the doll had a notice pinned to its yellow dress and read:

Put this doll on your bed or in your rocking chair. It can retire, but you keep going.

Marnesba Tackett cannot be sufficiently thanked for her devotion and continued commitment to helping others. A poem by Langston Hughes captures the spirit which she embodies.

STILL HERE

I've been scarred and battered.
My hopes the wind done scattered.
Snow has frix me, sun has baked me.
Looks like between'em
They done tried to make me
Stop laughin', stop lovin', stop livin'—
But I don't care!
I'm still here!

Mr. Speaker, I can attest that those of us in Los Angeles are indeed fortunate and grateful that Marnesba is still here. Much work remains in our cause, and it won't be done without her. ●

MONO LAKE

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I recently cosigned a letter to Congressman SEIBERLING with a number of my California colleagues regarding Mono Lake. In this letter we urged the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks to hold hearings this fall in Washington, D.C., on the whole issue of Mono Lake. Because of the increased interest in the Mono Lake issue I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared yesterday in the Christian Science Monitor. This may help explain the growing concern about current policy with regard to the entire Mono Lake area.

LOS ANGELES IS DRINKING UP BEAUTIFUL
MONO LAKE

(By Leon Lindsay, staff correspondent of
the Christian Science Monitor)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Efforts to save Mono Lake, a unique natural wonder bequeathed by the ice age to the Sierra Nevada region of California, are receiving renewed atten-

tion because of recent developments—some discouraging, and some positive.

The blue, saline lake, in dry hill country abutting 14,000-foot, snowclad peaks, is not nearly so well known as its resort-rimmed neighbor, Lake Tahoe. But it is being cited by environmentalists as a classic example of how human society can, in a few years, dismantle nature's works of eons.

Formed some 12,000 years ago when glaciers receded, Mono Lake is salty, but not "dead"—at least not yet. Its waters support a chain of life that begins with microscopic plants (phytoplankton) and takes wing with gulls, ducks, and other bird species.

Tourists who find their way to the lake marvel at the geological formations—including two volcanic islands; the Mono craters, a recently formed chain of cones and lava flows; and "tufa towers"—chalk-white, erosion-sculptured upthrusts of calcium carbonate which are in some cases delicate, in others grotesque.

What endangers Mono Lake is the thirst of Los Angeles. Since 1941, the metropolis to the south has diverted water from streams in the Mono basin to help meet its ever-growing need for water. At present, the city water and power department takes 101,000 acre-feet a year from the basin. Over the past 40 years the lake level has dropped at a rate of 1 to 2 feet a year. It was at 6,417 feet (measured from sea level) in 1941; in June of this year it measured 6,373 feet.

This summer it was discovered that, possibly because of increased salinity, the population of brine shrimp, a key part of the Mono Lake food chain, had dropped sharply. Researchers found that only 5 to 15 percent of shrimp eggs hatched in June.

One-fourth of the California gull population in the United States nests at Mono Lake, and the chicks are nurtured on brine shrimp. This summer, says biologist David Gaines, practically all the gull chicks have starved. If it happens again next year, he adds, that will be the end of the California gull colony at Mono Lake.

California gulls are not an endangered species; they breed at a number of other locations, including Utah's Great Salt Lake. But Mr. Gaines and others say that what is happening to the shrimp and gulls at the lake is dramatic evidence of how the whole system is slowly—or perhaps not so slowly—destroyed.

The answer, they say, is for Los Angeles to reduce the amount of water it diverts from the lake. In 1979 a state task force recommended several alternative plans for maintaining the lake level at 6,388 feet. The Mono Lake committee, of which Gaines is chairman, supports one of the plans.

But Los Angeles, which has a permanent state license to divert as much as 167,000 acre-feet of water annually from the Mono basin, accepts none of the alternatives.

Further, the city recently informed the US Department of the Interior that it would like to purchase 23,000 acres of federal land along the Mono Lake shore. This was in response to a letter sent out by Interior Secretary James G. Watt inviting state and local governments to apply for the right to purchase federal lands at \$1.25 an acre.

Acquisition of this land would give the Los Angeles Water and Power Department control over much of Mono Lake's shoreline. But there are countermoves afoot in California and Washington, D.C.

A bill to establish a Mono Lake state preserve was introduced this year in the Legislature. Passed 30 to 0 by the state Senate, it

is expected soon to be approved by the Assembly.

Although this step would not affect the rate of water diversion by Los Angeles, Gaines says, it would at least give official status to the lake environs and help protect against vandalism, which is increasing.

US Rep. Norman D. Shumway (R) of California, whose district includes Mono County, has introduced two bills in Congress. One would grant national monument status to the immediate Mono Lake area and provide for a study of ways to reduce water diversion. The other bill would repeal the 1936 federal law under which purchase of federally owned land at \$1.25 an acre is authorized.

Both bills have been sent to the House Subcommittee on Public Lands, and Gaines says hearings are expected in October.

He says the effort to preserve Mono Lake has gained support among state legislators and California congressmen. There is a good deal of support among officials of state resources agencies, he adds, but Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr. has taken no position. The governor, who plans to run for the US Senate in 1982, is treading a fine line on water issues, always politically dangerous here.

Perhaps more than anything else, Gaines points out, the Mono Lake committee needs support in Los Angeles. The group maintains an office there and is circulating news letters and petitions. Response lately has been encouraging, the committee chairman says. ●

CLEANING UP FEDERAL WORKERS' COMPENSATION

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, together with my colleagues Mr. ASHBROOK and Mr. JOHNSTON, comprehensive amendments to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Federal Government's workers' compensation program for its own civilian employees. FECA provides compensation—wage-replacement income, medical benefits, and death benefits to survivors—for job-related injuries or death.

This bill, entitled the "Federal Employees' Reemployment and Compensation Amendments of 1981," stems from the administration's proposal of June 2, 1981, which was incorporated in the Gramm-Latta substitute and, thus, in the House-passed reconciliation bill (title V, subtitle C, ch. 1, subch. C). The Senate did not include any amendments to FECA in its reconciliation bill. The Senate FECA subconferees, however, recognized the underlying merits of the administration's package and were prepared to recede to the House with clarifying and improving amendments. My bill incorporates those amendments.

Despite the manifest fairness of the Senate amendments, the House majority members of the subconference, in confederacy with the House majority

budget conferees, and contrary to their responsibility under the House rules to support the House position, immediately voted to recede to the Senate and, thus, sabotage the FECA amendments and the mandate of reconciliation as it related to the FECA subconference. Senator HATCH agreed only when it became apparent that his refusal would jeopardize timely consideration of the conference report on the Omnibus Reconciliation Act.

The thrust of the administration's amendments is to reduce the skyrocketing costs of the program (currently exceeding \$1 billion annually) by removing some of the current incentives for fraud and abuse, by revising the benefit structure, and by integrating the program with civil service retirement (CSR).

The record shows strong medicine is necessary. Since the 1974 amendments liberalizing the program, claims filings and costs have skyrocketed.

In fiscal 1978 the total number of FECA claims had risen to 126,000 from 31,000 in fiscal 1974, prior to the amendments. More specifically, annual filing of COP (continuation of pay) claims rose from 32,000 in fiscal 1974 to over 94,000 in fiscal 1978; and, as an indication of employees taking advantage of COP, lost-time reported injuries during this period increased from 36 to 51 percent.

Long-term claims have increased in numbers and complexity; 30,000 back injuries reported annually since fiscal 1975; hearing loss claims have jumped from 13,900 total between 1966 and 1974 to 37,200 between fiscal 1975 and 1978. These long-term cases accounted for about two-thirds of total costs in 1979, with direct payment rising from \$26.4 million in 1966 to \$463.6 million in 1979. Estimated future costs for long-term cases are over \$6 billion.

Total compensation costs have risen from fiscal 1974 to fiscal 1979 from \$270,676,000 to \$700,023,000 to an estimated \$1 billion in fiscal 1982.

While acknowledging significant FECA cost problems, some minimize this explosion by citing Federal pay increases to which FECA benefits are tied, medical costs, and cost-of-living adjustments as major contributing factors. They are, indeed, contributing factors, but focusing on these elements ignores why claims find their way into the system in the first place. That is utilization, and GAO findings indicate a rapid rise in utilization since 1974. The Government Printing Office suffered an astronomical increase in lost time injuries from 1974 to 1976 of 862 percent. The comparable figures for the Postal Service is 112 percent; for the General Services Administration, 109 percent; for Department of the Army, 106 percent; and for the Veterans' Administration, 115 percent.

Undoubtedly, some sudden incentives must have been injected into the

system to produce such a rapid expansion in caseload, utilization and costs. The narcotic is the 1974 amendments; and the FECA system has just about overdosed on them.

Significant changes were incorporated in the 1974 amendments:

First, a 45-day continuation of pay period was enacted permitting agencies to continue an employee's full pay up to 45 days following an injury. Its purpose was to alleviate claimants' cash-flow problems stemming from claims processing delays;

Second, employees were granted free choice of physician; and

Third, the 3-day waiting period before which compensation is payable was moved from the onset of disability to after the 45-day COP period.

GAO's extensive study of the FECA program places the onus for FECA's difficulties largely on these three changes. As to:

COP: Although the Federal civilian workforce has remained stable over the past 10 years, lost-time traumatic injury claims, as noted above, have risen sharply. Claims actually dropped during the period 1970 to 1974—from 17,000 to 12,000. Passage of the amendments, however, saw claims—COP claims—jump the next year to 37,000, then to 80,000 in 1976, and to 101,000 in 1979.

Three-day waiting period: The 1974 amendments' elimination of a 3-day waiting period at the onset of disability is clearly the most serious shortcoming in the present law and has led to an avalanche of abuse. GAO found that up to 46 percent—nearly half—of all COP claims could have been eliminated were there merely a 3-day waiting period at the onset of disability. Fully 46 percent of surveyed claims were considered by GAO's physician to be minor, frivolous, or marginal claims—37 percent minor or frivolous and 9 percent marginal (lasting 4 to 7 days).

Free choice of physician: The 1974 amendments granted an employee the right to choose his own physician. This, GAO concluded, has contributed to abuse of COP and to employees not using light duty to the extent possible. Specifically, GAO found that 20 percent of its claims sampled appeared abusive in occurrence, job relatedness, or duration; and that in all cases light duty could have been used.

The free choice of physician permits doctor shopping for a sympathetic physician. Not surprisingly, if the claimant's personal physician is not sympathetic, another doctor is likely to be. A physician, especially one unfamiliar with the patient or his employment, often must accept the patient's statements that he is in pain.

FECA's problems extend beyond these three areas, however:

Benefit structure: The overlay of an uncommonly generous benefit structure on COP, lack of a waiting period, and free choice of physician has aggravated FECA cost and administrative problems. The current formula based on 66½ percent or 75 percent (if one or more dependents) of gross pay (tax-free) replaces far too great a proportion of predisability pay—from 86 percent for a GS-2, receiving the basic benefit under FECA, to 118 percent at the maximum FECA rate for a GS-15. The result is claims filing incentives, and rehabilitation and return-to-work disincentives.

Retiring on FECA: The law now permits Federal employees to use FECA as a retirement system. There is essentially one reason for this malady: Generally, FECA benefits are higher than Civil Service Retirement Act annuities or other disability benefits and are tax free. In recommending conversion of FECA beneficiaries to retirement programs at age 65, the Department of Labor explored the differences in the two programs:

FECA beneficiaries receive a greater net compensation beyond retirement age than persons who retire with the maximum years of Federal service (41 years and 11 months). While current FECA benefits are tax free, and Civil Service retirement income is taxed at regular rates, the disparity between FECA benefits and CSRA retirement income would, with few exceptions, not be resolved by taxing FECA benefits. In nearly all instances, FECA benefits would still be greater than the retirement income of an uninjured worker.

The disparity in benefit rates between FECA and CSRA creates substantial economic incentive for Federal employees to seek FECA benefits. Although the absolute number is not great, there is increasing evidence that employees are seeking FECA benefits in lieu of retirement, particularly when few years of service are involved. The economic incentives are inversely related to years of service * * * In fact, under the existing system, it is possible for a permanently disabled employee to obtain FECA benefits and also withdraw all contributions from the CSR system. Workers who are injured or diseased and otherwise eligible increasingly argue that their injury is work-related.

GAO's claims survey revealed that 85 percent of FECA beneficiaries on long-term rolls will probably never return to work; 51 percent were over 55 years old. Of these, 62 percent were over 60, and 30 percent exceeded age 65. Thus, most long-term beneficiaries have, in effect, already retired. In fact, GAO found that most Federal employees retire within 3 years of eligibility—age 55 with 30 years' service—so a case could be made for converting them to CSR at age 58.

This bill addresses these and other shortcomings in FECA by:

Changing the benefit formula from 66½ percent or 75 percent of gross pay to 80 percent of spendable income, defined as gross pay minus amounts withheld for Federal, State and local

income taxes, mandatorily withheld pension contributions and, where applicable, social security;

Eliminating the 45-day continuation-of-pay period but providing a safety net of interim compensation beginning on the 21st day following the Labor Department's receipt of all information necessary to adjudication. The employing agency would also have the option of advancing compensation beginning on the third day of disability if the employee was expected to be totally disabled for at least 28 days;

Establishing a waiting period of 7 workdays at the onset of disability, with 5 days compensation repaid if the disability lasts beyond 14 days;

Converting FECA beneficiaries to civil service retirement at age 65 or when vested after age 65, returning FECA to the proper role of workers' compensation of replacing lost wages due to employment injuries;

Paying the same benefit (80 percent spendable income) to survivors as paid to disabled workers;

Paying the same benefit (GS-8 step 1) for loss or loss of use of a body member regardless of income level with no offset for wage-loss benefits;

Instituting mandatory rehabilitation;

Increasing funeral, attendants, and maintenance allowances;

Amending the basis for the cost-of-living adjustment from increases in the Consumer Price Index to the average annual Federal wage increase, so that employees on disability are treated equally with nondisabled employees;

Pursuant to hearing, prohibiting reimbursement under FECA to medical providers who have been indicted or convicted of fraud, in connection with another Federal program, or have been found to have furnished inappropriate medical services;

Requiring the Labor Department to develop a fee schedule for providers of services under FECA;

Granting employing agencies, pursuant to a recommendation by the GAO, specific authority to order agency-paid medical exams; and

Revamping the claims review process by narrowing the scope of review of cases by the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board consistent with appellate-level review, and providing both employing agencies and employees with a new right of case-reconsideration by the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs.

The legislation's effect would be prospective only, both as to the new benefit formula and conversion to CSR. Current beneficiaries would be "grandfathered" and, thus, not sustain benefits cuts.

I call on the chairman of the Labor Standards Subcommittee to schedule hearings and markup on remedial legislation.●

SOVIET UNION PERSECUTES CHRISTIANS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, in the Soviet Union, equal protection under the law means that not only Jews are persecuted for their religious beliefs. While we hear frequent horror stories of the plight of Soviet Jewry, this story of five Christians sentenced to labor camps and internal exile for seeking to emigrate to practice their religion freely is a reminder that in the Soviet Union all creeds are equally repressed so long as they deviate from the party line.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 3, 1981]

SOVIETS SENTENCE PENTACOSTALISTS

A court in the Ukraine sentenced five members of a religious group to terms in labor camps and internal exile on charges of slandering the Soviet Union, dissident sources said in Moscow. Four of the Pentacostalists were given five years in labor camps followed by five years of internal exile. The five had asked for emigration visas and renounced their Soviet citizenship in protest against not being allowed to practice their faith freely.●

WHEAT INDUSTRY COUNCIL BEGINS OPERATION

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to announce that on July 1, 1981, the Wheat Industry Council began its first fiscal year of operation. The entire wheat industry is to be congratulated and commended for their efforts in making this organization a reality.

The Wheat Industry Council was established by the Wheat and Wheat Foods Research and Nutrition Education Act of 1977. As one of the sponsors of that legislation and a longtime advocate of a wheat industry education, research, and promotion organization, I am happy to report that the intent of Congress is being fulfilled in the clearly stated goals, objectives, and planned programs of the council adopted March 24, 1981, as follows:

Contribute materially to the health and well being of all people;

Enhance the quality and use of American Wheat, processed wheat, and wheat end products to insure the economic vitality of the wheat foods industry;

Educate the public on the nutritional and economic value of wheat foods;

Increase sales and per capita consumption of wheat based foods; and

Evaluate effectiveness of the program.

The programs and activities of the council are directed by its members who represent the entire wheat foods industry and consumers. Specifically the members include the following segments: Producers—wheat farmers; processors—millers and others; end product manufacturers—bakers, pasta manufacturers, and cereal producers; and consumers. Incidentally, it should be noted that the inclusion of consumers as members of the council is unique among industry-wide promotional organizations.

The following have been appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to serve as members and alternates of the board of directors:

Baird, Vernon, Mrs. Baird's Bakeries, Inc., Fort Worth, Tex.
 Bathurst, Harry, National Wheat Growers' Association, Blackwell, Okla.
 Batty, Lauren, IIT Continental Baking Co., Rye, N.Y.
 Bisogni, Dr. Carole, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
 Capps, Clifton, California Milling Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.
 Davis, Raymond, National Wheat Growers' Association, Potter, Nebr.
 Feeney, J. J., General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Hale, H. D., ADM Milling Co., Shawnee Mission, Kans.
 Hatcher, E. L., National Wheat Growers' Association, Lamar, Colo.
 Hayes, Earl, National Wheat Growers' Association, Stafford, Kans.
 Heffelfinger, M.W.K., Peavey Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
 Hinkle, B. J., Interstate Brands Corp., Kansas City, Mo.
 Holmes, Howard, Chelsea Milling Co., Chelsea, Mich.
 Jepsen, Robert, National Wheat Growers' Association, Heppner, Ore.
 Knutson, Carolyn, Clackamas Community College, Lake Oswego, Ore.
 Krafft, Richard, Star of the West Milling Co., Frankenmuth, Mich.
 Kruse, Richard, National Wheat Growers' Association, Breckenridge, Minn.
 Liebman, Bonnie, Ctr. for Science in the Public Interest, Washington, D.C.
 Milner, Dr. Max, American Institute of Nutrition, Bethesda, Md.
 Myers, R. G., Seaboard Allied Milling Corp., Shawnee Mission, Kans.
 Nelson, Wayne, National Wheat Growers' Association, Winner, S. Dak.
 Nissen, John, Nissen Baking Co., Falmouth, Maine.
 Orth, Philip, Philip Orth Co., Oak Creek, Wis.
 Rasmussen, Dr. Arlette, University of Delaware, Newark, Del.
 Rawlinson, Frank, Centennial Mills, Portland, Ore.
 Sands, Frank, Sands, Taylor & Wood Co., Brighton, Mass.
 Schaus, Robert, Raymond Baking Co., Waterbury, Conn.
 Shepard, Victor, National Wheat Growers' Association, Gilliam, Mo.
 Sides, Sheila, Iowa Consumers League, Centerville, Iowa.
 Stack, Richard, Capital Area Community Food Bank, Washington, D.C.
 Thom, Jeane, Consumers Coop. of Berkeley, El Cerrito, Calif.
 Thurston, Lester, C. F. Mueller Co., Jersey City, N.J.

Tollett, Clifford, National Wheat Growers' Association, Thornton, Wash.

Viviano, Joseph, San Giorgio-Skinner, Inc., Hershey, Pa.

Wager, Robert, American Bakers Association, Washington, D.C.

Winterfeldt, Dr. Esther, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.

Witteman, William, National Wheat Growers' Association, Mohall, N. Dak.

Oversight is assigned to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Initially the role of the USDA was to hold hearings, conduct the referendum, and other administrative procedures. On a continuing basis it is responsible for seeing that the council's programs meet the mandate of the law.

The formation of the council was officially approved in a March 1980, referendum of end product manufacturers. The end product manufacturers will support the council under an assessment based on wheat flour usage.

I particularly want to commend those forward-looking, progressive business leaders who are supporting the Wheat Industry Council. Their efforts and their financial support will help insure that every American knows that wheat and wheat food products are essential for good nutrition; that wheat food products are an important protein source; and that wheat food products are not fattening.

Everyone—from the wheat producers to the consumers—will benefit by the council's information, education, and research programs. The council plans a balanced program which will help all segments of the wheat foods industry and the general public.

For more information on the specific programs of the council, contact executive director, C. Joan Reynolds, Suite 205, 6000 Executive Boulevard, Rockville, Md. 20852; telephone (301)984-1300.

A TRULY AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, for over a century and a half, with only a few, short-lived violations, the United States followed the foreign policy formulated by President Washington: peace and commerce with all nations; permanent, entangling alliances with none.

However, over the last 30 years, we have intervened in countries around the world, subsidized the defense of wealthy allies, provided aid and comfort to our enemies, and spend a national treasure on the military. This policy has had devastating effects on the economy and has compromised the security of the Nation.

Recently, the writer and former FBI official Dan Smoot commented that

while President Reagan may be "the right man, in the right place, at the right time," without the right policy direction we will travel even further down the path to national destruction.

If we merely change the names of our "friends" and "enemies," direct our rhetoric and aid to different quarters, and spend trillions more on outmoded weapons systems that do not increase our real defense capabilities, we will continue to fail.

I commend Mr. Smoot's essay to the attention of my colleagues.

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT ON OUR FOREIGN POLICY

All of the necessary governing powers of a great nation cannot be listed in a constitution, defined, and limited to specified functions. Many forces—global wars, political upheavals, technological revolutions, natural disasters—change society and its needs. Government cannot remain static, and serve a social order forever changing.

These assertions being considered, we must marvel at the wisdom of our Founding Fathers. They made no attempt to list, define, or circumscribe the vast governmental powers that are, or may be, necessary in regulating domestic affairs. They specified the few matters they wanted the federal government involved in, explained its jurisdiction in those matters, and left all the rest (unmentioned, undefined, unlimited) to the states or to the people. On the other hand, they denied the states direct power in handling foreign affairs, giving all necessary powers, largely undefined, to the federal government.

Consequently, the Constitution is not the same infallible guide to the proper handling of foreign affairs that it is in the handling of domestic affairs. We do have an adequate guide, nevertheless: George Washington's Farewell Address to the nation in 1797. Washington warned against foreign influence in the shaping of American affairs, saying the nation could not fulfill her high destiny if government kept her permanently entangled in the wars, revolutions, and internal politics of other nations. He suggested a foreign policy of benign neutrality.

President Washington's benign neutrality became America's traditional foreign policy. Americans clung to that policy doggedly even reverently, until the middle of the Twentieth Century. For decades, internationalists—largely under the pervasive influence, if not consciously under the direct control, of the international Communist movement—vilified and misrepresented the policy of benign neutrality, calling it "isolationism." Eventually, America surrendered to the internationalists. Our traditional foreign policy was abandoned in 1949. Now, 32 years later, the consequences are hideous and obvious.

In October, 1980, Burt Raynes published an analysis concerning the probability that the Soviet Union will destroy the United States in a preemptive first strike with nuclear weapons. Raynes, former chairman and chief executive officer of Rohr Industries, had spent a year studying this momentous problem and working on possible technical solutions. He says the Soviet missiles that can reach the vitals of the American nation greatly outnumber American missiles that can reach comparable Soviet targets. The Soviets have an anti-ballistic missile defense system; we have none. We

have only a warning system that might give us an 18- or 22-minute alert before impact of Soviet missiles.

Raynes believes the Soviets will make the strike against us not later than the fall of 1983, because, by that time, the Soviets think the N.A.T.O. nations of Europe will be sufficiently armed with nuclear missiles threatening Russia that they will be a real danger to the Soviets. So, the Soviets will elect to eliminate the problem. They will reason that if they hit European N.A.T.O. nations, the United States would come to the aid of Europe, and that would be dangerous. On the other hand, if the Soviets hit the U.S., the European nations will not come to our defense, and the building up of European nations as nuclear threats to Russia will be stalemated and neutralized.

But the Soviets are stupid to believe that N.A.T.O. ever was or ever will be a threat to Russia. The United States has squandered something like a quarter of a trillion dollars on N.A.T.O., which has never provided a dime's worth of deterrence against Soviet imperialistic aggression, or a penny's worth of defense for the American homeland. It follows, therefore, that N.A.T.O. has been a mighty boon to the Soviets in that it has drained off immense sums of money that could have been spent on weaponry to defend America against a Soviet surprise attack. I agree with the Soviet conclusion that none of our N.A.T.O. allies will come to our aid if the Soviets attack us. Consequently, I think we are near the point of no return in defending our homeland.

AMERICA IS ON ITS OWN

Frankly, we do not have any allies. We have accelerated our own rush into bankruptcy by a hemorrhage of about a trillion tax dollars to aid, arm, defend, and fight wars of other nations everywhere, without thus acquiring one ally who would make a life-or-death decision to stand with us in the face of a Soviet nuclear threat. With this prolonged outpouring of our treasure and our blood, we have helped build the industrial and military strength of our sworn enemies, the Communist nations; we have overthrown governments and destroyed rulers friendly to the United States, aiding the installation of Communist rulers; we have subsidized socialist nations, and foreign industries which have captured world markets from American industries; we have aided both sides in some 50 wars since the end of World War II.

For 35 years, we have armed, aided, and defended other nations in the vain hope that they would be willing and able to help us when needed. In our preoccupation with mutual defense of the world, we have left our homeland without adequate defense in the presence of the deadliest foreign menace in our history.

Yet, there is no national leadership to change the basic foreign policy which has so betrayed us. Patriots have been outraged, of course, at what our foreign policy has been doing for decades, but they attribute this to mismanagement of the policy. Most of them are now rejoicing that the Reagan Administration shows promise of managing the policy so that it will support our friends instead of our enemies and will thus secure for us sturdy foreign allies who will stand by us in need.

It will not work, it has a 2,000-year record of never working. A great nation is dependent exclusively upon its own strength (and God) for survival; and that strength cannot be kept at the level necessary for survival if it is shackled and dissipated by permanent

commitments to, and entanglements with, other nations.

In World Wars I and II, we violated our traditional foreign policy, but the public did not realize the consequences. Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt lied repeatedly and engaged in secret commitments to draw us into the two World Wars. In 1916, while E. M. House was manipulating Wilson to get us into World War I, Wilson campaigned for re-election on the promise that he hated war and would continue to keep America out of the then-raging European conflict. In 1940, while maneuvering to get us into World War II without it looking as if he were doing so, Roosevelt campaigned for re-election on the promise that he hated war and would continue to keep America out of the then-raging European conflict. On both occasions, the American people clung to their traditional policy of benign neutrality until the adroit falsehoods and manipulations of their Presidents frightened them into accepting temporary involvement, as allies, in the wars and internal affairs of foreign nations. Temporary, notice! The people did not give up their traditional foreign policy until 1949, when Truman committed us to the N.A.T.O. pact, clearly entangling us permanently in the internal political and military affairs of foreign nations.

THE TRADITIONAL SOLUTION WILL WORK

Our discarded traditional policy is more needed today than it was when President Washington first explained it. Other nations could not afford the expensive and destructive wars they have been fighting for more than half a century with our money. Restoration of our traditional concepts of national defense is also necessary. We cannot afford, do not need, and cannot effectively use massive land armies, permanently mobilized and stationed in foreign lands—or even at home.

If we had, in place, the kind of defenses against intercontinental weapons that we are capable of building; if we had, in readiness, the kind of retaliatory and first-strike capability that we could produce; if these were manned by a relatively small corps of technicians and engineers, all under the control of the kind of commander-in-chief that Ronald Reagan appears to be, no nation or combination of nations would ever risk a preemptive first-strike or any other kind of strike against us.

Having that kind of national defense would necessarily mean that our government was no longer aiding and abetting the existence and expansion of the worldwide Communist slave empire, as it has been doing for a generation. This fact alone would provide the non-Communist nations of the world more security against foreign aggression than they now have under the prevailing imbalance of terror.

Thus, by looking to our own national interests and concentrating on our own national defense, we would make the greatest contribution to world peace that we have ever made since the foundation of the Republic. This would not be done under the duress of aggressive military power, or bought with foreign aid, or achieved with mutual defense pacts, or sustained by any other form of meddling in the affairs of other nations, but guaranteed simply by our resolve to leave other nations alone, and to inflict grievous wounds on any who do not leave us alone.

If President Reagan could persuade Congress and the people to restore constitutional government, as I believe he could, surely he could lead them in restoring traditional

American foreign policy and creating effective defense for the nation. The public has no respect for the foreign policy our nation has followed since 1945. People would rejoice at the idea of spending our tax money on armaments to defend our homeland, rather than on largess to foreign nations.

It may be that we have the right man, in the right place, at the right time. But all of us who helped put him there need now to help him move quickly in the right direction. ●

DONALD STINGEL'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, Don Stingel, stepped down from his position as a director of the Export-Import Bank. I hope this Congress and the country will recognize the contributions Mr. Stingel has made to the Export-Import Bank and to our economy through his work in promoting American exports.

Mr. Stingel came to the Ex-Im Bank from the presidency of Pullman-Swindell, a Pittsburgh-based corporation engaged in engineering and construction worldwide. Although a Republican, Mr. Stingel was appointed by President Carter in 1977 and was unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate. He brought to the bank the distinction of being the first graduate engineer to serve as a director of the bank along with his broad background in business management.

Over the last 4 years, Mr. Stingel worked hard to dispel the deep misunderstanding in the American public and Congress about the purpose and benefits to our economy of the Ex-Im Bank. He gave a special effort to educate Members of Congress and the press about the direct benefits to the American economy of Ex-Im Bank financing—a program that is often mistakenly confused with foreign aid or thought to be an expenditure of Government funds rather than an investment.

The fact is that, although treated in our budget process as a current expenditure, Export-Import Bank loans have, for all practical purposes, always been repaid with interest and have resulted in increased revenue flowing to the Federal Treasury of almost \$2 billion since its inception.

Mr. Stingel has been an effective advocate in presenting the bank's case to House of Representatives and the Senate. Thanks to his efforts to a considerable degree, the Export-Import Bank supported \$18.2 billion worth of exports alone in 1980. That represents \$18.2 billion of income for American

companies to employ tens of thousands American workers.

Exports now make up a major part of the American economy. What was simply an "add on" 30 years ago has become a major factor in the strength of the American economy. It is a certainty that exports will only increase in their importance as international trade grows in the future. If this part of our economy is to grow, our commitment to the Export-Import Bank must grow.

Donald Stingel has made a major contribution in giving future Congresses a good base to build on. The country is better off from this man's public service. ●

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL UNITED STATES/MEXICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—PART II

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in Part I of my report on the 21st Annual United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference, this year's meetings in Manzanillo, Mexico, took on added significance in light of the highly successful Presidential talks concluded just prior to the conference. In addition to the distinguished delegations from both bodies of the two nations' legislatures and visit by Mexican President Lopez Portillo, the conference was honored by the presence of the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, His Excellency John Gavin, and the Mexican Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Hugo Margin. Both the visits by President Portillo and the Ambassadors underscored the important role the legislators play in helping to formulate and implement bilateral policy.

One of the major issues in our bilateral relations and one that played an important part in the conference discussions was the subject of cooperation in the fight against the production, traffic, and consumption of drugs. As a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I was privileged to lead the discussions on this important topic. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting the entire text of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN BEFORE THE 21ST MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE HELD IN MANZANILLO, MEXICO, JUNE 11-15, 1981

Mr. Chairman, distinguished legislators from Mexico and the United States, I welcome this opportunity to participate again with our Mexican colleagues in the 21st Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference and to discuss the progress of

our mutual efforts to prevent and control narcotics trafficking and drug abuse.

As a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control and as the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I detect a new ERA of mutual respect and understanding between our two nations on a variety of issues: Trade, tourism, immigration, fishing agreements, energy, and drug abuse prevention and control.

We have come a long way since both our delegations adopted, in 1977, the Hermosillo Declaration committing both of our nations to greater cooperative efforts in combatting the traffic in drugs.

The efforts of the Mexican law enforcement authorities and the Mexican military forces in interdicting narcotics trafficking and in eradicating the illicit production of drugs at their source have become successful models for other nations to emulate.

During the past year, we have been advised that Mexican law enforcement authorities are establishing new records in drug interdiction. During the first 6 months of this year, Mexican law enforcement authorities seized 7 heroin laboratories, 1,870 pounds of narcotics, more than 1.8 million pounds of marihuana and hashish, 726 pounds of cocaine, compared to the seizure of 6 heroin laboratories, 3,476 pounds of opium, and slightly more than 2 million pounds of marihuana and hashish for the entire preceding year.

The eradication of opium poppy fields has dramatically increased by 70 percent—from the destruction of 863 poppy hectares in 1979 to the eradication of 1,468 poppy hectares in 1980.

Although Federal, State, and local drug law enforcement authorities in my country are also reporting increased seizures of heroin, cocaine, marihuana, hallucinogens, and other dangerous drugs, our two nations must not become complacent and must not rest on our accomplishments.

Drug trafficking is a multibillion-dollar business, reaching into every region of the world and causing misery for unknown millions of citizens throughout the world. Drug trafficking just in the United States alone has reached a staggering \$64 billion in street sales, compared to an estimated \$48 billion in 1977. Obviously, this is only the tip of the iceberg since global narcotics trafficking far exceeds that amount.

Both our nations share the common urgency to prevent and control drug trafficking. According to one recent report, the cultivation of illicit drugs in Oaxaca, an area of 570 municipalities and 2.8 million inhabitants, far exceeds the lawful cultivation of food crops by more than 7 billion pesos. Food crops in this area amount to 3.6 billion pesos, compared to the cultivation of marihuana and poppy valued at 10 billion pesos, thereby making Oaxaca the number one cultivator of marihuana and poppies in Mexico and replacing Sinaloa as the main producer of marihuana and heroin. (See article entitled, "Drug Crop in Oaxaca Worth More Than Legal Crops," by Rafael Medina C., Mexico City, Excelsior, 7 March 1981, Pp. 4-A, 20-A.)

We share this problem with you. In the United States, domestic cultivation of marihuana in California has become a billion-dollar business, replacing that State's largest legal crop, grapes, by more than \$136 million.

The "war" on drug abuse is a dangerous, difficult, and frustrating task confronting law enforcement officials throughout the

world. According to the regional coordinator of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic of Mexico:

"The fight against drug trafficking in the area is difficult. The drug traffickers take advantage of the [people . . . and] the fact that the Federal authorities cannot reach many of the sites in the mountain side. They give the [people] money to sow death."

The regional coordinator further states that when government officials arrive to eradicate the marihuana and poppy fields,

"The people receive us with applause and greeting from below. They think we are the same people who invited them to plant marihuana. When we land and tell them that that is bad, they agree, explaining that the ones who gave them seed and money also were in helicopters and were well armed."

Mr. Chairman, there is an urgent need for both our nations to continue to work closely together to prevent and control drug abuse. There is also an urgent need to develop a comprehensive, coordinated regional drug strategy designed (1) to interdict drug trafficking, (2) to eradicate the illicit production of drugs at their sources, (3) to educate our citizens regarding the dangers of drug abuse, and (4) to properly treat and rehabilitate those individuals who are dependent upon or addicted to drugs.

In this regard, we urge the Government of Mexico, whose drug eradication and drug interdiction programs are highly respected throughout the world, to help us formulate such a regional drug strategy. If the "war" on drug abuse in this part of the world is going to be won, then there is an urgent need for all of us to benefit from the leadership, skill and dedication of Mexico's law enforcement officials.

Mexico is a leader in the drug field * * * it is self-sufficient in this area. The entire international community is indebted to this great nation for the expenditure of funds and for the commitment of its law enforcement officials who have dedicated their lives to the interdiction of narcotics trafficking and to the eradication of the illicit production of drugs harvested in Mexico's dangerously rugged mountains.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we commend the Government of Mexico for its support of the United Nations Funds for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC). Last year, for the first time since UNFDAC was created a decade ago, Mexico contributed to the UN Fund. In 1980, 6 nations from Latin America contributed \$25,000 to the UN Fund: Argentina (\$10,000); Bolivia (\$1,000); Brazil (\$5,000); Chile (\$3,000); Mexico (\$4,000); and Venezuela (\$2,000), compared to the \$20,000 contributed by Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela for 1979. Hopefully, Mexico will encourage other members of the Latin America community to contribute to UNFDAC.

With regard to United Nations drug initiatives, Mexico is to be commended for its leadership in hosting this December a UN sponsored conference on combating the illicit production of drugs.

Preventing and controlling drug abuse is a never-ending task * * * a herculean problem. It requires the concerted, cooperative efforts of the entire international community. In this regard, Mexico plays a vital role: Its leadership and expertise are urgently needed. We encourage cooperative efforts between Mexico and our National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to develop sophisticated scanning devices to identify marihuana and opium poppy fields.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of those in my Government who have been working on our drug problems, I want to thank the people of Mexico and its distinguished President for your efforts in assisting us in trying to stem the tide against drug traffickers whose business transactions are undermining the health of our citizens and corrupting the political, economic, and social institutions of our two great nations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for providing me this opportunity to share with you and this distinguished committee my thoughts regarding this vitally important issue. ●

BLANCHARD ANNOUNCES QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this spring I mailed a questionnaire to residents of Michigan's 18th Congressional District. My purpose was to find out what priorities people feel I should be spending my time on, and how people feel about President Reagan's economic policies.

To date I have received responses from nearly 5,000 citizens, I believe that the preliminary results of this survey would be of interest to my colleagues.

The questionnaire consisted of four parts. The results were as follows:

In response to the statement, "(A) I wish that you would give the President what he wants; (B) vote the interests of your district; (C) make your own judgment and vote as you think best", the breakdown was:

	<i>Percent</i>
Give the President what he wants	33
Vote the interests of your district	41
Make your own judgment and vote as you think best	25

In response to the statement, "I would like to see you spend your time on the following issues and activities", the 5 most frequently cited concerns were:

1. Decreasing waste in Federal programs.
2. Preserving the social security system in its present form.
3. Reducing taxes.
4. Exempting education from budget cuts.
5. Diversifying and revitalizing Michigan's economy.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty we face is determining how best to make progress on these issues. Hopefully we can craft innovative and forward-minded proposals.

I would especially note that the fifth most often mentioned point, was the issue of diversifying and revitalizing Michigan's economy. While this issue would probably not be listed as a major concern in other parts of the country, the results of the questionnaire clearly demonstrates the need for developing an effective economic revitalization policy targeted to certain sectors and regions.

The House Banking Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, which I

chair, is in the process of a thorough indepth examination of the subject of economic revitalization. We have already conducted 17 days of hearings and heard from 61 witnesses in such key issues as capital formation, research and development, job retraining and relocating policies, the effects of high interest rates, the status of the defense industrial base, and urban infrastructure needs. We have also contacted experts from all over the country in the fields of business, labor, finance, and education seeking their ideas and insights. We plan to continue hearings in September and hopefully issue a report with recommendations later this fall. ●

CALIFORNIA ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECT

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Southern California Edison Co. and the Community Services Department of San Bernardino County for the effective implementation of a unique, cost effective energy conservation project.

The southern California mobile home audit program resulted in an annual energy savings of approximately 500 kWh and an estimated \$40,000 reduction in energy costs for 1,000 low-income families in San Bernardino County. I applaud this joint private/public sector effort to reduce energy costs and conserve energy.

I am inserting an article which presents the specifics of this creative energy conservation effort which was awarded the President's Award for Energy Efficiency.

The article follows:

A joint conservation campaign sponsored by a San Bernardino County poverty agency and Edison has helped 1,000 low-income families reduce their energy bills by a total of nearly \$40,000.

In conjunction with the campaign, Robert L. Boyton, vice president, Eastern Division, presented a plaque during ceremonies before the County Board of Supervisors citing the "substantial contributions" that have been made.

Bob Hammock, board chairman, and Rodolfo Castro, executive director of the County Community Services Department (CSD), accepted the plaques, which read:

"In recognition of outstanding contribution to America's economic and national security, through exemplary leadership in the national effort to achieve energy efficiency."

Edison and CSD focused their consideration efforts on low-income mobile home residents, since that group is among the hardest hit by rising energy costs.

Dina Hunter, SCE conservation resources coordinator, said that Edison has contributed several thousand dollars for the year-long effort.

Energy-use surveys were conducted by CSD conservation teams trained by Edison personnel and were able to identify no-cost or low-cost ways to cut energy waste.

It's estimated that because of the year-long, joint effort, the average family experienced an annual consumption cut of about 400 to 500 kilowatt-hours, representing an annual savings of about \$40,000 in reduced energy costs.

Most older mobile homes, it was pointed out, have little insulation. The metal sides and roofs act as conductors of heat and outdoor temperatures quickly transfer into living areas. The older mobile homes are thus hot in summer, cold in winter.

"In many cases, families in such situations were paying more than the average customer living in conventional housing," Boynton said.

Results of the campaign were noted in the Company's candidacy last year for the President's Award for Energy Efficiency. Edison was subsequently honored for "successful residential programs" which contributed to achieving the national goals of reducing U.S. oil imports during 1980.

"And remember," Ms. Hunter added, "the low-income families involved will be saving energy for years to come, thanks to this program." ●

SALUTE TO JANE HANSON

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise to salute Ms. Jane Hanson of WNBC-TV in New York. Ms. Hanson is that special kind of reporter whose work in my district in Brooklyn typifies the impact a persevering and caring journalist can have on a neighborhood.

Jane Hanson first reported that raw sewage was backing up to residents' homes in the Midwood section of Brooklyn and that community pressure alone had not gotten the proper government agencies to alleviate the problem. She, however, did not stop there. She pursued the matter with my district office staff and and pressed the municipal authorities who had theretofore turned a deaf ear to the residents. Ms. Hanson continued her efforts until the sewage pipes were repaired.

On behalf of our neighborhood, I want to thank Jane Hanson for an outstanding job of reporting and investigating and even more importantly, for her persistence and commitment in helping to solve what had seemed an unsolvable problem. She is a journalist that the people of New York City need, and we applaud her for her outstanding work. ●

CONGRESSMAN CLAY ADDRESSES THE LOW VOTER TURNOUT ISSUE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues an interesting and provocative article written by my distinguished colleague and good friend from the First Congressional District of Missouri—the Honorable WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY. The article is entitled "What Low Voter Turnout?" and was published in the July, 1981 St. Louis Journalism Review.

In the article, Congressman CLAY carefully examines the sometimes confusing and distorted view projected by media organizations to the Nation about the existence and reasons for the proverbial low voter turnout in recent national elections. In a very concise manner, Congressman CLAY clarifies the issue by contrasting the voter turnout in previous elections versus the 1976 and 1980 Presidential elections. From this contrast, he effectively sets the record straight about the dismally low voter turnout stories we hear so often.

Mr. Speaker, probably just as important, Congressman CLAY, in his well written article, outlines possible reasons as to why the voting record in this country is not better. It is on this point that I refer back to my initial statement that the article is quite provocative and is worthy of more than just passing acknowledgment.

I believe that the facts and theories presented by our distinguished colleague from Missouri on this matter provides a good starting point for Members of this body and journalists alike to responsibly analyze the voting behavior of the American people in general and more specifically, voting patterns of underrepresented groups in this nation.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD, the article entitled "What Low Voter Turnout?" written by Congressman WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY. I hope that my colleagues will join me in applauding Congressman CLAY's efforts in addressing this issue and in starting the dialog on the appropriate note for this issue.

The article follows:

WHAT LOW VOTER TURNOUT?

(By Representative WILLIAM L. CLAY)

The gentlemen of the media have made quite a do about the fact that less than a majority of the voting age population participated in the 1976 and 1980 presidential elections. Editorials and news stories flourish with indignation because only 27.2% and 26.7% of the voting age population went to the polls in 1976 and 1980 respectively. The point is emphasized that the republic is fall-

ing apart and citizens no longer care about who will lead the nation.

But the simple truth is that those percentages are higher than the turnout for twenty-eight previous presidential elections. Not once in the history of this country has a majority of the voting age population cast votes to determine who would be president. It's misleading for the media to give the impression that the number of persons involving themselves in the electoral process is decreasing. That number may be shocking, but, nevertheless, it is not decreasing. It's pretty much par with the percentage of voters since 1920 when Warren Harding was elected by 25.6% of people of voting age. Certainly it's better than the 23.7% which elected Calvin Coolidge, the 25.3% which elected Harry S. Truman and the 26.4% which elected Richard Nixon to his first term.

Between 1828 and 1916, from Andrew Jackson to Woodrow Wilson, 23 presidents were elected. The highest percentage of voting age population participating was during the election of William McKinley and it was only 18.8 percent. Admittedly the entire populace was not permitted to vote during those years. Blacks were not permitted to vote until 1870 when the 15th Amendment abolished race as a barrier to voting. Even then only a few actually were permitted to vote. Then, in 1920, the 24th Amendment gave suffrage to women. In 1971 the 26th Amendment lowered the voting age to 18 years, giving this privilege to those who were allowed to fight in the military.

Without attempting to condone the practice of not voting, it should be pointed out that there are many reasons people don't exercise this right. Probably the biggest reason is that they don't have the capability of relating government and its leadership to their everyday lives. But beyond that there are factors which tend to discourage voting. Registration in itself is an impediment. When the media attempts to compare election results in this country with foreign contests, the comparison is tainted. In most of the countries where 80 to 90 percent of the electorate go to the polls, there is no requirement for registration.

Perhaps the second biggest reason for boycotting elections is fear. Many are actually afraid to enter a polling booth and pull levers. Some cannot read and are ashamed to ask for assistance. Some are not acquainted with the candidates or issues and fear voting blindly. Others, usually in low income areas, refuse to register for fear that the information is not confidential. In too many instances they have moved to new residences in order to avoid creditors. A change of registration immediately alerts the creditor to their new addresses.

Criminal records also play a role in low registration and voting. In most states persons who have been convicted of a felony automatically lose citizenship and the right to vote. Until the governor or some state agency restores that citizenship, it is another felony to register to vote.

So, until the rules of the game are drastically changed, there will be no drastic change in the percentage of people who exercise their right to vote. ●

CAREER INTERN PROGRAMS

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, unemployment among our youth remains unacceptably high. Unless we take the necessary actions to lower the unemployment rate among teens, we will soon have an entire generation of capable people who have never held a meaningful job. This type of tragedy cannot be allowed to happen.

As our lives become more complicated due to ever higher levels of technology, the level of education needed to obtain gainful employment increases. Young people who have failed to learn how to read and write adequately, or who have simply dropped out of school, are unable to compete in today's job market. The sophistication of today's technologies means that even entry-level jobs require high school degrees at a minimum.

Our Government must address the problems associated with youth unemployment. To help in this effort, I have today introduced a bill which I feel will go a long way in solving the problems of youth unemployment. The bill will encourage local educational agencies to develop career intern programs (CIP).

The career intern program is not a new idea. It is a proven way of helping the educationally disadvantaged unemployed youth. The program was started in the early 1970's by Dr. Leon Sullivan through the Opportunities Industrialization Centers in six cities. Since then hundreds of young people have earned a high school degree through the CIP's.

The following is an excerpt from an OIC publication discussing in detail the career intern program. I commend this reading to every Member of the House. Hopefully, when the Congress returns in September, work can begin to insure passage of this program.

The decade of the 1960's was a time of struggle, strife and turmoil. Millions of Americans who had been systematically excluded from the economic mainstream of American society demanded access to improved economic conditions. The nonviolent protests of the Civil Rights Movement opened the doors of opportunity for a few of these alienated and disenfranchised Americans. The vast majority, however, lacking skills to compete for meaningful jobs, were left in a state of hopelessness, frustration and despair. Their anger erupted into riots in urban centers throughout America.

The Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC/A) was born during this period, led by Dr. Leon H. Sullivan, Founder and Chairman of the Board. OIC provides alternatives through training and services which enable the poor and the disadvantaged to make reality of their hopes. From the beginning, in 1964, the program

focused on individualized, integrated work/life planning, fusing academic instruction, skills development and personal and occupational counseling.

Today, OIC/A is the largest private, non-profit, skills-training network in America. OIC programs are in over 140 communities in various states, serving thousands of adult poor and disadvantaged persons.

As the impact of OIC/A spread throughout America and the world, Dr. Sullivan turned his attention to the problems of young people who were dropping out of high school. Without a diploma and without a job skill, they were poorly prepared for a constructive role in society. To stem the tide of dropout-ism, Dr. Sullivan formulated the Urban Career Education Center (UCEC) in 1971. It involved parents supportively in the educational, career and personal development of their children. It introduced career education concepts and techniques into traditional school curricula. The first CIP was a model, experimental career education program. With the endorsement and cooperation of the Philadelphia Board of Education, and the support of the National Institute of Education and the Office of Education, UCEC was initiated as a pilot project in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Its central component was an alternative high school program for potential and actual high school dropouts, as well as other students who needed help to integrate their educational, career and personal goals. Thus was born the Career Intern Program (CIP). Since then, expansion of the Program has been guided by the experience OIC has gained from organizing independent affiliates throughout America and abroad.

Formal, internal and external assessment has been rigorously applied to refine the CIP model. Current operations are rooted in the experience of what works. There are now five CIP branches, locally operated but based on CIP principles. The CIP design provides the flexibility needed to adapt to local conditions.

CIP requires each intern to set specific career goals and to work toward those goals. Interns are provided with a consistent flow of honest feedback on both educational and personal progress. Assessments are formalized in report cards; interns also are appraised in other ways: staff conferences review each intern's status, problems, progress and contingency alternatives. Thus, constant communication between staff and interns provides honest "readings" of individuals' progress.

Program performance has been objectively measured. In 1972, the National Institute of Education established an external evaluation component to conduct a rigorous formative and summative evaluation of the Career Intern Program.

The evaluation consisted of administering a battery of standardized instruments to measure the comparability of CIP interns to control and comparison groups in academic, career and personal growth. The control groups were randomly selected and the comparison groups consisted of traditional high school students. An ethnographic design was employed to identify casual linkages and basic interrelationships among various components of the CIP and observed intern outcomes. A follow-up component was added to the evaluation to determine what happens to interns after graduation from CIP.

No CIP program starts without the endorsement and a resolution of cooperation and support from the local school system.

CIPs are authorized to function as an adjunct to the school system, to enroll eligible youth as interns, to help interns earn the course credits necessary for graduation and to validate those credits. The CIP course requirements and credit-awarding procedures meet local educational standards. CIP staff members should meet the certification requirements of the local school system.

Each CIP thus becomes semiautonomous, observing the procedures of the local school system but providing an alternative educational experience and setting for students. Each CIP cultivates a close working relationship with its local school system. It is not a rival, but rather a specialist and an ally to the school system, educating disadvantaged youth. Interns maintain their association with their "parent" school and can participate in athletic and extracurricular programs. Upon graduation, they receive diplomas from that school. The strong, cooperative bond between CIP and the local school system gives interns a mix which furthers their educational, personal and career goals.

For CIP to be viable on a local level, other strong supports have been established. These include, but are not limited to, cooperative linkages with the business and industrial sector, institutions of higher learning, skills-training and technical schools, social service and community agencies, state and local governmental institutions, civic and professional groups. CIP staff members continually strengthen and broaden this array of supportive linkages so that interns have access to a network of effective ancillary services. A CIP Advisory Council is an important channel for this support systems; with representation from the public and private sectors. Local Councils assist in expansion and practical implementation of the linkage system. Council members also advise the CIP leadership of changing conditions and new opportunities in the various fields they represent.

The CIPs incorporated the OIC policy of cementing partnerships with federal, state and local agencies. They recruited as advisors, executors of major business and industrial corporations, religious and social institutions, community and civic groups, and educational and professional organizations.

After passage of the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects in 1977, Dr. Robert Taggart, former Administrator of the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs, and the National Institute of Education authorized OIC/A to establish four additional CIPs: Detroit, Michigan; New York, New York; Poughkeepsie, New York; and Seattle, Washington. This was to test whether CIP would work in communities with different clienteles and different programs.

In such manner, CIP evolved from problem-analysis, adapted OIC philosophies and formulated career education concepts which have been tested and have proven effective in a variety of settings. It is a replicable, educationally-sound model. It is flexible and responsive. It adapts to specific community and youth problems. Interns get individualized, one-on-one attention. The program fosters a supportive atmosphere. CIP interns respond positively to a staff which cares about them, respects them and gives them practical assistance in the maturation process. CIP interns develop social identity and a positive sense of status, tools which will help them all their lives. CIP is not where they have to be, but where they choose to be.

Interns learn first-hand how and why employers select, supervise, discharge or promote employees. They learn which skills, work habits and interpersonal techniques are essential. They learn about career options in the world of work. They are prepared to address that world and to negotiate for themselves a place in the economic life of the nation.

CIP staffs deal with the personalized needs of the whole individual. Academic progress is inter-related with personal well-being. Curricular materials, teaching and counseling methodologies are designed to facilitate individual and groups inquiry, to fuse career and affective information into academic subject areas, and to provide opportunities for experimental learning through in-class and out-of-class experiences. CIP staff members impart positive expectations to interns and convey both the determination and inspiration that interns can, will and must succeed.

Recruitment is active wherever young people congregate. Referrals come from the school system. Others are nominated by social, religious, and community agencies, by parents and peers. Some candidates are found in pool halls, youth centers, and on street corners. CIP recruiting is designed to reach and involve all eligible and interested youth within a community.

From the first day, staff members strive to create an atmosphere of awareness, understanding and cooperation with a prospective intern. Parents are encouraged to become involved, as they must become an active and integral part of the educational process.

The Intake Interview and an assessment determine the youth's potential for adaptability to CIP, and that CIP is the program the youth is seeking and needs. Since CIP is designed to screen young people in and not out, all efforts are made to insure that a correct and unanimous decision is made by the prospective intern, his/her parent(s) and the CIP staff. If it is determined that another program would be more appropriate, CIP refers the youth to such a program. CIP staff "follow-up" afterwards to see that youth get such other services.

Orientation officially welcomes the intern into CIP and gives interns and their parents additional information about CIP. Orientation facilitates information exchange, fosters supportive relationships between interns, their families and staff, and establishes mutual goals.

Career Awareness course offerings are consistent with the courses required by the local school system. They vary in accordance with the state and local educational requirements. Classes and other activities provide fundamental academic skills, improve attitudes and stimulate interest. Instructors use creativity and initiative in designing course syllabi and lesson plans—consistent with school system requirements. They utilize minilessons, individualized instruction, small or large group interactions, didactics, and other teaching techniques. Subject matter, activities and materials are career-oriented. Career fairs, resource speakers, field trips, and off-campus activities correlate classroom subject-matter with the surrounding environment, the world of work, and personal, career and academic aspirations.

During the summer, interns become involved in other summer employment programs, summer classroom programming, off-campus educational programming, or consumer programming. This keeps them

motivated and committed to learning while meeting their income needs.

CIP utilizes the entire community as a learning resource. More advanced interns who have accrued sufficient credits and are successfully progressing in all levels of CIP endeavors are involved in a variety of other activities. These include educational enrichment programs, collaborative programming with postsecondary institutions, technical schools, and on-the-job training.

Counseling is intensely individualized and encompasses academic, career, and personal development. Counseling sessions are held with each intern at least once every two weeks. Counseling is the coordinative bond to provide such services to interns as child care, employment, health, etc., from service resource centers within the community. Counseling also involves parents in support activities to assist interns in achieving their goals. Counseling support further prepares the intern for the attitudinal and behavioral adjustments which are required in the world of work.

As interns complete more quarters (or semesters depending upon the schedule of the local school system), and accrue more credits toward graduation, more advanced course work is introduced. A variety of more sophisticated instructional methodologies are used. More specialized career-oriented subject matter and supplementary materials are introduced. Career options are explored through career fairs, resource speakers who are employers, field trips, and off-campus activities. There is more intensive career counseling as well as greater parental involvement.

As interns begin to focus upon particular careers, they are prepared for their "hands-on" experiences. Interns spend time at worksites where they observe pace and procedures and learn the parameters and educational requirements of careers in which they are interested. This usually includes performing tasks, under a worksite supervisor, through which they learn more dimensions of the work world. (When company or union regulations preclude their performing "hands-on" tasks, the interns observe intently—and review processes and procedures afterward, in class.) Interns who complete the "hands-on" phase of their training have a more realistic perception of their career choices, the world, and the expectations associated with their career choices.

When the intern approaches graduation, planning for the next level of activity begins. Interns interested in college get enrollment and scholarship information. Interns interested in employment are taught job-finding skills. Those seeking advanced skills or technical training are assisted to enroll in appropriate institutions. Interns interested in the armed forces or on-the-job training are assisted in researching proper placement. CIP is designed to insure interns' transition into situations commensurate with their training, abilities, goals and ambitions.

Entering the 1980s, the problems of youth have reached epidemic proportions. With no chance for meaningful careers and lives, millions are dropping out of school. The unemployment rate has reached nearly 40% among some youths. Hopelessness and despair are spreading.

The CIP's effectiveness has been demonstrated in terms of the compelling evidence presented in the publication, the Career Intern Program: Final Report: An Experiment in Career Education That Worked and the Citing of CIP by the U.S. Division of

Education's Joint Dissemination Review Panel as an exemplary, educational program in 1977. Though the evaluation reports for the CIP Replication have not been published, (they are to be published by June 1981), the Interim Reports present strongly encouraging evidence, across sites, of the effectiveness of the CIP on a national plane. According to the Reports, among the findings are:

Statistically significant gains were observed in both reading and math across sites.

Statistically significant gains were observed across sites on the Planning, Use-of-Resources, and Informational Scales of the Career Development Inventory; the Self-Esteem Inventory, and the Internal-External Scale.

Enforcement of maintenance, system, e.g. school rules and regulations regarding promptness, appropriate apparel, etc., contributes to interns' internalizing "world-of-work" norms.

Enforcement of the program's maintenance component is also responsible for the absence of profanity, smoking in class or in the hallways, graffiti and loitering.

The use of contracts and various teaching devices contribute to a greater understanding and sense of responsibility on the part of the intern.

Maintaining high expectations of interns, personally and academically, contributes to an improved attendance pattern, higher grades, and increased self-esteem for many interns.

Providing a supportive context for interns contributes directly to increased attendance, higher grades, selection of a career, and graduation.

Providing auxiliary services, e.g. day care facilities, enable them to attend on a regular basis.●

VOTING RIGHTS REQUIRE BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 extended in 1970 and again in 1975 will expire in October 1982.

Efforts to further extend this act are based upon a need to continue its beneficial effects without impairing the voting rights of any American against whom discrimination might still be practiced.

It should be borne in mind that under the 1965 legislation those States and counties which are subjected automatically to the stringent requirements of this law have been obliged to submit all statutes and ordinances relating to elections or voting to the U.S. Attorney General for preclearance. This requirement imposes a 60-day delay in the effective date of all such measures pending which the Attorney General may interpose objections and thereby nullify the attempts of States and local units of government to amend their statutes or ordinances.

In the pending legislation intended to extend for another 10-year period,

the original Voting Rights Act, substantial interest has been expressed to permit States and counties to bail out of the stringent preclearance requirements where practices of discrimination have been discontinued. Certainly a 10-year record of nondiscrimination would seem sufficient to liberate States and communities from the burdensome preclearance provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the diligent efforts to reach a bipartisan agreement on this issue were frustrated, not from within the committee but from sources outside the committee structure where adamant demands were made, intended to impose restrictions on affected jurisdictions even beyond those established in the original Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that a bipartisan measure may yet emerge from persons of good will in this body from both sides of the political aisle. Fairness and equity should control our actions. Precious voting rights should be enhanced, discrimination must be discouraged, and those jurisdictions where discrimination has been eliminated should be restored to equality with other areas of the Nation where Federal examiners have never been installed and where preclearance has never been imposed.

Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act must not be permitted to descend into the uncertainty of the political arena when a truly bipartisan solution is ready and available to keep this worthwhile program in effect.●

THE DEFENSE BUDGET IN CONTEXT

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress has deliberated the 1982 Federal budget in recent months, I have had deep reservations about the level of defense funding that has been approved.

The Reagan administration has requested \$222 billion for the Department of Defense for 1982. The administration has indicated that they plan to spend \$374 billion annually by 1986, meaning that defense will receive 37.6 percent of the Federal budget compared to the 24.7 percent it now receives. During this 5-year buildup, defense expenditures will total \$1.65 trillion.

Congress has in effect ratified this plan by adopting the Gramm-Latta amendment to the budget resolution, by adopting the Gramm-Latta reconciliation amendments, and by approving the Department of Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 3519.

I am disappointed and worried about the course this administration has set for defense and which Congress seems willing to rubberstamp. No one, and certainly not I, denies the need for a strong defense. But we should put the magnitude of these numbers in perspective and examine just what these dollars buy for us. Few Americans can conceive of \$1.65 trillion; it is a mind-boggling figure. What it means is spending \$1 billion a day in 1986.

I am troubled about this course for several reasons: First, national priorities have gone awry; second, efforts to cut waste from the Defense Department have failed; yet almost every other Federal program has been reduced; third, spending \$1.65 trillion is not good economics; fourth, spending \$1.65 trillion will not necessarily get us a good defense.

PRIORITIES ASKEW

The flood of budget cutting has left the Department of Defense essentially untouched. The Gramm-Latta budget included \$226.3 billion for 1982. Let us compare this to some other programs. For the current year, the following programs are receiving these amounts:

[In millions]

Elementary and secondary education.....	\$2,800
Education for handicapped children.....	1,100
Alcohol and drug abuse education .	3
Rehabilitation services for the disabled.....	930
Home health care.....	4
National Cancer Institute.....	1,000
Emergency medical services.....	30
Highway safety research.....	9
Mass transit.....	3,700
Bridge repairs.....	200

Quite frankly, I think this policy puts peoples' needs last.

WASTE SHOULD BE CUT FROM DEFENSE TOO

Waste, fraud, and abuse have been popular catchwords lately, yet we have refused to apply them to the DOD, and to that Department alone. Congresswoman SCHROEDER proposed a sensible amendment, requiring the President to cut \$8 billion of waste from the Defense Department by January 15, 1982. In my view, this was quite reasonable in light of the \$16 billion or more of waste found by both the GAO and the Republican Study Committee. I supported that amendment, but it was voted down.

There are ways to reduce the Defense budget and I have cast several votes to do so:

On July 16, I voted for the Schroeder amendment to require the President to make rescissions of at least \$8 billion in Defense Department spending so as to combat waste, fraud, and abuse.

On July 9, I voted for an amendment that would have permitted the President to transfer B-1 procurement funds to research and development for an advanced technology bomber.

On July 9, I also supported measures to reduce spending for the MX by \$2.4 billion and to prohibit obligation or expenditure of funds for the MX missile system basing mode until the President certifies a specific mode to Congress, and Congress is given 60 days in which to disapprove the basing mode selected.

On May 7, I voted against the Gramm-Latta budget, which allocated \$226 billion to the Department of Defense, \$7 billion more than in the Jones budget, which I supported.

On July 16, I voted to tighten up on multiyear weapons procurements, which increasingly have resulted in seemingly uncontrollable cost overruns.

DEFENSE SPENDING IS INFLATIONARY BY ITS NATURE

Economic recovery has also been the watchword this year, but I am not convinced that massive spending for defense is going to revitalize our economy. In fact, it might help drag it down. Quite simply, putting money into expensive weapons systems is inflationary by its very nature. Just as printing money to cover deficit spending by the Government leads to inflation by causing more dollars to chase the same amount of goods, defense expenditures, by their very nature, have the same inflationary result.

It is in the nature of defense spending that the product produced by our money is removed from the marketplace because we do not offer things like the B-1 bomber for sale. The result of removing the work product of defense expenditures from the marketplace is to have the same amount of money chasing fewer goods. The inflationary effect of this kind of spending is equal to deficit spending; defense spending only affects the other side of the equation that must be kept in balance if we are to avoid inflation.

TRILLIONS DO NOT MEAN A STRONG DEFENSE

The philosophy reflected in the size of these figures seems to suggest that spending is the sole path to a strong defense. In my view, there are several other important elements.

First, there is people. We must have members of the Armed Forces with a high morale and dedication to their country. To attract and retain these individuals, we must offer incentives and provide good working conditions. And yet, what few military cuts that have been made have been made in the people aspect of the military—not the weapons, not procurement, not in the military functions that are duplicated in the various branches.

Maintaining peace and national security also depend on cooperative international defense, like that that we have with NATO, with efforts like nuclear disarmament and arms limitations—not to mention a healthy domestic economy. I am very afraid that

this spend-spend-spend course will endanger international peace, by stimulating a new arms race and by threatening our economy with more inflation.

I have supported and voted for a strong national defense. I am concerned that defense spending today is going largely unscrutinized, largely unquestioned. When programs like social security, school lunches, and medicare get slashed, defense too must take a share of the slice.

Because the average person does buy things like guns and airplanes, the production of defense equipment will result in the same number of dollars chasing fewer goods. When the same amount of dollars chases fewer goods, inflation will be inevitable.●

GARY HYMEL ENTERS PRIVATE SECTOR

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of last month a very good friend and key employee of the House of Representatives left to enter the private sector. I am sure all of us feel the loss of our good friend, Gary Hymel, but we understand his reasons for leaving, and we congratulate Gray & Co. for its gain.

Gary was a long-time close personal friend and confidant of mine and my family. He has helped me immeasurably over the years by providing advice, counsel, and moral support in times both trying and joyous. His dear wife, Winky, and their lively and attractive children have added precious dimensions to our relationship.

Last Saturday, the Richmond Times-Dispatch carried a column in which Gary shares some of his observations of the political changes that have taken place in this body in the years since he came to Washington to work with my husband, Hale. I would like to take this opportunity to share Nick Thimmesch's column with my colleagues.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, July 31, 1981]

THE SPEAKER LOSES RIGHT-HAND MAN (By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—Gary Hymel, until recently Tip O'Neill's right-hand man, is little known in the Republic, but was an important figure on Capitol Hill for 16 years. To hear Hymel, a gentlemanly Louisianaan, ruminate is to realize how dramatically Congress has changed in recent years.

When Hymel arrived in 1965 as the late Hale Boggs' administrative assistant, the great Society legislation of the Johnson administration was being churned out. The federal government swelled and so did Congress.

The number of House employees has nearly doubled since Hymel arrived, and now totals 12,200. It costs nearly three times as much to just run Congress now. Where there were 107 subcommittees in 1972, often understaffed and lethargic, there are now 136 busy ones fully staffed.

"The proliferation of subcommittee and staffing is the biggest change in my time on the Hill," Hymel says. "By allowing younger members to bid for subcommittee and committee posts, and even let them become chairmen, the old seniority system was shook. The Watergate class of 1974 made the reforms, but they were originated by the Democratic Study Group (a liberal congressional organization).

"Another big change involves trust.

"People don't trust each other like they did when I came here. If a committee voted a bill out, members trusted the chairman's advice to vote for it. Now, the members are younger and brighter and want everything proved."

In an earlier time, say, when Sam Rayburn was speaker, freshmen members were sworn in, and resigned themselves to constituent services, listening to their elders, and waiting for years before earning a measure of power. That situation prevailed in Hymel's first years on the Hill when John McCormick was speaker.

"LBJ had made a fine art out of tuning Congress, and with the discipline we had then, legislation poured through," Hymel said. "When Tip was leader during the Watergate period, and Carl Albert was speaker, Congress overwhelmed Nixon. The benchmark was when Congress passed the anti-impoundment act, and stopped Nixon from tying up funds.

"Nowadays, there isn't the party loyalty there was when I first came. Members get elected by running against the Establishment. There's less fun up here and more scrutiny by the press. There are fewer characters and wheel horses—the kind of men with a sense of humor who didn't take themselves so seriously. And there are no more spittoons. The last one was owned by Speaker McCormick."

In 1971, Hymel's boss, Hale Boggs, was killed in an airplane crash in Alaska where he was campaigning for Rep. Nick Begich. "You know," says Hymel, "that trip showed the kind of man Hale was. Begich had opposed Hale when he ran for leader, but Hale went out and campaigned for him because he felt the key to being a good leader is not to get mad and stay mad.

"Hale hired me from the New Orleans States-Item where I was a political reporter. He thought I knew the political turf in Louisiana and could help him. He treated me fine, and was the brightest man I ever knew. "With Hale gone, Tip became leader and kept me in the job. I was the only Southerner on his staff. Tip felt I could help him with the Southerners. But New Orleans is a little different from the rest of the South.

"Tip and I had some things in common—we are both Catholics, Jesuit-educated, and regarded ourselves as liberals. I must say that Tip wasn't for McGovern in 1972 though. He was the only Massachusetts delegate for Ed Muskie.

"The hardest decision in my life was to leave Tip. He was a great boss, a warm human being, unpretentious, and totally honest. I had been holding back, and finally, at the elevator one day, I just let it out, and I flinched a little."

O'Neill misses Hymel professionally and personally. Hymel was the eyes and ears for

Tip on the Hill, and also served as his connection to the press. But Hymel, father of eight, has three children in college and a wife about to enter college. He felt that his \$55,000 salary wasn't enough, though it is top pay on the Hill for a staffer.

So Hymel, 48, signed on with Bob Gray, a Reagan Republican, who runs an influential public relations firm. Hymel is now paid a salary reported to be in six figures.

He'll be working the Hill, but in a different way. He has lost none of his affection for it. "The beauty of the House is that it is a mirror of what America is," Hymel says. "America is more educated and independent now, and so is the House. Running every two years is good for members, because it makes them respond to their constituencies. This is a very human institution.●

SOCIAL SECURITY OVERVIEW

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, no issue has generated more controversy and caused more concern among the citizens of this country than that of the future of the social security system. The intense debate over social security's financial problems has tended to undermine public confidence in the ability of the system to meet future commitments; current and future retirees alike are growing increasingly concerned that anticipated benefits may not be forthcoming at all.

Because of the confusion presently surrounding the social security debate, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the history of the social security system, the nature of current problems, and prospects for the future. In so doing, I hope to lay to rest much of the misunderstanding which now exists.

When the social security system was established in 1935, it encompassed a social insurance system to provide benefits for retired workers, an unemployment compensation program to be financed by the States, and a mechanism for matching grants to States to provide help for the aged, blind, dependent and crippled children, and for maternal and child welfare. Title II of the basic Social Security Act provides the statutory authority for the old age and survivors insurance program (OASI) and the disability insurance program (DI), through which most current recipients receive benefits.

Social security was originally intended to be a form of social insurance to protect against the loss of income at retirement. It was never expected that social security would be the only means of support for the elderly, but rather one source of income to be supplemented by private investments, pensions, and savings. As a social insurance plan, social security is today further meant to protect individual

workers and their families from income loss as a result of occurrences such as retirement, death, and disability, as well as to protect society as a whole from the problems associated with those individuals who, for one reason or another, are not self-sufficient. Inherent in this basic premise is the concept of social adequacy rather than social equity. Unlike traditional annuities, for instance, benefits are not now and were never intended to be allocated strictly on the basis of earnings and years employed, but are instead computed by a benefit formula weighted to favor the long-term, low-wage earner. In so doing, social security is to some degree an income redistribution system which awards the highest relative benefit to the lowest earner, and vice versa.

The original act covered only workers in commercial and industrial occupations—about 60 percent of the workforce in 1935—but amendments over the years have extended mandatory coverage to more employee classes as well as increased the categories of eligible beneficiaries.

Federal employees as well as railroad workers were exempt from the outset because it was felt their own retirement systems were adequate. State and local government employees were excluded because of the constitutional difficulties levying a Federal tax on States and localities; nonprofit employees were considered to have the same tax-exempt status as their employing organizations, and agricultural and domestic workers were excluded because of administrative problems in keeping comprehensive wage histories—one of the advantages of social security is that OASDI credits are "portable," that is, "carried" with the employee as he moves from job to job.

Over the years, mandatory coverage for OASDI has been extended to regularly employed domestic and farmworkers, most self-employed professionals, members of the Armed Forces, Federal civilian employees not under a retirement system, residents of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, Americans working overseas for American employers, home workers, ministers, and some religious orders. Voluntary group coverage was extended to State and local government employees as well as to nonprofit workers.

As mandatory coverage was expanded, so have the categories of eligible beneficiaries. The original act provided benefits to retirees age 65 or older who had been paid wages in 5 different years—after 1936 and before reaching age 65—the sum total of which was not less than \$2,000. Recognizing the effect that loss of income could have on an entire family, the act was amended in 1939 to provide benefits to dependents and survivors of insured wage earners—the eligible cate-

gories included: Aged wife, child under 18, widowed mother caring for an eligible child, aged widow and dependent aged parents, if there were no surviving eligible widow or child. This approach also served to further the concept of social adequacy since benefits are not strictly related to contributions—even though a single wage earner and the primary wage earner of a household pay the same payroll tax, the family of the primary wage earner receives a higher return on contributions through survivors benefits than does a single person who would only receive his or her retirement benefits.

Currently, primary old-age benefits are paid to a fully insured worker who has reached age 62—the amount of monthly payment is 80 percent of what would otherwise be received at age 65—and terminate with the monthly payment for the month prior to the death of the insured worker.

Primary disability benefits are paid to workers who are unable to engage in "substantial gainful activity" by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted for a period of not less than 12 consecutive months, or blindness. A disability-insured worker under age 65 is entitled to a disability benefit after a waiting period of 5 consecutive months; benefits terminate with the payment for the month prior to the month of death or attainment of age 65, whichever happens first. A worker receiving disability becomes entitled to an old-age benefit when he reaches age 65.

As noted, secondary benefits—that is, benefits payable to dependents and survivors of the wage earner—have expanded drastically since the social security system was established: Dependent aged husbands of insured workers were added in 1950; widows, aged 62 in 1956; children aged 18 to 21 who are full-time students, in 1965; undergraduate students up to the end of the quarter or semester of their 22d birthday, in 1972; and dependent grandchildren in 1972. In 1965, the hospital insurance (HI) benefits program (medicare, part A) was started, financed by a portion of the payroll tax. In addition, benefit levels have been repeatedly raised and adjusted for inflation.

Contrary to widespread popular opinion, OASI benefits are not paid to illegal aliens. In fact, it is far more likely that such illegal workers are paying social security taxes, but never collecting benefits, and that they are obtaining false social security cards to work rather than to collect benefits. Further, supplemental security income (SSI) which is totally funded through general revenues—although administered by the Social Security Administration—is paid only to eligi-

ble U.S. citizens or eligible aliens legally admitted for permanent residence.

With regard to prisoners' benefits, Public Law 96-473 passed last year suspends the payment of DI benefits to any individual who is in prison due to conviction of a felony unless he or she is actively and satisfactorily participating in a court-approved rehabilitation program. Legislation has been introduced in this Congress to suspend all social security benefits paid to prisoners.

The mechanism by which the social security system is financed is often misunderstood. Since its beginning, social security has essentially been operated on a current-cost financing basis; that is, current taxes are used to pay current benefits and administrative expenses, and to maintain the reserve levels of the trust funds. A few, relatively minor programs are funded by general revenues. Because the current-cost financing mechanism is designed to produce tax collections that are approximately equal to the benefits and administrative expenses during a given period—plus a small amount to maintain the trust funds at an appropriate contingency level—the trust funds generally serve as reserve accounts only, to be used to pay benefits for a short period of time should current payroll taxes not be sufficient to cover all of the costs of current benefits.

Since an individual's contributions to the system are not retained by the trust funds, but are passed along to pay benefits to current retirees, the social security program is sometimes said to be a "treaty among generations" whereby current workers pay OASDI taxes which are used to fund benefits for an older generation of retirees. When the younger generation reaches retirement age, its social security benefits will be paid only if the following generation of workers agrees to support the system with its taxes. Viewed in this light, the system can also be termed an intergenerational income-transfer mechanism, by which part of the earnings of current workers is transferred to current retirees.

The current-cost financing system was more than adequate in 1935 when there were 11 workers for every person 65 or older. Today, however, there are only three workers for every retiree, and by the year 2020, the ratio is expected to be 2 to 1. Further, when social security was enacted, the life expectancy of the average American was 61 years. Today it is 73.2 years; those males who reach the age of 65 today can expect to live an additional 14 years, females an additional 18.4 years.

Initially, social security was financed by a matching 1-percent employer-employee tax on maximum earnings of \$3,000. The tax rate was first increased in 1950, to 1.5 percent on \$3,600, and has since been raised on

several occasions—including the 1977 enactment of the largest peacetime tax increase in our history. Today the social security or FICA tax is 6.65 percent on maximum wages of \$29,700, for a maximum annual tax contribution of \$1,975.05. Yet, because of inflation, unemployment, the demographic changes mentioned above, rising health care costs, and extended benefit coverage, current social security taxes cannot assure the future solvency of the system.

Each year the trustees of the OASDI and HI funds—the Secretaries of the Treasury, Labor, and Health and Human Services, and the Commissioner of Social Security—issue a report to Congress and the public on the financial condition of the trust funds. This annual report outlines trust funds expenditures for the previous year, and provides long-range, actuarial predictions of trust fund financing and retiree benefit needs based on several different scenarios. While actuarial assumptions can be highly accurate, they are nevertheless dependent on variables such as employment rates—high unemployment decreases contributions—inflation—high cost-of-living adjustments increase expenditures—and the kind of demographic changes discussed earlier.

At this point, I would like to quote from the Trustees' 1981 annual report:

The actuarial cost estimates presented in this report are based upon economic assumptions which are subject to considerable uncertainty. Nevertheless, it is virtually certain that, unless legislation to strengthen the financial status of the OASI Trust Fund is enacted soon, that fund will be exhausted in the latter half of 1982. The DI Trust Fund, on the other hand, is projected to increase rapidly. The enactment of legislation to reallocate tax rates from the DI Trust Fund to the OASI Trust Fund or to permit interfund borrowing between the two funds would not, however, postpone the latter's exhaustion by more than a few months.

The fact of the matter is that, based on current projections, the OASI fund will be bankrupt by fall 1982 unless major changes are soon made. Simply stated, the increase in benefits paid is now significantly greater than revenues received. The problem is not new—the large 1977 social security tax increase was an effort to insure solvency at that time—nor is it by any means insoluble. In this regard, much of the political rhetoric that has surrounded the social security question thus far has been quite misleading. In drawing attention to the precarious nature of social security financing, the administration and others are not attempting to frighten or threaten recipients, and are not contemplating a reduction in benefits for current retirees, but rather are attempting to openly explain the problems that now exist. In so doing, reasonable and effective solu-

tions can be openly debated and hopefully implemented before insolvency becomes a real threat.

From the outset, the administration has expressed its willingness to compromise on its preliminary proposals, which have not yet been introduced in the form of legislation. As announced by Secretary Schweiker in May, the administration proposes to reduce the pensions of workers who retire before age 65, reduce somewhat payments to those who retire at the age of 65 or older—again, no current recipients would be affected—relate disability insurance more closely to a worker's earnings history and medical condition, and eliminate the social security minimum benefit. The administration also proposes to abolish the outside earnings limitation on recipients between the ages of 65 and 72, and to gradually reduce the social security payroll tax.

With respect to early retirement, those who elect to retire at age 62 receive, under current law, 80 percent of the benefits they would be entitled to at age 65. The President proposes to discourage early retirement by offering only 55 percent of the maximum entitlement for those who retire at age 62, but under the President's plan, this amount would gradually escalate over an 18-month period until, at age 63½, retirees would receive exactly what they would have under existing law: 80 percent of full benefits.

Although I do not necessarily agree with all of the changes proposed by the administration, these proposals have the advantage of restoring both the short- and long-term solvency of the system without raising the retirement age, without taxing benefits, without changing the cost-of-living adjustment formula, and except for a one-time delay in the COLA of 3 months, not affecting current retirees.

The elimination of the minimum benefit is another proposal which has generated tremendous constituent concern, and one which I would like to discuss briefly.

The original Social Security Act of 1935 provided for a minimum social security benefit of \$10 a month in the interest of administrative efficiency and to avoid the public relations problems that would arise if very small monthly benefits were paid. The minimum benefit amount has been continuously raised over the year, and in 1972 a special benefit computation formula was provided by Congress for certain long-term, low-paid workers so that no one would get less than the minimum payment—currently \$122 per month—regardless of the amount earned through contributions. The share of minimum payments which exceeds earned benefits constitutes a pure welfare payment; one which the trust funds can no longer afford.

Careful analysis of the 3 million minimum payment recipients indicates that virtually none would suffer significant hardship as a result of this change. The General Accounting Office estimates that 1.2 million would continue to receive the same size payment because they earn the benefit based on their contributions or because they are classed as "minimum" through an accounting technicality; 200,000 are college students and minor children of double-dippers; up to 800,000 have comfortable total incomes which exceed an average of \$20,000 a year. Only about 300,000 would be seriously affected by elimination of the minimum benefit, and even they would be protected by a Federal safety net of supplemental security income, food stamps, and medicaid which, added together, provide the equivalent of \$6,980 for individuals and \$10,600 per couple. Another 500,000 could make up the loss, dollar for dollar, through SSI.

Other comprehensive legislation to restructure social security financing and benefits—most notably H.R. 3207 introduced by Representative JAKE PICKLE—is currently pending in the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security. Several of the provisions of H.R. 3207 have already been included in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, including the phase-out of postsecondary student benefits, termination of mothers' and fathers' benefits when a child attains age 16, elimination of the minimum benefit—PICKLE's bill would have eliminated it prospectively, but the Reconciliation Act applied the termination to both current and future minimum beneficiaries—rounding of benefits, a cap on disability benefits, and elimination of funding—with certain exceptions for vocational rehabilitation services.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the social security system has been one of this country's most successful social programs. I share the President's desire to restrain the growth of the nonretirement portions of social security, and to redirect the program to its original purpose. Further, I am committed to doing all I can to see that those who have contributed for many years to the social security system continue to receive their rightful benefits upon retirement.●

A SALUTE TO FRANK L. "DOC"
KELKER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, thank you for providing me with this opportunity to bring the man who, in every sense of the phrase, has been the

doctor of the spirit of the city of Cleveland and many of its residents to the attention of my colleagues—Mr. Frank L. "Doc" Kelker. Probably more than any other Clevelander in recent memory, Frank "Doc" Kelker has helped to cure the societal ills of the city and pave the way for achievements by both the city and its residents.

As Doc Kelker, as we affectionately call him, enters retirement, I would like to pay tribute to him on behalf of the residents of the 21st Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I can attest to the outstanding virtues of Doc Kelker through the long association that I have had with him. My brother, Carl, and I were two of the Clevelanders of whom I spoke who were taken under the protective wing of Doc Kelker. He showed us that mediocrity was intolerable. He instilled in us the philosophy that bridging the gap between rich and poor, white and black and between the haves and the have-nots should be our primary goal. We aspired to these philosophies because of the shining example Doc Kelker set for us to follow.

Mr. Speaker, like many other Clevelanders, I remember when Doc Kelker came to the old Central High School in Cleveland as the physical education teacher. It was at that time that he took an interest in me and my brother.

The guidance and fatherly image he portrayed continued as I participated in youth clubs directed by him at the central YMCA in Cleveland. Throughout our association, he armed me with both the physical strength and moral conviction which has helped me to achieve and face seemingly insurmountable odds. I know that he did similar things for others. That is why the respect and love for Doc Kelker is shared by so many people in the city of Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, you would think that a man like Doc Kelker who had dedicated himself to improving the lives of so many young people and the vitality of the city would have little time for career achievements in his own right. This is not the case with Doc Kelker. A well-known high school and college athlete, Doc Kelker went on to become chairman of the Cuyahoga Community College Board of Trustees, a great civic and civil rights leader, and confidant to many of the public officials in the city of Cleveland.

In his career, Doc Kelker fought racism and forged new paths where others dared not tread. He almost singlehandedly has taken this drive, determination, and power and instilled it in prominent city officials so that Cleveland today is a much better place for all residents to live regardless of their race or economic class.

Mr. Speaker, Doc Kelker is a man of great integrity. He is a man of great vision. He is loved and respected by people throughout the city.

Most importantly, Doc Kelker is one of Cleveland's shining stars. He placed a glimmer of hope in the lives of many of the less fortunate in the city while letting them know that success in any endeavor was within their reach. For these unmatched gifts and for being an exceptional human being, I thank him and send him my best wishes as he enters retirement.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to join me in wishing Doc Kelker the very best as he starts his new life. I enter in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Doc Kelker:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 24, 1981]

DOC KELKER HELPED MOLD, HOLD CLEVELAND TOGETHER

(By Dan Coughlin)

People remember Frank L. (Doc) Kelker as a great athlete, probably the greatest who ever played for Western Reserve University in its heyday as a regional sports power in the 1930s. This is unfortunate, because that is but a speck on the sundial of his life.

The impact Kelker made on Cleveland in the 43 years since he was graduated is the stuff of legend. He was part of this city's backbone. He helped mold it. He helped hold it together.

"Everything I ever was, did or will be was Cleveland," he said May 12, the final day his address was 13935 Southington Rd., Shaker Heights.

Kelker, 65, and his wife, Audrey, left the next day for their retirement residence, an apartment in Los Angeles.

"My wife has a sister and two brothers there. She's been bugging me—no, she asked me to consider it—for a long time," Kelker explained. "Oh, yes, I'll miss Cleveland. But you remember when the Browns played Oakland last January? We were in Los Angeles and watched it on television. It was 85 degrees. The next day it was 90."

Kelker had more going-away parties than anybody in recent memory. 15, he estimated. Every civic group he belonged to honored him with a luncheon: Cuyahoga Community College, Juvenile Court, the Citizens League, Rotary Club, Marymount Hospital, Dyke College, Case Western Reserve University, and the Great Lakes Region of the YMCA. Mostly it was the YMCA, where he spent the last 41 years.

Kelker did not become rich, although he was graduated from Western Reserve in 1938 with honors and with nine athletic letters, three each in football, basketball and track. Upon graduation, he was offered coveted jobs in Cleveland industry. He eschewed them to work with youngsters.

For two years he taught and coached at old Central High. In 1940 he joined the Cedar YMCA, where he remained until 1950, when he moved to Kansas City as executive director of a YMCA there. In 1956, he returned to Cleveland and became executive director of the Cedar YMCA.

All the time, the legend of Kelker as a civic leader grew. He became chairman of the board of Cuyahoga Community College, which he served nine years. Last year, he

served as foreman of the Cuyahoga County grand jury. Afterward, he advocated abolition of the grand jury system, calling it redundant.

Ironically, the man who gave so much was rewarded with abuse late in his term as chairman of the CCC trustees. In 1969, during the peak of racial unrest, black students labeled him an Uncle Tom and called him a pig and racist.

"There were times during that turbulent period when that became almost a full-time job," Kelker reflected. "One time we had meetings for 15 consecutive days."

Kelker's philosophy never changed. He turned the other cheek and plunged even more enthusiastically into his job.

"All these things I became involved in were therapeutic," he explained. "If they asked me to join something, I wouldn't unless I knew something about it and felt I could make a contribution. So few people are willing to take on responsibilities beyond their jobs. So many people helped me. I wanted to do my fair share to make life better for everybody."

Like those who taunted him in the '60s, Kelker experienced racial ostracism.

He came out of Dover High School in 1934, after leading the Tornados to undefeated football seasons and to the state basketball championship. Paul Brown, who coached Massillon at the time, dropped Dover from his football schedule after Kelker's team beat Massillon two years in a row.

Kelker recalls that there were about 1,000 blacks in Dover's population of about 10,000 in those days. As a youngster he was oblivious to racism. It didn't touch him until he made a trip to Springfield with the Dover High basketball team.

"We went into a hamburger stand, just a little hamburger stand, and they wouldn't serve me. We thought those people were crazy. So we all left," Kelker recalled.

"You'll see a lot of that," his father advised him.

When Dover played for the state basketball championship in Columbus, Kelker found that as the only black on the team, the only place he could get a meal in the state capital was the diner at the railroad station.

He was headed to Ohio State University, where the coaches said he would break the Big Ten color barrier, but Western Reserve coach Sam Willaman persuaded Kelker's father to send the young man to Cleveland.

"My father said I was going to Western Reserve, and I said, 'Yes, sir,'" Kelker recalled.

College scholarships for blacks were rare in those days. Kelker was an exception. A scholarship at Western Reserve consisted of free tuition, period. He worked for his room, board and everything else.

He rose at 5 a.m. to sweep floors and wash walls at Flora Stone Mather College, working three hours each morning for 40 cents an hour. After classes and practice for either football, basketball or track, he studied and then sifted ashes at the school power plant.

He was graduated with honors. He made Little All-American in football. He scored as many as 21 points in basketball. He ran the 100-yard dash in 9.9 seconds and the quarter mile in 49.1 seconds, both school records at the time. His speed was remarkable for a man so big, 6 feet 2 and 195 pounds.

Kelker set school scoring records in basketball against competition that included

such major powers as Stanford, Nebraska, Notre Dame and City College of New York.

Until the University of Dayton and Syracuse defeated Reserve on consecutive Saturdays, Kelker had played in 53 straight victorious football games in high school and college.

On the football field, Kelker was a rangy, sure-handed end who also occasionally carried the ball from the backfield position and on end reverses.

Kelker was a target not only for his own tailback's passes, but for the other teams' mayhem. He always had to be alert on the football field, jumping to his feet after making a tackle. When he was on the ground, he was vulnerable to a kick—not because he was Kelker, the great football player, but because he was Kelker, the black football player.

"People always asked me why I jumped up so quick," he said with a laugh. "I said I was anxious for the next play. It was survival, that's what it was."

He wasn't always quick enough. He came out of some games with his face swollen and bleeding, his countenance bearing enemy bootmarks. He was knocked out of the Dayton game in the first quarter because of a vicious kick, for which his assailant apologized many months later.

Kelker learned in later years that some schools, Nebraska and Georgetown among them, canceled football games with Western Reserve because of Kelker.

His contemporaries contend he could have starred in the National Football League or in major league baseball, but professional sports were not sufficiently enlightened.

In September, following graduation from Reserve, Kelker played on an Ohio collegiate all-star team in an exhibition game against the Cleveland Rams of the NFL. The Rams won, 9-0, at League Park.

Kelker recalls a Rams' assistant coach saying to him afterward, "We'd like to use you, but you know we can't do that."

The idea of traveling around the country playing in the Negro National League of baseball did not appeal to him. Thereafter his sports interests were in golf. He became an excellent golfer, scoring in the mid-70s. Later he gave golf lessons.

"I'd teach doctors how to play golf," he remembered. "I'd call them Joe or Bob or John. They'd call me Doc."

Many people thought Kelker was a medical doctor because of that nickname. He acquired it as a toddler learning to say "Da Da."

The nickname was pinned on him by his twin brother, Fred, who died of cancer three years ago.

The Doc spent a lifetime trying to cure what ails Cleveland. He has been closer to former Mayors Ralph J. Locher and Carl B. Stokes and Mayor George V. Voinovich. Locher was a football foe at Heidelberg. Stokes and his brother, Rep. Louis Stokes, D-21, came under Kelker's wing at the Cedar YMCA.

"This city is having its problems, but they can be cured. The city is better than it was," Kelker maintained.

The city is better, of course, because of Doc Kelker. ●

THE SMALL BUSINESS
INNOVATION RESEARCH ACT

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, the Small Business Innovation Research Act, together with the Honorable JOE MCDADE, the Honorable JERRY LEWIS, and 42 cosponsors. This bill seeks to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the role of small innovative firms in federally funded research and development programs.

I believe this bill will also serve to strengthen our Nation's economy. We are in grave danger of losing our technological superiority and this dearly affects our desire to maintain our national security, achieve energy independence, increase our industrial productivity and expand the quality of our lives.

The bill we are introducing today is similar to one introduced in the Senate by Senator RUDMAN. The Senate bill has attracted 82 cosponsors. The bill simply requires that large Federal agencies with research and development budgets over \$100 million establish a small business innovative research (SBIR) program to enable small firms to develop new products and processes that fall within areas of national need as designated by the agency.

The small business innovative research programs the agencies will organize under this legislation will be modeled after the National Science Foundation's successful small business program. That program provides for a three-phase developmental cycle for small business research and development proposals. In the first phase, selected proposals are funded to determine technical feasibility. Phase II funding would be given to those projects that are deemed technically feasible and are suited for the marketplace. Phase III requires that the private sector pay for the commercial development of the research.

This legislation also requires that Federal agencies with research budgets in excess of \$20 million annually evaluate their activities with small business contractors and set goals that would increase the role of small businesses in their research and development contracting activities every year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is needed because the role of innovative small businesses has continuously been neglected by Federal agencies. The statistics are astounding. In addition to being the economy's leader in job creation and employment growth, small businesses have provided this Nation with over half of our major innovations since World War II. According to the

National Science Foundation, small businesses are far more cost effective than larger corporations when engaging in research, producing 24 times more innovations per research and development dollar.

How do our Federal agencies respond to those statistics? The answer is disappointing, but the facts are that small businesses' share of Federal research and development funding is between 3 and 4 percent of the total Federal research and development effort. For example, one witness told the Senate Small Business Committee that of the more than \$15 billion of Federal research and development procured from business, just 70 companies contract for 80 percent of this research, and only 4 companies contract for nearly 20 percent.

I find those statistics incredible. Those large companies whose research programs are being financed by the Federal Government have the funds to pay for their own research. Of course, there are some projects of such a huge scale that the prime contract work must be performed by large companies; but is it really necessary for the Federal Government to fund for a new automobile engine program with General Motors, or pay to develop the commercial viability of a catalyst owned by the Mobil Oil Co.

These companies have plenty of money to fund their own research programs. And are we that naive to believe that a large company, with considerable investment in existing technologies, is going to fully and quickly exploit a new innovation that may make a part of their product line obsolete?

Small businesses, on the other hand, do not have the access to internally generated funds to support their research programs. And they do not have the embedded investments in other product lines, manufacturing facilities, and channels of distribution that are threatened by new innovations. It is in the best interest of a small firm to quickly and fully exploit new innovations, through joint ventures, licensing agreements, and internal growth. This self-serving interest on the part of the small entrepreneur in turn serves the best interests of society.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that this legislation would require no new Federal spending. In fact, where applicable, I would like to see the Federal Government recoup its investment in successful research and development projects. I would like to encourage Federal agencies to set their own rules in this area. This legislation merely states that each Federal agency that is covered, set aside by 1984 only 2 percent of what it is already spending on research and development for its small business innovative research program.

In light of the tremendous contributions that small business makes to our Nation's economy, it is not unreasonable for Congress to ask that large Federal agencies spend 2 percent of their research budgets to promote small business innovative research.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

H.R. 4373

A bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the role of the small, innovative firms in federally funded research and development, and utilize Federal research and development as a base for technological innovation to meet agency needs and to contribute to the growth and strength of the Nation's economy

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Innovation Research Act of 1981".

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) technological innovation creates jobs, increases productivity, competition, and economic growth, and is a valuable counterforce to inflation and the United States balance-of-payments deficit; and

(2) while small business is the principal source of significant innovations in the Nation, the vast majority of federally funded research and development is conducted by large businesses, universities, and Government laboratories.

(b) Therefore, the purposes of this Act are—

(1) to stimulate technological innovation;

(2) to use small businesses to meet Federal research and development needs; and

(3) to increase private sector commercialization of innovations derived from Federal research and development.

Sec. 3. Section 9(b) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) to develop and maintain a source file and an information program to assure each qualified and interested small business concern the opportunity to participate in Federal agency small business innovation research programs;

"(5) to coordinate with participating agencies a schedule for release of SBIR solicitations, and to prepare a master release schedule so as to maximize small businesses opportunities to respond to solicitations;

"(6) to independently survey and monitor the operation of SBIR programs within participating Federal agencies; and

"(7) to report annually to the Committee on Small Business of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on the SBIR programs of the Federal agencies and the Administration's information and monitoring efforts related to the SBIR programs."

Sec. 4. Section 9 of the Small Business Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'Federal agency' means an executive agency as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, or a military de-

partment as defined in section 102 of such title;

"(2) the term 'funding agreement' means any contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into between any Federal agency and any small business for the performance of experimental, developmental, or research work funded in whole or in part by the Federal Government;

"(3) the term 'small innovation research program' or 'SBIR' means a program under which a portion of a Federal agency's research or research and development effort is reserved for award to small business concerns through a simplified, standardized acquisition process having a first place for determining, insofar as possible, the technical and economic feasibility of ideas proposed under the program, and a second phase, the awarding of which shall take into consideration the potential commercial applications of the research or research and development, to further develop the proposed idea to meet the particular agency needs; and a third phase where private capital pursues commercial applications of the research or research and development; phase three may also involve follow-on production contracts with some agencies for products or processes intended for use by the United States Government; and

"(4) the term 'research' or 'research and development' means any activity which is (A) a systematic study directed toward fuller scientific knowledge of the subject studied; (B) a systematic study directed specifically toward applying new scientific knowledge to meet a recognized need; or (C) a systematic application of new scientific knowledge toward production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements. Such term does not include studies related to the social sciences or the humanities.

"(f) Each Federal agency which has a research or research and development budget in excess of \$100,000,000 for any fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1982 shall expend not less than three-tenths of 1 per centum of such budget for fiscal year 1982, not less than 1 per centum for fiscal year 1983, and not less than 2 per centum of such budget for all subsequent fiscal years with small business concerns specifically in connection with a small business innovation research program which meets the requirements of this Act and regulations issued hereunder. Funding agreements with small business concerns for research or research and development which result from competitive or single source selections other than under an SBIR program shall not be counted as meeting any portion of the percentage requirements of this section.

"(g) Each Federal agency required by subsection (f) to establish a small business innovation research program shall in accordance with this Act and regulations issued hereunder—

"(1) establish an agency small business innovation research program;

"(2) determine categories of projects to be in its SBIR program;

"(3) issue SBIR solicitations in accordance with a schedule determined cooperatively with the Small Business Administration;

"(4) receive and evaluate proposals resulting from SBIR proposals;

"(5) select awardees for its SBIR funding agreements;

"(6) administer its own SBIR funding agreements (or delegate such administration to another agency);

"(7) make payments to recipients of SBIR funding agreements on the basis of progress toward or completion of the funding agreement requirements; and

"(8) make an annual report on the SBIR program to the Small Business Administration.

"(h) In addition to the requirements of subsection (f), each Federal agency which has a budget for research or research and development in excess of \$20,000,000 for any fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1982 shall establish goals specifically for funding agreements for research or research and development to small business concerns, and no goal established under this subsection shall be less in actual percentage than the portion of research or research and development awards made to small businesses in 1981.

"(i) Each Federal agency required by this section to have an SBIR program or to establish goals shall report annually to the Small Business Administration the number of awards pursuant to grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements over \$10,000 in amount and the dollar value of all such awards, identifying SBIR awards and comparing the number and amount of such awards with awards to other than small business concerns.

"(j)(1) The Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, in conjunction with the Small Business Administration, shall promulgate and issue appropriate regulations, in accordance with the provisions of subsections (f), (g), and (h) and within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of the Small Business Innovation Research Act of 1981, for conduct of small business innovation research programs within the Federal Government. Such regulations shall—

"(A) provide for simplified standardized and timely SBIR solicitations, proposals, and evaluation processes; and

"(B) require Federal agencies to coordinate SBIR solicitation release schedules with the Small Business Administration.

"(2) The National Science Foundation and the Small Business Administration shall furnish the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy advice and assistance in the promulgation of regulations under this section."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act do not authorize the appropriation of funds.●

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MASTER BUILDER ROBERT MOSES

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of master builder Robert Moses, who passed away on July 29, 1981, of congestive heart failure.

Mr. Moses was a firm believer in satisfying the needs of the people, especially those of moderate resources. Due to his efforts to connect New York City with its outlying areas—through the construction of 481 miles of highways and 11 bridges—Moses made New York City the "Nation's

first city for the automobile age." He will also be remembered for his work in building 75 State parks, 658 playgrounds, the New York Coliseum, the Lincoln Center, the Robert Moses Niagara Powerplant, zoos, civic centers, exhibition halls, the 1964-65 New York World's Fair, and Jones Beach—as well as other beaches. Moses also reconditioned Central Park Zoo. Many of these projects were funded by the revenues obtained from previous projects that came under the control of the public authority.

During his 40 years of service, he held positions on the city planning commission and the housing authority. Moses also served as New York City Park Commissioner from 1934-60, the head of the city parks department and Triborough bridge authority, consultant to the Triborough bridge and tunnel authority, and city construction coordinator. He was also instrumental in bringing the United Nations to its present East River location.

The city of New York and the Nation at large are indebted to Robert Moses for his vision, his creative genius, and his lasting contribution to the society in which he lived.●

A-PLANT FUNDING STATEMENT

HON. BOB McEWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my sincere appreciation that both the budget reconciliation bill and the energy and water appropriations bill contain the necessary funding for continuing the scheduled construction of the gas centrifuge uranium plant at Portsmouth. The timely completion of this plant is a key element in reestablishing the United States as a reliable international supplier of enriched uranium. To date, foreign sales of enrichment totaling nearly \$3 billion have added favorably to our balance of trade.

The assured supply of uranium is also an essential element in the development of alternative energy sources in this country. In addition to supplying 100 percent of our domestic needs, all the requirement for defense needs must be met by the gaseous diffusion plants operated by the Department of Energy. DOE currently holds long-term contracts to supply separative work well above the capacity of its diffusion plants. These demands for enrichment can be met most economically by keeping the Portsmouth centrifuge plant on schedule for operation in 1989.

There are other compelling reasons to complete the Portsmouth plant as rapidly as possible. The centrifuge process requires one-twentieth the

electric power consumed in the diffusion process. The energy savings would result in tremendous cost savings as well.

In closing, let me point out another serious problem addressed by the enrichment activities. Today there are approximately 10,000 people engaged in the operation, maintenance, and support of the three diffusion plants at Portsmouth, Oak Ridge, and Paducah. In addition, more than 3,000 people at all locations are engaged in the design and construction of the gas centrifuge project. This does not include the subcontractors who supply components, materials and services—perhaps another 5,000 to 7,000 people gainfully employed by this worthwhile project.

The important economic impact of uranium enrichment on U.S. jobs, balance of trade, and efforts to reduce dependence on foreign oil are quite evident. Therefore, I thank my colleagues for their foresight in approving adequate funding for this project so vital to the interests of the United States. ●

MY VOTE AGAINST THE REAGAN TAX CUTS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I have received many inquiries relative to my vote on President Reagan's tax cut proposals. I think it is important for me to state for the record my reasons for not supporting the President's proposals.

First, let me assure you that I believe that tax reform is essential to the revitalization of the Nation's economy. I do not believe, however, that the administration's tax reform proposals will provide economic relief or incentives in those areas needed to stimulate our economy. Unfortunately, and I use this term in complete sincerity, the House of Representatives approved the administration's tax proposals by a vote of 238 to 195 on July 29, 1981.

I did not support the administration's proposals because I believe that these proposals are geared toward the rich rather than the low- and middle-income families who really need tax relief. I disagree with the administration's "trickle down" philosophy which has already proven to be inequitable and unworkable in this country back in the early part of this century.

The Washington Post has labeled the tax package "a monstrous grab bag of expensive gimmicks" which "could lead to a nearly uncontrollable loss of revenue in future years." The combination of untargeted individual

tax cuts, distortionary business tax cuts, and special interest provisions will fail to encourage orderly economic growth and will produce massive deficits. At a time when the public is increasingly concerned about the reality of future budget cuts and inflation, the magnitude and bias of these tax cuts can hardly be justified. Public opinion polls have shown that voters do not want large tax cuts that will set off another round of rampant inflation.

The individual tax cuts in the President's proposals would disproportionately benefit upper-income taxpayers who are less vulnerable to inflation and cuts in Government programs. These taxpayers would receive virtually all the benefits from more favorable capital gains treatment, the all-savers certificates, incentive stock options for executives, and estate and gift tax cuts.

The business depreciation proposal, 10-5-3, would cost more than \$100 billion between fiscal year 1981 and fiscal year 1990. Although 10-5-3 has been billed as a major stimulus for all industries, it would, in fact, provide uneven benefits and distort investment flows. It would be especially generous to very profitable, capital-intensive industries and in some cases would actually provide tax subsidies for investments in certain kinds of assets when the new, more valuable investment tax credit is taken into account. As a result, businesses will be encouraged to invest in plants and equipment solely because of tax benefits. Similarly, investors will be drawn to invest in some industries for their tax shelter potential, not for their prospects for long-run economic growth.

The tax proposal which I supported, the Udall-Obey-Reuss substitute, was the only fiscally responsible and realistic proposal. This substitute would have provided significant tax reductions while balancing the budget. It would have resulted in a \$2 billion surplus in fiscal year 1982 and more than \$20 billion surplus in fiscal year 1983. The substitute permitted a balanced budget which would not have required the Government to enter the money market and compete with businesses and private borrowers to raise the money to pay for the tax cut. In addition, the substitute contained no costly special interest giveaways to the oil industry, savings and loans, and the very wealthy.

For individuals, the Udall-Obey-Reuss substitute would have provided the lions share of tax relief to those families with incomes of \$30,000 and below—the majority of the American public. The Udall-Obey-Reuss approach would have allocated 50 percent of the tax cut for these families as compared with only 36 percent under the administration's bill. In

stark contrast, the administration's bill provides a whopping 35 percent of the tax relief to the most wealthy families in America—those with incomes above \$100,000. These prosperous families would have received a more moderate 18 percent of the tax cut under the Udall-Obey-Reuss substitute.

For businesses, the substitute would have provided \$9.5 billion in tax incentives for modernization and increased productivity in fiscal year 1982. It would have helped small businesses by lowering their corporate tax rates and widening the tax brackets, but would not have provided bailouts to failing industries or unnecessary cuts in the maximum tax rates for large corporations.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I did not support the President's tax cut proposals. As in the past I will continue to oppose those Reagan policies which I deem to be inimicable to the best interests of the American people. ●

ENDORSEMENT OF SOLIDARITY DAY

HON. GUS SAVAGE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, I sent a letter to Lane Kirkland, President of the AFL-CIO, informing him that I was circulating a "Dear Colleague" among the Members of the House of Representatives, asking for their endorsement of Solidarity Day.

I think the American people should be aware of the Representatives who are actively opposed to the Reagan administration's "feed the rich and starve the poor" economic program.

Listed below are the names of those who have endorsed Solidarity Day. I would like to take this opportunity to commend them and thank them for their support.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—SOLIDARITY DAY ENDORSEMENT

Joseph Addabbo of New York.
Mike Barnes of Maryland.
Jonathan Bingham of New York.
David Bonior of Michigan.
William Brodhead of Michigan.
John Burton of California.
Phil Burton of California.
Bill Clay of Missouri.
Cardiss Collins of Illinois.
John Conyers of Michigan.
George Danielson of California.
Ron Dellums of California.
Bob Edgar of Pennsylvania.
Dante Fascell of Florida.
Geraldine Ferraro of New York.
Thomas Foglietta of Pennsylvania.
Harold Ford of Tennessee.
Augustus Hawkins of California.
John LaFalce of New York.
Mike Lowery of Washington.
Nicholas Mavroules of Massachusetts.
Barbara Mikulski of Maryland.
Parren Mitchell of Maryland.

Austin Murphy of Pennsylvania.
James Oberstar of Minnesota.
Richard Ottiner of New York.
Claude Pepper of Florida.
Henry Reuss of Wisconsin.
Pat Schroeder of Colorado.
Charles Schumer of New York.
John Seiberling of Ohio.
Stephen Solarz of New York.
Ted Weiss of New York.
Frederick Richmond of New York.●

A THANK YOU FROM A
GRATEFUL NATION

HON. ED WEBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WEBER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, August 30, 1981, will mark the end of a 33-year career of a medical officer in the U.S. Army who dedicated himself unselfishly to the service of our country. His efforts have gone beyond the realm of just duty. It has touched the lives indirectly of everyone in every State, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the District of Columbia. I am referring to Col. John Raymond Daniels, U.S. Army, affectionately known as Jack Daniels. He is a fellow Ohioan. He is from Columbus, Ohio. He typifies the all-American from the Midwest and never hesitates to make the fact known that his hometown is Columbus, Ohio. Yes, you can take the boy out of the country, but you cannot take the country out of the boy—that is Jack.

Columbus, Ohio was the center of his formal education—North High School, Ohio State University, and his medical degree from the Ohio State University College of Medicine in 1950. His medical internship was served at William Beaumont Army Hospital in Texas and he came to Washington, D.C. in 1952 to attend the Army Medical Graduate School at Walter Reed Medical Center.

I will quickly touch on some highlights of his career before I concentrate on his final assignment here in Washington. In August 1952, he was assigned as the Army Surgeon of MAAG—Formosa where he worked closely with the Chinese Nationalist Army. Using an interpreter was time-consuming, so he learned to speak Mandarin. In July 1954, Captain Daniels was sent to airborne school at Fort Bragg, N.C., where he earned his parachute wings. He subsequently attended the jump master school there and made 54 jumps from the heavens. He was assigned as Regimental Surgeon of the 82d Airborne Division, and sent to Germany as Clearing Company Commander and later, Medical Battalion Commander of the 11th Airborne Division. He learned to speak German there.

November 1957 and the following year found Major Daniels in general surgery at the U.S. Army Hospital at

Fort Bragg. That tour was followed by service in urology at Tripler Army Hospital in Hawaii. It was during that tour that he met and married Lorna Leong Douglas. His Hawaiian assignment moved him to the famous Schofield Barracks. However, all good things must come to an end. At the end of 2 years, in February 1962, he was transferred to Fort Hood, Tex.

In Texas, Lieutenant Colonel Daniels was the Division Surgeon of the First Armored Division. Shortly thereafter, he was transferred to Fort Lawton, Wash., and then for 1 year from July 1964, was the Corps Surgeon of I Corps in Korea.

It was in September 1965 that he was first assigned to the National Guard Bureau at the Pentagon as the Army Surgeon, an assignment which he thought would be his longest tour—5 years. There he began the task of pulling all the loose ends together—there it was that he realized he needed all his experience and knowledge of hospital and field medical training. His ability and his personality were assets and a great deal of diplomacy was required since he dealt with all the adjutant generals and the State physicians of the Army National Guard. He slowly became aware of the needs and most of all basic requirements to function more effectively in their respective missions.

At the end of 5 years, Col. Jack Daniels was sent to Alaska as the Chief Surgeon of the Army Medical Alaskan Command. Again, there he established new guidelines and implemented the regulations which were required for the then expanding command. He was even able to establish a rapport with the State medical officers and the Natives in the bush, making it possible for the villagers in the back country to receive basic medical assistance while using unique ideas and giving the Army physicians the practice they wanted. You can't say that Jack doesn't make the most of an assignment.

Following the rigors and hardship of Alaska for 2 years, Jack and his family were packed off for another 2-year assignment at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii again.

And then, in April 1974, Col. John Daniels was reassigned back to the Pentagon—a tour to last 7 years! He was asked to return to his old job as Army Surgeon of the Army National Guard Bureau—but the responsibilities were greater in view of the emphasis being focused on the growing National Guard of our country and the growing decline of the Volunteer Army.

It is on this tour that I would be remiss if I did not especially recognize his efforts which went beyond the scope that was required. He established and implemented ideas which stirred the very spirit and drive of his

colleagues and fellow physicians throughout the Nation. He guided the medical officers of the Army National Guard in programs which helped them in their own areas of responsibility. Those programs and ideas were successful and are ensconced as procedures today.

Jack Daniels is responsible for the medical readiness of 390,000 individual Army National Guardsmen and the organizational readiness of more than 200 Army National Guard medical units comprised of 20,000 individuals. He substantially upgraded the medical situation within the Army National Guard throughout the country by creating a centrally planned, regionally coordinated, and State-operated medical service. He successfully established an Army National Guard physicians assistant program coordinating with the U.S. Air Force which enabled the Army National Guard to utilize their facilities to train personnel in a physicians assistant program when such capabilities were not available within the Army. He was also able to establish a civilian education program for licensed practical nurses using the facilities of the civilian community to train these personnel for Army National Guard duty. He established three Army National Guard medical brigades in the three Army areas, one of which is in Ohio.

In face of the acute shortage of physicians in the military and in order to procure and retain qualified physicians in the Army National Guard, Jack established a program which enabled physicians in the National Guard to participate in a continuing medical education (CME) program at Federal expense.

Jack, no doubt, has gained much satisfaction from his career in realizing the fruits of his efforts to build and maintain a physically fit and healthy Army National Guard. His colleagues and multitude of friends are sad to see him leave for other challenges.

The Army National Guard found recognition as a result of Jack's efforts to become active in the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States where he served as Chairman of the Army National Guard Section. The section is now well-established and the Army National Guard has found its place in this prestigious medical association. It can now share in decisions with other military services of our country.

Colonel Daniels has been recognized by individual States and other governments he has worked with. Among the awards he was decorated with by the Army, he wears the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster, Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Army Commendation Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, American Campaign Medal, and the World War II Victory Medal.

He still finds the time to belong to civic organizations. He is a member of the American Medical Association, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Association of Military Surgeons of the United States, a Member of the Pan-Pacific Surgical Association, and an active member of the Arlington Rotary Club.

Jack found the time to be a father to his son, Capt. William Douglas, who is stationed in Fairbanks, Alaska, Glen Douglas of Spokane Washington, Tom who is a senior at Dartmouth, and his daughters, Lori attending Mary Washington College and Lisa attending James Madison University, both of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Ohio and the rest of the Nation, I would like to express our heartfelt thanks to Col. John Raymond Daniels, a friend whom I am proud of, for a job well done. I wish him good health and success in all his future endeavors.●

VISTA PROGRAM

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disturbed by the recent charges issued against the VISTA program by the new Director of ACTION, Thomas Pauken. His attack is unwarranted and illustrates the Director's inexcusable disregard for the goals of the program. Clearly, the dubious action of the administration's appointee reflects the President's interest in eliminating this valuable program.

Mr. Pauken recently distributed a "hit list" of 32 VISTA projects which had allegedly taken "partisan political positions" which they are prohibited from doing. The evidence makes clear, however, that these accusations are nothing more than an attempt to undermine many worthwhile VISTA projects.

The factual errors and distortions in Mr. Pauken's list betray the haphazard methodology used to prepare it. At the time the list was compiled, 6 of the 32 criticized projects no longer had VISTA volunteers on staff. Projects were singled out for no discernible reason and without indepth documentation of their purported wrongdoing. Each of the questionable projects has been previously approved by the ACTION State and regional offices as well as by the Governor of each State involved. Many targeted projects, such as the Massachusetts Association of Older Americans, which has succeeded in securing the construction of housing projects and an eye clinic for the elderly, have been applauded for their contribution by public officials in the communities they serve.

The VISTA program embodies many of the values that we as Americans have espoused throughout our history. Over the 17 years it has existed, it has proven that our noble tradition of volunteerism can effectively help people to help themselves.

Since 1964, VISTA has focused its attention on the most challenging and serious of our Nation's concerns: Poverty, equality and social justice; 70,000 men and women of all ages and ethnic groups have served as VISTA's in thousands of communities across the country. They have successfully demonstrated innovative approaches to assisting the less privileged and fostering feelings of hope in their communities.

Last year, 4,000 VISTA's served more than 4 million low-income people. A recent survey found that each VISTA volunteer mobilized an average of \$25,000 in resources at the local level and recruited an average of 15 community volunteers to work on the project. Remarkably, 75 percent of the projects were continued and supported by the community after the VISTA assistance was phased out.

There are many examples of the fine work that VISTA has performed to date. In 1 year, 4 VISTA's, working with a citizens' organization in Chicago, generated jobs for 1,200 unemployed people. Two tenement buildings were rehabilitated and converted into cooperative apartments for low-income residents in the South Bronx through the work of VISTA's and the neighborhood association. VISTA volunteers started the first battered women's shelter in Anchorage, Alaska. I've offered only a few examples, but the list goes on and on.

At a time when we are examining the cost effectiveness of every program that aids the poor, it should be clear that VISTA is worth the relatively small sum we spend on it. VISTA's budget for 1981 was \$34 million. The president plans to slash its budget by \$15 million next year and phase out the program entirely by 1983. VISTA's budget constitutes less than one tenthousandth of the Federal budget. For that minimal investment, the rewards have been substantial.

VISTA continues to generate needed jobs, resources, and services for poor communities as well as to create a sense of self-respect and dignity for those it serves. I urge my colleagues to express their support for this program and condemn the unjust attack of its new Director on its goals.●

TIME TO GET WITH IT

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence Hinton of Lomstead, Ky., re-

cently sent me a clipping from the Kentucky New Era, published in Hopkinsville, Ky., which reflected the thinking of many of my constituents when he said it is time for Congress to embrace President Reagan's solutions to this Nation's economic and defense problems. I feel the editorial should be shared with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time. The editorial follows:

REAGAN IS TRYING TO DO WHAT HE PROMISED TO DO

The basic issues seemed very clear as the presidential campaign progressed last year. In November, the voters made their choice and overwhelmingly voted for Ronald Reagan.

We don't believe most of those Reagan votes were cast for the man Ronald Reagan, but rather for the solutions he proposed to the country's economic and defense problems.

After all, Reagan was no American hero. Although he was a former movie actor, he never attained great stardom in that field. If there is a personal quality about the man that attracted masses of voters, it is his ability to communicate well in speech.

But there were legitimate doubts about candidate Reagan when the campaign began, some of which persisted right up to the election. There was his lack of experience in national affairs, and certainly the matter of his advanced age. He turned 70 shortly after taking office. In short, many wondered whether he could handle the job.

There seems little doubt that Reagan's ultimate appeal to the voters grew out of his message. He struck a responsive chord with Americans who had lost patience with inflation, burdensome taxes, government interference in their daily lives, and lost national respect around the world.

The people bought Reagan's proposals for turning the country around and pointing it in a new direction.

He promised to reduce federal spending and the taxes that fueled it. He vowed to attack waste, fraud and mismanagement in government agencies.

He pledged to get the federal government, where possible, out of people's lives and off the back of the country's free enterprise system. And he promised to rebuild the nation's defenses to counter the massive military buildup of the Soviet Union.

Even President Reagan's severest critics must admit that he did not hoodwink the American voters. His plans for the country were made crystal clear.

The voters had a clear choice of whether to continue down the path the country had been following in recent years or opt for real change.

They chose the latter, thus giving Reagan a mandate to initiate the programs he described so vividly throughout his campaign.

So far, at least, he has followed through on his campaign pledges, even while dragging the Democratic congressional leadership kicking and screaming every step of the way. Such now is the case with the president's across-the-board income tax cuts.

The issue is being clouded with charges that the president's plan is inflationary and favors the rich over the poor.

Reagan is trying to do what he promised to do. That's what the voters wanted. It's time for Congress to get on with it.●

**IL PROGRESSO—100 YEARS OF
QUALITY AND EXCELLENCE IN
JOURNALISM TO BE COM-
MEMORATED IN NEW YORK**

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1980, a major milestone in U.S. journalism occurred as *Il Progresso*, the leading Italian language newspaper, observed its 100th birthday. On September 9, 1981, a special 100-page issue will commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of this newspaper. I am honored to bring this information to the attention of my House colleagues, and wish to pay tribute to *Il Progresso* for this marvelous achievement.

In 1880, *Il Progresso* was founded by Carlo Barsotti to serve the needs of the burgeoning Italian immigrant population in the United States. The first issue was published on December 13 of that year. *Il Progresso* continued to operate under its original owners until 1928, when the paper was sold.

New ownership and life came to *Il Progresso* in the summer of 1928, when it was purchased by Generoso Pope, the famous industrialist and philanthropist. Under Mr. Pope's direction, this journal became the leading Italian language newspaper in the United States. It is published daily and on Sundays. To Italian immigrants, *Il Progresso* became a dear friend, aiding them in assimilating into the United States while allowing them to remain in touch with their homeland.

Throughout its 100 years, *Il Progresso* has had a profound impact on politics, business, government, education, and the professions. When Generoso Pope assumed ownership of *Il Progresso* in 1928, Italians and Americans of Italian origin held no high positions in the aforementioned fields of endeavor. By demonstrating the kind of journalistic persistence that has characterized *Il Progresso*, he let politicians, businessmen, labor people, educators, and professionals know that there were highly qualified, intelligent, hard-working, dedicated men and women of Italian origin available and ready to accept important and responsible positions. Fortunately, the tide began turning; today we can point to great progress, measured by the increased number of Italian Americans in the upper echelons of these fields.

Il Progresso has always used the columns of its newspaper to reinforce the bond of friendship between Italy and United States. It has consistently been in the forefront of all campaigns to help Italy whenever the country was

struck by a disaster. One personal example I can recall occurred following the tragic earthquake which devastated the Friuli region of Italy. Working closely with *Il Progresso*, we were able to pass emergency legislation providing some \$25 million in relief aid to Italy. *Il Progresso* leadership also aided in raising millions from other sources to help the affected area. *Il Progresso* has never let the Italian people down in their hours of need.

Another area in which *Il Progresso* has been in the lead is the battle to end discrimination against Italians. I have worked with *Il Progresso* throughout my life in public service, in a partnership to eliminate those false stereotypes and stigmas about Italian Americans which have been allowed to exist for too long in our society. This is a battle in which progress, though it is being made, never seems to be swift enough. Yet we would not have made what progress we already have, had it not been for the work of *Il Progresso* and the Pope family.

In April of 1950, Generoso Pope passed away and his son Fortune Pope became publisher and editor. I am proud to say that Fortune is one of my closest friends, and that under his leadership, many important technical and editorial changes have been made to improve the quality of the newspaper. Through his talent and hard work, Fortune Pope has earned both national and international acclaim and respect. Like his father, he continued to defend and fight for the rights of Italians and Americans of Italian origin.

The profession of journalism is a highly competitive one in these United States. Through some 1,700 daily newspapers and 8,000 weekly newspapers, the multiplicity of journalistic voices in the United States by far surpasses that of the rest of the world. Consequently, in order for a newspaper to continually publish for 100 years, it must maintain both a standard of excellence and a fluidity to reflect the changing times. *Il Progresso* has done this and much more in its history.

Journalism has always been a profession in which experience is the best teacher. The breadth of experience associated with *Il Progresso* is remarkable. As it observes its 100th anniversary, *Il Progresso* looks back with pride on what it has accomplished, and forward—to another 100 years of service. I know my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating *Il Progresso* on its 100th anniversary.

During this anniversary period, there is a new and special excitement at *Il Progresso*. The first and oldest Italian-language daily published in the United States has started on a new course, under the direction of its new publishers, Piero Pirri Ardizzone, Oscar Maestro and Carlo Caracciolo,

who have acquired the newspaper in order to relaunch it, revamp it, and redesign it. They could not have seized upon a more favorable time and opportunity. For, in the United States of the eighties, the nearly 30 million Italian-Americans are surely going to exert a growing, powerful influence on the decisionmaking process of this country. With their combination of knowledge, culture, dedication, willpower, affluence, and well-placed ambition, they already represent a power—collectively and individually—recognized by the entire country.

I look forward to *Il Progresso's* continuing inspiration toward the advancement of the Italian-American community within this country in the decades ahead—for another 100 years of solid development and achievements. I delight in the expectation of new improvements at *Il Progresso* to carry their message. *Il Progresso* has opened its pages to an unconditionally free debate among all segments of the Italian-American community. The newspaper is about to become a real bridge between the public opinions of this country and Italy. Most exciting of all, the format of the newspaper is being redesigned and the publication will become bilingual. This is certainly a sign of the times, and a turning point in the century-old life of the paper.

My very best wishes to the new leadership at *Il Progresso*, Piero Pirri Ardizzone, Oscar Maestro, Carlo Caracciolo, and general manager and managing director, Carlo Scarsini, for their success in all their good and talented efforts. With the aid of all Italian-Americans of good will, I am certain that they will succeed. Clearly challenges lie ahead—as they did in the previous century. However, I am certain that like the Pope family, the new leadership of *Il Progresso* will meet these challenges with the same standards of excellence which have highlighted the history of this great newspaper. I wish them and *Il Progresso* another century of success and accomplishment. It has been and will continue to be a mainstay of the all important Italian American community in this Nation.●

THE SOVIET DAY OF SHAME

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members to the upcoming 13th anniversary of the Soviet Day of Shame, which occurred on August 21, 1968, when Soviet-led armies invaded Czechoslovakia. The continuing violation of human rights of the people of

Czechoslovakia under Soviet occupation obliges us as representatives of a free people to denounce the Soviet's contempt for the Helsinki accords, the United Nations Charter, as well as the Czechoslovak Constitution. With its invasion and occupation of Afghanistan in 1979, the Soviet Union continues its quest for world domination.

On that day in August 1968, the Soviet troops invaded Czechoslovakia to crush the reform-minded government of the then President, Alexander Dubcek. Although this invasion contravened the independence of a sovereign state and denied its people self-determination, it is important to note that there existed and does exist today a strong yearning for freedom in Czechoslovakia. This strong nationalistic spirit is still evident. Unfortunately, experience has shown that the Soviet bloc, despite an occasional small concession to its people, has no regard or respect for human rights and justice. Even peaceful dissent is not permitted and to express an unpopular view is to invite imprisonment.

The Helsinki accords forbid political or military intervention into the affairs of other countries. However, the Soviets have shown no inclination toward embracing a policy of upholding those basic human rights outlined in the Helsinki accords.

We must continue to express our support for the freedom-loving Czechs and Slovaks who suffer under the tyranny imposed upon them by the Soviet Union. The Soviets justify their occupation with what has become known as the "Brezhnev Doctrine." We must emphasize the strong opinion that exists in the U.S. Congress that the people of Czechoslovakia and other peoples of Eastern Europe have a right to self-determination.

It is especially evident that the people of Czechoslovakia continue to oppose the violations of their human rights by the Soviet-imposed government by their demands for the restoration of fundamental civil and political rights in manifestos, "Charter 77" and "Petition 78" which were circulated and signed by nearly 1,000 signatories, and their numbers are growing despite the severe oppression by the puppet government in Prague.

As attention is directed to this tragic anniversary, we must express our support for the cause of freedom for the people of Czechoslovakia. Only with the end of political repression, religious persecution, and cultural genocide, will the Czech and Slovak peoples be able to obtain their legitimate aspirations of independence and self-determination.●

EXTEND THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the landmark legislation which has been vitally important in increasing the voting opportunities for all citizens—the Voting Rights Act. Now, some have suggested that we no longer need the protections embodied in the act. They argue first, that the act has accomplished its goal and, therefore, is no longer needed, and, second, that we should get the Federal bureaucracy off the backs of State governments. I strongly disagree with both of these arguments.

It is imperative that those who still want to guarantee the rights embodied in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments vigorously support H.R. 3112, Judiciary Committee Chairman ROBINO's bill to extend the Voting Rights Act past its August 6, 1982 deadline.

We must extend the Voting Rights Act in order to express our most vehement determination to curb a disturbing trend toward discriminatory election changes made by local authorities. There is a distinct difference between Federal interference in local affairs and the need to keep a close eye on the discriminatory practices of localities in order to protect freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. The citation of 538 election violations over the last 5 years should be enough to convince anyone that we cannot afford to weaken the major vehicle for protecting these freedoms.

It is important that, in this time of merciless cuts in social services to minorities and the rekindling of hatred by groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the American Nazi Party, we in Congress do all we can to strengthen rather than weaken the inalienable, constitutional right of all Americans to vote. At the very least, let us extend the Voting Rights Act so that all Americans can enjoy that most cherished of American freedoms.

I proudly join my colleagues who have spoken out on this issue, and urge those who have not yet done so to join us in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, a New York Times editorial of July 28 persuasively states the case for extending the act. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

SUSTAINING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

These are critical days for the Voting Rights Act, even though the struggle for its renewal is not even half over. The House Judiciary Committee meets today to mark up a bill extending the 1965 law for another ten years. Given the chilly atmosphere in the Senate, the House is the more promis-

ing forum for early action on a strong bill. Much depends now on the legislative skill of diverse factions. The trick will be to meet civil rights needs with enough flexibility to attract the votes of moderates.

It seemed for a time that this most effective of all civil rights laws had run its course and lost its broad, bipartisan support. Some argued that the past 17 years brought so much more political freedom for blacks and Hispanics that the law was no longer needed. Some found the law oppressive, putting whole States in political receivership by requiring them to clear any voting rule changes with the Federal Government.

But the House hearings have shown that the job is not finished. And fresh political soundings have shown that the act is still widely appreciated.

The hearings made clear that minority gains are too recent and too fragile to withstand the hostility that endures in many States and localities. Some jurisdictions still observe the law in name only; they continue to make it hard for minorities to vote and still cook up schemes to devalue their ballots with racial gerrymanders. This was the notable finding of Representative Henry Hyde, the Committee's ranking Republican, who at first opposed but now favors extension of the act.

Others, too, have been coming around and no longer see extension as a political liability. Senator Barry Goldwater supports it. Southern Republicans are going along, chastened by the loss of a House seat last month in Mississippi, where the act was an issue. President Reagan, though slow to join the issue, is leaning toward renewal.

The politics surrounding the measure come down now to a few major issues, the most crucial of which is something called "ballout." It has been virtually impossible so far for a reformed State or locality to get out from under the act's restrictions. Civil rights forces recognize that the time has come to allow some jurisdictions to earn back their sovereignty. The challenge is to draft a bailout procedure that does not become a sieve for the undeserving.

If the House can hold out realistic hope for jurisdictions with clean records and constructive programs for wider enfranchisement, it will command the respect of all factions and probably the support of the Senate. But if Congress adopts a bailout that is really a copout, permitting wholesale reversion to the old discriminatory ways, the act itself will not be worth renewing.●

NAIROBI CONFERENCE ON RENEWABLE ENERGY (PART III): U.S. NATIONAL PAPER READY

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer today the third and final report on the upcoming U.N. Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy—UNCNRSE—scheduled for August 10-21, 1981, in Nairobi, Kenya.

Because the conference is drawing near we should reflect on the preparation conducted during the past 2 years. As initially conceived, UNCNRSE was organized into three

distinct groupings: Eight technical panels, six ad hoc expert groups, and a synthesis group. The technical panels were to assess the "state of art" and development prospects for solar energy; biomass; fuel wood and charcoal; wind energy; oil shale and tar sands; ocean energy; geothermal; and hydropower. The ad hoc groups were responsible for studying certain cross-cutting issues including financial barriers; inadequate education and training; R. & D.; and restricted information flows. In addition, the ad hoc groups examined the broad restraints on energy applications in the rural and industrial sectors. Finally, a preparatory synthesis group summarized and integrated the technical panel and ad hoc group recommendations for use at the conference itself. Copies of all these studies are available through the U.N.

For its part, the United States has prepared three major documents, each to be distributed to participating delegations: "The U.S. National Paper," "Information Resources in the U.S.A.," and "U.S.A.: Living With the Sun." These represent, in highly readable form, the latest national effort to assess the growing potential of renewable energy, and can be obtained through the State Department.

The "U.S. National Paper," prepared by the Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI), details the U.S. experience with and expectations for 10 new and renewable energy technologies: Low temperature solar collectors, intermediate and high temperature solar collectors, solar cells, biomass, wind energy, ocean energy, hydropower, geothermal systems, oil shale, and tar sands. It begins by noting that the United States depended almost entirely on renewable energy—primarily wood—until the late 1800's. At present, however, renewable sources meet roughly 5 percent of U.S. energy needs: 3 percent hydropower, 2 percent wood, and a small fraction from wind, solar water heaters, and alcohol-fuel supplements. The study is careful to point out, however, that while "renewable energy may be humanity's most ancient power source * * * it is also becoming the basis for some of our most modern power systems." Indeed, the report concludes that by the year 2000 renewable technologies could account for 20 percent of the Nation's energy consumption.

The document "Information Resources in the U.S.A.," is an excellent reference work prepared by the Department of Energy's Technical Information Center. It describes not only what technical research is being done, and by whom, but also how this information is distributed, including a discussion of trade secrets, patents and international technology transfer. As such it outlines the availability of U.S. scientific and technical information on

renewable energy, the policy framework in which these technologies are developed, and the roles of both public and private sectors. Equally important, the report contains a directory of sources for additional printed materials, computerized data bases, institutional services, and personal contacts at Government facilities, trade associations, nonprofit research institutes, and special libraries throughout the country.

The third document, "U.S.A.: Living With the Sun," was prepared by the National Center for Appropriate Technology (NCAT) as an illustrated pamphlet of successful private and grassroots renewable energy projects. The pamphlet will add to the international awareness of small-scale opportunities in the field of renewable energy, as well as give practical examples of possible near-term demonstration projects. In addition, it will demonstrate to developing countries the commitment within the United States to small-scale renewable technologies.

The State Department has stated three broad U.S. goals for the Nairobi Conference:

Accelerate the development, acceptance and use of new and renewable sources of energy, taking into account the effects on the global environment and resource base;

Elaborate a program for improved and expanded international cooperation in new and renewable energy as part of our overall strategy of furthering constructive international treatment of energy matters; and

Help educate all countries about the real opportunities new and renewable sources of energy offer in meeting energy needs.

In many ways, the UNCNRSE preparations have brought us closer to these goals. Through the process of drafting a "national paper," many countries for the first time have assessed the potential for new and renewable technologies within their own borders. Participating countries, moreover, have created "national focal points" on new and renewable energy, which will be critical to future awareness and development of these resources. Above all, the conference preparations have legitimized greater reliance on nonconventional energy sources, much as the 1972 Stockholm Conference did for environmental concerns, particularly in skeptical LDC's anxious for rapid modernization. ●

A SALUTE TO AGNES JACKSON

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the atten-

tion of my colleagues an individual who is on the frontline every day in the fight for decent housing and economic equality for all residents of the Buckeye-Woodland area in Cleveland. That individual is Agnes Jackson, president of the Buckeye-Woodland Community Congress which is located in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Agnes Jackson is a master negotiator and formulator of policy and planning for housing for the disadvantaged and working class of the Buckeye-Woodland area in the 21st Congressional District. She is a fierce warrior when it comes to fighting for the cause she has dedicated her life to—the right to quality housing and safe neighborhoods. At the same time, Agnes Jackson displays the savvy and tactical shrewdness of a seasoned veteran in working with housing financiers and government officials to secure needed funds for housing and neighborhood revitalization.

However, Mr. Speaker, under this tough facade, Mrs. Jackson is a kind and warmhearted individual. People in the Buckeye-Woodland Community Congress know that she is a relentless fighter for them and at the same time is keenly sensitive to their needs. For these reasons, she is loved by everyone in the Buckeye-Woodland area and maintains a rapport amongst her associates and neighbors that is unmatched.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of working with Agnes Jackson on many occasions. I, too, respect and admire her. The comments I have made about her are an attempt to give my colleagues an opportunity to feel and see in their mind's eye just what Agnes Jackson has meant to the residents of the Buckeye-Woodland area in Cleveland.

If it had not been for Agnes Jackson, many of the renovated houses in the Buckeye-Woodland area still would be gutted shacks, eyesores and useless to the community. If it had not been for Mrs. Jackson, the number of homeless and ill-housed people in that area would be at an abominably record high level. Finally, if it were not for Agnes Jackson, many people in the Buckeye-Woodland area would be stranded hopeless with little or no motivation to fight for what they deserve and need—quality housing.

Mr. Speaker, for these people and for myself, Agnes Jackson has been an unflinching supporter and pillar of strength. I take this opportunity to formally thank Agnes Jackson for that commitment, determination, and sensitivity to her peers and disadvantaged in the city of Cleveland. I ask my colleagues to join me in a very special tribute to Mrs. Agnes Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I will insert in the RECORD, an article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain

Dealer on this very special woman—Mrs. Agnes Jackson, president of the Buckeye-Woodland Community Congress in Cleveland, Ohio.

The article follows:

(From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 31, 1981)

AGNES JACKSON: A TOUGH, LOYAL FRIEND TO THE DOWNTRODDEN
(By Judy Pennebaker)

She's battled everyone from the board chairman of AmeriTrust Co. to the lowest city bureaucrat, challenged the federal government and made Cleveland's fat cats howl.

Agnes Jackson, president of the Buckeye-Woodland Community Congress, knows what it means to be tough. She learned early and does it well.

Dressed in black jeans and a bright floral tunic that bespeaks a forceful personality, the tall, imposing Jackson is someone you know you wouldn't want to cross. Yet, beneath that tiger-like facade beats the heart of a pussycat, filled with genuine concern for her downtrodden fellow man.

"She doesn't always use the right verb tense," said one of her supporters, "but she gets the job done."

Jackson learned about toughness in Tuskegee, Ala., where she grew up in the '40s, being pelted with eggs and overripe tomatoes hurled by unfriendly white children as she walked home from the movies.

"They didn't like us being there," she recalled. "There" was a reference to a segregated section of the theater. "If we fought back, we got jailed."

Retribution, when it came, was sweet.

As a teen-ager, Jackson participated in a boycott of town merchants, which served as a model for some of the early civil rights action in the South and made Jackson an optimist for life.

"I believe there's always a way to get things done," she said. "I'm always willing to give it my best shot."

She remembers growing up on a small farm outside Tuskegee with six brothers and two sisters, helping her parents raise "mostly cotton and corn." Her family was strongly religious, Southern Baptist, and "that basic belief in God and goodness has kind of gotten me through," she said.

Jackson's mother, 73, has only a fifth-grade education, the fond daughter said, "but she is the smartest woman I ever met."

"My mother was kind of like Jesus," she continued. "He turned water into wine. She could turn water into meat. She made us think we were eating well even when things were rough."

Jackson said that as she was growing up, her mother would say to her, "You're the black sheep of the family. You always question things."

When Agnes Jackson was graduated from high school in 1953, she was more than ready to come North.

"There were no jobs for us in the South, besides picking cotton and baby-sitting," she said.

She moved to Cleveland, lived with relatives and got a job running a knitting machine at Dalton of America. Soon after, she was married.

Today she has daughters, 23 and 9, a son 7, and two grandchildren.

"Being with my family is one of my greatest joys," said a sentimental Jackson, whose streetwise countenance melts quickly when she talks about those she loves.

Her husband, Theodore, was disabled on the job and no longer works: "He stays at

home, cooks, takes care of the kids and says to me: 'Go get 'em.' I do."

Attracted to the Buckeye-Woodland Community Congress in its early years because of her frustrations as a homeowner, Jackson has stayed to help the group become strong. It was formed in the early 1970s, and is the granddaddy of Cleveland community associations.

Jackson has been able, through tough talk and demonstrative action, to get banks and savings and loan associations to invest more in the neighborhood. Dealing repeatedly with the Federal Housing Administration, she has successfully countered many of the problems of early foreclosure and faulty home inspections.

"I envision the world as good and democratic," she said. "That's what I was taught in school. I became disappointed when I saw how things really are, how the fat cats—the oil companies, the utility companies, the banks and the big politicians—control everything."

"We have to put Government back in the hands of the people," she philosophized. "We're the taxpayers. They can't shove us around."

Jackson, who is not one to mince words about politicians or their politics, had some relatively kind comments for former Mayor Dennis J. Kucinich.

"We had the same philosophy: Get the fat-cat establishment. He was on the right track, but couldn't execute it," she said. "He was often surrounded by bad people."

Jackson classifies Mayor George V. Voinovich as "a smooth operator. I like his style. He isn't too flamboyant, but I take issue with a lot of things. We need a safety director and a safer city to live in."

She considers the Reagan administration a major setback. A staunch supporter of former President Carter and his policies, she finds the Reagan cutbacks "to the poor, the elderly, the oppressed—shocking."

"If he continues this, all hell is going to break loose," she predicted. "When you have a family to support, hungry kids to feed, you've got to have some income or there's going to be a lot of trouble."

Jackson is involved in many political and activist groups and was instrumental in the recent formation of a local jobs program committee.

"We're going to fight back," she pledged. "We're going to start at the local level and go all the way to Washington." (She's been there before, testifying at hearings on housing.)

Jackson believes in peaceful racial co-existence, and has fought hard for that in her neighborhood.

"Maybe I'm a dreamer, but I still think we can be a great country—when more people become aware of others' hurts and needs," she said. ●

COMMUNITY CRIME PREVENTION ACT OF 1981

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Community Crime Prevention Act of 1981, which would authorize the Attorney General to make grants and contracts with units of local government or nonprofit com-

munity based organizations, for the prevention of community crime.

We all know that crime is the first and foremost problem currently plaguing our Nation's communities. My hometown of Los Angeles, as well as most communities throughout the country, have experienced dramatic crime increases. According to a recent poll taken by Public Response Associates of California, crime surfaced as the No. 1 concern among Californians. Correspondence from my constituents indicates that they want some action by Congress to combat the crimewave sweeping our country. While we are not in the position to intervene locally, we should provide encouragement alternatives at the Federal level. I believe the key to fighting community crime lies with organized, visible, and vocal neighborhood organizations, and Federal efforts should be steered toward involving community residents in fighting crime.

As you know, the Congress has significantly reduced the authorization and appropriation for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, over the past year. While some of its programs and projects were perceived as ineffective in reducing various crimes, a significant number of the Agency's programs proved to be very effective. One such program is the community anticrime program, which encourages neighborhood residents to get involved in neighborhood crime prevention. I believe it important that we continue this commitment.

Created in 1977, the community anticrime program has funded nearly 200 projects in urban and rural communities throughout the country and between 100,000 and 200,000 citizens have been mobilized to fight crime. Since the lack of citizen involvement is a major problem in efforts to prevent crime, we should encourage approaches to prevention which involve individuals and stimulate the interest and involvement of entire neighborhoods and communities.

A wide range of important services have been provided through this program, including escort services for the elderly; block watch programs; tenant patrols in housing projects as well as suburban communities; victim assistance programs; security education campaigns; youth crisis centers; and community based approaches to crime prevention. The program has been particularly responsive to the needs of the elderly, in providing services to prevent victimization. This aspect should not be overlooked, because for the elderly, fear of crime is often the most serious problem, and because of that fear, many older people virtually imprison themselves in their own homes.

The Community Crime Prevention Act of 1981, would allow the Attorney

General to make grants and contracts with units of local government and nonprofit community based organizations, to continue those programs and services which have been available to our Nation's crime-ridden neighborhoods and communities. The program would be authorized for a 3-year period, with annual authorizations of \$25 million. The Attorney General would be authorized to identify those affected communities through consultation with the Community Relations Service. As you know, the Community Relations Service has much expertise working with communities and local law enforcement agencies, which can be drawn upon in identifying successful model programs.

I believe it important to note that these projects are not limited to our major urban areas, just as the problems of crime know no geographic boundaries. The community anticrime program has helped to create lasting improvements in all types of communities. I believe it would be a mistake to send a message that Congress no longer cares about community participation in fighting crime, at a time when our Nation's problems in this regard have reached crisis proportion. I strongly urge that we maintain this small but effective sign that we care and ask that we act swiftly to enact the Community Crime Prevention Act of 1981.●

OBSERVING WORLD FOOD DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON), and I have introduced legislation, House Joint Resolution 243, to commemorate October 16, 1981 as World Food Day. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation in order to demonstrate our commitment to helping resolve the critical problem of world hunger and malnutrition.

I recently received from Ms. Patricia Young, Coordinator, National Committee for World Food Day, suggestions which the committee has prepared, for World Food Day observances. At this point in the RECORD I would like to share these suggestions with my colleagues who may be receiving inquiries from their constituents about World Food Day:

SUGGESTIONS FOR WORLD FOOD DAY OBSERVANCES BY NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR WORLD FOOD DAY

Letters are coming to us from individuals and community groups throughout the country requesting suggestions on how to organize World Food Day observances. The first thing to remember is that there is no single theme for the Day this year. It was decided that each country—and even each

group or community within a country—might have different food-related interests and priorities for local, national or international action.

The link between national and international action is clear. All World Food Day observances will serve to heighten awareness of food, nutrition, land use and poverty issues, and all observances together will demonstrate our global concern.

Remember, too, that the National Committee for World Food Day, the U.S. Department of Agriculture or the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations will help you with appropriate materials or further guidance once your group shows a special interest in an observance plan. Requests sent to the National Committee will be forwarded to one of the official organizing channels or to appropriate organizations among the committee's participating members.

With this as background, we offer the suggestions below. Any one of them will contribute to our national and world effort.

1. Raise the idea of holding a World Food Day study meeting with friends or a community organization to which you belong. For a good analysis of the issues, write to the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, for a copy of "Overcoming World Hunger: The Challenge Ahead" (Price: \$2). This excellent 29-page booklet is an abridged version of the report of the Presidential Commission on World Hunger. It can be a valuable resource for discussion with public officials.

2. It's hard to act alone. Join a community or national organization which is doing something to solve hunger problems year around. These groups may already be planning World Food Day observances or be able to give you advice on how to organize or participate in one.

3. Ask your local school officials to organize World Food Day events that involve parents and students, and to include world food and hunger material in social studies for that week (Oct. 12-16). School observances might include essay contests, homework projects or World Food Day fairs that combine fun with educational material and perhaps fund raising for a food-related cause at home or abroad. (Ask school officials to write to the National Committee for guidance on study materials.)

4. Have your study group, club or church invite local government officials to discuss hunger and poverty problems in your town, county and state, and what programs are available to those in need. One action plan for World Food Day would be to insure that all people in your area are aware of state and federal programs they might be entitled to share in. With local officials, discuss how well food programs are working and what problems they face.

5. Find out what resources on world hunger issues are in your local public library and school library. If these are limited, suggest that additional material be obtained for World Food Day, including audiovisual presentations. Both FAO and the Department of Agriculture have both free and sale materials, as do many of the sponsoring organizations of the National Committee. Ask that libraries organize special displays of this material throughout the week of World Food Day.

6. Does your town have a community vegetable garden? World Food Day would be a good time to launch one. Plots can be offered to apartment dwellers and others without gardening space to grow an impor-

tant part of their own food. These community gardens have proven extremely popular across the country.

7. If your children belong to a Boy Scout or Girl Scout unit or any other kind of youth organization, talk to the group leaders to suggest ideas for youth programs built around World Food Day. Ask group leaders to write to the National Committee for further ideas on how this can be done.

8. Ask the editor of your local newspaper and other media in your community (radio/TV) to publicize the World Food Day observance you are planning and also to include world hunger material in their publications and broadcasts during that week. Materials to give to media, including suggested editorials, will be available through the National Committee. Have your group leader offer to appear on local radio or TV programs to discuss food issues and your World Food Day observance.

9. The United States is a "representative" democracy. After your World Food Day observance write a joint letter to your national congressman or senator stating your views on what should be done to solve hunger problems at home and abroad. Your representatives in Washington want to hear from you. Without your guidance he or she cannot fully know your views and therefore cannot fully "represent" you as an American citizen.

In all of the suggestions given above, you can find an organization eager to provide further information or technical advice on programs. Why not write to several of them and then choose a program that suits you best. Even if you decide not to pursue one of these ideas, you will be learning more about national and international food and poverty issues by contacting the organizations involved. And simply by doing that you will be participating in the spirit of World Food Day.●

ROBERT MOSES

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1981

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of loss to our country that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Robert Moses, who almost single-handedly changed the face of New York State as no one else probably ever will.

Mr. Moses, the quintessential urban planner, directed a bevy of public works projects throughout his life, from building highways through New York to developing over 70 State parks encompassing 2.6 million acres of land. He helped bring the world to New York City with the building of the United Nations and through his presidency of the New York World's Fair Corp. in 1963.

His building achievements and contributions to New York State aside, Robert Moses left his influence on the way in which all of America has built her cities. He once said, "Those who can, build. Those who cannot, criticize." Robert Moses certainly built, and we can only admire.●

FULFILLING THE PROMISE OF
THE BLACK LUNG BENEFITS
PROGRAM

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Reform Act of 1977 and the Black Lung Benefits Revenue Act of 1977, both enacted in 1978. The necessity of understanding the problems of the Federal black lung program and the need to tighten up the eligibility for the program are overwhelming.

The black lung program originated in 1969 as a one-shot deal to compensate those who had contracted totally disabling black lung before it was recognized by the States as an occupational disease. Even though all States now recognize black lung as a compensable occupational disease, it remains a permanent Federal program. Originally, the program was to compensate miners totally disabled by black lung. In 1972, the program was changed to compensate all miners with some stage of black lung, whether or not the disease was in a disabling stage. In 1978, the program was changed to compensate most miners and their dependents and survivors whether or not the miner had any medical evidence of the disease.

It should be pointed out that the scientific and medical testimony clearly establishes that black lung is medically detectable and that disability can be medically determined. Black lung, known as coal workers' pneumoconiosis (CWP), can be determined by X-ray. Simple CWP is categorized as stages 1, 2, and 3, and in those stages is not usually disabling and is not usually progressive. The complicated form of CWP is called progressive massive fibrosis (PMF) and is usually disabling and is usually progressive without further exposure to coal dust.

In 1976, the National Academy of Sciences issued a report entitled "Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Medical Considerations, Some Special Implications" which showed that after working 30 years in coal mines of the anthracite regions, only 14.3 percent of the miners had progressive massive fibrosis, the disabling stage, while 60 percent had some stage of the disease. The number of miners with the disease is smaller in other regions. In the Appalachian region, only 2.1 percent of the miners were disabled, while 45 percent had simple stages of the disease. In the Midwest and West, no statistically significant number were disabled and 25 percent in the Midwest and 10 percent in the West had the simple stage of the disease. In recent testimony before the Subcommittee

on Oversight, House Committee on Ways and Means, July 27, 1981, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health reported some of the results of the third round of examinations in the national coal workers' health surveillance program. Over 95 percent of those examined had no evidence of the disease, over 3 percent demonstrated category 1 of CWP, and no statistically significant number had advanced stages of this simple form of the disease or the complicated form of the disease.

With these figures in mind, despite the low percentage of miners with the disabling stage of black lung, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reports that from 1969 to December of 1980, the Social Security Administration (SSA) has paid over \$9 billion in benefits to almost 400,000 claimants, out of 537,000 miners and survivors who filed claims with SSA. From July 1973 through April 1981, the Department of Labor has approved over 94,700 claims out of the more than 282,500 claims it has reviewed, paying benefits of over \$1.75 billion from the black lung disability trust fund created in 1978.

Very clearly, the approval of these claims has not been based on disability. The startling fact is that in 88.5 percent of the cases, medical evidence was not adequate to establish disability or death from CWP (GAO report entitled "Legislation Allows Black Lung Benefits To Be Awarded Without Adequate Evidence of Disability" (HRD-80-81, July 28, 1980)). In a recent review of the Department of Labor's administration of its program, GAO concluded that in 84 percent of the cases deemed eligible for benefits, the medical evidence was not adequate to establish disability or death from black lung (testimony of GAO before the Subcommittee on Oversight, Committee on Ways and Means, July 27, 1981).

These statistics and these findings by GAO, the National Academy of Sciences, and NIOSH demonstrate the need to drastically revise the black lung program. The bill I am introducing today will bring the black lung program closer to a real disability program. Further, the bill fulfills the promise of the sponsors of the original law by having State workers' compensation cover future black lung claims after February 28, 1983, the same as States cover other occupational diseases.

A summary of the provisions of the bill follows:

The bill narrows the definition of pneumoconiosis since the present definition has been interpreted to include such conditions as emphysema, which is not a chronic dust disease of the lung, and lung cancer, which has not been shown to be related to coal workers' pneumoconiosis. In addition, the

bill excludes sequelae, thus excluding unrelated lung conditions.

The present definition of "miner" includes anyone who has worked around a mine, in transportation, or even in construction. The Benefits Review Board has allowed a claim of a laboratory analyst who worked in the lab analyzing coal. There is no evidence that these people suffer any increased likelihood of developing coal workers' pneumoconiosis. The bill amends the law to define miners as those who have been employed directly in the mining—extraction—of coal.

In order to keep definitions in different Federal laws parallel, the bill amends the definition of "total disability" to be compatible with that of the Social Security Act. To collect benefits for total disability, the claimant should be unable to perform any work. The definition of total disability applied by the Social Security Administration requires proof that the claimant cannot "engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment."

The bill also restricts the use of the present presumptions in the law and strikes the 411(c)(3) and 411(c)(4) presumptions and the 411(c)(5) entitlement. It is really necessary that proof of the existence of black lung disease be required before any presumption is raised, and the bill does this. Besides, if there is medical evidence that black lung disease does not exist, the bill provides that a presumption cannot be used to establish a claim.

The bill deletes the provisions tying the benefit level to the increase of the Federal wage level of a GS-2. The increase only contributes to the rate of inflation and the rapidly increasing costs of the program. Since the program was intended to provide a supplement to income—not as the sole income of a recipient—there is no reason to index these benefits.

The bill removes the "unrelated death benefit" provision. Presently if a miner who is entitled to benefits dies from any cause—even a cause completely unrelated to his pneumoconiosis—his eligible survivors are entitled to benefits. This amounts to a life insurance program and not a compensation program and should be repealed, which my bill does.

Black lung benefits are presently offset only by benefits from a State black lung program. They are not offset by workers' compensation benefits from any other program. This means that for benefit purposes a worker can be disabled twice—an irrational concept. The bill amends the statute to permit the offset of black lung benefits by any other workers' compensation benefits.

Since an X-ray is one way of proving or disproving a claim, the bill allows

the denial of a claim based on negative X-rays and strikes the provision that does not allow for the rereading of X-rays. If the program is to be placed on a sound medical basis, the best available medical evidence should be sought and allowed. Presently, claims may be denied or allowed based on a totally inaccurate reading of X-rays. The bill will correct this inequity.

The present law allows an affidavit to be sufficient where there is no medical or other relevant evidence. That means those who will benefit can submit an affidavit that a miner had a cough and can receive benefits. This provision is probably one of the most important reasons the GAO concluded that 88.5 percent of the random sample of claims are not supported by medical evidence of disability. It is a provision encouraging fraud. Because of its total inappropriateness, the bill strikes this affidavit provision. The bill further strikes the provision requiring the Secretary to accept an autopsy report. That does not mean the Secretary cannot accept an autopsy report; it just means the Secretary does not have to accept all autopsy reports submitted.

One of the original promises of the black lung program was that it would be a temporary Federal program. However, despite vast improvements in State programs and benefits, no State program has yet been approved. This is in part because the black lung statute requires the States to adopt standards similar to the Federal law for the determination of the existence of the disease and the definition of disability, and to automatically provide widow's benefits without proof that the miner's death was the result of pneumoconiosis. Even if the Federal Government were to approve a State plan, the program would still remain federally regulated. Rather than have the Federal Government approve State plans, my bill totally terminates the Federal program from processing new claims after the fifth anniversary of the 1978 amendments (Feb. 28, 1983). This is compatible with the original promise that the black lung program was to be a temporary supplemental program.

The black lung program has incorporated many of the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act. One of those provisions provides for a 20-percent penalty when a claim is not paid upon approval. This is an abuse of the due process procedure. Accordingly, the bill provides that no penalty is added to the compensation award until the operator, or trust fund, has the right to contest the claim. In addition, the bill provides that no retroactive payments shall be made of reviewed claims until all administrative and judicial review is completed. Those retroactive payments which have already been paid

out where it was ultimately concluded that the miner or survivors were not entitled to benefits have not been retrieved by the Federal Government. This adjustment to the law will provide that those moneys will not be lost to the Government.

Presently, benefits payable from the trust fund are not subject to being contested by either operators or the trust fund. The bill establishes a special counsel in the Department of the Treasury in order to controvert claims that are the responsibility of the trust fund. By being able to protect the trust fund from ineligible claims, it is hoped that moneys from the Federal Treasury will be saved. Although the trust fund is financed by a tax on coal, the trust fund is insolvent, with continued projected insolvency, and the trust fund must borrow against general revenue funds. Those funds should be protected and the Office of Special Counsel will do that.

The present 50 cent tax per ton on underground coal and 25 cent tax per ton on surface coal is inadequate to fully fund the trust fund. The bill changes that tax to 3 percent and 1 percent of the price at which coal is sold by the producer of underground and surface coal, respectively. Projections by the Department of Labor in early May show such a tax would make the trust fund solvent in fiscal year 1986.

A summary of the bill follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE—"BLACK LUNG AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1981"

TITLE I. SECTION 101 GENERAL (AMENDMENT TO SEC. 401)

Changes the findings and purposes to reflect that all States now cover occupational disease, that Congress will cooperate with the States, and removes the reference to death unrelated to pneumoconiosis.

Sec. 102. Definitions (Amendment to Sec. 402)

(a) Redefines "pneumoconiosis" as it was originally defined in 1969, eliminates "sequelae" and "respiratory and pulmonary impairments."

(b) Redefines "miner" by striking "or around" and transportation and construction workers. The definition specifically excludes certain workers, including those listed above as well as lab workers, supply clerks, administration and supervisory persons who do not work in a coal mine.

(c) Redefines "total disability" to have the same meaning as "disability" in section 223(d) of the Social Security Act.

Sec. 103. Presumptions (Amendments to Sec. 411(c))

(a) Requires 15 (instead of 10) years of mine employment for a rebuttable presumption that pneumoconiosis arose out of such employment.

(b) Strikes Sec. 411(c)(2)—the presumption that if a miner who had 10 years' employment died from a "respirable disease," it is presumed that death was due to pneumoconiosis.

(c) Changes the irrebuttable presumption in 411(c)(3) (redesignated 411(c)(2)) to a rebuttable presumption.

(d) Strikes 411(c)(4)—the 15-year rebuttable presumption of pneumoconiosis where there is a negative X-ray but other evidence of respiratory or pulmonary impairment—and 411(c)(5)—the 25-year employment before June 30, 1971, and death prior to February 28, 1978, entitlement of survivors—and requires the presumptions in the remaining 411(c) (1) and (2) to come into play only where there is no relevant medical evidence.

Sec. 104. Benefit Payments (Amendments to Sec. 412)

(a) Removes the indexing of benefit payments to the cost of living adjustment to the pay of a GS-2.

(b) Removes the "unrelated death benefit" provision. [If a miner is receiving benefits, but dies from an unrelated cause, the eligible survivors are presently entitled to benefits—this is stricken. However, if a miner dies from pneumoconiosis, the eligible survivors are still entitled to benefits under this amendment.]

(c) Provides for offset of black lung benefits by other workers' compensation, unemployment compensation, or disability laws of the State. Requires the Secretary to take action to insure that the reductions are carried out.

(d) Provides for offsets in part C, in other than just "due to pneumoconiosis."

Sec. 105. Medical Examinations (Amendments to Sec. 413)

(a) Allows denial of a claim on the basis of an X-ray.

(b) Strikes the provision allowing affidavits to be sufficient where there is no medical or other relevant evidence; strikes the no rereading of X-ray provision; and strikes the provision requiring the Secretary to accept an autopsy report.

Sec. 106. State Compensation (Amendments to Sec. 421 and Sec. 422)

Terminates the part C Federal program on February 28, 1983 (the fifth anniversary of the 1978 amendments), and provides thereafter that claims of a coal miner will be treated under State workers' compensation laws.

Sec. 107. Penalty Payments (Amendments to Sec. 422)

Provides that no penalty is added to the compensation award until the operator, or trust fund, has had the right to contest the claim.

Sec. 108. (Amendment to Sec. 430)

Apply amendments to part B of this act to part C as appropriate.

Sec. 109. (Amendment to Sec. 435)

Provides that no retroactive payments shall be made of reviewed claims until all administrative and judicial review is completed.

TITLE II. PROTECTION OF TRUST FUND

Establishes a special counsel in the Department of the Treasury in order to controvert claims that are the responsibility of the trust fund.

TITLE III. COAL TAX

Changes the tax from 50 cents per ton on underground coal and 25 cents per ton on surface coal to 3 percent and 1 percent of the price at which each ton of coal is sold by the producer of underground and surface coal, respectively. ●

THE VIEW FROM LITHUANIA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following article from Newsweek into the record describing the political reforms of Poland's Communist Party and the rippling effects on the people of Lithuania and the Baltic States.

Ever since solidarity cast the first stone at the glasshouse of Poland's Communist Party, the entire world has focused its attention on the historical changes taking place in the lives of Polish workers.

But few have watched the events with greater interest than the neighbors of Poland: the people of Lithuania. Although Lithuania is far smaller than Poland they both share a historical hatred for Moscow's constant efforts to deny their countries independence.

We can only hope that the monumental reforms of Poland's Communist Party will play a major role in breaking down the imperialistic colonialism which the Soviets maintain over the nations of Eastern Europe. The Soviets, through their illegal occupation of the Baltic countries, holds captive the people of these nations with barbed wire, prison fences, and a relentless KGB. We pray that the tide is turning.

[From Newsweek, Aug. 3, 1981]

THE VIEW FROM LITHUANIA

After six days of outspoken meetings, the reform congress of Poland's Communist Party closed last week. At the final session, delegates chose a new, fifteen-man Politburo; it included eleven new faces but kept a careful balance of centrist reformers, conservatives and liberals. In a tough speech, Prime Minister Wojciech Jaruzelski warned that a 110 percent increase in food prices—far more than the boosts that have led to strikes in the past—is required if Poland is going to address its desperate economic crisis. The government also cut the individual meat ration by 20 percent. The Soviet Union seemed willing to live with the results of the congress, at least for now. Just across the border, Soviet Lithuania was intently watching Poland's experiment in reform. From Vilnius, the Lithuanian capital, Newsweek's Moscow bureau chief Andrew Nagorski filed this report:

Every Sunday, St. Theresa's Church bustles with worshipers of all ages streaming in for the Masses that are conducted alternately in Lithuanian and Polish. Outside, one eye cocked for Soviet authorities, peasant women do a brisk business selling rosaries, imitation-gold crosses and holy cards. No sooner had I begun taking pictures than one alarmed middle-aged woman ordered me away, assuming that I was a KGB agent. After we cleared up the misunderstanding, the woman apologized, explaining that Soviet authorities have been trying hard to keep Lithuania's Catholics on a very tight rein. "They are trying to prevent what is

going on in Poland from happening here," she told me.

Like the Poles, Lithuanians are overwhelmingly Roman Catholic. They share Poland's pride in famous sons such as the nineteenth-century nationalist poet Adam Mickiewicz and last year's Nobel Prize laureate Czeslaw Milosz, both of whom studied in Vilnius. And they join the Poles in a deep, historical hatred of Russian domination. "Everyone talks about Poland all the time," said one woman of mixed Polish-Lithuanian background. "Lithuanians say the Poles are smart and they know what they are doing—if only it could be like that here."

It probably can't be: Poland's population is 36 million and Lithuania's only 3.4 million. Even so, Moscow has much to worry about. Lithuanian partisans resisted the 1940 Russian seizure of their country well into the 1950s, and even today, Lithuania is one of the most troublesome Soviet republics. Despite Soviet repression of Lithuanian dissidents, numerous underground journals now circulate widely, protesting everything from the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan to the regime's new policy of teaching Lithuanian children Russian as a second language beginning in first grade. "To destroy a country, the most important thing is to destroy its language," chided one dissident.

REPRESSION

The government's anti-Catholic policy is another very sore point. The Soviets permit only ten churches to operate in Vilnius, a city of nearly 500,000, and the church at the university is now a "museum of science." Priests are not allowed to teach religion to the young. Only one seminary, at Kaunas, offers training for the priesthood, graduating about twelve young men each year, and the KGB must approve candidates. It is not unheard of for priests to be waylaid and beaten by thugs presumably working for the regime.

Lithuania's Catholics have long since found ways to cope. Believers who occupy state or party positions often avoid trouble by attending Mass in towns where they will not be recognized. The church conducts a small underground seminary, and many women who work in occupations such as nursing also belong to secret orders of nuns.

To stop the "Polish disease" from spreading to Lithuania, the Soviets have restricted contacts with Poland: once-routine visas for family visits are now granted rarely and grudgingly. Lithuania's Polish minority complains that letters from Poland arrive weeks late, if at all. "I don't know what is happening with my family," said one elderly woman who had not received a single note since Polish strikes began a year ago. Newsstands now sell only those Polish newspapers the authorities consider "safe." At political sessions for Lithuanian workers, Soviet lecturers stress the dangers of "counter-revolution" on Poland. Anyone with personal ties to Poland is suspect—and the KGB has stepped up its surveillance.

Lithuanians are nevertheless fascinated by Poland's heretical path. Although the Soviets often jam Western broadcasts, Lithuanians listen to Polish radio and some have been able to watch Polish history—from the Pope's visit to Lech Walesa's press conferences—unfold on Polish television. But if Lithuanians yearn openly for a Polish-style renewal, most seem to realize it is an impossible dream for them. "We can only envy the Poles—and we can only be happy for them if they succeed," one Lithuanian dissident told me. Then she added,

with a shrug of hopelessness: "Our poor Lithuania."●

RABBI LOUIS J. CASHDAN RETIRES AS SPIRITUAL LEADER OF TEMPLE SOLEL, BOWIE, MD.

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding religious and civic leader, Rabbi Louis J. Cashdan of Bowie, Md.

For 48 years, Rabbi Cashdan has served as spiritual leader of congregations in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. In 1967 he came to the Temple Solel in Bowie, where his tireless dedication to his congregation and his community made him one of the area's most beloved citizens.

A native of New York City, Rabbi Cashdan was ordained at Hebrew Union College, after graduating from the University of Michigan and doing graduate work at the Universities of Wisconsin and Chicago.

As rabbi of the West London Synagogue during World War II, he was one of the few American rabbis who remained at his post during the torturous days of the Battle of Britain. After his home was bombed, he lived in the synagogue during 58 days and nights of intense aerial bombings.

Throughout Rabbi Cashdan's distinguished career, he has served as the president of the welfare councils in West Virginia and Missouri; he is a past national officer and member of the executive committee of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Rabbi Cashdan was a delegate to President Truman's White House Conference on Children and Youth and was president of the Rabbinical Association of both Greater Kansas City and Toronto.

Since coming to Maryland, Rabbi Cashdan has served on the faculties of Johns Hopkins University and Bowie State College. He is a member of the Board of the Jewish Social Service Agency of Washington, D.C., and is the immediate past president of the Washington Board of Rabbis.

Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1981, I had the great honor to attend services at Temple Solel in Bowie for retiring Rabbi Cashdan. His congregation and civic and political leaders in Bowie paid tribute to the rabbi and his lovely wife, Eve, for their outstanding contributions to their community, both religious and secular.

Since then, Rabbi and Mrs. Cashdan have toured Egypt and Israel and, on their return, have become able advisers to me on the question of Soviet Jewry.

As Rabbi Cashdan assumes his new role of rabbi emeritus of Temple Solel, I know all the Members of this House will join with me in wishing him and his lovely wife, Eve, good health and happiness in the years ahead.●

**REAGAN'S UNJUST ATTACK ON
AMERICA'S ELDERLY**

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I address my remarks to a subject which touches the life of each and every individual in this country. It is a subject which we, as a body, will have to take action on very soon, and will shortly thereafter have to account for to our constituents. I am speaking of the proposed changes in the social security program that the administration has asked this Congress to approve.

In return for approving the changes, the President claims we will at some future point in time be able to reduce the social security tax workers must currently pay.

In preparing for the debate on the President's proposals, and I use the word debate in a very literal sense, I believe we here in Congress need to fully understand the effect of the President's proposals on a program which was designed to protect this country's workers, and their families, from the loss of income suffered through retirement, death, or disability. I believe that we also need to consider the circumstances under which these proposals are offered. And finally, I believe we need to view these proposals in light of the very severe and extensive cuts this body has already imposed on social security beneficiaries through the budget reconciliation process.

While I am inclined to believe that even the changes incorporated in the budget bill may not be enough to completely solve social security's financing problems, I am firmly confident that all of the proposals submitted by the President are not necessary to save this vital program. I have just returned from a working trip in my district where my constituent's very clearly voiced their disapproval of the President's reversal of his position on social security. In campaigning for office the President repeatedly stated that he would not change social security. Then, less than 2 months after taking office he began unfolding a very comprehensive, inhumane, discriminatory, and unjust program for changes which can only lead to financial disaster for this Nation's aged population, survivors of deceased workers, and those who have been disabled.

The proposals are comprehensive because they touch every current beneficiary, 36 million people, regardless of the type of benefit being received. For example, the proposal to compute the annual cost-of-living increase based on the annual CPI rate will result in small, yet very real, decreases in the system's ability to protect individuals against inflation. For a great many individuals, every dime in benefits received is accounted for before their check arrives. When one considers that the payment of the cost-of-living increase is made after prices have risen, the effect of the administration's proposal would be to further erode the purchasing power of each and every beneficiary.

The administration's proposals would also reduce benefits for future retirees by changing the formula used to compute benefits. According to estimates by the Select Committee on Aging, approximately 3.5 million new retirees and their dependents would be affected by this proposal during the first full year of enactment alone.

The administration's proposals are inhumane because they will force current beneficiaries, and those workers planning to retire in the near future, to make radical changes in their plans and spending habits, without advance notice. For workers planning to retire at age 62, the administration plans to reduce the benefit payable by about one-third from current levels. In addition, if those workers have dependent children, the children's benefit will no longer be payable.

In the same vein, the proposal to change the requirements for disability benefit eligibility will result in over 30 million people losing coverage overnight. To approve a change such as this would be a disastrous travesty for individuals who, through no fault of their own, suddenly became unable to work.

The administration's proposals are discriminatory because they eliminate or reduce benefits for lower paid workers, the category many minorities and women fall into.

Through past discrimination in jobs and educational opportunities, minorities and women have had to accept lower paying jobs thus having smaller earnings records on which benefits are based. The administration proposes to cap benefits for families in the lower earnings group so that families that have an average indexed monthly wage of \$196 or less would not receive any dependent benefit. Families with an average indexed monthly wage between \$196 and \$270 would have dependent benefits reduced. Families with three or more dependents and an average indexed monthly wage in excess of \$270 would also have dependent benefits reduced. This provision, contrary to the original intent of social security, would all but eliminate

protection from the loss of income for those most in need of it; lower paid minority and female-headed households.

Finally, the proposals are unjust because they provide for removing the work test as a criteria for eligibility. Over 67 percent of the increased benefits payable based on this provision would go to individuals already earning over \$17,000 annually. To use an old phrase, this amounts to "the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer."

I think it is important at this point to understand that the administration, through these inequitable proposals, intends to solve both the short-term and long-term problems faced by the social security system. This is important because in projecting the magnitude of the long-term problem, the administration has changed the rules on us. First, the rules are changed to use a more pessimistic set of economic assumptions for social security financing purposes than were used in the overall budget request. To me, that smacks of "having your cake and eating it too."

Second, the rules were changed by using a new method of interpreting the effect of the economic assumptions on the social security program. The administration, in projecting the needs of social security, wants us to believe that everything that can go wrong will go wrong—for the next 50 years. Based on this philosophy, the President and David Stockman want us to approve a program which can only lead to the dismantling of the social security entirely.

As a result of the budget reconciliation process, both Houses of Congress have passed measures which virtually guarantee the elimination of the social security minimum benefit for all current recipients, not just those individuals receiving a Government pension; and the elimination of new student benefit awards with a reduction and phaseout of current student benefits. The House provisions were included in the Gramm/Latta amendments in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3982, and the Senate provisions were included in the Senate budget bill (S. 1377) introduced by Senator PETE V. DOMENICI, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget. These changes, if coupled with a provision to allow interfund borrowing between the old age and survivors insurance fund, the disability insurance fund, and the health insurance fund would be sufficient, I believe, to address the critical short-term financing shortfall. To go beyond these changes at this time to correct dubious, at best, or nonexistent long-term problems would be a grave error.

On Thursday, July 16, 1981, one of the major networks aired a program entitled "Social Insecurity." At the conclusion of that program the question was asked—"what do we—the

American people—want social security to be?" That question will be answered by the measures we here in Congress pass. Secretary Schweiker, during the course of the program, suggested that the administration's proposals are bitter but necessary medicine to solve the system's long-term problem that workers and beneficiaries will swallow, and must swallow now.

Well, I say that we, the Members of Congress are the doctors who prescribe the medicine. I for one, don't intend to prescribe what can only be described as an overdose to a problem not clearly or adequately diagnosed. ●

JOHN M. SNYDER, POINT MAN
FOR THE PROGUN LOBBY

HON. DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ALBOSTA. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD today an interview with John Snyder, director of public affairs for the Citizens Committee for the Right To Keep and Bear Arms. I think you will find the interview most interesting and informative. Mr. Snyder is an acknowledged expert on this subject:

JOHN M. SNYDER, POINT MAN FOR THE
PROGUN LOBBY

Question. Americans more than any other people seem peculiarly fascinated with guns. Why this preoccupation with weaponry? Doesn't the easy availability of handguns perpetuate the climate of violence in our society?

SNYDER. The fact that most Americans want handguns is not necessarily an indication that they also want violence. The fact of the matter is that handguns are peculiarly suited to the purpose of self-defense. You can't assume that Americans want handguns simply for nefarious purposes. Regarding the easy availability of handguns, it is virtually impossible to legally buy a firearm without complying with a few of the 20,000 gun laws we already have in the United States governing various aspects of gun ownership and acquisition. Most of the guns used in crimes are illegally acquired.

Question. It is believed that some 60 million handguns are now in circulation in the United States, with more than 2 million being added each year. At the present rate, Americans will have 100 million handguns by the turn of the century. What are law-abiding citizens doing with all these handguns? Are you saying that all are used for self-defense?

SNYDER. There's no question that a good portion of the handguns are in private possession are acquired for purposes of self-defense. But many are purchased for other legitimate activities like target shooting, including competitive shooting as well as for plinking and hunting. Few people realize it, but 48 states have laws specifically regulating hunting with handguns. So there are various legitimate purposes for which people acquire handguns.

The climate of crime and violence that we are experiencing in this country has caused a lot of concerned people to buy handguns

and learn how to use them for self-defense. I think it is pretty obvious that the police cannot protect all of the people all of the time. People must have a way to protect themselves, and the acquisition of a handgun is one of the simplest means of accomplishing that objective.

Question. But any way you look at it, handguns are made and sold for one purpose: to kill human beings. Why not put limits on their availability? Why this obsession with the "right" to bear arms?

SNYDER. Often the mere presence of a handgun in the possession of a law abiding citizen is enough to deter a criminal. As I pointed out before, there are also other legitimate uses for handguns. As a matter of fact, many of the most valuable handguns monetarily are those that are made for competitive shooting, including Olympic competition. It's a fallacy to argue or state that handguns have only one purpose, to kill. Their chief purpose, I believe, is to save life; to protect oneself from criminal attack.

Any limits on the availability of handguns should be placed on their availability to criminals. The best way to do that is by placing mandatory minimum penalties on the use of handguns in felonious acts of violence. But I don't think the limitation should be general. You're taking the position that anyone and everyone who wants a handgun is a criminal. The right to keep a gun for self-protection is in many cases concomitant with the ability to protect one's life. So the interest in the right to keep and bear arms is not an obsession.

Question. You told Congressional Quarterly recently that the gun is a symbol of freedom and that it has more significance to many people than a job. You don't call that an obsession?

SNYDER. Not at all. An obsession is an interest in one aspect of life to the exclusion of all others. For many people, their job is not an all-consuming interest in life. I have to believe that more men and women have a greater interest in their spouses than they do in their jobs. In that context, keeping a firearm for protection is more important than a job because it is the means by which one can protect their loved ones.

Question. Do you seriously believe that your right to possess handguns should take precedence over someone else's right not to be gunned down in the street?

SNYDER. That's a loaded question. I believe that the right to possess handguns is necessary in order to prevent one from being gunned down in the street. The two issues should not be posited as antitheses, but rather as concomitants.

Question. New Right conservatives are the first to defend the right of life for the unborn and are willing to impose government controls on abortions. But when it comes to protecting the lives of individual citizens through gun control, they seem to adopt a "pro-choice" attitude and insist on their "rights." How do you grapple with this philosophical inconsistency?

SNYDER. It's not a philosophical inconsistency at all. The right to life is the paramount right. It is a right given to us by God. It precedes any grant of privilege by any government. In order to maintain the right to life one must have the capability under certain circumstances to protect one's life against those who would illegitimately try to take it away. In other words, if you deny the means to protect life, you deny the right to life.

Question. Gun advocates claim controls won't work. Isn't it a fact, though, that in

Japan where laws make it almost impossible to get guns, the kill rate is 200 times lower than in the United States, where 10,000 people a year die by the gun?

SNYDER. In Japan the conquering army of the United States under General MacArthur disarmed the citizenry. I would hope that the gun control advocates do not seriously believe that we should regard ourselves as a conquered people. But there are countries that have strict gun laws and high homicide rates—some of which are much higher than the United States. I'm talking of Mexico, which the gun control advocates usually don't like to mention because it has strict controls on firearms. There the homicide rate is 22.1 per 100,000, whereas in the United States the rate is 9.7 per 100,000.

Question. Wait a minute. You say "homicide rate." Shouldn't you differentiate that from deaths caused specifically by handgun violence?

SNYDER. What difference would that make to the victims? What difference does it make to a dead person whether he's been stabbed to death or shot to death?

Question. It makes a lot of difference. You're distorting statistics to bolster your argument against gun control.

SNYDER. Are we talking about preventing homicide or merely preventing gun ownership?

Question. C'mon, you know what we're talking about. We're talking about preventing homicide and violent crimes using handguns.

SNYDER. The real issue here is the prevention of crime per se. As I said, it makes little difference to a dead person whether he's been stabbed to death or shot to death. The interest on our part is in preventing homicide—period. So when I cite the example of Mexico, which has strong gun controls but a homicide rate three times higher than that of the U.S., I'm using it to show that the imposition of strict gun control laws is not something which can be correlated with a homicide rate. My interest is in preventing homicides and I point to Mexico to show that gun control laws don't necessarily prevent homicides.

Question. With the killing of John Lennon in New York and the attempted slayings of Ronald Reagan and Pope John Paul, the nation again expressed shock and outrage as it has so many times before. Until handguns are eliminated altogether, won't we eventually lose all sensitivity to such violence?

SNYDER. It's interesting that you should bring up the case of Pope John Paul II, one of the great religious leaders of our time. It brings to mind the Biblical story of the first murder, when Cain killed Abel. This was thousands and thousands of years before gun powder was even discovered. So obviously homicide is something which preexisted firearms. The argument that sensitivity to violence will increase as the number of handguns are decreased simply doesn't make sense. It's the guy who pulls the trigger on unsuspecting victims who is insensitive to violence. That's the guy who should be dealt with, not the inanimate object.

Question. Cheap crimes by cheap criminals with cheap handguns. Is this the kind of image of America that your organization has come to tolerate? What has to happen before you become outraged too?

SNYDER. I'm outraged by violence period, whether it's committed with handguns or anything else. But my outrage is directed against the perpetrators of violence and not at the instruments with which such acts are

committed. The gun control advocates, if they are sincere about reducing crime, will begin to direct their outrage at the criminals and not at the mere possession of handguns by people who use them to prevent criminal acts.

The gun control advocates are inadvertently contributing to a climate favorable to crime. The only people who obey gun laws are the law abiding citizens. A criminal bent on murder or theft certainly won't think twice about disobeying laws limiting the possession of firearms. Thus, the effect of gun control would limit the availability of firearms to law abiding citizens who would become even more helpless against criminals.

Question. Every publicized shooting revives the debate about gun control without bringing the two sides closer together. Is there no room for compromise, or is the safety of every American citizen just not that important?

SNYDER. There is room for compromise, provided the gun control advocates surrender. Without that there will be no compromise because the right to keep and bear arms is concomitant with the right to life itself. There is absolutely no way we are ever going to give up arguing for that right. There's no room for compromise on so basic an issue.

Question. Progress in reducing handgun violence would almost certainly require aggressive police methods, undercover operations, and other techniques that would trample on the civil rights of all of us. Isn't gun control the lesser of two evils?

SNYDER. That's another loaded question because the lesser of two evils is still an evil. To be effective any gun control law would jeopardize the rights of law abiding citizens against unreasonable searches and seizures.

Question. Isn't the reluctance of elected public officials to do anything about either gun control or to stiffen the penalties for violent crimes nothing less than an abdication of their moral responsibilities?

SNYDER. I can't comment on the morality of individual legislators. I don't know what their motives are. But I would say that they do have a responsibility to penalize violent criminals and to make punishment swift and sure. Until we really sock it to these criminals, I don't think we can ever stop this outrageous groundswell of violent crime. Our public officials have a moral responsibility to address this issue and to address it promptly.

Question. Finally, what is the status of gun control legislation on Capitol Hill? Does the election of Ronald Reagan and a GOP Senate put the lid on controls for the foreseeable future?

SNYDER. The climate for the repeal of existing federal firearms legislation is warmer now than it's ever been in the last 13 years. The McClure-Volkmer bill would eliminate certain of the more onerous provisions of the gun control act of 1968. It has been endorsed by the Reagan administration and has wide support in both the House and Senate. It has a good chance for passage sometime during the 97th Congress. ●

GOLDEN DOOR AWARD

HON. FRANK GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to present for the edification of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives a report of an outstanding event, sponsored by the International Institute, which has taken place at St. Peter's College in Jersey City, N.J.

The International Institute is an organization in Jersey City, more than 60 years old, which has dedicated itself to assisting newcomers to the United States adjust to the American way of life.

Indeed, this group has a record of outstanding service, helping tens of thousands of individuals enter the mainstream of our society, many of whom have distinguished themselves in medicine, law, education, nursing, and business. They are a volunteer group which develops programs in immigration assistance, interpreter services, refugee resettlement, and student, ethnic, and cultural awareness.

As a tribute to the tremendous efforts of individual volunteers, the International Institute has established the Ethel Jones Golden Door Award, in honor of one of the founders of this fine group. The coveted Golden Door Award is presented annually to a foreign-born person who has contributed significantly to the betterment of the community. A main stipulation is that the recipient must not only have gained opportunity for himself but must have taken the opportunity of being an American to help others.

On a visit to the Statue of Liberty, which I am proud to say rests in the geographic boundary of my district, but 200 yards off the Jersey City shore, one will find The New Colossus by poet Emma Lazarus engraved on the famous Bartholdi statue, symbol of hope for the millions of immigrants who have come to our shores. This poem provides the inspiration for the Golden Door Award:

Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me: I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The award, which was created 3 years ago, was first received by Charles Kreiger, an Austrian-born financier, who rose to become the mayor of Jersey City. Last year's recipient was Mrs. Santa de Gross, who has spent a lifetime of service to others in the development of mental health programs. Born in Tunis, North Africa, of Italian, French, and Jewish ancestry, she was motivated by a problem with one of her family members, and has dedicated her life to helping others in

gratitude for the great blessing of American citizenship she has received.

This year, Melachrine Karagounelis, president of the International Institute, has advised me that a 96-year-old Italian immigrant, Dominick Colonna, of Hudson County, has received the prized Golden Door Award. Grace Bilotti Spinelli, past president of the International Institute, told me that Colonna, a successful businessman, is being honored because he opened his own golden door after landing alone, a virtually penniless immigrant at the age of 18, on the shores of the United States.

Mr. Colonna's hard-working, forward-minded attitude can be summed up in the following passage from the museum at the base of the Statue of Liberty, which states:

Before World War I, the crowded streets of New York's lower east side echoed with the many-tongued cries of pushcart vendors and the squalling of newborn Americans. Life was hard in the teeming, squalid tenements but the immigrant generation endured hardship so that the next generation might enjoy the promise of America. At least there was hope and always the inspiring example of those who had succeeded by self-sacrifice and hard work.

The Jersey Journal, in an excellent article written by Marion Courtney, traces the saga of Mr. Colonna from the day he came to the United States in 1902, landing in Jersey City, to his current status, that of founder and president of the flourishing Colonna Food Products.

After living briefly in Manhattan, Mr. Colonna worked as a barber and with his brother-in-law in an electric business. In 1907, he married the former Grace Di Lena. They made their home in Union City, N.J., and raised four children. Grace Colonna died in 1939; they would have celebrated their 74th anniversary only days before this award's presentation.

Mr. Colonna entered the food business during World War I in response to the scarcity of certain products. Purchasing cheese wherever he could, he grated and packaged it at home, and sold his goods to the many neighborhood stores in surrounding communities. This later developed into the family grocery operation now operated by Joseph and Leonard, his sons.

Our Golden Door Award recipient feels that it is not yet time to retire, at age 96, and shows up every morning to work. He now lives in Fort Lee with his daughter, Madeline Florio, his son-in-law, and grandchild. He has six grandchildren and six great-grandchildren.

His contributions have been many. He has touched thousands of immigrants who sought him out as their friend and counselor. His friends point with pride to St. Rocco's Church in Union City, which he helped found. He has given a start to hundreds of

families by providing work in his operation. He has provided financial assistance to countless small businesses, which have always been the lifeblood of our Nation.

Dominick Colonna has worked hard to catch the good within our reach. He is a master of the great art of living because he encourages the golden moment of opportunity. He epitomizes the late John F. Kennedy's message that:

As the iron of the new world is being forged and being readied for molding, our job is to shape it, so far as we can, into the world we want for ourselves and our children and for all men.

I am pleased to join Nino Domingo, chairman of the program, and Alberto Rosiak, Albert Arendas, members, and Nicholas Montaldo, executive director of the International Institute, who have worked so long and hard on this tribute, along with Geraldine Gillio and Grace Schut. Of special significance is the work of Purita Hornilla, who led the Garden State Filipino-American Dance Ensemble in a fine presentation.

Dominick Colonna is a reminder to some within our Nation who have attempted to build walls of social stratification. They are reminded of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's famous message delivered November 4, 1944, in Boston, that:

All of our people all over the country—except the pure-blooded Indians—are immigrants or descendants of immigrants, including even those who came over here on the Mayflower.

Dominick Colonna proves that life gives nothing to man without labor.

God has blessed Dominick Colonna and has also blessed us by sending Dominick to America. May he enjoy good health for many years to come.●

A SALUTE TO MARYLAND
PUBLIC SERVANT, JO-ANN OR-
LINSKY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to recognize the achievements of one of Maryland's leading public servants, Jo-Ann Orlinsky of Baltimore City.

Mrs. Orlinsky's 2-year term as chairperson of the Maryland Commission for Women has just recently ended, as well as her 7-year tenure on the commission, and her friends, colleagues and fellow commissioners will be gathering in Baltimore on August 5, 1981, to honor her many achievements. Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend, which I deeply regret, since my association with Jo-Ann goes back many, many years. I have been privileged to work with Jo-Ann and her

husband, Walter S. Orlinsky, the distinguished president of the Baltimore City Council, in the Democratic politics of our State for much of the past two decades.

A graduate of Mount Holyoke College, Jo-Ann Orlinsky has been associated with and served as an invaluable adviser to numerous government officials. She began her career as a special assistant to former Maryland Senator Joe Tydings, and is presently executive assistant to the commissioner of the Maryland Division of Labor and Industry. However, in her ceaseless volunteer efforts she has had a most dramatic impact in our State, and it is for these numerous and varied activities that she is this week being honored.

In the mid-1970's Jo-Ann served as the first chairperson of Women Together, a coalition of 23 Baltimore metropolitan area women's organizations representing more than 20,000 women. Because of her knowledge and leadership of women's rights in 1974, the Governor of Maryland appointed Jo-Ann Orlinsky to what was then known as the Maryland Commission on the Status of Women.

In her work on the commission, Jo-Ann has been a tremendously effective advocate of strengthened laws relating to crimes of rape and sexual assault. On the commission she chaired the central assault task force, the rape task force, the rape coalition and the rape coalition conference on legislation. While I was president of the Maryland Senate, and chairman of the general assembly's committee on rape and sexual offenses, I was privileged to work with Jo-Ann on legislative efforts to investigate and reform the State's laws regarding rape and sexual assault crimes. With her able assistance, the general assembly enacted a comprehensive package of reforms which provide appropriate penalties to the criminal and create a system with greater compassion toward the victim. I believe Maryland's laws in this area are a model for the rest of the Nation, and they would not have been enacted without the significant contribution and dedication of Jo-Ann Orlinsky.

In other work on the commission, Jo-Ann was the guiding force in establishing a State network of sexual assault centers. Maryland's program of centers is far ahead of most other States, and again we have Jo-Ann Orlinsky to thank.

In the implementation of title IX equal education opportunity programs in our State, Jo-Ann has played an important role as a member of the committee to implement title IX of the Maryland Department of Education. On the Commission for Women she chaired the title IX task force on equal education and women's sports and cochaired the conference for title IX equity.

Certainly Jo-Ann's expertise and leadership ability has been recognized nationally and she currently serves as a board member of the Women's Equity Action League.

Jo-Ann's history of public service does not begin and end with her more than 7 years on the Commission for Women. While it is specifically for her service on the commission that this occasion has been planned, I would be remiss if I did not mention the other contributions Jo-Ann has made to her community and State. In hospitals, homes for the aged, programs for youth activities and children's rights, cultural and religious affairs, indeed in every facet of the Baltimore community, Jo-Ann has made an indelible mark. As you can see, it is with good reason that she has been more than once named "Woman of the Year" by various civic and professional organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I know you would want to join with me in a salute to Jo-Ann Orlinsky for her many achievements, and for her dedication as a true public servant.●

FRED J. KROLL

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Fred J. Kroll, one of the outstanding men of our time, died at the age of 45. Fred was elected president of the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks in 1976, when he was only 40. Two years later he was the youngest person in history to be named to the AFL-CIO Executive Council. Time magazine praised him for possessing the sense of boldness that remains the prime prerequisite for leadership, and pointed out his efforts to make the labor movement more attractive for younger workers by encouraging greater initiative at the local level.

As we all seek in the days and years ahead to resolve the difficult social, economic, and collective-bargaining problems that face the country, Fred Kroll's wisdom and leadership will be badly missed.

I would like to place in the RECORD a summary of Fred's unique achievements:

FRED J. KROLL, 1935-1981

A courageously-fought five-year battle with leukemia ended on July 30, 1981 when BRAC International President Fred J. Kroll died at the age of 45.

Death came in a Philadelphia hospital where he had been undergoing treatment and where, characteristically, he continued to chart the union's course and to develop programs and strategies for future collective bargaining and legislative campaigns.

Kroll first became president of BRAC in 1976 when he was chosen by the union's Executive Council to complete an unexpired term of office. He was reelected president by acclamation at BRAC's 1979 Toronto Convention.

When he was elected a member of the AFL-CIO's Executive Council in 1978, he became the youngest person ever to be named a federation vice president.

Assuming a leadership position within the ranks of rail labor, Kroll was elected chairman of the Railway Labor Executive's Association in February 1980. Composed of leaders of 20 unions with membership in the railroad industry, the RLEA is a policy-making group dealing with legislative and regulatory issues involving railway workers and the industry of which they are a vital part.

EARLY CAREER

No stranger to literally thousands of BRAC members, Kroll was an active and dedicated member of the Brotherhood for 28 years.

Born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on October 29, 1935, he came from a trade union family. His father was a long-time member of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

BRAC's leader launched his rail career in 1953 as an IBM machine operator on the former Pennsylvania Railroad. Quickly becoming involved in Quaker City Lodge 587, he served as vice president, president, and local chairman.

In 1970, he was elected general secretary-treasurer of the Penn-Central System Board. The next year he was elected general chairman.

Unanimously returned to office as general chairman in 1973, he continued to head BRAC's largest system board until January 1975 when the Executive Council elected him an international vice president. He was reelected at the union's May 1975 Convention in Washington, D.C.

During the period of his general chairmanship and later his vice presidency, his leadership abilities were successfully tested while meeting the challenge of protecting workers' rights when the northeast railroads (including the giant Penn-Central) plunged into bankruptcy. He played a key role in shaping the legislation that led to the creation of Conrail.

From his earliest days as a trade unionist, Kroll was widely recognized as a skilled and determined negotiator.

An equally skilled and forceful spokesman on behalf of his own members and all of rail labor, Kroll spearheaded the April 29 Rail Labor Rally in Washington that drew 20,000 railroaders to protest the Reagan Administration's budget-cutting policies with regard to Conrail and Amtrak. Throughout March and April, he worked tirelessly in testifying before Congress to urge restoration of adequate funding for both railroads.

And, shortly before his death, congressional conferees adopted legislation to insure the continuation of Conrail and Amtrak and to provide a solution to the financially ailing Railroad Retirement System.

FROM "REASONABLE MILITANT" TO "MAVERICK LEADER"

Once describing himself as a "reasonable militant," Kroll quickly captured the attention of the media after his election as BRAC president and was frequently profiled in major news magazines and newspapers.

The Norfolk and Western strike, which he launched in July 1978 and which lasted for

82 days, tested his mettle, and his masterful handling of it led to the eventual elimination of both the rail industry's mutual aid pact and one existing in the airline industry. Business Week magazine called him "the maverick leader who bested the N&W."

Kroll himself described that precedent-setting strike as one that "let the railroads know we are an aggressive union, that we mean business and that we have the support of our people."

A cover story in the August 1979 issue of Time magazine on "Fifty Faces for the Future" cited BRAC's president as one of those who possessed "the sense of boldness that remains the prime prerequisite for leadership." The article described Kroll's efforts to make the labor movement more attractive for younger workers by encouraging greater initiative at the local level.

As Next magazine phrased it in an April 1981 profile, Fred J. Kroll was one of the "five-score Americans who has the potential to achieve substantial power over the minds and lives of their fellow citizens during this decade."

That potential ended tragically on July 30, 1981, but his legacy of bold leadership and dedication to economic justice and dignity for workers will endure.

A devoted family man, he leaves his wife Hildegard; three daughters—Karen, Anita, and Michele; his parents—Fred and Catherine; and three brothers—Albert, John, and Joseph.

In lieu of flowers, the family requests that contributions be made to the Herbert L. Orlovitz Institute for Cancer and Blood Diseases, Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, 230 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102.●

GOLD STANDARD SUPPORT

HON. JIM JEFFRIES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, even before the dust has settled over the recent budget and tax cut votes, many are saying the economy cannot be turned around until the United States returns to the gold standard. I concur with this analysis as the 10-year experiment with an unbacked paper currency has been disastrous. The president is moving the country in the direction of slower monetary growth, reduced Federal spending increases, and true tax cuts. But an important ingredient in this recipe for economic growth is a gold-based currency.

History has proven that irredeemable paper has almost always been accompanied by soaring inflation, unbalanced budgets, and high-interest rates. On the other hand, during most times in our history when the dollar was backed by gold, we have seen reasonable price stability, balanced budgets, and affordable interest rates. Since severing the tie of the American dollar with gold, the debasement of the dollar has accelerated, with both the money supply and prices doubling in the last 10 years.

Obviously, gold is not the only currency which can be used by a free society. But it has served as the chief instrument of exchange throughout history because its value does not depend upon the whims of government. It is scarce, transportable, and impossible to counterfeit. On the contrary, the worth of paper money is dependent upon the promises made by government, and it is too easy to reproduce when in short supply.

I look forward to the Gold Commission's report in October and future congressional hearings on the subject. The return to the gold standard must be considered if our economy is to get back on the right track. ●

SUGGESTIONS FOR A BETTER FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, there are features—such as useless regulations—that hamper the efficiency of the food stamp program. James M. Huddleston, director of the division of family and children services of the Georgia Department of Human Resources offers an interesting commentary on the inequities of the food stamp program. The food stamp program must be returned to its original purpose: To provide nourishing food for the truly needy. I would like to share his letter with my colleagues:

DEAR NEWT: The workers and myself in this office, the Division of Family and Children Services, object to some features of the food stamp program with perhaps most of them being regulations.

In the case of Aid to Dependent Children, the parent must register for work when the youngest child reaches six, but it is not required in food stamps until the youngest child reaches 12. Of all the clients who are required to be referred to the Labor Department, only about 20% apply. We cannot deny them benefits until we contact them to find out if they have a good excuse, as everybody does, and refer them a second time.

We are not allowed to prosecute in the case of food stamps until there is an administrative hearing or court has ruled that it is fraud. Since this policy was instituted, we have yet to have the first administrative hearing.

A client can report no income and receive the total allotment of food stamps. The person no longer has to prove how they are paying other expenses such as rent, house payment or utilities. They can simply say somebody loaned them the money or is paying it for them.

An applicant can apply for food stamps on April 30th and if qualified, we must issue stamps for April and May. They have already survived the month of April, and they are not allowed to pay off a grocery bill using the stamps. We feel this is unnecessary.

An applicant can have a reserve of \$1,500 in the bank, and if they meet the Federal regulations on expedited services we must issue stamps within two days which sometimes does not give adequate time to check all the facts. We felt it was better when the local office was allowed to determine cases which were emergency and issue stamps in an expedited manner.

Under regulations it is permissible for a recipient of food stamps to refuse to work more than 30 hours per week, if by working more than 30 they would become disqualified from receiving stamps.

If husband and wife had a child under 18 and one is working, the other cannot be forced to accept employment. If the wife could earn \$125.00 per week working and the man had a skill paying \$500 per week, they could elect for her to work, and there is no requirement that he be required to work.

These are some of the objections we have to the program. We feel if these inequities were corrected, benefits might be more reasonable to those who are in need and qualify. I am not restricting this information, but you understand I am not agitating opposition to whatever our state officials thoughts may be in the matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. HUDDLESTON,
Director III. ●

THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S RACIST ABANDONMENT OF HUMAN AND CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in today's RECORD two articles which recently appeared in the New York Times and which clearly reveal the Reagan administration's racist attitude, opposed to human rights abroad and civil rights at home.

The first piece, written by James R. Hanson, concerns Mr. Lee Moon Young who is imprisoned in South Korea. Mr. Lee has been beaten so severely that he cannot raise his arms, he is plagued with frostbite, and he is condemned to solitary confinement—all for expressing his views freely. Yet the administration studiously has refused to seek to prevent the brutal human rights abuses perpetrated by the regime of Chun Doo Hwan.

"Looking back at United States involvement," notes Mr. Hanson in his article, "I think that the Soviet Union has succeeded in stripping us of our principles, for which we have substituted an inverted ideology under which we bind ourselves to dictatorships throughout the world." Clearly this is the inverted ideology which the President is pursuing, as enunciated in Ambassador Kirkpatrick's ludicrous theory on "benevolent tyrannies."

The administration is not only against human rights abroad, it opposes civil rights at home. This is made clear in another article which I

am including in today's RECORD, by Robert Plotkin, former chief of the special litigation section of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division. Mr. Plotkin protests the Reagan administration's attempt to turn back the clock on civil rights, and thus turn its back on millions of Americans.

I am appalled at efforts by the administration to replace principled civil rights policy with political gamesmanship. Indeed, as this article points out, not only has the Justice Department moved away from vigorous enforcement of civil rights laws, but in some instances it has purposely manipulated the legal process in order to abandon the country's commitment to civil rights. This reflects the administration's deep-seated hostility toward the laws that protect minorities and handicapped persons.

President Reagan claims that he is undecided about extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Recent hearings in the House Judiciary Committee demonstrated that our country has a long way to go before the rights of every citizen are guaranteed. Tactics which obstruct minorities from voting are still employed in some localities. In the face of these attempts to deny some Americans their most fundamental rights, the administration should be unwavering in its commitment to enforcing civil rights laws. Yet, as Mr. Plotkin states in his article: " * * * In a government otherwise tickled by its own ability to seem bold and imaginative, the lack of a coherent civil rights policy is ominous. It masks an antipathy toward civil rights that stretches far beyond particular disputes about effective remedies for discrimination."

Mr. Speaker, I commend both of these important articles to the attention of my colleagues:

INJUSTICE DEPARTMENT

(By Robert Plotkin)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan may be undecided about extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965, perhaps the most important civil rights legislation in United States history. But Justice Department policy across the entire spectrum of civil rights issues reveals a deep-seated hostility toward the laws that protect minorities and handicapped persons.

Attorney General William French Smith has already promised that the Justice Department will not pursue busing orders in school-desegregation cases, that it will not seek the imposition of numerical quotas to correct employment discrimination, and that it will not impose "onerous" standards upon state and local prisons to correct conditions that violate inmates' rights.

The Attorney General has not said, however, what the Reagan Administration will do in these and similar cases. This silence is not simply the pause of indecision. Indeed, in a Government otherwise tickled by its own ability to seem bold and imaginative, the lack of a coherent civil rights policy is ominous. It masks an antipathy toward civil rights that stretches far beyond particular disputes about effective remedies for discrimination.

This Administration sees civil rights laws as imposing unnecessary regulatory and economic burdens on society, and would like nothing better than ultimately to replace today's tough laws with toothless "tigers." The debate about the voting legislation is simply the opening round in a bout that is sure to go the distance.

Principled civil rights policy-making at the Justice Department has been replaced by the political gamesmanship of Deputy Attorney General Edward C. Schmults. Allies of the new Administration have learned quickly that a telephone call to Mr. Schmults will achieve favorable results and bypass the lawyers of the Civil Rights Division, whom their new bosses see as subversive "liberals."

For example, Senator Jeremiah Denton, Alabama Republican, recently called Mr. Schmults to complain about language that he found objectionable in a legal document filed by the Civil Rights Division in a voting case against the city of Mobile, Ala. Within 24 hours, an amended pleading had been filed at Mr. Schmults's personal direction, removing the offending words. Although the legal significance of the change was inconsequential, its political message was clear: The Civil Rights Division is under control.

The "Denton maneuver" was also executed by the Governor of Texas, William P. Clements. Complaining about a successful prison-conditions suit brought in district court by the Civil Rights Division, Governor Clements wrote to the Attorney General that the court's decision would cost Texas "billions of dollars" to implement, and pointed out that "it makes good political sense" for the department to reconsider its position. The letter was referred to Deputy Attorney General Schmults, who agreed to review the case and wrote to the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Texas asking it to delay further orders. To its credit, the court refused to delay again the eight-year-old controversy, but Mr. Schmults's promised review will continue while the case is on appeal.

Similarly, in a discrimination suit against North Carolina's college system, the Department of Education, without consulting the Civil Rights Division lawyers responsible, negotiated a settlement that failed to resolve important issues in the case. When those attorneys refused to sign the agreement, Mr. Schmults reassigned the case to another division and ordered the compromise to be filed.

The Administration has publicly denied that the Justice Department has moved away from vigorous enforcement of the civil rights laws. Labeling the new course as a "change of focus," Attorney General Smith has promised minority groups that he intends to seek more "innovative and practical approaches" to achieve racial equality.

Significantly, not a single Reagan appointee at the Justice Department has any background in civil rights. Not a single appointee is a member of a racial minority. No special "task force" exists to study controversial civil rights problems, although the Attorney General has made much ado about other task forces he has created, such as the one on violent crime.

If we are to believe that creative new solutions will replace the supposedly outmoded policies of the past, who will devise them? And when?

It is remarkable that the Reagan Administration continues to refuse to admit that the era of civil rights enforcement is dead.

This refusal, obscured as indecision, deprives concerned citizens of their right to publicly debate the matter. It also assumes that public dissatisfaction with busing equals rejection of racial equality. The Administration is not only turning back the clock, it is also turning its back on millions of Americans.

A KOREAN IN PRISON
(By James R. Hanson)

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—A friend of mine, a law professor in South Korea, was arrested last year, imprisoned, and beaten so severely that he could not raise his arms. He was in solitary confinement; last winter in his cell he suffered frostbite on his face and on an ear. He can contemplate spending next winter in the same prison.

I have great respect for this man and his courage, and his grasp of the simple, central principle that to live, one must give his life.

He is Lee Moon Young. In 1952, he was in the South Korean Army; I in the United States Army. I helped him find a school and a sponsor in the United States.

He was at the University of Michigan when I began law practice in Ann Arbor. My first assigned case was that of a black youth charged with wrongfully entering an automobile. His family and friends didn't have the \$250 for bond; attorneys were forbidden to put up bail. When Moon Young heard of it, he insisted on providing the money, despite the fact that he was skipping breakfast to economize. In his soft, halting English, he told me he could not understand how a person could be kept in prison for not having \$250.

Last year, impatient with the Carter Administration, I wrote the President about my friend's situation, enclosing a check for \$250 as "the least I could do for Moon Young."

A White House aide undramatized my gesture by returning the check, admonishing me that it was against the President's policy to accept money. I sent the \$250 to the American Friends Service Committee toward its campaign to save the opposition leader Kim Dae Jung from execution.

It was his association with Mr. Kim that got Moon Young in prison. He was quoted as having told Mr. Kim that he was not interested in political office but that he would advise him.

He was in prison before, when Park Chung Hee was President. He had ample opportunity to leave South Korea. When he was in Ohio a few years ago, he told me that he expected persecution, "even death"—the words startled me then, and now ring in my ears. He was removed from his professorship at Korea University. That didn't silence him, so he was imprisoned. He and others were released when Chun Doo Hwan took office. They were arrested by General Chun in May 1980.

When Mr. Kim's life was spared in this year's "amnesty," the sentences of Moon Young and some others were reduced from 20 years to 15. One gets the feeling that the chapter, and the book, are closed. The last letter to me from the State Department, in May, declared that the department does "not believe it either appropriate or productive for the U.S. to intervene." The American news media have turned to other subjects. Koreans feel abandoned.

We hear little from South Korea because of total censorship of press and mail, and the effectiveness of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency, even in this country. The full-page ads purchased by American Kore-

ans welcoming President Chun in February were a tribute to the K.C.I.A.

Moon Young's wife held a prayer meeting recently for wives and friends of the prisoners, and for this spent four days in jail. She gets to go to island jail once a month for a 10-minute view of Moon Young through a double glass. He is not allowed to speak of conditions, but once he told her it was good to see light! Those who have seen the prisoners say that some still bear scars from last winter's frostbite.

I went to South Korea in 1952 with ideals like Moon Young's. We spent our time there, and a goodly number spent their life's blood, to save Southeast Asia from Communist rule.

Looking back at United States involvements, I think that the Soviet Union has succeeded in stripping us of our principles, for which we have substituted an inverted ideology under which we bind ourselves to dictatorships throughout the world. I am told this is necessary and that the human cost can't be helped. Be that as it may, it doesn't follow that we should avert our eyes from what is happening on this frontier of liberty, which was established with our blessing and our blood.

At this time of renewed patriotism in America, it is important for us to recognize the quality of the devotion of these men to their ideals, which are the very ones we revere in our Founding Fathers.●

COMMUNITY EFFORT IN ARLINGTON

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article, "Search and Save' Drive Aims to Reclaim History," which appeared recently in the Arlington Journal. It describes the noble community effort headed by Janet Green, chairman of Arlington County's historical commission, to locate Arlington's records. Once part of the Nation's Capital, Arlington is rich in history which makes this work especially important.

The article follows:

"SEARCH AND SAVE' DRIVE AIMS TO RECLAIM HISTORY

(By Lee Michael Katz)

Once part of the nation's capital, and still home of innumerable political and military leaders, Arlington is rich in history. The problem is, most of it is recorded elsewhere.

"Arlington County has been part of the District. It has been a part of Fairfax. And it's been a part of the city of Alexandria," explains Janet Green, chairman of the county's historical commission. "So its records are dispersed in all directions."

In 1911, Arlington County became an independent government entity, according to historical commission member Michael Pollock.

But the county's history began in the early 1600s. And to make up for the more than 300 years Arlington didn't keep its own records, the historical commission is conducting a "search and save" drive in Northern Virginia. It is looking for photographs,

papers or letters that might provide clues to earlier Arlington life.

While county residents are being asked to comb through their attics and family safes, part-time genealogist Pollock aims to search a different written source: gravestones.

By reading the epitaphs in cemeteries with marked graves, Pollock hopes to ferret out information not now available.

Tombstones "can indicate the quality of life at the time," he says.

For example, "a significant number of infant deaths in a two- to three-year period might indicate an epidemic of some sort."

He estimates there are between 40 and 50 cemeteries in Arlington, though "many of them do not have stones."

Pollock and the other commission members, meanwhile, are launching an appeal for the personal archives of noted citizens.

"Many prominent public officials have lived in Arlington," commission chairman Green says. "We want any papers relating to such people as congressmen and senators." According to a commission study, six senators and 33 congressmen live in Arlington.

Chief Justice Warren Burger of the U.S. Supreme Court has been a resident for many years, Green notes. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower lived in Arlington when he was a general stationed at Fort Myer.

And the Wright Brothers conducted one of the earliest airplane flights at the turn of the century at Fort Myer, Green says.

Further back, Confederate leader Colonel (later General) Robert E. Lee was once master of Arlington in the late 1850s.

And colonial settler John Smith started it all by sailing up the Potomac in 1608 to the area that later became part of Arlington.

Interest in historical research has grown nationwide, Green declares. "I think the future is built on the past and always has been."●

ALBERT FRAENKEL: FREE ENTERPRISER OF THE YEAR

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the rags-to-riches idea popularized by Horatio Alger. In almost any other country such stories would be labeled fairy tales, but in the United States the right to succeed and prosper is as basic to the foundation of our Nation as the Declaration of Independence itself.

Such opportunity is possible because of our economic system, the free enterprise system.

Like any freedom, however, it is easy to lose sight of its importance until we lose it.

Each year I sponsor in my congressional district a special program, Free Enterprise Week, to remind the citizens in my area of the importance of the free enterprise system and the opportunity we all enjoy through it.

One of the most important aspects of this program is the Free Enterpriser of the Year Award. This is present-

ed to a local individual who has succeeded through the free enterprise system. The award recognizes the accomplishments of the individual and it also serves to remind others that such opportunity still exists. By honoring such individuals we identify role models for our young people.

This year, the Free Enterpriser of the Year Award was presented to Mr. Albert Fraenkel, owner of Fraenkel Wholesale Furniture Co., of Baton Rouge. Mr. Fraenkel's story is one which serves as an example to us all.

He attended high school in New Orleans, where he was the recipient of the American Legion School Award and the National Honor Society Award. He was a member of Beta Gamma Sigma scholastic fraternity and Kappa Delta Phi leadership fraternity, while attending Tulane University, from which he graduated with a bachelor's degree in business administration in 1947.

Mr. Fraenkel learned the wholesale furniture business while working for the Lester D. Scharff Wholesale Furniture Co. in Shreveport, La. He remained with that company from 1947 to 1959, taking time out for a 2-year tour of duty with the U.S. Navy, during the Korean war.

In February 1959, he opened Fraenkel Wholesale Furniture, in Baton Rouge, with three employees: himself, his wife, Eleanore, and M. L. Stewart. Now that company employs 113 persons and the Baton Rouge facility is currently being remodeled and increased to some 120,000 square feet of showroom, warehouse, and manufacturing space.

The company expanded to Memphis in 1972 and to Atlanta in 1976. Today, it serves over 2,000 retailers in a 12-State area.

Even with the demands of his growing business, Mr. Fraenkel has given unselfishly of himself to his community. He serves on the boards of directors of: Audubon Council of the Girl Scouts of America, Junior Achievement, Baton Rouge Alliance for Good Government, and the Louisiana Association of Business and Industry. He is a member of the board of trustees of the Baton Rouge General Hospital and the advisory board of trustees of the Baton Rouge General Hospital and the advisory board of the Salvation Army. In addition, he is a tireless worker for the Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Fraenkel is also currently serving as president of the congregation of Temple B'nai Israel and is past president of the Jewish Welfare Federation of Greater Baton Rouge.

Mr. Speaker. I salute Mr. Albert Fraenkel, Free Enterpriser of the Year for 1981.●

SRI CHINMOY

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1981

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly acknowledge the accomplishments of a public servant who will be celebrating his 50th birthday on August 27. Sri Chinmoy Kumar Ghosh came to the United States from India 17 years ago. In this period of time he has pursued the twin goals of public service and individual growth through his personal example as well as through the establishment of several nonprofit centers nationwide.

I met Sri Chinmoy last year as a result of our mutual enthusiasm for physical fitness. On this occasion, the gentleman was receiving an award on the steps of the Capitol from the President's Commission on Physical Fitness and Sports. The award was prompted by Sri Chinmoy's efforts in organizing a Nation-crossing bicycle route, a 50-State relay run in honor of the bicentennial, as well as his sponsorship of running events, tennis tournaments, and lectures.

Supporters and friends of Sri Chinmoy are quick to note that this is merely one interest of this multifaceted achiever. It has been brought to my attention that Sri Chinmoy is an artist, composer, musician, writer, and poet who has been nominated for the Nobel Prize in literature. In addition, he was named chaplain for the 1980 winter Olympic games in Lake Placid and has offered weekly meditations at the United Nations for diplomats and staff for several years.

In closing, I would like to submit Sri Chinmoy's tribute to the hope and promise of America:

SALUTATIONS TO AMERICA

Yesterday America enjoyed the sacred flame of liberty.

Today America enjoys the sacred light of equality.

Tomorrow America shall enjoy the sacred sun of divinity.

America's vision was to become transcendently great.

America's mission is to become universally good.

The spirit of the past was the discovery of inner adamantine will to fight against bondage. The present spirit is the aspiration for God-manifestation plus the aspiration to become humanity's brother, humanity's selfless lover and divinity's constant server.

There are two special qualities that Americans can work on to help bring forward all their potential divinity. These two divine qualities are the feeling of universal oneness and constant and cheerful self-giving to the Supreme Pilot, who is man's own highest Reality.

American citizens can learn to love their country more by realizing the supreme fact that there is no difference between true love of one's country and true love of God.

One's country is nothing short of God's concentrated creation.

America gained her independence two hundred years ago by virtue of her determined will power. Now her spiritual independence will be founded upon her consciousness with God, and this can be established only on the strength of her implicit surrender to God's divine Dispensation and Will.

In a freedom-loving country patriotism is a conscious prayer, a conscious concentrated force to spread freedom so that the country can achieve and distribute love-light to each of its countrymen and to the world at large.—SRI CHINMOY.●

H.R. 4144—ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, on July 23 and 24, I cast several votes to bring the Federal budget under control and which question several wasteful Federal expenditures. I opposed several large construction projects that I believe are not only questionable on their merits, but also drain resources from our waterway needs in the Northeast.

In western Pennsylvania and Ohio, we have a network of rivers that must be able to handle growing traffic, particularly heavier barge traffic as the Nation converts to increased coal use and as coal exports grow. A recent Corps of Engineers' national waterways study has reported that of the Nation's 184 principal locks, the average age is 40 years. Many of these locks have been in service for 80 years and are greatly in need of rehabilitation and/or replacement. According to the report, waterborne commerce has tripled since 1947 to 2.1 billion tons a year and will increase to 2.7 billion during the 1979-2003 period. Coal, grain, chemicals, metallic ores and crude petroleum—Alaskan crude—will be the fastest growing commodities.

The economy and jobs of the Northeast are greatly dependent on our ability to move these goods, and we must take some serious steps to make sure our waterways are capable of handling this traffic. Because of these needs, I have a hard time supporting questionable projects like the Tennessee-Tombigbee, the Garrison diversion, and the Clinch River breeder reactor. The rivers of our Nation are a vast network requiring careful planning and coordination among all the interlocking pieces. My region of the country, whose economy so greatly depends on our rivers, must receive our fair share of the Nation's resources. I believe that these three projects, should they go ahead, would proceed at the ex-

pense of the waterway needs of the Northeast.

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE UNSOUND

I cannot support construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, at a cost of \$2 billion. The proposed route, connecting Tennessee with the Gulf of Mexico, would parallel two perfectly usable routes, the Mississippi River and an existing rail network. The costs, originally projected to be \$386 million, have now mushroomed to \$3 billion, an inexcusable cost overrun. The General Accounting Office, Congress investigative arm, has concluded that only 20 percent of the benefits projected through 1981 have actually materialized. And at this \$3 billion price tag, there will be no flood control, no improvement in water supplies, and no hydropower benefits. Finally, the legal status of this project is cloudy. On July 13, 1981, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit halted construction on the project, saying, "We find no solid evidence that the corps has ever asked the right question, much less answered it reasonably."

GARRISON DIVERSION: MORE PORK BARREL

I also opposed the Garrison diversion irrigation project in North Dakota, to delete \$4 million earmarked for the project for 1982. For this project, the taxpayer would be spending over \$3,300 per acre to be irrigated, \$810,000 per farm. Irrigators are scheduled to repay less than 3 percent of these costs. During these budget-tightening times, I cannot support this tax-free subsidy to a handful of people for a very questionable project.

The Garrison project too has legal problems. In May, a Federal district court judge ruled that construction could not continue prior to congressional reauthorization. Finally, this project is not welcomed by our Canadian friends across the border. In 1977, the International Joint Commission reported that the project would introduce pollution into Canada's waters.

CLINCH RIVER BREEDER: COST OVERRUNS OFF AND RUNNING

The Clinch River breeder project cannot meet the test of cost-effective Government spending in an effort to make our country energy self-sufficient.

In 1973 the project began as a cooperative agreement between a consortium of utilities and the Federal Government. At that time, the utilities agreed to contribute \$257 million or 61 percent of the total expense of \$422 million. Since then, however, the costs have ballooned to a total of \$3.2 billion. As the utility contribution has remained static, the Government share has grown to a point where the taxpayers are now paying 30 times more than what was originally agreed upon.

A graphic example of the cost growth in the Clinch River project is

described in a report recently issued by the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. This report points out, among other things, that original plans called for spending \$56 million on 11 generators; yet the first 2 purchased have already cost \$143 million.

Mr. Speaker, during this time of economic trouble we are asking the American public to make sacrifices in the form of reduced services and reduced assistance. It is clearly appropriate that the same budgetary scrutiny and discipline be applied to all Government activities.

If we are going to tighten the Federal spending belt, we must do it in all areas, and make sure that no sacred cow, no boondoggle goes unnoticed. In the area of waterways, we must be especially prudent. These projects are often very expensive and mammoth in scope. We must be especially sure that they are sound and do contribute to restoring the Nation's economic vitality.

SUPPORT FOR THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the record my strong support for the National Science Foundation and for its research programs in the areas of economical, biological, behavioral, and social sciences.

On July 21, 1981, when the House of Representatives was considering H.R. 4034, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1982, Mr. WINN offered an amendment to reduce the NSF's funding for these programs by \$70 million. I incorrectly voted for this amendment and now wish to clarify my position on this matter.

For the past 3 years, since my arrival in Washington, I have continuously supported the National Science Foundation and have consistently opposed any efforts to cut NSF's budget for research programs.

I firmly believe, that if this Nation is to retain its position as a major industrial and social force throughout the world, we can ill afford to neglect basic essential research programs. We are not talking of frivolous and meaningless activities. We are speaking of indepth studies which go to the core of the problems which plague us as a nation and a society, and which must be resolved if we are to continue to advance. Issues like: the national decline in productivity—causes and solutions; the monumental breakthroughs in technology and society's ability to

adapt and progress; methods of improving innovation in small business; women and minorities in the work force—trends and implications. These are but a few of the social and economic issues that we must fully understand in order to formulate sound and intelligent public policies.

Furthermore, if we are to improve the quality of life, we must increase our understanding of biological and behavioral matters. But this is basic research, as opposed to applied research, and must be funded, at least in part, by the Federal Government. We cannot expect the private sector to bear the full cost of such studies, nor would it be in our overall best interest for that to occur. The results of basic research are too unpredictable and require a large investment in time. Private firms cannot afford these risks; but more importantly, the successes are of such enormous consequences that no single firm should be allowed a monopoly on this knowledge. Thus it becomes a necessary and legitimate governmental role to fund biological and behavioral studies. Otherwise, how are we to learn more about what causes abnormalities in behavior and how to address mental and psychological problems? How are we to know what types of widespread behavioral reactions will result from changes in environment, changes in demographics? These are issues that will have a profound effect upon us. Who will conduct these studies if the NSF can no longer award grants to our universities for such?

These institutions of higher education are responsible for 80 percent of the basic research done in this Nation. The men and women who conduct these studies are dedicated to the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge. They must be allowed to continue their vital work without unnecessary restrictions being placed upon them due to unsound budgetary constraints. For this would lead to a diminution of necessary information on which decisions are based. And indeed, without adequate data and indepth analysis on which to decide public policy, we, as Members of Congress who must draw upon these resources, are likely to make the wrong decisions thereby compounding our problems and our costs.

I realize that we are in an era of budgetary restraints and that we must look for areas where we can reduce Federal expenditures. But, we can ill afford to make across the board cuts without looking carefully at the full ramifications of our actions.

I commend the HUD Appropriations Subcommittee on the NSF funding levels contained in H.R. 4034, and I commend the House for overwhelmingly rejecting the efforts to cut funds for NSF's basic research programs. I

wish this statement to represent my views on this matter, and to reconfirm my present and future commitment to our Nations research institution. ●

A SALUTE TO CHARLES V. CARR

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce to my colleagues in the House of Representatives a man of legendary stature in the city of Cleveland—Mr. Charles V. Carr. Mr. Carr is a giant of a figure in the city of Cleveland and is a fountain of wisdom for city politicians.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of Charles Carr's 30 years of public service, I think that this is an opportune occasion and forum to salute him with all the dignity he deserves. By this salute, I want Charles V. Carr to know that his services in the past have been appreciated and that he will be remembered forever by people from every walk of life in the Cleveland metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, even though Charles Carr normally shuns such praise, he is, in fact, a legend amongst the citizens and politicians in Cleveland. One only needs to reflect on the positive deeds and continuous service to the community during Charles V. Carr's life to see what an important and priceless person he has been to the city of Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, Charles Carr had the longest running career in the Cleveland City Council when he left that body in 1975. He was a wizard of city administration and particularly city finances. He also was the first black elected to a city council leadership position when he served as the council's majority leader. Currently, he is one of the senior members of the 10-member Regional Transit Authority board and perhaps the most respected member of that body.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, he has been the confidant of many politicians in the city of Cleveland. My brother, former Mayor Carl B. Stokes, relied on his advice and political wisdom often during his tenure. The current city council President George Forbes also has a great deal of respect for Charles Carr's opinion and advice.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles V. Carr has been characterized by some as having a computerlike mind and being a shrewd politician. That is the absolute truth. However, I would like to add that Charles V. Carr also is a man who throughout his career has dedicated himself totally and unselfishly to working on behalf of the city and its people. He did that on city council. Even today, he continues to display

those same commendable qualities as a member of the Regional Transit Authority board.

It is exactly this dedication and loyalty which has made Charles V. Carr a legend among the politically powerful and the electorate. At the same time, this dedication and commitment for the people has kept him alive and alert.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank Charles V. Carr for his service on behalf of all those people in Cleveland who have benefited from his wisdom and work. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Charles V. Carr. At this time, I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Charles V. Carr.

[From the Plain Dealer, May 25, 1981]

OLD FOX STILL SLY

(By Brent Larkin)

He is kept alive by a tiny pacemaker which steers the heart on a proper course. The hearing is fading, and what was once a walk is a slow shuffle.

The years have taken their toll on the man referred to as the old fox. The hospital stays are becoming more frequent, the public appearances few and far between. In view of these physical limitations, it would seem that, at 77, Charles V. Carr is perhaps a mere shadow of his former self.

But like the old story about judging a book by its cover, those still granted the rare opportunity of watching Carr in action marvel at the shrewd, computer-like mind which functions beneath the surface.

As one of the senior members of the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) board, Carr is perhaps the most respected of the 10-member panel.

"When he is up to par physically, Charlie is always the one who puts things into proper perspective, and the rest of the board members seem to fall right into line behind him," said one high-ranking RTA official. "When the chips are down, he's the best."

Further testimony to Carr's RTA wizardry came from old friend, Council President George L. Forbes, D-20.

"Leonard Ronis (RTA general manager) told me Charlie Carr is the most talented member of the board," said Forbes. "He knows finances backward and forward. He's slowed down physically, but mentally he's as sharp as ever."

But Carr shrugged off such praise as unnecessary flattery. "I just try to keep up with the younger members of the board," he said. "Public service is something that's in my blood—or what's left of my blood."

It has been nearly six years since a young upstart named Lonnie L. Burten sent shockwaves through Cleveland political careers by drawing the final curtain on the longest-running career in City Council history.

Over a 30-year period, Charlie Carr became an institution in council, representing the near East Side's Ward 12. Having ousted W. O. Walker from the council seat in 1945, Carr proceeded to serve 15 uninterrupted terms before being unseated in 1975.

Through the years, Carr earned the reputation in council as the master of city finances. He was a trusted adviser to former Council President Jack P. Russell, former Mayor Carl B. Stokes and to Forbes. He served a brief stint as council majority

leader, the first black to be elected to a council leadership position.

Yet, away from City Hall, Carr was continuously haunted by rumors of involvement in illegal numbers betting. In 1948, his house was bombed during what police officials described at the time as part of a war among rival numbers factions, and the rumors about Carr persisted for so long that they became accepted fact.

Carr shrugged off the numbers talk as gossip and the frustration of law enforcement officials who spent years attempting to prove his involvement in illegal gambling. But the closest they came was in 1975, when a federal court jury found Carr innocent of evading \$74,000 in income taxes. It was soon thereafter that the voters sent Carr into retirement, and Forbes rewarded him with a seat on the RTA board.

Today, Carr said he devotes all his working hours to RTA and the board of directors of a Chicago insurance company on which he serves. But he keeps a close watch on city politics through conversations with old friends. Of city government in 1981, Carr pronounced Mayor George V. Voinovich as unbeatable in this year's election.

"Voinovich is a smart man," he said. "I admire him a lot. He can do no wrong and has a great future."

"Forbes is the shrewdest man I've ever seen in council," said Carr. "He's a magician. He's the greatest I've seen at getting councilmen to do what he wants. They act like trained seals for him."

Carr said that, health permitting, he has no intention of stepping down from the RTA board.

"RTA has a bad image, but that's because we've depended too much on the federal government in the past for help and now those funds are being cut back," he said.

One who pays little attention to RTA matters is Stokes. But the former mayor warned that RTA officials would be wise to follow Carr's suggestions, whatever they might be.

"I never went wrong by relying on him, and I'm sure the RTA people wouldn't either," said Stokes. "Charlie Carr has seen it all. He knows all the players, and he comes up with the decisions that will work. He's the old fox. There's no one better." ●

RUDOLF HESS, POLITICAL PRISONER NO. 1—PART 2

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet succeeded in finding any sane explanation of why the United States cannot extricate itself from continued participation in a Soviet atrocity. Last Saturday, on August 1, American troops marched through West Berlin to Spandau Prison. Their mission is a shameful one—to prevent the release of the single 87-year-old inmate who had, on that day, begun his 14,694th consecutive day of captivity. By August 6, that will become a rounder number, 14,700 days.

Rudolf Hess, who flew to Britain hoping to make peace between Britain

and Germany, on May 10, 1941, has paid more horribly for that than anyone could have imagined. From that day to this, he has never known freedom. So long as the American Government chooses to comply with Soviet wishes, he will never even be permitted to embrace his wife and son, much less step into freedom.

During this month, then, American troops are participating once more in this Soviet atrocity. We are told that the Soviets would not like to see Hess freed because they would then be deprived of their six-times-a-year parade through West Berlin. Well, perhaps we could allow them to guard a totally empty prison—the absurdity would be no greater than it is now.

Our officials claim to be terribly worried about a "tit for tat," as they put it. We might, that is, have to endure a tit of Soviet retaliation if we inflicted the tat of ending this sickening atrocity.

One might hope that the U.S. Government includes a few people who could think their way around a tit for tat.

On July 31, I placed in the RECORD (pages 19273-19275) part I of a summary of the Hess case. This is part II.

On September 30, 1966, two of the remaining three war criminals in Spandau were released, yet appeals to include Hess as well, and bring to a close this entire episode, fell upon callous Soviet ears.

Thus, on October 1, 1966, Rudolf Hess entered upon a period of unparalleled solitude as the only prisoner in the 600-man prison. From that day until today, four supposedly great nations have continued the ponderous process of keeping an old man imprisoned. Forty years now, and three governments claim to be slaves to the whims of the fourth.

Hardly able to believe it, the Hess family and its lawyer, Dr. Albert Seidl, embarked upon a campaign to publicize the gratuitous cruelty exhibited by the so-called great powers. Frau Ilse Hess and Wolf Ruediger Hess issued a public statement which was addressed to the Pope, the World Council of Churches, and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The text appears below:

STATEMENT BY THE HESS FAMILY, OCTOBER 1, 1966

Frau Ilse Hess and Wolf Ruediger Hess, the only living relatives of Rudolf Hess, erstwhile Reichsminister, make public the following statement, which they have also addressed to His Holiness Paul VI, the Council of World Churches at Geneva, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights at Strasbourg, and the Heads of State of the four custodian powers:

After hoping for many weeks for the release of our husband and father, Rudolf Hess, a possibility which for the first time had left remoteness and approached to within the bounds of possibility, it has today, 1st October, 1966, to our greatest consternation, become certain that he is to

continue to be held in allied custody as a solitary prisoner. We are convinced that this cruel situation, hitherto unknown in the annals of modern law, was neither foreseen nor desired by the Nuremberg Court.

In the verdict it passed on 1st October, 1946, the Court exonerated Rudolf Hess of the charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity brought against him. The only count on which he was found guilty was based on the historical and political accusation that he had aided and abetted the preparations for and the implementation of a war of aggression. During the proceedings, Rudolf Hess withheld comment; we, as his next of kin, decline to put forward any argument.

Even those who acknowledge the verdict of the Court will appreciate the fact that Rudolf Hess hoped, by his act of personal courage in flying alone to Britain during the night of 10th May, 1941, to terminate hostilities. Since that night—more than a quarter of century ago—he has been in custody. It was not the intent of the Nuremberg Court to impose the maximum penalty; that is why he was not sentenced to death. In every civilized country, however, a life sentence is considered to have been duly served after fifteen to twenty-five years, and the practice at Spandau with regard to release has also thus far taken account of humanitarian points of view. Admiral of the Fleet Raeder and Walter Funk, Minister of Economics in the Third Reich, both, like Rudolf Hess, sentenced at Nuremberg to imprisonment for life, were returned to their families in 1955 and 1957 respectively to spend the waning years of their life on earth in peace; Baron von Neurath, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Third Reich, sentenced at Nuremberg to fifteen years, was also prematurely released—in 1954.

What is now about to begin in Spandau, however, in absolute solitude, constitutes, we feel, what is tantamount to a subsequent aggravation of the sentence originally imposed and is perhaps a more dreadful process of extinction even than the executions at Nuremberg—a process exercised on a septuagenarian.

We appeal to every man and woman who thinks humanly to protest against this martyrdom before it ends as it must, unless restrained.

During the next few years, the Hess family obtained statements from many leading British and American participants in the Nuremberg trials who agreed that 25 years in prison was long enough, that in civilized countries a life sentence was considered served in less time than that. Normal human decency says as much, as reflected in the shift of public opinion in favor of Hess.

The best American expression of opinion on this subject which appeared during these early efforts to reach a larger public appeared in Modern Age, a quarterly published by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute of Bryn Mawr, Pa. It reviews Hess' motives and expressly deals with the fact that Hess was not convicted of war crimes or crimes against humanity. Rather, Hess flew to Britain on a peace mission and is the only man in human history to be sentenced to life imprisonment for crimes against the peace.

It is so sad to note that the same editorial could be written today—nothing has changed during the past 12 years—but we do not see the paladins of human rights rising to the occasion at all. Rudolf Hess is surely the most senior political prisoner in the world, yet the humanitarians with access to the mass media ignore him. Perhaps that is because he is not a Communist.

EXCERPTS FROM "THE PRISONER OF SPANDAU," AN EDITORIAL IN MODERN AGE, SPRING 1969

(By Eugene Davidson)

The last of the Nuremberg prisoners and the last man to be the cause of military collaboration by the four powers whose common deployment has long been limited to Spandau, is Rudolf Hess, the man who . . . flew to Scotland on a self-appointed mission of peace to prevent the two Nordic powers, Britain and Germany, from shedding more of their precious blood. Hess told his British captors he saw unspeakable horrors ahead unless peace were made, he saw long lines of women grieving over the bodies of their uselessly slain in a conflict that was "suicidal for the white race." Convinced that only a dramatic gesture would bring an end to this civil war of the Germanic brothers he had flown to Britain without Hitler's knowledge but with the conviction that peace would be made if the British would only listen to him . . .

It is the ambiguities in the search for peace that have been his downfall. For Rudolf Hess is the only man in all history to be sent to prison—in Hess's case the sentence is for life—for having plotted to wage aggressive war and then to have waged it. The decision to make war has hitherto been regarded as an act of state, an impersonal act made on behalf of a government and its people, and it was only the Nuremberg Tribunal that stated this new and retroactive law that sent Hess to Spandau for as long as he lives.

[Hess had] agreed with Haushofer that a victorious Russia would mean the end of the British empire and the triumph of Communism on the continent of Europe. In any event, what Hess yearned for was the collaboration of Britain and the Reich. Germany would get its colonies back, control the continent of Europe, and would help preserve the British empire . . .

Many people including Goering thought Hitler had secretly sent Hess to Britain so that if the mission failed he could disavow it, and if it succeeded England would at last be out of the war. But this seems an unlikely hypothesis. It was unnecessary for the Fuehrer's deputy to fly to Britain to make contact with British representatives. Switzerland, Spain, Sweden were all used during the war for negotiations between nationals of the warring powers and Hitler had no need to place such high propaganda cards in the hands of the British to make his "peace offers" known. Hitler's propaganda chiefs could not possibly make any capital from the flight, but Churchill could not use it to full advantage either. Hitler was beside himself when he heard the news. Here was his deputy taking off on a private peace mission, a demonstration to all the world of political crack-pottedness in the Third Reich, and this at a time when the preparations for the war with the Soviet Union was going into high gear. "I hope he dives into the ocean," Paul Schmidt, Hitler's chief interpreter, heard Hitler say . . .

Hess was indicted on all four counts of the Nuremberg charges—on the two counts of plotting to wage and waging aggressive warfare and also of committing crimes against humanity and war crimes. On the latter two he was found not guilty but concerning his crimes against peace the Court was stern. Hess' signature appeared on the law of March 16, 1935, establishing compulsory military service, the Court said, and he had known how determined Hitler was to realize his ambitions and how little likely the Fuehrer was to refrain from resorting to force. Also the Court declared that Hess had been an informed and willing participant in the aggressions against Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. All this was the dogma of the New Revelation written under pressure of the gaseous notions of a world order to be administered by peace-loving nations; and imaginary order which had already broken down long before the end of the trial.

As for the Court's findings, how could it be criminal for any member of a government (Hess was a Minister in Hitler's Cabinet) to sign a bill establishing compulsory military service when every country in Europe had conscription? How could Hess have been aware of Hitler's belligerent intentions when Hitler himself shifted as opportunity offered from pro-Polish to anti-Polish, from years of denouncing the Soviet Union as the arch enemy to making a pact and even a short-lived military alliance with her? As for the aggression against Austria, the German soldiers were joined by Austrian units in their "flower march" and were received with wild enthusiasm by the rejoicing millions of this most pro-Nazi segment of the Germanic peoples. As for Czechoslovakia, she had been partitioned with the aid of Britain, France, and Italy in as legal a fashion as any nonviolent change of borders in Europe has ever been effected. And as for Poland, almost every serious writer on the subject of Germany's post-Versailles boundaries had said the next war would be likely to originate there in the land of the Corridor and of a Polish state that has existed in modern Europe only when either Russia or Germany or Austria-Hungary were unable to partition her or to bring her in one piece into the Slav or Germanic orbit. In any event Hess had had nothing to do with Hitler's orders to invade.

... Aggression like sin may be more readily identified than defined and despite the labors of recent generations of international lawyers its definition still eludes any formulation. It is what the enemy does, it is what those who disturb the status quo do, it is any move made by any power we dislike or fear and above all it is the notion that we can never be safe until the world is moulded in our own image. Hess, the man who flew to England to stop the war, committed no crimes whatever against peace, and it is unlikely that anyone in a position to act on behalf of a sovereign power commits such a crime as a personal indulgence, persuasive as it may seem to equate members of governments with common law breakers. Heads of state and their advisors act for better or worse, mainly it seems for worse, on behalf of their own people. To prepare an invasion of a neighboring country like Cuba, which has intercontinental missiles aimed at the United States supplied by a hostile foreign power, can be regarded either as self-defense or as an act of aggression and any decision as to which it is will depend more on one's ideology than "pure" legality. The Allies who put him in prison have long since

abandoned any notion of bringing post-Nuremberg aggressors to trial. . . . Only this extraordinary precedent of the case of Rudolf Hess who flew off to stop the war and so landed in prison for the rest of his life, remains, for a time at least, a living reminder of the mental aberrations of those presumably sane people in high places who were building a world order of law and peace no wider than the Nuremberg courtroom.

In November 1969, Hess fell ill at Spandau, suffering the effects of a perforated ulcer—yet the Kremlin-dominated Soviet doctor vetoed his removal to the hospital for 5 days. At last Hess was moved to the British military hospital nearest to Spandau, and was successfully treated.

His recovery was slow, however, until a visit from his family was arranged. Hess had not wanted his family to visit him under prison conditions, especially Soviet-imposed Spandau conditions, which involve the physical humiliation of visitors, regardless of age or sex. But, facing the likelihood of dying soon without ever seeing them again, Hess relented and the visit took place on Christmas eve in the British military hospital. Naturally, it was marred as far as possible by the Soviets. The heartless rules they impose mean that Frau Hess, who has been faithful to her husband through the long and often extremely unpleasant years since 1941, has yet to be permitted to touch her husband. Nor has Hess ever been allowed to embrace his son, who he had not then seen since the boy was 3 years old. If the Soviet Government has its way, they will never be able to touch each other.

Actually, it tells us nothing which the experience of tens of millions of other people over the years since 1917 have not tried desperately to tell us about how Communists treat people when they have them helpless.

Because the visit took place at the hospital, there was some journalistic coverage despite the draconian gag rule imposed upon the family. Coming as it did in the holiday season, British and European public opinion was roused to considerable sympathy; 96 percent of Britons polled, in December 1969, favored the release of Hess. Nearly 200 Members of Parliament eventually, over the next few months, braved the slings and arrows reserved for anyone who tries to help any person bearing the Nazi label by signing a statement supporting Hess' right to freedom at long last.

In March of 1970, a discussion of the Hess case took place in the House of Lords. Beneath the various titles of those speaking lay government officials and former intelligence and Foreign Office veterans, nearly all with some first-hand familiarity with the case. Each in turn deplored what was being done to Hess, and most then followed the standard Western excuse for being part of it.

The standard excuse, from that day to this, is that the four-power agreement governing the status of Berlin is incredibly fragile and beyond price. A unilateral transfer or release of Hess, we are told, would bring upon us unnamed horrors which are nowhere laid out in any detail. The evocation of vague, murky, ponderous threats, inevitably left without supporting detail, could lead toward the suspicion that the actual dangers are overdrawn, but are summoned to screen a mere reluctance to shake the status quo.

By the end of 1970, all efforts had come to nothing, because the Soviet Government is not merely impervious to public opinion, both domestic and foreign, but because it serves the interests of political terrorism, the basis of Soviet rule, to be perceived as relentlessly vindictive.

The West German Government can do nothing except to pay the bills. West Germany is not yet a free and sovereign state, because among other things, no free and sovereign state would budget tax money, year after year, for the maintenance of a political prison which it does not control and does not want. But the German people are still required—not by, but through their Government—to pay for Spandau.

Dr. Seidl, the family lawyer, has constantly peppered every possible person or group which could bring influence to bear to end what one critic has called this macabre theatrical performance: The futility of appealing to organizations like the World Council of Churches or Amnesty International or the United Nations High Commission on Human Rights can be imagined, but in this case it has been experienced. The United Nations, by the way, ducked behind the enemy state clauses, articles 53 and 107, of the United Nations Charter, to maintain that, 35 years after the end of World War II, the winners still have the right to do anything they like to the losers. Those articles were inserted to make certain that none of the idealistic vaporings of the period interfered with the business of vengeance.

Life in Spandau is divided into monthly guard turns, when each country in turn provided the luckless platoon of soldiers who must man the grim brickpile within which a single man is buried alive. The American guard turn is the months of April, August, and December. Each such month represents opportunity to end our own dishonor. We have completed 44 guard turns since Hess has been in solitary at Spandau. Forty-four times our Government has lacked the courage to do the elementally decent thing.

Will August mark the 45th consecutive demonstration of that fundamental failing? ●

TRIBUTE TO FRED J. KROLL

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, last week the labor movement lost a courageous and dedicated leader with the passing of Fred J. Kroll, international president of the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express & Station Employees (BRAC).

Time magazine cited this fine man in its "Fifty Faces for the Future" story in 1979 as one of those who possessed "the sense of boldness that remains the prime prerequisite for leadership." In this instance they were describing Kroll's efforts to make the labor movement more attractive for younger workers by encouraging greater initiative at the local level.

This was only one of Fred's achievements and as an active and conscientious member of the brotherhood for 28 years, his record of such achievements is long and impressive. He played a key role in shaping the legislation that led to the creation of Conrail. He spearheaded the April 29 rail labor rally in Washington opposing the administration's budget-cutting policies with regard to Conrail and Amtrak. Throughout March and April, he worked tirelessly in testifying before Congress urging that adequate funding for the two railroads be restored. And, shortly before his death, congressional conferees adopted legislation to insure the continuation of Conrail and Amtrak and to provide a solution to the financially ailing railroad retirement system.

Fred Kroll was recognized from his earliest days as a trade unionist as a skilled and determined negotiator. The Norfolk & Western strike in 1978 lasted 82 days and led Business Week magazine to call him "the maverick leader who bested the N. & W." Kroll described the precedent-setting strike as one that "let the railroads know we are an aggressive union, that we mean business and that we have the support of our people."

He first became president of BRAC in 1976 to complete an unexpired term of office and was reelected president by acclamation at BRAC's 1979 Toronto convention. When he was elected a member of the AFL-CIO's executive council in 1978, he became the youngest person ever to be named a federation vice president. Assuming a leadership position within the ranks of rail labor, Kroll was elected chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association in February 1980.

It was a relatively short career as president for the Philadelphia-born son from a trade union family. He traveled a long distance from his days

as an IBM machine operator of the former Pennsylvania Railroad and active involvement in Quaker City Lodge 587. Along the way he made friends and countless contributions to the lives of union members and strength of the union movement. This man who once described himself as a "reasonable militant" leaves behind a great legacy.

We will miss him. As *Next* magazine said in its April 1981 profile, Fred J. Kroll was one of the "fivescore Americans who has the potential to achieve substantial power over the minds and lives of their fellow citizens during this decade." The potential ended on July 30. In 45 years he had proven himself a winner in many a battle, but there was one last courageous battle with leukemia he could not win.

I know my colleagues join with me in extending deepest sympathy to his wife Hildegard, his daughters Karen, Anita, and Michele and his parents Fred and Catherine and brothers Albert, John, and Joseph. Many of us who were privileged to know and work with Fred Kroll share their grief. ●

DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT

HON. JOHN BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1981, I introduced legislation at the request of many sport fishing organizations to expand the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act. That bill is now being considered in the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, which I chair.

George Reiger, the noted columnist for *Field and Stream* magazine, has written a thoughtful article on sport fishing in America that highlights many of the problems facing recreational fishing that I commend to my fellow Members' attention.

[From *Field & Stream*, June 1981]

SPORT FISHING IN AMERICA

(By George Reiger)

An unprecedented conference on the future of sport fishing in America was held March 4 on Capitol Hill. Its purpose was to elicit the support of the U.S. Congress and the Reagan Administration for an expended Dingell-Johnson Fund that would include a 3 percent tax on the factory price of boats less than 25 feet long (excluding hydroplanes, kayaks, and sailboats), outboard and electric trolling motors, boat trailers, fish finders (including depth sounders and temperature devices), outriggers, downriggers, fishing chairs, rod belts, harnesses, gaffs, nets, and other angling accessories.

The present Dingell-Johnson fund is woefully inadequate in meeting the rising costs of building launch ramps, artificial reefs, and hatcheries; acquiring property and easements for angling access; and conducting

fisheries research and restoration programs. The current 10 percent tax on rods, reels, and terminal tackle does not even cover your fishing line or the tackle box in which you pack your gear!

Thus, while the average American angler spends many hundreds of dollars per year on his recreation, he contributes well under a dollar in taxes specifically earmarked to improve his angling opportunities and to maintain the resources that make his recreation possible. By comparison, hunters pay between six and ten times as much per capita toward the perpetuation of their sport through the Pittman-Robertson Fund.

More than 100 senators and representatives turned up at the conference, along with Vice President George Bush, who pledged the Administration's support. However, the battle is just beginning. Several leading boat and motor manufacturers are opposed to anything that will increase their products' base price—even though there would be no market at all for their products without wholesome and productive waters to use them on!

Unfortunately, such short-sighted business considerations are not unique to boat and motor manufacturers. Back in the mid-1930's, when the Pittman-Robertson Fund was being created, certain arms and ammunition manufacturers fought like fury against the proposed tax with some of the same kind of arguments that are used by the boat and motor people today.

For example, "The nation is in an economic slump; it's the wrong time to propose another tax." (When is it ever the right time to propose another tax?)

Or "why should target shooters have to share the tax burden with hunters?" Today, it's "Why should water skiers have to share the burden with fishermen?"—as though target shooters never hunt and water skiers never fish!

All of the manufacturers who originally fought the Pittman-Robertson Fund now march at the head of the parade extolling its virtues and their part—although manufacturers don't pay the tax; hunters do!—in restoring wildlife in America. Hopefully, boat and motor manufacturers will soon be heading a similar parade on behalf of fisheries restoration.

My job at the conference was keynote speaker, and I began with a thought that had occurred to me the day before on my trip into Washington, D.C. As I drove across the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, I saw a great flock of whistling swans flying north along the Kent Island shoreline. Those birds would be obvious harbingers of spring everywhere they pass on their way up the Susquehanna before bending west to Canada. Migrating swans, geese, and ducks remind people that a new season is beginning—that throughout the temperate and sub-Arctic zones, life has begun to stir again.

Yet in the waters of the Chesapeake, other harbingers were on the move. They are not noticed by poets and politicians, so the miracle of their renewal has few artists and writers championing their cause. They do not pass in clamorous ranks to stir the imaginations of ordinary people.

Yet the unseen migrations of herring, shad, eels, and the striped bass are no less majestic than the migrations of birds, and no less apt symbols of spring. Certainly fishes are more important to the ecological and economic well-being of the areas they frequent than the here-today, gone-tomorrow waterfowl.

However, what most men cannot easily see, they cannot easily imagine, wonder at, or worry about. And each spring, the seeing becomes a little more difficult for most aquatic resources.

That is why there is a more important harbinger of spring than all the flights of swan, blackbirds singing in a marsh, or blooming redbuds—a harbinger that is readily perceived by anyone, and that should be viewed with increasing respect by politicians and economists.

I'm referring, of course, to the recreational fishermen, and whether he fishes for perch in a New England lake, for suckers in a Midwestern river, for trout in a Rocky Mountain stream, or for mackerel on the cold green waters of the Atlantic, he is as much a part of the seasonal landscape as his unseen prey.

In a sense, the fisherman is a seer, for his experience and imagination enable him to see things that other people cannot; and his optimism and energy enable him to prove that such wonderful things exist.

Where nature's first green is gold, the fisherman is there to share its wealth. When sunlight first thickens with the luxury of lengthening days, the fisherman is there to watch it scintillate from the ripples on a snow-fringed stream or burst through icy spray hurled against the coast.

Even in the seemingly endless summer of the Florida Keys, the pace of life begins to quicken when fishermen report the first daisy-chaining tarpon sculling their serpentine shadows across the dazzling flats.

Too often man perceives himself as something outside nature—an exception to its rules and a voyeur to its beauties. This describes the mode of those content to dip into national parks and view wildlife through rolled-down car windows. But it does not describe the angler.

In order to derive the most pleasure from his outings, the fisherman must immerse himself in his environment—sometimes literally. Stream fishermen prefer wading to walking the margins; surf fishermen turn their backs on the safety of the strand for the surge of the surf; and bass fishermen—contrary to the popular picture of them racing hell-bent-for-leather across the surface of placid lakes—are happiest when they've worked themselves back into a moss-hung slough where the biggest bass in the state should be living—if she has any esthetic sense, that is!

In matters affecting water quality, the recreational fisherman serves society the way the canary serves the miner. No one understands the cycles of aquatic life as microcosms of human life so well as the educated angler. His concern for healthy fish and compatible waters next season, and the season after that, has saved more than one river from thoughtless foresters, arrogant industrialists, and ignorant bureaucrats. By the example of his commitment, the angler has helped make many such men—and in the process, himself—a little less thoughtless, arrogant, and ignorant.

In *The Infinite River*, biologist and fisherman William H. Amos describes how each brook originates in the sun-heated seas, and how the ocean's gift is transfigured by clouds and rain to mist glistening on a rod and beading briefly at the tip before dropping and merging with the one immortality of which all men are certain.

Each angler has his favorite environment among the many ecosystems in which fish are found. Some prefer the sight of snow-capped mountains while they ply a broad

river with a fly rod; others like the domain and sanctuary-sense of cane-pole bobbing in a farm pond.

I'm an estuaries and ocean man myself—but only a fool, or a non-angler, would perceive such preferences as mutually exclusive. Water is the matrix of life, and it binds each ecosystem to the other and binds them all to the angler's soul. Any fisherman knows that when we're not near the waters we love and fish, we fish and love the waters we're near.

Yet all is not well with most of our favorite ecosystems, and, like the miner's canary, recreational fishermen have been earnestly telling the rest of society about it. The majority seem to be listening, but as often happens with people who achieve power, many of our politicians and industrialists have lost the acute sense of hearing that once gave them their power.

Dammers and channelizers continue to pore over maps to find free-flowing waters to homogenize and pasteurize; careless farming and industrial practices over-enrich some waters, sterilize others, or just plain poison still others; developers put up PRIVATE—KEEP OUT signs along every foot of coast, until their building schemes run afoul of Mother Nature's commonsense, and the developers begin sobbing for public money to pay off these bad gambling debts.

Tragically, Uncle Sam not only antes up the money under such euphemistic guises as "flood plain insurance" payments and "beach nourishment," but he also underwrites the continuing search for markets for what he calls "under-utilized fishery resources."

Now, whenever you hear a bureaucrat use the word underutilized, you know that (a) the resource to which he refers will sooner or later be a candidate for a threatened or endangered species list, because (b) the bureaucrat doesn't know the first thing about its ecological requirements, and because (c) commercial exploiters, by and large, don't care.

Open most any contemporary magazine and discover how our lack of political, economic, and biological restraint continues to erode America's once-vaunted Quality of Life.

American Forests magazine points out that for the supposed safety of U.S. drivers, one-tenth of all the world's annual salt production is dumped on our winter highways. Adverse rebates include slick and hazardous films left on pavements by dissolved salts, contaminated aquifers and reservoirs all across the nation and into Canada, and dying trees and fishes by the countless thousands during spring runoff.

Rail used to be the ultimate symbol of life, but besides overdoses of salt, freshwater fishes must now contend with sulfuric acid transported in our overindustrialized skies. The February issue of *Natural History* magazine documents how this problem was first noted by a Norwegian fisheries inspector in 1959, and how despite a growing number of articles concerned with the problem over the past two decades—including an award-winning piece by Field & Stream's Ed Zern—our elected officials continue to waffle on clean air standards, and every year more unsuitable factories continue to operate and more unsuitable power plants are built. As a consequence, with every year, more lakes, rivers, and streams throughout the Northern Hemisphere continue to die.

It is pathetic to consider that concerned anglers were once able to help the Atlantic salmon in its battle for survival with Danish

drift-netters, and that we continue to help this beleaguered species in its fight with coastal gill-netters and river poachers, but that we are helpless without support from our elected leaders during this, the most far-reaching war of all, in which countless salmon eggs, larvae and parr are destroyed before their first taste of the sea.

Finally, there is the endless, but increasingly passionate, story of water in the West. Since all life is based on water, so is all wealth. But what we in the East have long taken for granted, and even complained about—our humidity—some Westerners have literally committed murder to acquire. In these emotional, and often violent, arguments over who has the greater right to water—the farmers and ranchers who live near the source, or the majority living in cities many hundreds of arid miles away—the instream flow needs of aquatic life are often ignored.

In the allegedly farsighted plans for the Columbia River Basin, not one politician or engineer paused to compare the promises of fifty years of irrigation and power with the immense values of food and recreation from the river system as it was—without spending one public dime.

Sad to relate, the once-mighty Columbia and its tributaries had the capacity to feed more people more high-quality protein than will ever be possible by diverting its precious waters into irrigation pipes for farmers and ranchers.

Oh, sure, I know fishing is fine in many parts of the country. However, these areas are still good either because man has used his knowledge and skills to maintain local waters, or because man has found substitutes for missing resources.

Take the Chesapeake, for example. Fishing is great these days because Sciaenids such as weakfish, drum, croaker, and spot have moved in vast numbers into the lower bay to take the place of the vanished striped bass, and bluefish have moved into the middle bay to provide recreation for trollers and chummers who also once counted on the missing striper.

A multi-million-dollar program is underway to find out what happened to the striped bass. That knowledge may give us the opportunity to restore this magnificent food and game fish to the mid-Atlantic region and New England.

Yet what about the Sciaenids? Do we know enough about their life histories and ecological needs to prevent them from vanishing, as they periodically tend to do?

What about bluefish? They, too, experience cycles of abundance and scarcity. In fact, they are somewhat overdue for decline.

Are such cycles inevitable? What role does man play in these cycles? Why have we not worked out a management plan for this species in advance of seeking new markets for its products? Is it possible for man to learn anything at all from experience and history?

And so we approach the bottom line: The angler's responsibility to the resources he exploits. In the past, we either bought an inexpensive license to fish in freshwater, or no license at all to fish along the Atlantic coast. Many anglers seemed to view the freshwater license as a kind of an absolute: By paying a \$1 or \$2 fee, we consigned to the states our obligations to the resources.

Many fishermen still think this way. Yet not all states are equally competent as custodians, and even those that are working

with shrinking budgets and, rising costs. Broader bases for funding must be found.

Still, our fisheries crisis offers opportunity as well as adversity. After all, there are many areas and ways in which fisheries management can be improved and for which the ordinary angler should demand improvement. This is painfully evident in marine recreational fishing.

Of course, part of the problem is that appointed officials take their cues from elected officials, and elected officials know that fish don't vote. People who like to fish vote, but if many fishermen still complain about paying even a token share of the cost of research and maintaining resources, why should politicians care?

The word recreation means just that: Recreation. It is absolutely essential to our souls to have recreation, and anywhere between 40 and 75 million Americans derive significant portion of their annual recreation from fishing.

Yet the very fact that angling proponents don't know exactly how many of us there are is the politician's clue that we are not a very potent political force to reckon with.

Any politician is familiar enough with generalities, vague promises, and hyperbole to know that the only thing that really matters to his continuing occupancy of public office is a body of organized constituents willing and able to write letters, appear in court, and fight for their vested interests.

In other words, the people with political clout are those who are willing to pay something, not to have somebody else do their dirty work for them, but as testament of their willingness to take on greater burdens themselves. Squeaky hinges get oil, but only after they prove themselves worthy of the oil.

Thus, the two principal objectives of the Washington conference on the Dingell-Johnson Fund were to discuss ways to get more "oil"—the kind that will give American anglers energy independence long before the rest of the nation achieves that elusive goal—and to discuss whether there are ways we can build better "hinges."

For example, I'd like to see a genuine bluefin tuna management plan. But I know I won't see one until the hypocritical and ecologically disastrous tuna exemption in the 200-miles-fisheries law is eliminated. And I don't see a management plan even then until biologists pull together all that they know about this resource, decide what still has to be learned, learn it, and then allot the bluefin's annual surplus optimally—meaning with the welfare of the oceanic environment along with the sustained yield of the resource in mind.

Naturally, none of these things is possible without a recreational saltwater fishing license. Representative John Breaux of Louisiana recently introduced a bill for such a license. Since the Atlantic coastal states have refused to act, it is sadly, but inevitably, time for the federal government to create its own omnibus measure for making coastal anglers accountable to themselves and to our coastal resources. At the same time saltwater anglers are long overdue their fair share of the rebates from the Dingell-Johnson Fund.

A bluefin tuna management plan, just one of dozens critically needed, requires not only more money, but more thoughtful participation by anglers. Sadly, there are still too many fishery administrators who want less of our participation, and too many anglers who believe themselves too busy to participate.

I said at the outset that anglers are like seers in their ability to envision wonders to which others are blind. Yet in ancient mythology, seers themselves are depicted as blind. The idea was that after superficial sight is eliminated, a person may then be able to perceive things as they really are.

Hopefully, the conference on the future of sport fishing will help us perceive the fact that we are at an economic and political crossroads. Even more important, we are at a crossroads with the very resources that make our recreation, and—in turn—our revitalization and wisdom, possible.

William Shakespeare, evidently no stranger either to fishing or the sea, said it succinctly nearly 400 years ago:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which taken at the flood leads on to fortune;

"Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries

"On such a full sea are we now afloat

"And we must take the current when it serves,
"Or lose our venture."

Gentlemen and ladies, that tide is now. We need your support. Write your representatives and senators and ask them to vote for HR. 2250 and S. 546. These bills are the future of sport fishing in America. ●

CRITICAL DECISION ON MIDDLE EAST

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, in the very near future, this body will be called upon to make a critical decision which will have great impact in shaping the future of the Middle East. Congress will have to decide whether the United States should arm Saudi Arabia with AWAC's aircraft, Sidewinder missiles and other materiel. I hope that Congress will not acquiesce to the administration's new strategy of using Saudi cooperation in Lebanon as a justification for the AWAC sale. While laudable, these are separate issues and must be considered as such. The fact remains that the AWAC sale is not in the national interest of the United States. That must remain the bottom line, sole consideration.

I have already voiced my opposition to the AWAC sale for several reasons. First, Saudi cooperation in the recent Lebanese crisis notwithstanding, Saudi Arabia has done little to advance the peace process in the Middle East and remains an implacable foe of Israel. The Saudis have opposed the Camp David peace accords and the Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty. The kingdom remains in a state of war with Israel. And Saudi princes have rejected any restriction on the use of their military equipment.

Second, from the standpoint of American security interests the transfer of AWAC technology to a region whose long-term stability is in serious question makes little sense. This tech-

nology represents the highest, most advanced state of the art, and needs to remain under American control. It is sobering to reflect, in this connection, that the last time the sale of AWAC's was contemplated it was the Shah of Iran that was the intended recipient.

Mr. Speaker, during the last month Saudi actions have further proven the folly of providing Saudi Arabia with this military hardware. The desert kingdom has vowed to "bear the cost of rebuilding the Iraqi nuclear reactor * * * to shoulder its responsibilities in full." And last week, Saudi Arabia pledged to add an additional \$20 million to the hundreds of millions of dollars it already gives to the PLO.

These Saudi actions as well as the recent events in the Middle East reinforce my opposition to the sale of offensive military hardware to Saudi Arabia. The region is just too volatile, the Arab animosity to Israel is just too great, and the threat to our Nation's security is just too dangerous. I join the hundreds of my colleagues who stand opposed to the sale. ●

VIETNAM VETERANS OF SOUTH BOSTON

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, over 20 years have passed since the first young Americans were killed in Vietnam. When that grueling struggle finally ended, 57,000 American men and women had lost their lives. Equally important, however, are the estimated 9 million Vietnam-era veterans who have returned to civilian life.

No brass bands and cheering crowds greeted these men and women on their arrival. They returned to a nation that was desperately trying to forget the horror and the trauma of the Vietnam war. The Vietnam veteran went to a war which, in most cases, he did not understand. He came back to a peace where he found either an indifference or a contempt for the military service he felt compelled to perform.

The Vietnam war was an unpopular war, a war which incurred a great deal of suffering, not only on the battlefields, but also in the hearts of many Americans. It was altogether understandable that a majority of Americans were more than happy to put the war squarely behind them. But wars do not end when the shooting stops. They live on in the lives of those who fought. They live on in the lives of those who are survivors and dependents of those who lost their lives in war.

But most of all they live on and on in the memories of those who have served—who have given their best for

this country. That is why this Nation should never forget, because the veteran never forgets.

The men and women who served in the war brought back with them pain and problems—rage and guilt, sorrows and confusions—that have gone ignored and unattended for years. Now, at last, they are commanding our attention.

The Reagan administration's plans to cut \$131 million out of veterans' counseling, employment, and education programs met with considerable criticism from all sectors of the population. Editorial writers pointed out the hypocrisy of increasing defense spending while cutting out veterans' benefits and many veterans angrily stated that they would never let their sons fight for a country which victimizes and betrays its soldiers upon their return to civilian life.

Last month, the House of Representatives approved a number of bills which give Vietnam-era veterans long-deserved benefits.

But legislation can only make a dent in the Vietnam veteran's profound sense of exclusion, his bruised conviction that America has done him wrong. What is needed is a change in the attitude of the American public toward the individual Vietnam veteran. Unless the sacrifice they selflessly made for this country is acknowledged, younger Americans will be left with the inescapable impression that military service merely invites contempt.

A symbolic change in attitude toward veterans did begin last January. The lavish welcome home that America proffered the hostages filled many vets with a sense of maddening unfairness. It awakened in them a sense of aggressive pride, unencumbered by the old shame of the loser. For the first time, Vietnam veterans began insisting that they are an important resource for the Nation, not an embarrassment. Despite the fact that they are among the business, professional, and everyday people whose contributions to the community make up the news columns, one is never identified as a Vietnam veteran until he robs a store or shoots someone. The result has been the perpetration of the myth that Vietnam veterans are walking time bombs that cannot be trusted. It is about time that we changed the myth.

The men who went to Vietnam deserve much more than a guilt complex from their countrymen. The vast majority of them went, not willingly, but because their country called. And when they got there, the vast majority performed the same acts of valor and bravery that American soldiers have in every other war. So let us honor those men, not as poor unfortunate victims, but as we honored soldiers of past wars.

South Boston, Mass., lost 25 of its sons in the Vietnam war. This is the highest figure for a community of South Boston's size anywhere in the State of Massachusetts, and ranks among the top five in the Nation. A committee of South Boston Vietnam veterans was created over 3 years ago with the intention of erecting a fitting memorial to those 25 brave men. Both veterans and neighbors felt it their moral responsibility to pay homage to the memory of their brothers, to let their sacrifice be known forever to the people of the community, and on September 13, 1981, their goal will be realized.

Their effort not only bears witness to the depth of South Boston's spirit, but it stands as a forerunner to the larger national memorial which will be completed in Washington within the next 2 years. It is an outstanding example of the people of this Nation re-assessing their attitude toward those who served in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to those 25 men from my community who gave their lives for this country by having their names recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They are:

VIETNAM VETERANS OF SOUTH BOSTON

Joseph Agri, Lance Corporal, United States Marine Corps.

Charles Bazzinotti, First Lieutenant, United States Army.

Richard Borovick, Specialist 4th Class, United States Army.

John Calhoun, Lance Corporal, United States Marine Corps.

John Cole, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

Paul Daley, Specialist 6th Class, United States Army.

Ronald Delverde, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

Joseph Desmond, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

Joseph Dunn, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

Devon Enman, Sergeant, United States Army.

Eugene Grover, Staff Sergeant, United States Marine Corps.

Francis Hubisak, Private First Class, United States Army.

Douglas Itri, Specialist 5th Class, United States Army.

John Jacobs, Corporal, United States Marine Corps.

John Joyce, Corporal, United States Army.

Edward Milan, Sergeant, United States Air Force.

James O'Toole, Private First Class, United States Army.

Burton Peterson, Lance Corporal, United States Marine Corps.

Paul Sheehan, First Sergeant, United States Marine Corps.

Edward Sullivan, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

James Stewart, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

Edward Stone, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

Joseph Thomas, Private First Class, United States Marine Corps.

Donald Turner, Lance Corporal, United States Marine Corps.

James Wheeler, Specialist 6th Class, United States Army.

Those men, who were diverse in age, education, and interests, all shared one common ingredient—a loyalty and devotion to God and country. They went to war because their country called, and they made the ultimate sacrifice for something they believed in. That is why they deserve to be remembered. Those 25 young men who were friends of my family and me, as well as the entire South Boston community should be honored as positive examples of true patriotism during a period of profound uncertainty. ●

RESOLVING THE MONO LANDS ISSUE

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which is intended to resolve a longstanding issue between the city of Los Angeles and Mono County, Calif. Back in 1936, when the city of Los Angeles was building its Mono Basin aqueduct project, Congress passed a law authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to Los Angeles certain public lands and grant to the city rights-of-way over public lands in Mono County. Los Angeles has had, since 1944, applications pending before the Department of Interior for the purchase of 23,850 acres of Federal land. For many years now, a cloud has hung over the status of this land and officials from Mono County and the city of Los Angeles have worked together to resolve this issue. This bill, which is the product of that effort, will repeal the 1936 act while at the same time it will retain for the city the rights-of-way it needs to insure the operation of its project.

Mr. Speaker, while the purpose of this bill is to resolve the Mono lands issue, the Mono Lake issue cannot be overlooked. The situation at Mono Lakes needs to be addressed. It is my hope that a long-term solution which will protect this environmental resource will be achieved. This solution should not, however, come at the expense of the southern California ratepayers. The first step in finding this solution must be a careful and comprehensive study of problems at Mono Lake. The bill I am introducing directs the Secretary of the Interior to work cooperatively with the city of Los Angeles to study the effects on Federal lands and natural resources of the continued operation of the city's Mono Basin aqueduct project.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my California colleagues who have joined me in

sponsoring this legislation and I look forward to working with all of the interested parties in resolving both the Mono lands issue and the Mono Lake issue.●

INDOCHINESE REFUGEE GROUP ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, Oregon has opened its doors to more than 15,000 refugees from Southeast Asia. About 10,000 of these refugees rely on services provided through the Indochinese refugee group assistance program. Its services include the teaching of English and employment training. This program is a lifeline to refugees and their families who are struggling to adjust to a new culture and overcome the hurdles that lie between them and productive, independent lives.

Sadly, this program has been handicapped by unpredictable and inconsistent management by the Reagan administration. State program administrators in Oregon have no assurance from one quarter to the next that Federal allocations will be received—even though Oregon welcomed refugees from Southeast Asia on the basis of assurances that the Federal Government would share in the costs of resettlement, adjustment, and education.

One out of every four calendar quarters the Government has been so tardy in meeting its commitments that Oregon has had to turn to its congressional delegation for help. I am acutely aware of the problems because I have had to prod the Department of Health and Human Services time and time again.

Whether it is ineptness at HHS or a begrudging attitude toward refugee assistance, I really cannot say. As recently as May, I wrote to Secretary Schweiker asking for his personal attention to the State of Oregon and the overall management of the refugee assistance program. I pointed out that the shortsighted policy of limiting and delaying funds would have severe consequences.

Meanwhile, Oregon's third-quarter allocation for this fiscal year was unaccountably postponed. Under law, program administrators in Oregon ultimately were forced to send out termination notices to refugees.

The Department of Health and Human Services needs to know that it is manipulating people, not just numbers. Its accounting practices create uncertainty and have grave human consequences.

In the case of Shue Long Vue, a 62-year-old refugee from Laos, the conse-

quences were tragic and irremediable. Two years ago, Mr. Vue and his family joined the exodus of people fleeing political repression and genocide in Southeast Asia. They found sanctuary in Oregon.

Mr. Vue and his family were among the refugees receiving help through the Indochinese refugee group assistance program. A week ago, Shue Long Vue opened his mail to find a notice that financial aid would not be forthcoming. He was devastated by the news. He literally lost hope. In the early morning hours of Monday, July 27, Mr. Vue committed suicide.

Two weeks before Mr. Vue's death, the State notified the Department that termination notices would have to go out if funds were not forthcoming at once.

There is an ironic twist to this tragedy. Just hours after Mr. Vue's death, State administrators announced that the Federal Government was sending the State's allocation. Oregon now has \$2.6 million to keep the refugee assistance program in operation. Mr. Vue's family has been notified that help has been restored, and their grief is deepened by the knowledge that Mr. Vue's death was pointless.

In the aftermath of Mr. Vue's death, in the Indochinese community in Portland, a connection is being drawn between this death and the evident restoration of assistance hours afterward. In the refugee community, the question is being asked: Are suicides required to assure that help will be continued? These are people who have known unimaginable hardships, who are prepared to make sacrifices they believe are necessary and honorable for the sake of their families.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services needs to know this. The Secretary needs to understand the potential consequences in the Asian refugee community of administrative delays and holdups. I am not sure this is understood by the Secretary or his Department, or that he cares. The Secretary has not been responsive. I have not heard from him.

I wonder if he has heard about Shue Long Vue.●

DELAWARE COUNTY'S IDEA MAN

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend "Delaware County's Idea Man," Mr. Carl Mau. Throughout his 40 years in the area, Carl has been in the forefront of leadership of many charitable and civic activities. He has raised countless thousands of dollars for the less fortunate, particularly those left

destitute by the Johnstown flood and the Italian earthquakes. He has organized a program that recruits clergymen to give the opening prayer at county council meetings. Carl's notable record of service to his fellow man has been acknowledged through the many awards that he has won; the Philadelphia Bulletin's "Jefferson Award," the Delaware County Jaycee's "Man of the Year" award, and the Associated Press plaque for outstanding radio broadcasting. But as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am most proud of the work that Carl Mau has done on behalf of the brave men who have served our country in the military. Mr. Mau's distinguished contributions have been recognized most recently by the Pennsylvania chapter of the American Legion, who have bestowed on him the high honor of the "1981 Distinguished Service Medal." For these accomplishments, and other too numerous to mention, I would like to thank Carl Mau for his service to Delaware County, and to express my best wishes for his future.●

A SALUTE TO DR. NOLEN ELLISON

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to my colleagues an exceptional educator in the city of Cleveland—Dr. Nolen Ellison. As president of the rapidly expanding Cuyahoga Community College, Dr. Ellison simultaneously is a symbol of educational opportunity in Cleveland and a bulwark in the community.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ellison has worked tirelessly in planning the growth in physical facilities and academic reputation of the three-campus Cuyahoga Community College. His energetic and ambitious labor has reaped the fruits of accessible and quality educational opportunities for individuals in every economic class and age group in the Cleveland metropolitan area through the Cuyahoga Community College.

Appropriately Mr. Speaker, this achievement has brought recognition and accolades to Dr. Ellison. Even though he normally prefers to stay out of the limelight, I take this opportunity to officially applaud Dr. Ellison for his efforts and am proud to share his achievements with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, as I review in my mind the association I have had with Dr. Ellison and his background, I have come to the conclusion that Dr. Ellison's success is built on an uncanny desire to win. This motivation apparently has been with him throughout his life.

From his early days as an All-American basketball, football, and baseball star to his association with the Kansas City Community Junior College, the key to Dr. Ellison's achievements has been his constant determined effort to succeed with dignity and to break down barriers for himself and others. This philosophy about success has served him well as he has accumulated many firsts in his career.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ellison at the age of 31 was this country's youngest college president. Currently, at the age of 40, he serves as the president of the Cuyahoga Community College which is the third largest school of higher learning in the State of Ohio.

At the Cuyahoga Community College, Dr. Ellison has been the unshakable force which has prodded and managed the expansion of the college. Dr. Ellison has utilized his educational and administrative expertise, finesse and foresight to make Cuyahoga Community College one of the best in the area.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ellison has made the kind of lasting and significant mark on the community which many men dream of doing but few actually attain. He has helped to construct a superior campus and at the same time a quality academic program geared to the unique needs of the community.

The faculty of Cuyahoga Community College has followed the lead of Dr. Ellison in terms of enthusiasm for and commitment to the school and its students. This has resulted in a college which operates well administratively and academically. Therefore, the college serves as a tribute to him.

Dr. Nolen Ellison, in every meaning of the word, is the cornerstone of the Cuyahoga Community College. By virtue of that fact, Dr. Ellison also has been a positive force for the community.

With those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding the work of Dr. Nolen Ellison, president of the Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland. At this time, I will insert in the RECORD, an article which appeared in the Cleveland Press on Dr. Ellison.

TRI-C'S ELLISON LEADS QUIETLY
EX ATHLETE THRIVES ON HARD WORK
(By Barbara Chudzick)

In high school he was an all-state and all-American athlete. He attended college on a full athletic scholarship and was the third draft choice of the Baltimore Bullets basketball team.

At age 31, he was the youngest college president in the nation. Today at 40 he's president of Ohio's third largest school of higher learning—Cuyahoga Community College.

On or off the court, Nolen Ellison is a winner.

He was born in Kansas City, Kans., the second son of Tavern Ellison, chief mechanical inspector for the city, and Margaret,

manager of a neighborhood grocery store. Ellison and his brother Benoyd grew up knowing Satchel Paige and other professional athletes.

"Ours was a family where sports was stressed, and I believe this has contributed to my success," he said, "Athletics is a broadening experience for kids. It's an important part of the maturation process and helps develop the fiber of leadership.

"Athletics blurs the lines of separation between people. It's a way for mutual respect to be established. Thanks to athletics, I have strong feelings of respect for individuals. Colors and religions are not differences that separate us. They're strengths."

Living in the black neighborhood of Kansas City, Ellison became acquainted with urban renewal at an early age when his family was ousted from their home so the city could build a school on the site.

He attended black elementary and junior high schools, but along with a dozen friends chose to walk three miles to all-white Wyandotte High School.

"It was just after the Brown vs. the Board of Education court case which started desegregation," he said. "I've always made adventurous choices but the main reason I wanted to go to Wyandotte was for the sports.

"I had been a successful athlete in junior high basketball and track. But the black high school had no basketball or swim team, and it didn't play in a conference league."

During his sophomore year, Ellison won a varsity letter in basketball. In his junior and senior years, he won six letters—two each in basketball, football and baseball. He was named all-American for basketball and all-state for football and baseball.

He was equally successful in his studies and was the first black inducted into the National Honor Society.

"I was the only black in most of my classes, and this was a stimulus to achieve," he remembers. "I worked extra hard to prove I was as good as the white students and that I had come from a good background."

Ellison won a full basketball scholarship to the University of Kansas and soon was known as the "Kansas Iron Man" for his strength, tenacity, skillfulness and cunning on the court.

He played every minute of every game in his senior year, and with a career point total of 1,400 was the highest-scoring guard in the history of the school.

Despite his athletic success, Ellison says he never planned on a career in professional sports because "you have to be brutal." He majored in history and social studies, intending to become a high school teacher. In 1963 he was the third draft choice of the Bullets.

Ellison said he turned down the tempting offer because he "had a pregnant wife, a job offer at Sumner High School (the black high school in his hometown) and was a folk hero back in Kansas City."

After one year of teaching and coaching, Ellison accepted an invitation to join a State Department sponsored basketball team on a two-month goodwill tour of the Orient.

He returned to teach three more years before turning to a new career at City Hall.

"I was elected to the board of trustees of Kansas City Community Junior College, and the day after the election, the Sumner High School principal told me to choose between teaching or being a trustee," he said. "So I quit and joined the Kansas City planning department for two years."

During the next four years, the busy Ellison earned his master's degree from Hamp-

ton University in Virginia and his doctorate from Michigan State University, became executive assistant to the president of Michigan State and executive assistant to the chancellor of the Metropolitan Junior College District in Kansas City.

In 1972 he was named president of Seattle Central Community College. At 31 he was the youngest college president in the nation. Two years later he came to Cleveland as head of the three-campus Tri-C.

The 6-foot, 2-inch, mustachioed Ellison says he has spent the past seven years "trying to keep a low profile and simply do a good job."

"Who Nolen Ellison is isn't as important as what Cuyahoga Community College is," he says. "I have a great responsibility to serve the citizens and not get my own role out of focus. Leaders can be more effective if they're not always looking to be in the public eye."

He and his wife, Carole, sweethearts since junior high school, will celebrate their 20th anniversary this year.

The Ellisons live in Shaker Heights with sons Marc, 17, who will continue the family tradition of attending the University of Kansas in the fall, and Steven, a student at Woodbury Junior High School.●

TRIBUTE TO SRI CHINMOY

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a man of many talents who has contributed greatly to the effort of increased human cooperation and international peace. Through his work, Sri Chinmoy, a prolific musician, artist, author and spiritual leader has sought to foster the ideals of inner reflection and action in human life. As the Director of the Meditation Group at the United Nations, Sri Chinmoy is active in the pursuit of world peace and has been recognized by this esteemed body when he received the Silver Medallion.

Sri Chinmoy has also made important contributions to the State of Rhode Island. The Sri Chinmoy Center in Bristol has been active in community service through the sponsorship of cultural, civic and athletic events. On August 10, the Center will be sponsoring a triathlon in Watch Hill, R.I. Last year, Sri Chinmoy presented Brown University with 100 titles of his work. These represent a significant contribution to the University's collection of literary, religious and philosophical documents. Sri Chinmoy has also lectured at other universities in Rhode Island and a mural of his paintings hangs in the children's ward at the Rhode Island Hospital.

On the occasion of Sri Chinmoy's birthday on August 27 I would like to share one of his many poems with my colleagues:

SALUTATIONS TO AMERICA

Yesterday America enjoyed the sacred flame of liberty.

Today America enjoys the sacred light of equality.

Tomorrow America shall enjoy the sacred sun of divinity.

America's vision was to become transcendentally great.

America's mission is to become universally good.

The spirit of the past was the discovery of inner adamantine will to fight against bondage. The present spirit is the aspiration for God-manifestation plus the aspiration to become humanity's brother, humanity's selfless lover and divinity's constant server.

There are two special qualities that Americans can work on to help bring forward all their potential divinity. These two divine qualities are the feeling of universal oneness and constant and cheerful self-giving to the Supreme Pilot, who is man's own highest Reality.

American citizens can learn to love their country more by realizing the supreme fact that there is no difference between true love of one's country and true love of God. One's country is nothing short of God's concentrated creation.

America gained her independence two hundred years ago by virtue of her determined will power. Now her spiritual independence will be founded upon her conscious oneness with God, and this can be established only on the strength of her implicit surrender to God's divine Dispensation and Will.

In a freedom-loving country patriotism is a conscious prayer, a conscious concentrated force to spread freedom so that the country can achieve and distribute love-light to each of its countrymen and to the world at large.

—Sri Chinmoy.●

TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO
HONOR POLICE CAPTAIN
McLAUGHLIN

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, good laws make it easier to do right and harder to do wrong. And good policemen to enforce these laws help to keep our loved ones and our cities secure. Paul McLaughlin has been a member of the Chicago Police Force for the past 35 years and a captain for over a decade. He has served our city well. During his long and illustrious career, Captain McLaughlin has shown leadership, dedication, professional expertise, and personal courage throughout many troubled times such as the Chicago riots, the Croatian hostage situation, and the El train accident. In thanks, Captain McLaughlin has received hundreds of letters and many commendations praising his behavior in action.

On May 4, 1981, Paul McLaughlin retired from the Chicago Police Force. On September 3, 1981, there will be a testimonial dinner in honor of Captain McLaughlin. All those family, friends, and fellow police officers who have ad-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

mired and respected him through the years will have the chance to thank this outstanding public servant.

I commend Captain McLaughlin for his unflinching service and I know my colleagues join with me in wishing him a full and happy retirement.●

LIBERALS, CONSERVATIVES, AND GOD

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to attend Sunday services in Heber Springs, Ark., at the St. Francis Episcopal Church. Rev. Arnold Hearn delivered a most enlightening and thought-provoking sermon which I would like to share with my colleagues here in the House. Reverend Hearn's sermon of July 5, 1981, follows:

LIBERALS, CONSERVATIVES, AND GOD

(By Rev. Arnold W. Hearn)

The annual observance of Independence Day turns our thoughts to the life of the nation. And that prompts reflection on the turmoil, the divisions, the changes which have marked our experience as a people in recent decades and on the further change of direction represented by last fall's national elections. And these thoughts immediately raise the tangled questions of future social policy.

Each must ask: What stance, what posture shall I adopt? What shall be my hopes and expectations? How shall the church be related to society's decision-making processes? What orientation is appropriate from the standpoint of Christian faith?

I

We are in the habit of speaking as if we have two broad options. We can be liberals, or we can be conservatives. The situation is actually far more complicated than that and for a number of different reasons. Yet there is enough truth in designating liberalism and conservatism as the major alternatives to make it a useful way of speaking and to enable that distinction to serve as a starting point for further reflection. The labels "liberal" and "conservative" do seem to stand for two distinctive ways of confronting and participating in the life of the world.

At the risk of considerable further oversimplification, let me try to characterize the difference between these two postures. Liberals might be described as those whose chief concern is to bring new good into being. The liberal inclination is toward changing things, toward experimentation, toward extending the frontiers of justice, equality, and human rights. Liberals want to change things in the conviction that things could be much better than they are.

Conservatives, on the other hand, can be thought of as those whose chief concern is to prevent established good from being lost. The conservative inclination is toward tradition and order and the stability of institutions, toward preserving values and systems and practices that work—however imperfectly—rather than running the risk of chaos and disorder. Conservatives are skeptical of change and want to cling to the

goods we have for fear that, if we do not, things may turn out to be much worse than they are.

Whether or not "liberal" and "conservative" are the most accurate and illuminating labels for them, there are, in any case, these two ways of confronting the present. There are those who are turning on by a vision of a better future and who seek to bring new good into being. There is a creative impulse. And there are those who are filled with appreciation for the accomplishments of the past and who refuse casually to discard the heritage of long experience. There is a preserving impulse.

II

If, however, you and I are at all serious in our affirmation of Christian faith, then our concern is not just to decide whether we are going to be liberals or conservatives. Our first concern is to ask: where is God in all this? What is God doing in the midst of human affairs?

An important clue appears in words which you and I repeat each time we offer the General Thanksgiving from The Book of Common Prayer: "We bless you for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life." These two words, "creation" and "preservation," point to a great deal of what God is doing in his world. When you and I try to locate ourselves within or beyond the options of liberalism and conservatism, it seems to me profoundly important to remind ourselves that (while it might seem odd to call God liberal or conservative) the God we worship is both creator and preserver. He is one who is constantly at work to bring new good into being. He is one who is ever concerned lest any good be lost.

I am not suggesting God is a timid, middle-of-the-road moderate, lukewarmly creative and half-heartedly preserving. There is a thoroughgoingness and a steadfast faithfulness to be discerned in both his creative and his preserving work.

The God of biblical faith is one whose creative Spirit is constantly brooding over and surging through his world to bring new good to birth—though the birthing be painful and though something of the old does have to be surrendered to make way for the new. In the long story of natural evolution, God's power is at work, bringing a wonderful diversity of species into being to share in the life of the earth. In human affairs he moves for the increase of justice and the liberation of the oppressed. He is ever leading and goading his people toward greater and richer fulfillment of human possibilities and human community. He is the creating God who brings new good into being.

Yet the God of biblical faith is also one whose fatherly care is constantly exercised to confirm and conserve the good that has been already achieved—though the preservation of past achievements does sometimes establish banks within which the river of creativity must flow. By his providence advances are consolidated; protective structures develop; nature acquires the balance and harmony on which its creatures depend. In human affairs, stability is achieved through the emergence and experience of institutions such as family and state and laws and church and school; through functioning systems for the production and distribution of goods and services; and through all the things that make possible a sane, orderly, reliable, and at least tolerably just human existence.

The influential American theologian Paul Lehmann has described the divine activity

by saying that God is at work in the world "to make and to keep human life human."¹ And that is exactly the point! This making and keeping, this creating and preserving—these are what God is doing.

The philosopher Alfred North Whitehead has said that God is always leading and luring not only human life but the whole universe into what he calls "creative advance."² But Whitehead says also that God is constantly exercising "a tender care that nothing be lost."³

Creating and preserving—these are nothing less than the work of God. And these are divine activities with which faith intends always to be aligned. We dare not forget either concern.

The creative thrust involves making human life more and more fully and completely and authentically human. It involves bringing new good into being. The preserving thrust involves keeping in human life the humaneness and the humanity which have been already achieved. It involves preventing established good from being squandered. The God you and I worship is one who works both to create and to make and to preserve and to keep. And in the process he resists, overthrows, destroys whatever thwarts either his creative or his preserving concern.

III

So what does all this mean with respect to the question with which we began? With what outlook shall you and I face the decisions which confront our nation and ourselves? I shall not suggest how any one of us should resolve any particular issue, but I think what I have been trying to say about the nature and activity of the God we worship does imply something about the attitudes with which you and I can best face the future and participate in the society of which we are members.

If the God of Christian faith is both creator and preserver, then both "liberal" and "conservative" concerns have a legitimate role within the life of the church. Both have a place in our concern for human well being. Both have a place in our striving to express love to God and neighbor. But since both have validity, none of us ought let himself or herself get locked into a doctrinaire position wherein response to every issue is automatic. Whether our reflexes tend to be liberal or conservative, we need the grace to get beyond the knee-jerk response. We need to keep ourselves open to diverse possibilities.

As servant of God and neighbor, one ought to be willing to find oneself aligned with conservatives on one issue and with liberals on another.

We ought also be able to welcome correction from those who see things differently from the way you or I may see them. Each of us has got finally to come to his or her own decisions. We have to follow the best light we have. Yet we can, at the same time, be glad that—within the providence of God—there are other persons who see things differently and who are laboring on behalf of values we might be inclined to neglect.

Political and social struggle gets pretty messy sometimes. But through it all, you

and I can trust that God will use the partial insights and fragmentary wisdom and one-sided, unbalanced efforts of a lot of differing people as the context out of which he can bring forth something better than any one of us, or any limited group of us, could ever have achieved alone. And that conviction is surely close to the heart of what democracy is all about.

Still, it is not enough to say God is creator and preserver and leave it at that. There is more in the General Thanksgiving that what I quoted earlier. Listen to the same passage slightly extended: "We bless you for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life; but above all for your immeasurable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ."

The God we worship—the creator, the preserver—is also savior. And that conviction supplies the assurance you and I need if we are to do much of anything at all, whether in the more public arena of political activity or in the more private circle of personal life and interpersonal relationships.

For anything we do is risky. We can always be mistaken in our choices. We can always be misled by our own biases and our own blindness.

But we can run the risks and take the chances in the faith and trust that the same God who is creating and preserving is also saving. He will take your blunders and perversities and mine, and those of the persons and interests we oppose, and he will redeem them and use them for good as he weaves them into the story of his own gracious and ongoing purpose.●

ERIE, PA., ZOO

HON. MARC L. MARKS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. MARKS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I had the distinct pleasure of visiting the Erie Zoo in Erie, Pa. The zoo, founded in 1924, is a small 15-acre public park run by the Erie Zoological Society. Director James Rhea and his friendly, highly competent staff are always on hand and eager to explain particulars and answer questions.

Besides housing 70 species and 200 specimens, the zoo contains picnic facilities and playgrounds which are in full use throughout the spring and summer months. The zoo also sponsors an annual spring parade which is widely attended by the entire community. More than a quarter of a million people visit the Erie Zoo in the course of a year. Erie ranks third in the Nation as the most attended zoo for the size of its metro area. One of the zoo's most popular attractions is Pixie Land, a playground of tame animals that roam about free from confinement. Children have the opportunity to pet and feed goats, lambs, ducks and a wide assortment of friendly, gentle animals.

While at the Erie Zoo this past weekend, I was particularly fortunate to be able to see their newborn giraffe. The beautiful baby giraffe calf was

born on Monday, July 27, 1981. The birth of a baby giraffe is unusual for a zoo the size of Erie because giraffes and other large specimens often do not reproduce in relatively confining habitats. The calf was approximately 7 feet tall at birth. The calf is unique in his markings in that he has the identical shamrock design on his chest that his father possesses. The calf has yet to be named, but as is the custom for popular newborns at the Erie Zoo, officials are planning a name contest in which the community can participate.

The Erie Zoo, despite its relatively small size, has also been successful in breeding polar bears, having had successful births in 1977 and again in 1980. The birth of polar bears in confinement is a delicate procedure since a polar bear will often abort or devour its young at the slightest provocation. The officials at the Erie Zoo were able to devise a successful method of isolation which provided the proper conditions for birth.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Erie Zoological Society, its many patrons and the officials and attendants at the Erie Zoo. Through their dedication and hard work the Erie Zoo has served as one of the community's favorite sites for recreation and family get-togethers as well as a fascinating museum of live wildlife.●

PRUDENCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the head of Michigan's Department of Public Health recently testified before my Appropriations Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over programs of the Department of Health and Human Services. I have been asked to make an abstract of his remarks available to the full House and would like to do so at this time.

Thanks for this opportunity. I have some true stories to tell you this afternoon. They come from a quarter of a century in Michigan's State Health Department. They also reflect the views of the 55 other states and territories. I believe, as do colleagues in county, city and state health departments, that it is prudent to invest in public health. Here's why:

In southwest Michigan this afternoon, a child lies in bed in a hospital. He does not recognize his family. Doctors say his brain has been destroyed. He is a victim of Eastern Equine Encephalitis, a disease carried by mosquitoes. The cost to him and to his family is beyond words. The cost to taxpayers through Medicaid is \$450,000 this year. We face more such losses to the extent that prevention funding is reduced. The sequel to this story is that, thanks to an alert Governor and Legislature and dedicated staff, we were able to move some money around

¹ Paul L. Lehmann, "Ethics in a Christian Context" (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), p. 85 et passim.

² Alfred North Whitehead, "Process and Reality" (corrected edition, eds. D. R. Griffin and D. W. Sherburne: New York: Free Press, 1978), p. 344 et passim.

³ Ibid., p. 346.

fast enough to hire DC-3s for a massive spray program, which wiped out the mosquitoes and held the damage to one child and several horses.

You've heard how we made spectacular advances against infectious diseases. Our death rate has gone down by over 60 percent since the turn of the century. Your lifetimes and mine, on the average, are 20 years longer than they would have been in 1900. Each year, local and state health departments serve over 30 million people directly in communicable disease control programs, and the entire population indirectly. However, in order to sustain a reasonably adequate national program to protect children from acute infectious diseases, you've been persuaded to provide special, high level funding for immunization. This may be one of the easier things to support. It is harder to help Michigan battle Equine Encephalitis. Or Arizona, with rabies along the border. Or Mississippi, with tuberculosis. That was why we worked with you in 1978 to design the PHS 314(d) cost sharing incentive, and the companion accountability tool known as the National Public Health Program Reporting System. Apparently, this halfway house between block grants and categorical—a national investment, state by state, in a defined set of services, subject to local priority setting, but accountable to you—has been all but abandoned. We do not understand why. But, we urge you to do all you can to sustain the national investment in disease prevention and control. We urge you to sustain the Centers for Disease Control, which those of us in public health look to as a beacon of hope and direction in an otherwise bizarre world of Federal acronyms.

In Michigan, as in the nation as a whole, our investment in sickness care in the last 15 years has far outstripped prevention. We pay about a billion yearly for Medicaid alone, in our State, compared with less than one-third billion for local and state health department services combined—and many of these include treatment activities. This is a costly imbalance.

In a nursing home in central Michigan a 55 year old man spends most of his days rocking endlessly in a worn, maple rocker. He had uncontrolled high blood pressure for many years. A stroke at age 54 left him partially paralyzed. Even though our health department regulatory programs assure him a reasonable hope for quality care, he is a failure of public health. We didn't act soon enough to help him learn to control his disease. We face more such losses to the extent that funding for prevention is reduced. Each year, it's estimated that we needlessly lose 65,000 Americans to the plague of hypertension—as many as from highway accidents. In Michigan, less than one of three of our nearly one million adults with hypertension have their blood pressure under control. Where our country's local and state health department maternal and child health programs serve over 20 million people and our communicable disease program about 30 million, our chronic disease programs (heart disease, cancer, stroke, diabetes, renal disease) serve only a little over 5 million. We do not have equity.

In southeast Michigan, a three year old has scars around her face which will last her lifetime. She was bitten by rats in her crib. She will carry the evidence of those hungry rats into her teens and adult life. She is a failure of public health. We didn't move fast enough to save her. The cost is in medical bills and whatever the scars may do

to her life chances. We face more such losses to the extent that funding for prevention is reduced. Even though you've provided, in the past, some funds for the control of hazards such as rats and lead-based paint poisoning, the investment has not reached out sufficiently to help us do the job. In Michigan, for instance, we have six community programs in rat control, while nearly all urban centers have similar problems and are not helped. In 1979, state health officials of the nation reported 3.9 million field inspections in environmental health and 179,000 enforcement actions. But environmental health program data also show a broad variation in what is available and accessible to our people and communities, depending on which state you live in. We do not have equity.

In a small southern Michigan town of Adrian, a Mexican-American will lie awake tonight worrying about his children. His home, his dooryard, the playground, the neighborhood, have been contaminated with a chemical dust which potentially can cause cancer. The dust (Curene 442) was spread by a nearby plant, where his family and most of his neighbors work. His fears are a failure of public health. We didn't act in time to help protect this community. More communities will face such anxieties and disruption to the extent that prevention funds are reduced. The cost of clean-up, from private and public sectors, is expensive. The local and state governmental agencies are being responsive to this severe problem. But we are playing catch-up, having already lost the battle for community protection.

This is one of scores of examples of the substantial tasks confronting local and state health departments of the country, in collaboration with state environmental and agricultural agencies and the Centers for Disease Control.

We have emphasized that it is prudent to pay the lower cost of health, rather than the higher prices of sickness; that it is prudent to promote health; and prudent to help people and communities protect themselves and prevent contamination. The axiom remains that an ounce of prevention is still worth a pound of cure. In my written testimony, I include additional examples indicating what the country will lose if public health is cut, and what we will gain if we sustain robust public health programs. We salute you. We stand ready to try to respond to your questions on behalf of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials. ●

INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, August 21, 1981, marks the sad anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. This brutal invasion was a violation of the sovereignty of a member state of the United Nations and a cruel negation of the right of self-determination of peoples. The continued occupation of Czechoslovakia is another crime against the right of a country to determine its own destiny and aspirations.

Since that sad day in 1968, the brave people of Czechoslovakia have made repeated efforts to assert their right to freedom and self-expression. Over a thousand citizens of Czechoslovakia signed the Charter 77 which petitioned their government to adhere to the principles of the Helsinki Final Act. Instead of responding to the honest and heartfelt sentiments of its citizens, the Prague government responded with repression. Thousands have been arrested and harassed. Many more have had their careers ruined.

It is important that the United States take a strong stand opposing the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia, no matter how many years have elapsed since the first Soviet tanks crossed the border to crush the Prague spring 13 years ago. The American people support the efforts of all people to be free. After all, our own country began with the stirrings of independence and freedom.

And so I join with Americans of Czech, Slovak, Subcarpatho-Ruthenian and Moravian descent in commemorating this sad occasion to pray for the eventual deliverance of Czechoslovakia from the cruel occupation. May the day soon come when Czechoslovakia stands proudly and independently as a free and equal partner in the international community of nations.

LIST OF KEY VOTES

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice to periodically list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the key votes I have cast in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This list of my key votes is arranged as follows: Each item begins with the rollcall number of the vote, followed by the number of the bill or resolution, and a description of the question on which the vote was taken. This is followed by my own vote on the issue. Finally, the vote of the entire House of Representatives is indicated by passed or failed followed by the yeayay vote totals.

The list printed here includes key votes taken between January 5, 1981, and June 26, 1981.

LIST OF KEY VOTES OF CONGRESSMAN DON J. PEASE, 97TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

(10) H.R. 1553. Bill raising the temporary public debt ceiling by \$50 billion to \$985 billion, effective through September 30, 1981. Yes. Passed 305-104.

(13) H. Res. 13. Resolution re-establishing the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control for the 97th Congress. Yes. Passed 276-101.

(14) H. Res. 67. Resolution continuing the investigation of alleged improper conduct by Members of Congress in the ABSCAM affair. Yes. Passed 390-1.

(16) H. Res. 115. Amendment providing for a 10 percent reduction in the spending ceiling for standing and select committees in the U.S. House of Representatives for calendar year 1981. Yes. Passed 407-2.

(17) H. Res. 115. Amendment reducing the spending ceiling for standing and select committees to \$35.3 million or 9 percent below actual expenditures in 1980. No. Failed 184-225.

(20) H.J. Res. 182. Resolution designating April 26, 1981, as a national day of recognition for veterans of the Vietnam era. Yes. Passed unanimously.

(33) H. Con. Res. 115. Obey amendment to the budget resolution which mandated \$26 billion in spending cuts, provided a budget surplus in fiscal year 1982 as well as fiscal year 1983 and 1984, and delayed individual tax cuts until January 1, 1983. Yes. Failed 119-303.

(36) H. Con. Res. 115. Amendment to the budget resolution offered by Reps. Gramm and Latta which mandated \$23.1 billion in spending cuts, provided a \$31 billion deficit and provided a \$51.3 billion tax cut for fiscal year 1982. No. Passed 253-176.

(37) H. Con. Res. 115. Final passage approving the Gramm-Latta substitute to the budget resolution. No. Passed 270-154.

(39) H.R. 3512. Amendment to renege on the American commitment to the International Development Association by further decreasing our contribution even though the amount requested was the smallest percentage ever committed by the United States and 75 percent of IDA loans go to the poorest countries. No. Passed 272-126.

(40) H.R. 3512. Amendment to reduce direct loan authority for the Export-Import Bank which promotes overseas sales for U.S. corporations. No. Passed 231-166.

(49) H.R. 2098. Bill establishing Offices of the Inspector General in Defense, Justice, and Treasury Departments and in the Agency for International Development. Yes. Passed 334-65.

(50) H.R. 2979. Bill providing \$3 million in each of fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. No. Failed 165-231.

(53) H.R. 3520. Bill extending the deadline for steel industry compliance with requirements of the Clean Air Act on a case-by-case basis provided that funds saved as a result of the extension are committed to modernization. Yes. Passed 322-3.

(54) H.R. 3499. Bill providing hospital care to Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange and extending psychological readjustment counseling. Yes. Passed unanimously.

(56) H.R. 3337. Bill extending youth employment programs for one year while their effectiveness is being thoroughly reviewed. Yes. Passed 309-84.

(57) H.R. 1100. Bill changing from 6 months to 60 days the length of time a former POW must have been interned to establish a presumption of service connection for certain diseases and medical conditions. Yes. Passed 394-2.

(62) H.R. 3455. Amendment deleting \$29.6 million to acquire 244,000 acres to expand Fort Carson in Colorado and preventing a further encroachment of federal land ownership. Yes. Failed 175-209.

(63) H.R. 3455. Amendment withdrawing authority to construct a facility at the Pine Bluff Arsenal designed to produce binary nerve gas. Yes. Failed 135-220.

(64) H.R. 3455. Bill Approving \$7 billion for fiscal year 1982 for military construction and family housing covering 773 construction projects at 399 military installations. Yes. Passed 311-36.

(69) H.R. 3462. Amendment prohibiting the Department of Justice from using funds to require directly or indirectly the transportation of students to a school other than that nearest the students' home. No. Passed 265-122.

(73) H.R. 3413. Amendment prohibiting the Department of Energy national security programs from using federal funds for the production or research and development of enhanced radiation nuclear weapons. Yes. Failed 88-293.

(76) H.J. Res. 287. Resolution urging the Reagan Administration to notify the World Health Organization that the United States will cooperate fully with other nations to protect children from illness and contamination from U. S. infant formula. Yes. Passed 301-100.

(83) H.R. 3480. Amendment preventing the Legal Services Corporation from acting in behalf of poor persons to bring class action suits against federal, state and local governments. No. Passed 241-167.

(85) H.R. 3480. Amendment preventing the Legal Services Corporation for providing legal assistance to promote, defend or protect homosexuality. Yes. Passed 281-124.

(86) H.R. 3480. Amendment prohibiting Legal Services Corp. lawyers from informing eligible clients of the current state of abortion law. No. Failed 160-242.

(88) H.R. 3480. Amendment prohibiting Legal Services Corporation-funded legal assistance for or on behalf of aliens not legally admitted or permanent residence in the U.S. Yes. Failed 141-262.

(91) H.R. 3480. Bill continuing the Legal Services Corporation in fiscal year 1982 and 1983 and requiring the establishment of state advisory councils to review grant and contract applications. Yes. Passed 245-137.

(94) H.R. 32614. Bill further increasing Department of Defense funds already approved for fiscal year 1981 by \$2.66 billion. No. Passed 360-50.

(102) H.R. 3238. Bill to continue the Public Broadcasting Corporation with budget reductions from previous year. Yes. Passed 323-86.

(113) H.R. 3982. Omnibus reconciliation bill revising existing law to achieve budget savings by cutting social security, supplemental security income, school lunches and by consolidating numerous education, health, energy and community services programs into block grants. No. Passed 232-193.

RODINO QUESTIONS WAVE OF MERGERS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a piece that appeared on July 26, 1981, in the Newark Star Ledger by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, PETER W. RODINO, Jr. This piece reflects and comments on the present "merger madness" infecting the upper echelons

of corporate America and the response or lack thereof by our institutions of government. I should add that the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law of the House Committee on the Judiciary will begin a series of hearings on Wednesday, August 26, 1981, on present merger policy.

MERGER MADNESS

(By PETER W. RODINO, JR.)

The message to the corporate giants is out: Seldom will be heard a discouraging word from the new "trustbusters" out of the West.

Attorney General Smith has assured them that bigness is not badness. Assistant Attorney General Baxter has told them that Antitrust Division guidelines on permissible concentration are too tough.

Responding to these signals, some of our nation's largest corporations have embarked on a new wave of mergers.

All right, bigness may not necessarily be bad, but neither is it inevitably best, whether the evaluation is economic, political or social.

Disciples of relaxed merger standards suggest that the resulting freedom will ultimately bring about a more efficient industrial structure that more sensibly uses our valuable resources. This is questionable.

Studies show that economies of scale are also subject to the law of diminishing returns and are unlikely once a corporation exceeds a certain size. Moreover, any efficiency gains are most likely in mergers among competitors, the very type of horizontal combination that Mr. Baxter says should be most closely monitored. Anyway, according to former FTC Commissioner Robert Pitofsky, few of the recent large mergers have been undertaken to achieve efficiencies. Rather, as the Wall Street Journal has pointed out, corporate officials pursue mergers to diversify investments, to obtain tax breaks, or simply to increase the size and prestige of the corporation (and thereby nationalizing higher salaries for the top management).

These facts indicate that many mergers may be nearly meaningless for most of us, if not for a fortunate few. But, although all the evidence is not in, there are mounting indications that a continuing merger wave is not merely passive, that it could in fact adversely affect our nation's economic growth. The large sums of cash available in many corporate treasuries could be well invested in research and development or in capital expenditures to promote long-term growth. If, instead, this money is spent to acquire the assets of other firms, a major potential source of fruitful investment has been dissipated, because cash in the hands of stockholders usually only reluctantly finds its way quickly into productive investment.

Other drains on corporate cash result from merger. Every time there is an acquisition, significant transactional costs gnaw away at available capital: fees for lawyers, for accountants, for investment bankers. Also, the attention of a company's high-level management probably is diverted from other pursuits that might better benefit the company and our nation in the long term.

There is also the question of whether these huge merger efforts affect the credit markets and the flow of capital. In the Conoco affair and related developments, six corporations reportedly have borrowed or hold options to borrow some \$25 billion at a

time when the prime interest rate hovers around 20 percent. Is this borrowing devouring available credit? Is it driving rates up to the detriment, for example, of the auto industry, the housing industry, and small business?

Finally, there is evidence in a recent National Science Foundation study that, while bigness may not in itself be bad, it may be less productive of new technology. Over a 20-year period ending in 1973, the study found that small firms produced 23 times more exploitable ideas per dollar spent on research and development than did the large corporations.

These concerns I have expressed relate only to the economic effects of mergers. The Members of Congress who passed the Sherman Act of 1890, reacting to the economic domination of "trusts" such as Standard Oil, also feared the social and political consequences of concentrated corporate power. Local communities and their workers, they knew, suffered when plants were closed or relocated. But, at least, they dealt with local owners who likely had a personal commitment to the community's well-being. Today these local groups more often must deal—if, indeed, they can deal at all—with a far-away conglomerate management interested primarily, if not only, in short-term profits. Some businessmen may admire such detached decisionmaking that is devoid of human and community values, but in the long run, I doubt that our Nation will tolerate this kind of aloof management.

There are also troubling social and political consequences if small businesses were to die. Self-reliance, hard work, innovation, these are the threads of the fabric of American life, woven into it by the traditional independent entrepreneurs of this nation. Will these values survive if all our economic assets are concentrated in the hands of a few large corporations? Might not complacency replace self-reliance? Why work hard if benefits flow only to a distant management and unknown shareholders? These surely are concerns as important as the presumed beneficial economic effects of monopoly that seem to be the sole point of reference of this administration.

Any departure from long-term antitrust policy, I think I have shown, brings with it large, political, social, and economic risks. And once mergers and acquisitions have occurred, the damage may be irreparable. When any merger or acquisition has been consummated, assets are comingled; personnel shifted, hired or discharged; technology and trade secrets shared. Recreation of the original separate entities becomes impossible, even when dictated by the courts. For example, the 1959 Pabst acquisition of the Blatz Brewing Company was declared unlawful by the Supreme Court; but, after 16 years of litigation, the case was ended when the Government could not obtain any divestiture of Blatz. And recent Government antitrust litigation involving IBM and AT&T suggests the crushing economic and political costs in any attempt to restructure an industry.

Because of the Government's inability to deal effectively with illegal mergers and acquisitions, I sponsored the Hart, Scott, Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which gave the enforcement agencies sufficient access to advance information about proposed acquisitions and mergers so they could block unlawful activity. However, all the Government's enforcement tools are worthless if the Administration declines to tighten the screws, or close the cutoff

valve. In short, despite the available enforcement tools, we may suffer structural changes to our economic system that might be damaging and irreversible.

The new merger wave highlights rather dramatically some of the remaining inadequacies of our merger law, including its failure to address directly large conglomerate acquisitions. The Administration, by its nonchalance about these issues, could, ironically, spark a campaign that will end up deciding that bigness, if not bad, is not benign. ●

FREEDOM OF CHOICE AND RETIREMENT PLANS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, within the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, under the innocuous title of "Miscellaneous Provisions," is section 314(b), a section that will drastically alter the basic concept of individual retirement accounts (IRA's) and other types of individual retirement plans. Section 314(b) will impose a prohibitive penalty on those individuals who seek a hedge against rampaging inflation by investing in tangible assets. By this provision, we are, in essence, establishing a national economic policy with regard to retirement plans whereby only intangible assets—paper—are to be considered as a proper form of investment by those who are working and who are making investments and attempting to plan for their retirement.

We must ask ourselves if this is our intent, because regardless of our intent, this will be the effect of our actions. In a fluctuating economy, can we say with certainty that one form of investment, tangible or intangible, is acceptable while the other is not?

Section 314(b) is contrary to the basic principle under which Congress enacted legislation creating IRA's and other types of individual retirement plans. Is it now our intention to renounce that principle and declare that the individual is incompetent to invest the money that he or she has earned and that Congress will direct such investments? What is to become of the concept of freedom of choice and its basic tenet that the individual is the best judge of his own personal affairs? For in no uncertain terms, section 314(b) deprives our citizens of that basic freedom of choice, to self direct their investment dollars.

In the near future, legislation will be introduced to correct the unfortunate provision that we are voting on today. However, I bring this matter to my colleagues' attention at this time and I urge them to support legislation that will return the individual's freedom of choice in directing their investment dollars into whatever medium they be-

lieve will provide them with the greatest security.

In addition, I recommend to my colleagues the following statement of Harry V. Lamon, Jr., Esq., of Atlanta, Ga.:

I am founder and past president of the Southern Pension Conference and the Southern Federal Tax Institute, and served as a member of the ERISA Advisory Council representing the general public from 1975 through 1979. In my view, the conference committee report language is unfortunate for a number of reasons.

Current tax law generally permits individuals to self-direct investments in individual retirement accounts (IRA's) or in accounts held under qualified retirement plans. Many individuals have chosen to invest in coins, metals, gems, stamps, art and other items of tangible personal property. To avoid current taxation on such investment, current law requires that such investments be held under the earmarked account, and not be held as a personal possession of the individual. A little known provision of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, Sec. 314, would change current law effective January 1, 1982, and would provide that any investment in a "collectible" automatically would be deemed a current distribution subject to current taxation. This provision should be repealed for the following reasons:

1. The provision was adopted without prior notice to the public and without hearings.

2. The provision effectively prohibits a form of investment which has substantially outperformed more traditional investments in recent years.

3. The provisions substantially curtail the freedom of individuals to invest their own money as they determine is in their own best interest.

4. The provision discriminates against individuals who wish to invest their own money in tangibles as opposed to intangibles.

5. The provision will have a substantial and detrimental impact on thousands of businesses, most of which are small, which trade in coins, stamps, gems, antiques, art, precious metals, antique automobiles, and other items of tangible personal property.

6. The provision grants to the Internal Revenue Service through the Secretary of Treasury, extremely broad powers to expand the restrictions to "any other tangible personal property". It would appear that the IRS could assert the authority to extend the restrictions to investments in commodities and equipment and items not even contemplated by the Congress.

7. Portions of the provision are unclear. Does it extend to jointly owned property? To property owned in a joint venture or general partnership? To property owned through a limited partnership? To property owned by a corporation? To property owned by an electing corporation under Subchapter "S" of the code? To property owned by a trust?

8. The provision is limited to IRA's or individually-directed accounts. It apparently does not apply to non-directed accounts under qualified plans. This would permit a trustee to invest plan assets in "collectibles" for all participants, whether the individual participants desired such investments or not, but would not permit individuals to direct their own investments.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that Sec. 314(b) applies not only to Individual

Retirement Accounts (IRAs) but also applies to acquisitions of "collectibles" by participants in all self-directed qualified retirement plans described in Internal Revenue Code Sec. 401(a).

This is a major reversal of tax policy and one which will begin a rush, in the coming months before December 31, 1981, by individuals to earmark "collectibles" which they may never have considered had they been given the option to acquire them over a period of years. This is simply bad tax policy. It focuses millions of dollars in a direction which might never have been considered by participants under qualified plans had collectibles not been singled out for elimination as a permissible investment in "individually-directed accounts".

In the hearings leading to enactment of ERISA, much testimony was given in favor of exempting "individually-directed accounts" from the normal rules on diversification and prudence. The concept adopted was to allow individuals to invest their own money as they saw fit. This policy is now being attacked by defining as impermissible investments, those "hard assets" which have always been the ground rock of our American democracy.

This opportunity to protect one's purchasing power at his actual retirement date is now, by this section, being eliminated without the benefit of any hearings or public discussion of this important tax policy change.

Sincerely,

HARRY V. LAMON, Jr. ●

NEW ECONOMIC CHAIR AT
HARVARD

HON. MARC L. MARKS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. MARKS. Mr. Speaker, I have the unique good fortune to count as one of my dearest friends, Mr. Herbert Ascherman of Erie, Pa. Herb is one of Erie County's leading business figures, having served for years as the president of American Hardwood Industries of Union City and as a consultant and a leading stockholder of Hammermill, Inc., one of the Nation's major producers of paper products.

Herb is a highly competent business executive, a community leader, philanthropist, and a devoted husband and father.

One of his particular areas of interest has been economics. Herb in my opinion is one of the most thoughtful and articulate defenders of a free enterprise economic system that it has been my privilege to know. It is Herb's nature to support with his time, energy, and financial resources that in which he believes strongly. He has therefore just recently generously endowed a teaching chair in economics at Harvard, which is his alma mater.

This new economic chair at Harvard, the Ascherman Professorship, was created specifically to "stimulate consideration of alternate ways of providing for the legitimate social needs of the American people within the frame-

work of our free enterprise system." Herb's own articulately expressed rationale for endowing this economic chair gives real insight into Herb's combined commitment to free enterprise economics and to the social welfare of his fellow human beings, and I quote:

1. In December 1980, an under-publicized but very significant conference entitled "Eurosocijalism and America" was held in Washington under the auspices of Michael Harrington's Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee. Speakers included Willy Brandt, Olof Palme, Francois Mitterrand, Tony Benn, Joop den Uhl and other leading Western European socialists—intelligent, committed, persevering leaders of western society, not wild-eyed radicals. They espouse a very appealing message for large numbers of people in the western world.

Based on twenty years of extensive business travel throughout Europe, my observation is that Europeans perceive socialism to be the best available means of effectuating a justified correction in the imbalance between the way of life of the rich and the average, not just the poor. That the process involves central planning, the concentration of economic power in the hands of a bureaucratic few and the erosion of a degree of individual freedom is regarded as an acceptable price to be paid for the benefits received. Restrictions on free enterprise hardly justify conversation, much less concern. Economic systems are not nearly as interesting to European voters as the promised size of their piece of the economic pie—as evidenced by the recent national elections in France, notwithstanding the economic problems currently developing for the socialist governments of Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium and West Germany.

In my opinion, Western Europe today is a mirror of this country tomorrow unless strong, affirmative action is taken to counteract socialism's ideological momentum. If we do not devise and articulate an understandable, creditable and appealing social program consistent with our free enterprise system we will lose our way of life simply by default—not because of any conscious effort to change our economic system, but because political promises to ameliorate society's social ills will lead to bigger government, central planning and socialism. In short, the social tall will wag the economic dog.

2. While we Americans are quite articulate in our criticism of what we are against in the socio-economic sphere, we are very inarticulate in promulgating what we are for. If there is a well defined, proactive, creditable and appealing approach to America's social system, it is well hidden from the vast majority of Americans. We don't read about it, we don't hear about it and we are incapable of debating it with those who urge and defend other systems.

3. The American genius has often solved difficult problems when attention is focused and energies, resources and creativity are harnessed in concerted effort. The formulation of a social policy consistent with our free enterprise system that can renew the hope of all Americans for a life of dignity characterized by freedom from want warrants (indeed demands) a coordinated attack by thinking, concerned Americans.

I think all Americans will benefit from this magnanimous act of Herb Ascherman and I am privileged to bring his philanthropy to the atten-

tion of my colleagues in the Congress. ●

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE
MEDIA

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, thank you for providing me with this opportunity to put forth my candid assessment of the performance and responsibility of the media to serve every citizen of this Nation regardless of their race or economic class.

From my perspective as a public figure and one confronted with the press on a daily basis, I have to say that the media does not always meet its responsibility. Too often, it is my belief that the determination and actual communication of the news is done without taking into account the news needs of every segment of the population.

Mr. Speaker, we need not look far to find supporting evidence for this assessment. In March 1981, when I and my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus met the President's challenge by developing an alternative budget which was more in line with the needs of the poor and disadvantaged in America, news organizations across the country were provided information on the budget. However, few news organizations with the exception of the ever vigil black press, gave the proper coverage of this significant news event.

Through this arbitrary classification and disregard for this legitimate news event comes the stark realization that news affecting minorities and the less influential Americans, especially positive news, is oftentimes ignored.

Mr. Speaker, for a medium that enjoys such freedom and one that repeatedly references the fact that it fulfills "the people's right to know", this absence of news and communication to minorities and the downtrodden in this country is a breach of responsibility and inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duty if I merely cited the problem and provided no solution. One way that I envision that this situation can be rectified is by the hiring of blacks and other minorities by our news organizations. This hiring should range from the starting reporter position up the ladder to include the people who actually determine what is newsworthy.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. Thomas Winship, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors on this subject:

REMARKS OF THOMAS WINSHIP, PRESIDENT,
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS

My president's speech will be short and to one point. I appeal with all my heart to the conscience of the leadership of the print media to confront our failure in minority hiring. I realize social engineering is a taboo subject in Washington these days but maybe I can have safe passage because I'm talking about social engineering initiated and paid for by private industry, not government.

Our casual attitude toward minority employment is particularly embarrassing because our mission is semipublic and because it is protected by constitutional guarantees. Yet newspapers, with a nearly all-white face, attempt to portray accurately a mixed society.

Our industry has spent millions in dramatically successful technological research separation for the age of satellites, computers, cable and video.

Our industry has invested millions in readership and market research.

Our industry has devoted uncounted programs, panels, discussions and staffing in a national push for better writing.

The commitment and funding for these enterprises has been impressive.

But how strong is the moral commitment to equal opportunity inside our newspaper offices? Where is the commitment to sensitivity in new coverage that can be enhanced by racial mixture on our staffs.

Fourteen years ago, the Kerner Commission, which studies racial strife, said: "By and large, news organizations have failed to communicate to both their white and black audiences a sense of the problem America faces and the sources of potential solutions. The media report and write from the standpoint of a white man's world. . . this may be understandable, but it is not excusable in an institution that has the mission to inform and educate the whole of our society."

The Kerner Commission barely pricked our conscience. The effort to increase the number of minority journalists simply never has had broad-based backing among editors and publishers. The majority of the daily newspapers in the Nation still do not employ minority journalists—and never have. The number of minorities in newspaper management jobs is still negligible.

A year ago, there were 47,300 professional journalists in the country—reporters, copy editors, photographers, artists and news executives, and of these, 2,400 were minorities, up 100 from a year ago and 4.96 percent of our work force.

Two years before, in 1978, the same survey showed 1,700 minority journalists out of a total 43,000 in the profession—or 3.9 percent.

Although 4,300 more minorities were hired in 1980 as business expanded, only one of every 11 was a minority.

But, according to Jay Harris, Assistant Dean of Medill School of Journalism, the percentage of newspapers with minorities on their news staffs has dropped 40 to 37 percent in the past year.

From the standpoint of background, 29 percent of the minorities have five or more years experience. Ten percent have 10 or more. Only a trickle of minorities are working their way up the ladder. Most are still coming in as reporters or at other entry-level positions rather than closer to the top.

You can count the number of top-ranking minority editors on one hand.

No one can feel comfortable about that record. One conclusion can be drawn from

the last 14 years: Apparently most publishers and editors do not see a compelling enough argument—professional moral or economic—for ending this history of neglect of a truly integrated American press. It is fair to ask whether such compelling arguments do exist.

I believe they do.

First, the right of the press to be free from government control was guaranteed by an amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1791. The goal of the framers of that amendment was not just to ensure that newspapers in the country would be free. Rather, the Amendment was intended to protect the press because newspapers are an essential means to an important end—a fully informed citizenry as the necessary foundation of a democratic society.

As far as minorities are concerned, the press has failed to satisfy that responsibility and a major reason for this failure is the paucity of minorities among the ranks of reporters and editors of newspapers.

Consequently, too many minority readers reject newspapers and in so doing reject an important opportunity to become fully-informed. They thus lessen their ability to participate effectively in the process of self-government.

Second, newspapers are—or at least should be—the glue which makes a community out of a group of individuals who live in the same area. But, once again, because of the absence of an integrated staff and the resulting inadequate reporting, this community service is not performed well. To be sure, there are periodic blockbusters produced by newspapers—those impressive and often commendable one-shot efforts to "tell it all." But persons in a community live from day to day, and need to be informed about each other's lives on just that regular a basis.

Newspapers also offer leadership to a community—or should. Most often that is accomplished through reporting or editorials. But newspapers also lead by example, and in all too many American communities the example newspapers set and the leadership they offer in the matter of equal opportunity are ultimately quite out of step with the best principles in this Nation.

Third, profits. The time has come to cease being shy about mentioning profits in connection with minority hiring. There are literally millions of minority nonreaders to whom, I believe, newspapers can be sold. And, if we are able through the development of a better newspaper, a more widely distributed newspaper, to sell newspapers to more minorities then we can sell those new minority readers to advertisers. Thus, newspapers will be more prosperous and in a better position to do more important things for more important reasons.

The racial complexion of nearly all city rooms in 1981 presents a crisis in moral values and demographic blind-sidedness. Can we afford business as usual in minority employment at a time when our electronic brethren and exploding scientific and computer breakthroughs are bombarding newspapers in all directions; at a time when newspaper circulation and lineage gains are not the easiest to achieve.

Today the black population stands at 26.4 or 11.7 percent of the Nation's total.

Today there are 19.8 million Hispanics in the United States. A figure that has grown 14.3 percent in just the last 5 years. In Texas one of every four residents is Hispanic; in California, one out of five. Recent Census figures on minorities in all major cities underscores this dramatic shift.

Yet the average daily newspaper is still covering this multi-faced society through white eyes and ears.

Ask any circulation manager how he is doing in the nonwhite areas of the city.

Ask any advertising director how well he does in the nonwhite market. A respected market research firm in California places the combined income of blacks in this country at \$125.8 billion and Hispanic income at \$60 billion and rising.

Fourth, and most important is the morality issue. We believe in equal opportunity for all. The momentum has somehow slipped. Let's pick it up.

I have a proposal, not a cure-all by any means, but one I wish the various journalist organization would consider. Among newspaper organizations, the Nation's editors have been in front of others in expressing concerns over minority hiring. Only ASNE has a standing committee on minorities, thanks to the wisdom of Eugene Patterson of St. Petersburg, who set up this committee 3 years ago during his presidency. Since then, this committee, especially under the leadership of Chairman Richard Smyser, has been the most active group in ASNE.

But, we are dealing with a critical situation that is industrywide. We need the help of the advertising directors, who know the growing purchasing power of Blacks and the Hispanic population. We need the help of circulation managers who are out on the streets, and above all, we need the help of the publishers, who are the ultimate word on hiring and firing and who negotiate the union contracts.

Dick Smyser's ASNE report mentioned the need for a "super committee." I take his thought a step further.

Let us use the Newspaper Readership Project, now in its second year, as a structural model for bringing all elements of the newspaper industry together to address this most crucial moral and economic problem. I suggest that we set up a separate newspaper minorities project. It should have adequate industry funding and be directed by a respected publisher or expublisher. It should be represented equally by all the standing industry organizations—the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Associated Press Managing Editors, the International Advertising Executives Association and the International Circulation Managers Association.

This plan would at least do two things. It would display a new sense of urgency about this social blight in our business. It also would provide the funding for fresh hard-headed market research into the economic and educational aspects of our crisis in morality. There's no other way to describe it.

I urge the hierarchy of ANPA, ASNE and APME to consider the proposal. Tear it apart, come up with a substitute approach, if you will. But, please at least address seriously this overriding problem. ●

COMMEMORATING THE DAY OF
THE INVASION OF CZECHOSLO-
VAKIA

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, August 21 will mark the 13th anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. It was on that fateful day that the Soviets invaded that country with over 650,000 Warsaw Pact troops and crushed the dreams and liberal reforms of the Czechoslovak nation. With events in Poland somewhat similar to those of Czechoslovakia 13 years ago, this anniversary takes on an increasingly important meaning.

Throughout the early part of 1968, the people in Czechoslovakia had begun to enact liberal reforms. Under Alexander Dubcek, the Government attempted to incorporate these reforms while at the same time not arousing Moscow's ire. In many respects, the Czechoslovakian reforms followed the Khrushchev doctrine of "other roads to Socialism." By summer, though, the Soviet press had begun a war of vilification against the liberal reforms of the Dubcek government. By August it seemed a compromise had been worked out between the Kremlin and Prague. The denunciations in the Soviet press stopped, Soviet troops were removed from the border, the problem seemed to have lessened. A business-as-usual feeling prevailed and plans were underway for the summit meeting between President Johnson and Prime Minister Kosygin in Glassboro, N.J.

The euphoria in the streets of Prague, however, was to be shortlived. Late on the night of August 20 and early into the morning of August 21, without the slightest warning or provocation, Soviet troops and tanks poured over the border and destroyed whatever hopes the Czechoslovakian people had of reform. In all 650,000 Soviet troops were employed, and Prague, with a population of only 1 million, was awash with Soviet troops and tanks. By means of comparison, the United States at the very height of the Vietnam War had 530,000 combat troops in all of Vietnam.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia did little more than cause international condemnation and instill in the people of Czechoslovakia an undying hatred of the Soviets. The invasion also shattered once and for all the myth that the Soviet Union was the "fraternal brother" to all the Eastern European peoples. It was a grim reminder of how totalitarian and how unmerciful the Soviet leadership is. Most significantly though, it demonstrated that these Soviet Eastern European satellites have an unquenchable thirst for na-

tionism. As was the case with Czechoslovakia 13 years ago, and in Poland today, the Soviets must always look over their shoulder and be wary of nationalism. Today in the Ukraine, the Baltic States, East Germany, and most notably in Poland, the seeds of nationalism have again begun to germinate. Marxism-Leninism has not given any cohesion to compete with nationalism. Cracks have appeared all over the Soviet house of nations.

As a Congressman, representing a community deeply tied to its roots in Eastern Europe and in the nations of the Soviet Union, as a member of the Helsinki Commission, I am proud to stand up today and speak with pride and respect for the people of Czechoslovakia and for all the people who continue to work toward the day when freedom replaces totalitarianism. Although 13 years have passed from that fateful day in August, the spirit and courage they demonstrated to the world has not and will not be forgotten. ●

SPACE IS A VITAL AREA FOR
CONSERVATIVES

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I do believe that America is back in space to stay. But it is a critical time for America's space program; we must look toward the future and set clear goals for America in space. George F. Will in a column for Newsweek takes a creative look at politics and space. His column follows:

MEET HALLEY'S COMET
(By George F. Will)

In 1910, the last time Halley's comet came by, an Oklahoma sheriff had to stop some peculiar citizens from sacrificing a virgin to the comet. The comet is coming again in 1986, so Oklahomans should lock up their daughters. And David Stockman should stop sacrificing science on the altar of parsimony.

I shall use my dying breath to whisper praise of Stockman, but he should not have killed NASA's plan to send a satellite to intercept the comet. It would have cost \$300 million over five years, 25 cents per person a year, and it should have been an occasion for the Administration to leaven its frugality with a farsighted exception.

Comets, and especially Halley's, have excited superstition far from Oklahoma. The historian Josephus said a comet resembling a sword (Halley's, in A.D. 66) foretold the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). The visit of Halley's comet in 1066 was thought to have been a portent of the unpleasantness that befell King Harold at Hastings. Shakespeare said: "When beggars die, there are no comets seen; the heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes." The day Edward VII died (May 6, 1910) Halley's comet was especially vivid (more vivid than that particular prince merited). Mark

Twain, born during the comet's 1835 visit, said he would be disappointed if he didn't depart when it came again. He died April 21, 1910, just before the comet's "tail" brushed earth and as (Twain would have loved this) people were selling anti-comet pills to a public panicky about gases in the tail.

In "The Comet Is Coming! The Feverish Legacy of Mr. Halley," Nigel Calder says Halley's comet is, as most comets probably are, "sky pollution," a "dirty snowball that comes tumbling out of the freezer of twilight space." (There are an estimated 100 billion comets in our itchy-bitsy solar system.)

FLU MACHINES

These cosmic jaywalkers rarely bump into each other because space is even more vacant than Wyoming. (If there were just three bees in America, the air would be more congested with bees than space is with stars.) But there is a constant rain onto earth of meteoric debris, and an occasional "thump." Calder writes: "Early in the morning of 30 January 1908 the driver of the trans-Siberian express heard loud bangs and imagined that his train had exploded . . . his wide-eyed passengers said they had seen a bright blue ball of fire . . ." A small comet had leveled a 70-mile-long strip of forest.

But some collisions may have been constructive. One theory is that a comet brought to earth the first bacteria or whatever it was that started the ol' ball of life rolling 4 billion years ago (fortunately, before governments demanded environmental-impact statements). Another theory is that comets are "flu machines," bringing viruses to earth. Ask now what caused the fall of Rome and the rise of Christianity. Calder says some theorists argue: "During the period from A.D. 400 to 1400 the earthlings had a particularly nasty time with the clouds of diseases spun off from comets. A 'diseases-filled' millennium . . . forced people to live farther apart and thus to 'uncivilise' themselves; it also . . . moved the Europeans to adopt the 'sombre' religion of Christianity."

But if that is true, Calder asks, why not now? "If a millionth part of the meteoric debris falling to earth from comets consists of viruses, a small garden could collect millions of viruses every day, ready to assail plants, pets and humans."

Calder finds a bit more plausible the theory that a comet killed the dinosaurs; they did die out suddenly, and folks used to think they were just too big for Noah's ark. Today some scientists think a big comet, perhaps 6 miles in diameter, struck earth, throwing up a hundred times its weight in dust—much more dust than was sent up by the eruption in 1883 of the Krakatau volcano, which produced "glorious sunsets" around the world for two years. The theory is that the cloud produced by the comet collision blocked out sunlight, and in the four-year "night" much vegetation and most dinosaurs died.

Why, then, is there no crater? Well, there is a suspicious ring-shaped something on the seabed north of Australia. (Oceans and continents have been meandering around during the last 65 million years.) And in geological formations around the world are thin layers of clay with a chemical composition that suggests that long ago the earth was suddenly swamped with a particular element (iridium) in an amount that seems unlikely to have come from a source on earth. If this theory is true, then if, 65 million years ago, the comet had come by an hour

earlier or later, it would have missed and dinosaurs might still rule the earth. So a comet may have been a benefactor.

MYSTERIES

Anyway, comets are owed the respect due the elderly. Most comets in our solar system spend most of their time loitering (relatively speaking) beyond the outer planets. So they are among the "oldest," meaning least changed, objects; they experience less of the erosion and evolution that erases the imprint of the birth of the solar system. A rendezvous with one might reveal evidence about the origins of the universe, the human race and Oklahoma.

If our curiosity about such things atrophies, so will our humanity. That is why the Halley's comet intercept program, which can still be saved, should be used by the Administration as an opportunity to practice "creative exceptionalism." The country wants conservatism, but needs conservatism subtle enough to make exceptions to the principle of parsimony. Conservatives cannot turn space exploration over to their two lovers, federalism or capitalism—to the states or the private sector. Neither Utah nor Exxon can do it. Only Big Government—only our government—can do it.

Conservatives are supposed to take the long view, and to take intangibles seriously. They should want to look back toward the creation of the universe that has produced, as its crowning glory, the Reagan Administration. And they should look far into the future and imagine a future in which mankind is not curious about the wondrous mysteries of its situation.

We know next to nothing about virtually everything. It is not necessary to know the origin of the universe; it is necessary to want to know. Civilization depends not on any particular knowledge, but on the disposition to crave knowledge. ●

JOHN GLENN'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE TAX BILL

HON. BOB SHAMANSKY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SHAMANSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the efforts of Senator JOHN GLENN on the recent tax bill as outlined in the Wall Street Journal of July 28, 1981.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 28, 1981]

MORE TAX CREDITS FOR RESEARCH ARE VOTED BY SENATE, COMING CLOSER TO HOUSE BILL.

WASHINGTON.—The Senate voted to liberalize corporate tax credits for research and development costs, bringing its measure closer to the more generous provisions in the House tax bill.

By voice vote, the Senate approved a measure offered by Sens. JOHN GLENN (D., Ohio) and JOHN DANFORTH (R., Mo.) that would allow business to calculate incremental tax credits for research expenses incurred for wages, supplies and leasing computers. The original tax bill based the credits only on wage outlays.

The Senate amendment broadens the definition of eligible research expenses but doesn't change the original bill's formula for calculating the credit.

Under the formula, a business would average its research expenses over the preceding three tax years, then take a 25% tax credit in the fourth year for the amount exceeding that average. For example, if a company spent \$1.5 million on research in one year after spending an average of \$1 million in each of the prior three years, its credit in the fourth year would be 25% of the \$500,000 difference, or \$125,000.

However, the eligible research expenses in the fourth year can't be more than twice the average of the past three years. Therefore, if a company's average research expenses are \$1 million during the three-year period, its 25% credit would only apply to as much as \$2 million in outlays in the fourth year.

The ceiling, which Senate sources said was pushed by the Reagan administration, was imposed to keep the estimated loss of revenue from the new provision in line with the losses projected from the original measure. The credit is expected to cost the Treasury \$40 million in fiscal 1981, \$329 million in fiscal 1982, \$602 million in fiscal 1983 and \$724 million in fiscal 1986.

The House is considering two versions—offered separately by Democrats and Republicans—that include a broad definition of research expenses along the lines of the one the Senate approved. In addition, both House versions allow corporations to deduct 65 percent of their expenses for research contracts granted to universities. The Senate version doesn't have any such provision.

Separately, the Senate approved an amendment of Sen. George Mitchell (D., Maine) that would make the last-in, first-out method of inventory accounting more attractive for businesses whose annual sales averaged less than \$3 million over the three preceding tax years. Under the LIFO method, items purchased last are considered sold first and charged against current sales. This reduces the ballooning effect of inflation on profit.

Under generally accepted accounting standards, companies must increase their inventory values when they adopt LIFO. That generally raises their tax liability.

The Mitchell amendment, which was approved in a 94-to-0 roll call vote, would allow small businesses to spread that higher tax liability over three years instead of the current one year.

In addition, the Mitchell amendment would let companies use either the Labor Department's consumer price index or the Commerce Department's producer price index for valuing their inventory under the LIFO method. Under current law, a company must calculate its own index at a huge cost. The index is applied to its inventory for each year after the year LIFO is adopted. ●

ROBERT ABRAMS' COMMENTS ON THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT EXTENSION

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert in the following testimony on the Voting Rights Act to my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT ABRAMS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, ON EXTENSION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

I am grateful for the opportunity to testify before this distinguished subcommittee in support of the proposed extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I speak as the elected Attorney General of the State of New York—a state which has three of its largest counties covered by the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act. I believe that extension of those provisions is essential.

The right to vote and to have that vote count is the bedrock of our democracy. By ratifying the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments in the 1860's, the states declared this to be true. By passing the Voting Rights Act one hundred years later, Congress sought to make the Constitution's promise of voter equality a reality, at long last, for our minority citizens.

Every state of course has the right to determine its own electoral processes, and the Voting Rights Act does not interfere with this right. But Congress has also declared that states' activities must be exercised within the constraints of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. Federalism can mean no less.

The history of the past fifteen years has proven Congress right. The Voting Rights Act does give practical effect to the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. It has led to dramatically increased registration and voting among Black and Hispanic citizens, and has helped to increase the numbers of Black and Hispanic elected officials. Because the Act works so well, Congress wisely decided to extend its terms in 1970 and again in 1975.

The Act eliminated the literacy test for voting, a discriminatory requirement of long standing. And to assure that more novel or subtle devices did not replace older forms of discrimination, the Act included a "preclearance requirement." For the past fifteen years, this requirement has deterred the use of new forms of discriminatory practices—in many cases by discouraging even their introduction into state legislatures.

In 1975, many argued that because the affected jurisdictions had made significant gains, the Act's preclearance requirement was no longer necessary. It turned out not to be true. In 1976, the Department of Justice objected to as many or more proposed changes from some affected states as it had in any previous year. The same arguments are being made today, and are equally likely to prove untrue. Unfortunately, discriminatory practices will continue to be devised next year, and in future years, and our nation cannot tolerate that. Extension of the preclearance requirement is the crucial safeguard we must maintain.

In 1975, Congress also extended the protections of the Voting Rights Act to language minorities, after finding that they too had been systematically excluded from the electoral process. In the last six years, bilingual elections have begun to translate the Fourteenth Amendment into a reality for many American citizens who are not fluent in English. For example, the number of Hispanic citizens who voted last November was 20% higher than in 1976. And this increase took place despite what the Federal Election Commission in 1979 found to be "minimal" compliance with the bilingual provisions in some areas of the country.

The Voting Rights Act's prohibition against discrimination in voting applies nationwide. The special provisions of the Act apply only to states and political subdivisions that meet certain specifications. Kings, New York and Bronx counties in New York State are subject to the Act's special provisions, including Section 5, which requires preclearance of any changes in voting, and Section 203, which requires bilingual elections. The balance of my testimony will relate to New York's experience in complying with these requirements. That experience convinces me that neither requirement is overly burdensome and that both requirements effectively serve to protect the rights of minority citizens.

ADMINISTERING THE PRECLEARANCE REQUIREMENT

The counties of Kings, New York and Bronx first came within the purview of the Act in March, 1971. It was then that the United States Attorney General determined that the literacy requirement imposed by New York law was a "test or device" within the meaning of the Voting Rights Act, and the Director of the Census Bureau determined that less than 50% of the persons of voting age residing in each of the three counties had voted in the preceding presidential election.

Thereafter, as allowed by the Act, the three counties attempted, to be exempted by the federal court from the preclearance requirement. They tried without success to demonstrate that New York's literacy test had neither the purpose nor effect of abridging any citizen's right to vote on account of race or color. As a result, New York has been required to submit to the Department of Justice all the voting laws and procedures enacted since November, 1, 1968 which affect any of the three counties.

Because any change in state law or regulation necessarily affects the three counties, all such changes are precleared with the Department of Justice. Redistricting affecting any of the three counties is precleared; two examples are the upcoming statewide reapportionment and the recent realignment of the New York City Council after the 1980 Census. Additionally, changes unique to any of the three counties, such as location of polling places, are also precleared.

Because responsibility for complying with the Act's preclearance requirement regularly falls both on the New York City Board of Elections and the New York State Board of Elections, I recently had my staff discuss with the heads of these two agencies their views on the preclearance requirement. From these discussions, it became clear that the preclearance requirement has not been overly burdensome to administer.

The New York State Board submits to the Justice Department for preclearance all amendments to our Election Law. On average, eight to twelve amendments are submitted each year. The submission includes a cover letter of transmittal, a copy of the bill, the memorandum in support prepared by the bill's sponsor, any other memoranda that were influential in gaining passage, and the memorandum explaining the bill's terms and effect, which is prepared by the State Board of Elections for the Governor. By submission of these documents, the State Board of Elections is usually able to provide the Justice Department with all the information it requires to determine whether or not a proposed change will have a discriminatory impact. It should be noted that with the exception of a routine cover letter, the submission generally includes only doc-

uments which had already been prepared as part of the process by which the bill was enacted into law. On the rare occasion when this information is insufficient, the additional information required can generally be transmitted by telephone. When the voting change is not objectionable, the preclearance process imposes an insignificant burden on the state and results in no delay in implementing amendments to our voting laws.

The preclearance procedure followed by the City Board of Elections is similarly not cumbersome. The vast majority of changes submitted involve changes in local district lines and polling places. Again, the original submission is usually sufficient; when the Justice Department requires additional information, that information can also generally be provided by telephone.

OBJECTIONS TO VOTING CHANGES

Since becoming subject to the Act's preclearance requirement, New York has had approximately 500 changes in voting practices reviewed by the Justice Department. The Department raised objections three times: twice in 1974 and once in 1975.

A brief mention of these situations aptly demonstrates the Voting Rights Act's effectiveness in preventing changes with harmful consequences for minority citizens. In September 1974, the Department objected that certain polling places had been located in New York County in apartment complexes with mostly white tenants, although polling places had not been similarly located in complexes with mostly minority tenants. As a result of the objection, steps were taken to make polling places equally accessible to white and minority voters. In September 1975, the Justice Department objected to the consolidation of two Democratic leadership districts in Manhattan. The proposed consolidation would have dismembered a predominantly minority district, with the possibility that the votes of minority voters would be diluted. As a result of the objection, the consolidation plan was abandoned. In each case, the objection was interposed in a timely manner, causing the minimum necessary disruption to the electoral process. And, in each case, the matter was resolved without litigation.

The third objection, and the one which resulted in the United States Supreme Court's decision in *United Jewish Organizations of Williamsburgh, Inc. v. Carey*, involved the 1974 redistricting of State Assembly, State Senate, and Congressional districts in Kings and New York counties. Most of the redistricting was unobjectionable. However, the Justice Department was concerned that the creation of certain districts in those two counties would have the effect of abridging the right to vote on account of race.

While, of course, New York had the right under the Voting Rights Act to challenge the Justice Department's determination in court, the state chose instead to redraw the districts to prevent vote dilution. The reapportionment amendments were submitted to the Justice Department on May 31, 1974 and were approved one month later. However, white voters in Kings County sued, alleging that the plan violated the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.

Ultimately, the Supreme Court in the UJO case upheld the plan, ruling that the Constitution does not prohibit racial considerations when they are used to minimize the consequences of racial discrimination. New York, in redrawing the districts, had appropriately sought to alleviate the consequences of racial inequities and to achieve a

fair allocation of political power among white and minority voters in Kings County. Under the Voting Rights Act, the effectiveness of minority voting power could not be diluted by dividing minority communities among predominantly white districts.

The Court's decision in UJO acknowledges that a blind approach to redistricting may well produce grossly unfair results—albeit perhaps unintended. For example, in Kings County, in the early 1970s, the bulk of the Black population was concentrated near the center of the county. At that time, the traditional method of drawing district lines in New York State was to start at the peripheries of a county and work toward the center. Using this method of redistricting, the Black population would likely have been divided among more districts than would have been the case if the redistricting procedures started at the interior of the county and worked outward. The 1974 district lines in Kings County were, accordingly, drawn to avoid any unintentional discriminatory effects that prior districting plans may have had in distributing black residents, and thereby reducing the chances to elect representatives responsive to the needs of the minority community.

I have spoken in some detail about the effect of preclearance on the redistricting in Kings County because it raises the issue of vote dilution; that is, the practice of reducing the potential effectiveness of the votes of minority group members by redistricting, at-large elections, and annexations. We cannot permit the voices of black and Hispanic voters to be muted by dispersing these voters among districts in which by their numbers they comprise ineffective minorities. Both on local and national levels, legislatures will reflect the interests of all of the people, and not just one segment of the population, only when election districts are drawn in a non-discriminatory manner.

In the 1970's and 80's, the issues of voting discrimination have shifted from vote denial to vote dilution. With this shift, the preclearance requirement of Section 5 has become crucial. The overwhelming majority of objections interposed under Section 5 to expire just as the post-1980 census redistricting is taking place would be particularly inappropriate.

One recent New York example again highlights the complexities of redistricting and the continuing need for the preclearance mechanism. After 1980 census figures were released (unadjusted for minority undercount), the New York City Council rewrote the council lines in all five boroughs of New York City. The Voting Rights Act, and especially the preclearance requirement, has figured prominently in this redistricting. On the one hand, the Council redistricting appears to preserve the opportunity for incumbent minority members to be reelected. On the other hand, some claim that the Council could have been realigned to increase the number of districts in which minority voters constitute a majority, and thereby more accurately reflect the increased minority population of New York City which went from 31% to 47% between 1970 and 1980.

The Council's redistricting plan will have to be submitted to the Department of Justice for preclearance prior to its implementation. Obviously, we cannot now adequately analyze the factors that went into the reapportionment, or the effect on minority voters of the City Council redistricting. The Voting Section at the Department of Justice, with its acquired expertise, will evalu-

ate its ultimate impact. It will do so within 60 days, before the plan is implemented. If there were no preclearance, a potentially discriminatory redistricting plan might be implemented, and years spent in expensive and time-consuming court challenges. And even if the plan were ultimately found to be fair, the perception of deception or discrimination that might grow out of accusations made in protracted, heated litigation could not easily be eradicated.

The 1980 and 1990 post-census redistricting create the opportunity for diluting the voting strength of the growing numbers of minority voters. This seems to me argument enough for a ten-year extension of Section 5's preclearance requirement. Additional argument, however, is found in Section 5's deterrent effect. Some point to the fact that of the hundreds of submissions from New York, only three have resulted in objections. They cite this as evidence that Section 5 has become an unnecessary burden. I believe rather that these figures are evidence of the Act's effectiveness as a deterrent. A former member of the New York Senate's Election Committee has described to us how amendments to the Election Law, which might have had a discriminatory effect if passed, were often defeated or not even offered because of the barrier erected by the Voting Rights Act and the need for preclearance by the Justice Department.

The burden of meeting the preclearance requirement is one we can well afford. It is far less costly and far more expeditious to process five hundred voting changes through the Justice Department than to litigate through the courts the manifold challenges that would ensue absent preclearance. And, more importantly, Section 5 is a crucial safeguard of the gains the nation has made in transforming the promises of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments into reality.

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF LANGUAGE MINORITIES

The language minority provisions of the Voting Rights Act are equally important in guaranteeing the right to an effective vote. New York State has a Hispanic population of at least 1.6 million people, 1.4 of whom live in New York City. As much as I would like to be able to say that New York has a long history of protecting the voting rights of its language minority citizens, I cannot fairly say that. However, I can state that—with a prod from Congress and the federal courts—we are now taking steps to bring our Hispanic citizens into the electoral process.

In 1965, the Voting Rights Act included a provision, Section 4(e), which mandated that no person who had successfully completed the sixth grade in a public school,¹ or a private school accredited by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which English was not the language of instruction, could be denied the right to vote in any election because of an inability to read or write English. This provision was sponsored by Senators Robert Kennedy and Javits and Representatives Gilbert and Ryan, all of New York. Its explicit purpose was to deal with the disenfranchisement of large segments of the Puerto Rican population in New York because of an English-language literacy requirement in New York's constitution and election laws. There were those who honestly believed that New York's English-language literacy requirement for voting was

an appropriate mechanism to encourage our citizens who did not speak English to learn it. But Congress declared that so precious a right as the right to vote cannot be withheld while a citizen, otherwise qualified to vote, is learning English.

As an example, all those born in Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States. While Puerto Rico has a bilingual society, the primary language of Puerto Rico's people and its classrooms is Spanish; many citizens, born and educated in Puerto Rico are unable to speak, understand or read English. Until the mid-1970's, New York had no comprehensive program of instruction in English and Spanish. Congress recognized that it was inappropriate to penalize citizens for attending Spanish-language schools in Puerto Rico, or schools in the United States which had only recently begun to implement effective educational programs to teach English.

Elimination of the English literacy test was only the first step in opening the New York electoral process to citizens who are not fluent in English. In 1974, in *Torres v. Sachs*, a federal court, finding that New York's English-only voting procedures violated the Voting Rights Act, ordered New York City to provide bilingual elections. Specifically, the court order requires the New York City Board of Elections to:

1. Provide all written election materials, including ballots, in both Spanish and English;
2. Provide a sufficient number of bilingual election officials at each Board of Elections county office and at all polling places in areas with a high concentration of Hispanic citizens;
3. Post Spanish-language signs at all polling places and places of registration, stating that election officials are available to assist Spanish-speaking voters or registrants, and that bilingual printed materials are available; and
4. Publicize elections in the media in Spanish.

In 1975, the State Board, after encountering some difficulties in obtaining statewide implementation, consented to a similar federal court order requiring bilingual elections statewide in *Ortiz v. New York State Board of Elections*.

New York's experience with bilingual elections demonstrates that although local officials may indeed be committed to a fair electoral process, it may take federal legislation or a court order to ensure that the commitment becomes action. The 1975 amendments to the Voting Rights Act, requiring bilingual elections in areas with significant numbers of language minorities, do precisely that. The Act's bilingual election provision, like those of Section 5, apply only to the counties of the Bronx, Kings and New York, where they serve to reinforce federal court mandate.

The New York experience demonstrates the importance of the bilingual provisions and the fact that they are not burdensome or costly to implement. In New York City, all printed election materials are bilingual. To the extent possible, all forms are printed in both Spanish and English on the same form—either front and back, top and bottom, or left and right side. This policy extends even to the "No Smoking" signs. The envelope containing the "Notice of Cancellation of Registration" has a return address in English and Spanish, and a warning that the enclosed material is "very important . . . concerning voting status" in both English and Spanish. And, needless to say, the enclosed notice is entirely bilingual.

The financial burden to the state of bilingual elections is minimal; beyond start-up costs, the sums are truly insignificant. For example, all translation of state-wide registration and voting materials is handled by the New York State Board of Elections. The translations are done by the Chairman of the Political Science Department of the State University at Albany, and cost, on average, just over \$1,000 per year for the entire state. In Westchester County, with a Hispanic population of over 45,000 people, the costs of providing bilingual materials is approximately \$3,000 per year, or less than .2% of the County Board of Elections' budget. By using volunteer interpreters provided by the Maryknoll priests and local Hispanic organizations, Westchester County spends no money on interpreters. And the return on these insignificant expenditures is enormous. It is estimated that since New York first provided bilingual elections, Hispanic registration has increased by 20 percent. Since 1965, the number of New York Hispanic representatives in the state and federal legislatures has more than doubled. With minimal costs or burden, New York has done much to integrate the Hispanic community in New York into the electoral process.

To those who contend that the bilingual provisions of the Act are no longer necessary, I point to the fact that significant numbers of people still emigrate to the United States from Puerto Rico alone. All of them, and many other Hispanic citizens who are not fluent in English, are citizens, entitled to vote. The Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of voter equality demands continuation of the Congress' commitment to the Act's bilingual provisions.

CONCLUSION

The special provisions of the Voting Rights Act apply to all or part of 22 states. As I have testified, three New York counties, with more than 4.8 million people, are covered by the Act's special provisions. More people are protected in these three counties than are protected in the States of Alabama (3.9 million), Mississippi (2.5 million) or South Carolina (3.1 million) and only slightly less than in Georgia (5.4 million) or Virginia (5.3 million).

I am troubled by the argument that the Act singles out the Southern states. Even the few statistics that I have cited indicate otherwise. Furthermore, the Act's special provisions are triggered only by practices that are demonstrated to have a discriminatory impact, regardless of the state where they occur.

I am equally troubled that one response to this perception of regional discrimination is that preclearance should be implemented nationwide, without a trigger mechanism. Unless there is a need in all jurisdictions, it seems simply wasteful and arbitrary to extend preclearance in this fashion. At a time when the stated goal of Congress is to cut the budget, and the goal of the Administration is to do away with excessive government, it is ironic that some in Congress would propose extension of a program without any prior showing of need for that extension. One can only suspect that the effort to extend preclearance nationwide is in reality an attempt to undermine the Act's effectiveness.

At a time when our national priorities are undergoing a major reassessment, it is critical that the Congress as our representatives not permit our commitment to voting rights to wane. The right to vote is fundamental

¹In 1970 Congress eliminated the sixth grade education requirement.

because, as the Supreme Court has noted, it alone preserves all other rights. If elected officials are to consider eliminating programs which aid racial and language minorities in obtaining social and economic equality, it is imperative that those minorities fully and fairly participate in the electoral process. We can ill afford to send to the American people a signal that voter equality is no longer a top national priority. Failure to extend the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act would do just that.●

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again this year to present to my colleagues the important results of the latest congressional questionnaire from my own Eighth District of Wisconsin. I know that other Members of Congress feel as I do that our job of representing the people of our great Nation would be much more difficult without the detailed information these thoughtful citizens bring to us in the form of questionnaire responses.

This survey was returned by more than 10,000 residents of my district. They responded from not only the metropolitan areas, but also from rural areas of northeastern Wisconsin. The ages of the respondents corresponds to recent Census Bureau information about our district's population. In all, I am assured that the respondents mirror quite well the balance of their fellow citizens in the Eighth District.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the respondents gave President Ronald Reagan's economic recovery plan their endorsement. They supported his spending and tax-cutting program with optimism. These have been important steps we have taken in Washington this year.

The distribution of Federal aid through the administration's planned block grant programs was also endorsed by a 70- to 22-percent margin. The Eighth District's respondents thus reflect not only a high degree of support for President Reagan's economic program, but realize, too, that the cost of doing business in Washington has risen far too high.

Crime control, specifically legislation I have introduced to extend mandatory sentencing for most Federal crimes committed with the use of handguns received overwhelming, across-the-board support. Stricter probation standards and less plea bargaining by our prosecutors similarly motivated a favorable response from all parts of northeastern Wisconsin. Crime is an issue which I trust this Congress will adequately address in the coming months because our coun-

trymen undoubtedly sense more needs to be done to stem lawlessness in our cities and towns, at the Federal level no less than the local level.

People were generally in favor of a firm stand toward the Soviet Union. Stressing a resurgence of American prestige around the globe appeals to over 80 percent of the respondents to this questionnaire. Support of some form of national service by young Americans continues to be a matter of great concern among the people of the Eighth District as is also evident around the country.

Those are highlights of the responses I received. I am certain that this information is of value not only to my fellow residents, but to other Members of Congress and the executive branch. For that reason, and to further clarify the views of the participants, I add the detailed results to the RECORD today:

CONGRESSMAN TOBY ROTH'S 1981 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

	Yes	No
1. If Congress passes the President's economic program basically intact, are you optimistic it will reduce inflation and interest rates?	67	29
2. Do you think Federal tax dollars would be better spent if State and local governments distributed federal block grant funds?	70	22
3. Indicate which alternatives you believe would best ensure a sound social security system for the future:		
a. Supplement system with Federal tax dollars.....	43	48
b. Increase social security taxes.....	20	71
c. Raise age of eligibility for full benefits to 68.....	26	66
d. Discourage early retirement by lowering benefits.....	39	54
e. Trim extra programs for students, survivors, and the disabled.....	68	26
f. Reduce cost-of-living benefits for current recipients.....	32	59
4. Do you favor relaxation of federally-imposed air, safety, and environmental regulations if it would get the economy moving again?	56	41
5. Which of the following do you feel would best curb the rise in violent crime?		
a. Strictly enforced mandatory minimum sentences.....	89	6
b. Registration of handguns.....	32	59
c. Less plea bargaining and more strict probation standards.....	90	5
d. Death penalty.....	72	21
6. Do you support the administration's "get tough" policy with the Soviet Union?	80	14
7. Should American youth be required by law to spend time serving their country in either military or community-related service?	68	26

Note.—Percentages do not total 100 percent as all questions were not answered by all respondents.●

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS PROGRAM

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Chairman Roe of the Public Works and Transportation Subcommittee on Water Resources and the members of the subcommittee for their diligent work in conducting 5 days of comprehensive hearings on the construction grants program of the Clean Water Act.

Construction grants provide Federal assistance for communities to build sewage treatment plants. Our recent hearings in the Water Resources Sub-

committee conclusively reaffirmed that this program is critical to our Nation's efforts to clean up and protect our waters. As one witness testified:

Nationwide, the program helps stop the further degradation of our waters, and fosters significant improvements in the quality of our waterways * * * when the nearly 5,000 projects currently under construction begin to come on-line in the next few years, we should see more dramatic improvements in the Nation's water quality.

Furthermore, we have the firm commitment of the Reagan administration to work for reforms in the construction grant program and insure the program's continuation. Speaking for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Deputy Administrator John Hernandez testified:

I really believe that the administration wants a bill and wants this thing to move along * * * We will do everything we can to move it along * * * so that we have some kind of consensus that will be funded.

In Delaware County, Pa. (Delcora), the regional water authority, will need over \$20 million from the construction grants program as local sewage treatment projects enter construction. Philadelphia treatment facilities, which are used by many Delaware County residents, also require multi-million dollar grants to continue current construction.

The current construction grant authorization expires September 30, and the Water Resources Subcommittee is currently drafting a reauthorization bill. Witnesses testified about a number of important changes in the program which would increase water quality benefits, reduce costs, and avoid project disruptions. I would like to point out several important changes which I feel should be included in the new clean water legislation:

Multiyear reauthorization: An authorization of at least 4 years would insure the kind of stability that is the most essential ingredient for an efficient construction grants program.

Maintain and increase the current set-aside for innovative and alternative technologies: These technologies, such as land application, water and energy conservation, and others, are our best hope for attaining clean water at a reasonable price.

Eliminate Federal funding for reserve capacity and collector sewers: This should encourage communities to more realistically assess their future growth needs, and more carefully plan their projects.

Increase emphasis on water conservation: Conservation should be recognized as an important means to reduce needed treatment capacity and costs. This is a legitimate focus for Federal assistance.

Retain funding for infiltration/inflow and rehabilitation: This is especially important in older urban areas where ground water leaks and rain-

water inflow unnecessarily burden treatment capacity.

Increase operator training and public education: We must protect the huge Federal investment in treatment plants by insuring that they are properly operated. Expanded education programs and information sharing would increase use of innovative, cost-effective technology.

Implement plans on nonpoint source pollution: Toxic pollutants entering water from urban and agricultural sources can defeat the water quality gains made through sewage treatment. Federal funding for areawide planning boards under section 208 must be made available as well as funding for the implementation of these plans.

Combined sewer overflow development program: This is a major water quality issue, especially in older cities. A development program should be created to provide grants to develop cost-effective solutions to combined sewer overflow problems.

Contractor liability: Faulty design and construction, leading to costly plant malfunctions, is made worse by a lack of accountability of designers and contractors. Supervision of construction, design standards, and liability provisions must be strengthened.

Taken together, these changes would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the construction grants program. In addition, these reforms are consistent with the key elements of the Reagan administration's proposed program reforms, and also paralleled many of the provisions of a clean water bill approved by the Senate Environmental Pollution Subcommittee. The President has made a funding recommendation for construction grants contingent upon program reforms, and the budget reconciliation conference report includes conditional budget authority for the program if a reform bill is enacted.

I am confident that the House subcommittee will approve a bill which addresses these important reform issues. We are at a critical stage in the reauthorization process. The legislative committees of the House and Senate must move quickly and responsibly in order to insure that proper funding action is taken by the Budget and Appropriations Committees. Further disruptions in program funding would wreak havoc on vital sewage treatment programs across the Nation.

The health and safety of the American people depend to a large extent on clean water. We must responsibly reform the construction grants program so that it can continue its vital function.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AGONY PROLONGED—THE MIA PROBLEM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the recent return of the bodies of three of our MIA's from Vietnam highlights the cruelty of the Hanoi regime as regards the MIA problem. Communist countries think nothing of keeping prisoners years beyond the end of hostilities as they have proved time after time. It makes no difference whether they are dealing with a live or dead prisoner. Prisoners are not taken by the Communists just to prevent them from fighting against them as in the normal rules of warfare. To Communist nations, prisoners are a prize to be tortured in order to break their spirits, used for propaganda purposes and then if possible sold for ransom. The individuals and families mean nothing to the Communist rulers. The Richmond Times-Dispatch of Friday, July 24, 1981, summed this all up in an excellent editorial which I strongly commend to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Friday, July 24, 1981]

AGONY PROLONGED

Nothing more graphically illustrates the ghoulish nature of the communist regime in Vietnam than the facts behind this month's release of the remains of three American servicemen who were shot down in the war from 10 to 14 years ago.

It is not as though these three men were killed in action and their bodies lost in some remote place, their skeletal remains to be recovered only years later. They had been seen parachuting to safety. The Navy told the family of Lt. Stephen O. Musselman that he probably had been shot to death as he floated to earth. But Cmdr. Ronald W. Dodge and Capt. Richard H. Van Dyke were known to have been taken into captivity.

The evidence of Cmdr. Dodge's incarceration as a prisoner of war, although never confirmed by Hanoi, became a matter of worldwide record when *Paris Match*, a French magazine, published a photograph of him in September 1967 being escorted by North Vietnamese soldiers after capture. The photo was subsequently reprinted on the cover of *Life* magazine and used on five million brochures distributed by an organization on behalf of the MIAs.

And yet Hanoi not only failed ever to acknowledge that Cmdr. Dodge had been in custody, but also never reported his death, even after the end of the war, never produced the smallest scrap of information about him. Brad Dodge, who was 4 when his father was shot down in 1967, grew up wondering about his baseball-playing father, a prospect for the Cincinnati Reds, wondering if he would ever have a chance to play catch with him some day.

As for Capt. Van Dyke, POWs who were later released confirmed that he had been in the same camp with a leg injury incurred during bailout. A Vietnamese guard told one of them,

"Your buddy has to have his leg amputated," and then returned to say, "Your buddy didn't make it."

Once again, Hanoi did not have the elementary decency to report this death or to repatriate the body until a decade later, when American laboratory technicians had to identify it.

Why would any regime want to prolong the agony of the MIA families for so long by holding corpses and refusing to acknowledge their identity? The only conclusion, if there is any rational one, is that the Vietnamese Reds were trying to hold America hostage by means of a diabolical sort of body politics. It was the kind of ghastly ploy that even Iran's grim ayatollahs only briefly indulged in after eight American servicemen were killed in the aborted raid to free the U.S. Embassy personnel in Tehran. Hanoi hoped, by keeping the fate of some Americans a secret, to retain leverage that might be used to extract concessions from the U.S.—diplomatic recognition and billions of dollars worth of reconstruction aid.

There are still 2,528 Americans listed as missing in action in a tragic war that ended for America, essentially, with the signing of the ill-fated Paris treaty of Jan. 23, 1973. Based on the grossly tardy return of these three bodies, it is reasonable to assume that Hanoi knows about the fate of many more MIAs—and it is even remotely possible that a few may still be alive in Indochina.

Americans should never forget the MIAs and the agony their families have bravely endured, and the Reagan administration ought to continue to make plain to the jackals of Hanoi that prolonging the agony beyond the ridiculous extreme it already has been dragged out will gain them nothing, and in fact cost them much.●

DISTRESSED INDUSTRIES

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD alluding to the so-called Bailey bailout in a detrimental fashion. None of them have been accurate; all of them have been false. Every single one of them engendered either a misunderstanding or a misperception of the changes these carryback provisions make, as well as serious misperceptions of their obvious and clear interrelationship to current law.

First, no profitable company would have an incentive to take advantage of these provisions to the detriment of any other company in a designated industry. In fact, under current law a profitable company, because of current tax liability, would be encouraged to avoid the incentives that we have provided. Simply put, if you are profitable and have current tax liability, instead of having to elect to collect your investment tax credits over the next 4 years, write them off under this year's tax liability, as current law provides.

Second, it simply is not true that the industries chosen were haphazardly, surreptitiously, or deliberately chosen for selfish, unfair, or unreasonable purposes. These industries were chosen because they are all highly capital intensive. They were chosen because the remaining bulk of the unused investment tax credits carried by marginally profitable firms, eligible to utilize them, lie almost totally within the utilities area. Utilities have other advantages in the Tax Code, and because of pass-through problems, quite frankly would not choose to participate in these provisions if they could.

The arguments that you have heard about other industries who need this help or could use this help and are being denied it because they were not one of the chosen few is completely and totally false, without foundation, do not make good economic sense, and any person who studied these matters would know that.

Quite frankly, other industries either lack the capital intensive nature of the distressed industries, and thus are not carrying earned but unused ITC's, or are in an economic environment where they have either not earned the unused investment tax credits referred to in these provisions, or they have already utilized them.

Third, you have been told that this is a giveaway or a slush fund of some type for a designated few. That also is not true. None of the above are accurate. It is no type of slush fund. These credits and the tax liability against which they can be used are only applicable to productivity-improving investments of the type of property that qualifies for an investment tax credit in the first place.

In short, not one penny could be used for dividends or profits, and because an investment tax credit only has value of 10 percent of the qualifying investment made, there is certainly no incentive under this provision to invest with that kind of writeoff in mind. Therefore, these provisions do not encourage acquisitions or mergers, as has been erroneously reported to you. They are only good and provide some necessary relief for capital intensive industries, who suffer under a discriminatory Tax Code and under the yoke of harsh environmental regulation requirements.

Takeovers would not be encouraged; mergers would not be encouraged. There is no special tax break involved. The use of language like "slush fund" and "boondoggle" and "ballout" are sad misrepresentations of proper recognition only to the extent of tax liability for qualified investments which have already been earned. Unfortunately, we had a chance to do something for America with these provisions—something to insure basic industries like steel, where 19 percent of our

domestic market goes to more modern foreign companies. And that 19 percent will grow year after year. Modernization of our mills is vital to our national defense.

This irresponsibility and inaccurate misrepresentation of the intent and purposes of these provisions will not serve this Nation's industrial base very well. Long-term investment suffers in our system; capital is taxed disproportionately and excessively. Only some type of response to this situation will enable this Nation to survive with an industrial base that will serve her needs.

It is no curious fact that the industries most in trouble in this country are our capital-intensive industries. Automobile manufacturing is a good example. Airlines are another good example. And in the case of these industries, the examples go on and on.

All this extended carryback provision was intended to do was to allow marginally profitable companies within these vital industries to write off qualified investments they have already made against taxes they have already paid to help modernize these industries, to help make them competitive, to save American jobs, to insure America's strength.

A profitable company and/or an unprofitable company with a profitable partner or parent company, would not want to wait the 4 years and elect to take the payback against past tax liability. But you have been told incorrectly that this is the situation—beneficial to such profitable entities under these provisions that I have drafted. Such is not the case.

This opportunity to change the Code is being disserved by inaccurate and misleading information, and is a sad commentary on the dire need our Nation has to recognize the precarious problems faced by her vital and necessary capital-intensive industries. ●

THE TRUE MEANING OF THE REAGAN ECONOMIC PROGRAM

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, with today's House passage of the conference report on the tax cut, President Reagan now has had 100 percent of his economic program approved by the Congress.

The President has accomplished this radical turnaround in American economic policy in just 6 short months. Although much of the impact of the deep cuts to social, health, and educational programs will be felt almost immediately in the months ahead, the most profoundly important repercus-

sions of the President's program will not be apparent for a number of years.

Recently, an article in one of the leading newspapers of the Pacific Northwest, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, offered a glimpse of what these long-term repercussions might be. The vision is a sobering one, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

In the article, Prof. Arval Morris of the University of Washington School of Law argues that President Reagan's program represents a wholesale shift away from the enhancement of our Nation's greatest resource—the energy and creativity of the American people—toward a concentration upon the machinery, capital investment, industrial plant, and all the other trappings of our manufacturing-based economy of the 1940's which represents economic recovery to the Reagan White House.

Professor Morris' analysis exposes the poverty of the administration's shortsighted policy of pursuing immediate budgetary savings through slashes to social program spending, without regard to the consequences—and, ironically, higher costs—in the future.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, July 23, 1981]

REAGAN PLAN SHOULD PUSH PEOPLE POWER (By Arval A. Morris)

President Reagan declares that the point of his economic plan is to produce a welter of new capital investment—new plant and machinery, the instruments of production that will reindustrialize America.

His method is enormous budget and tax cuts that greatly favor the rich, because, he says, the rich will save the money. Savings institutions will loan that money to businesses which will use it to buy new capital goods, and thereby increase the productivity of the American economy. With a greater supply of goods available to meet existing demand, Reagan expects prices, and inflation to fall. He does not say exactly when, especially since he is increasing defense spending by about \$40 billion.

It's a supply-side, trickle-down plan, with a vengeance. Also, it's very "iffy"—if the rich save, if business borrows and invests, if, if, if, John Maynard Keynes once said that there are many a slip between cup and lip. And, THAT may well be the fate of Reagan's plan.

But, no one can deny that we have suffered a decline in productivity for more than a decade. From 1948 to 1965, the output per hour of all workers in the private sector increased an average of 3.2 percent per year. But, between 1965 and 1973, the average rate of increase dropped to 2.3 percent a year. From 1974 to 1979, it rose by only 0.6 percent. Except for the depression, one must go back to before World War I to find such low increases in productivity rates.

LOOK AT GNP

So, Reagan sees the need to increase productivity, but his plan to do it probably will fizzle. What he does not see is the revolution that has occurred during the last 20 years in our labor force. First, there was the

post-war baby boom, and second, the dramatic entrance of significant numbers of women into our work force. But, most importantly, there has been a wholesale shift away from production to service jobs in the private sector.

We had a Gross National Product of \$259 billion in 1948, with the manufacturing share accounting for \$74.5 billion and the service sector share accounting for \$140.6 billion, roughly twice that of manufacturing. By 1977, manufacturing's share of GNP was \$456 billion and the service sector's share was \$1,250.2 billion, or roughly three times that of manufacturing.

Reagan's tunnelvision is concentrated solely on increasing productivity in manufacturing. It ignores the real productivity pattern in our country as a whole. It is obvious that the President's focus should be on human beings in the services sector as well as on machines in the manufacturing sector. Simplistic assumptions that the American economy is predominantly a manufacturing economy are at least 35 years behind the times. Eli Ginzberg recently stated that "proposed reindustrialization of an economy dominated by services is an exercise in futility." This is Reagan's supply-side follies.

What America needs from its President is a fresh look at human capital formation. And this need is rooted in the actual production patterns of this country today.

"SPIRIT" SPREADS

Yet, Reagan is marching in precisely the wrong direction with a significant share of his drastic budget cuts. For example, the Stockman-Reagan cut in the National Science Foundation's education budget threatens its extinction, going from \$80.7 million in 1981 to \$9.9 million. Reagan has cut research in cognitive and behavioral sciences by 70 percent, from \$40.1 million to \$10.1 million. It goes on and on, slashing items like the school lunch program to provide money to build tanks and buy military hardware.

This "spirit" has caught on at state and local levels. The University of Washington's budget is austere, and community colleges are turning away students for lack of funds. Human capital investment is denigrated.

The people of this country did not give Ronald Reagan a mandate to change the fundamental structure of American society. Nor was last November's election an endorsement of supply-side economics. The presidential choices offered were so lackluster that only 54 percent of this country's eligible voters bothered to vote. Of that 54 percent, only 50.8 percent voted for Reagan. So, he was elected by 27.4 percent of the eligible voters of this nation, most of whom were worried about inflation and voted for a change from Jimmy Carter. It was not an ideological victory at all.

A recent New York Times-CBS poll showed that only 31 percent approved of Reagan's budget proposals; and only 38 percent supported his proposed tax cuts; about half were undecided or bemused by it all. That is no mandate for radical change in the fundamental structure of American society.

On the other hand, there is the Soviet Union. University of Chicago Mathematician Izaak Wirszup has published an article showing that the Soviet Union is far surpassing us in mathematics and science education. The new program was voted on in 1966. Its effects are just being felt. All young Russians now get:

1. Three years of arithmetic (grades 1-3)

2. Two more years of arithmetic combined with algebra (4-5)
3. Five more years of algebra (6-10)
4. Ten years of geometry (1-10)
5. Two years of calculus (9-10)
6. Five years of physics
7. Four years of chemistry
8. One year of astronomy
9. Five and one-half years of biology
10. Five years of geography
11. Three years of mechanical drawing
12. Ten years of workshop training

ADVANTAGE TO SOVIETS

Obviously, if Russia were a free country it would have to include significant amounts of liberal education in the humanities—literature, history, philosophy, classics, art and drama—as well as social sciences. But it is totalitarian, and seeks to develop only science and technological skills in its people.

Professor Wirszup assesses the situation this way:

"The Soviet Union's tremendous investment in human resources, unprecedented achievements in the education of the general population, and immense human pool in science and technology will have an immeasurable impact on that country's scientific, industrial, and military strength. It is my considered opinion that the recent Soviet educational mobilization, although not as spectacular as the launching of the first Sputnik, poses a formidable challenge to the national security of the United States, one that is far more threatening than any in the past and one that will be much more difficult to meet."

Perhaps Reagan should give serious thought to the quip that the departments of defense and education should be combined because that is where the money is! Education is, after all, the best way for America to improve its human capital, which is its real, first line of defense, as well as its largest sector of domestic productivity.

He has no ideological mandate, and it makes no sense for Reagan principally to favor the manufacturing sector and to permit the service sector of the economy to be victimized by evangelical political simplism. He must focus on our broader and greater need to develop the human capital of America. Otherwise, our country will suffer, and Reagan's presidency aptly will be termed that of "The Man In the White House from Fortune's 500."●

DR. MARVELLE COLBY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pleasure that I congratulate Dr. Marvella Colby on her recent appointment as executive director of the Greater New York Council of Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. Dr. Marvella Colby, a former constituent and close friend, was recently honored at a special congressional reception. Her appointment is particularly noteworthy because the council is the New York metropolitan area's largest grassroots organization for young girls age 4-17 and it enjoys a membership of over 34,000.

The parent organization, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., was founded by Juliette Gordon Low in 1912. Ms. Low began with a troop of less than 20 girls and today Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. has a membership of nearly 3 million. The Girl Scout program is a "continuous adventure in learning that offers girls a broad range of activities which address both their current interests and their future roles as women." Through activities that stimulate self-discovery, they are introduced to the excitement in the world of science, the arts, the out-of-doors, and people. Girls have opportunities to develop new skills and self-confidence, to have fun, and to make new friends, and through meaningful community service to acquire understanding about themselves and others.

In conjunction with Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., the Greater New York Council has designed a career education program to address the critical need expressed by educators for age-appropriate career exploration and planning methods for children. The council's proposed program is specifically designed to fuse with New York City public school curriculum. Its present objectives are: To employ 100 teenagers in internship programs at minimum wage; to employ 10 college interns to help implement the program; to employ a full-time career education project director and administrative assistant; to initiate career-oriented activities; and finally to evaluate the program.

The program is fully developed and has been implemented and utilized in New York and other areas throughout the country.

Access to career development opportunities is important for all of our youth, and Dr. Marvella Colby should be commended for her participation in this area.●

OMNIBUS PENAL REFORM ACT

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Omnibus Penal Reform Act. The bill consists of original legislation built around what I feel is the most progressive proposals for penal reform introduced in Congress. In developing this legislation I sent copies of the bill to nearly 100 Federal prisoners as well as to criminal lawyers and experts in penology and requested that they all review the proposal and make suggestions for improvement.

The response to this mailing was incredible; many Federal prisoners said it was the first piece of legislation which realistically confronted the problems of penology in the United

States today. At the same time, the prisoners, due to their uncanny insight into the true nature of the prison system, made many suggestions to close loopholes, improve language, and to make the bill much more effective. Experts in penology and criminal lawyers were able to be most helpful and commented on both the form and content of the bill.

I believe this legislation now represents the most workable, progressive, and comprehensive piece of penal reform legislation to be introduced in the House of Representatives.

Many penologists and prison authorities say prisons have changed—that prisons are for rehabilitation, not for punishment. Despite these claims, rebellions at Attica, San Quentin, Soledad, and virtually every other major penitentiary have aptly demonstrated they are wrong. Prisoners across the land continue revolting against brutalizing and inhumane conditions. The sad truth is that in many instances prisons are no different today than at the turn of the century. For example, the Federal Government operates one of its largest institutions at Atlanta. It was built in 1910, and is just as oppressive today as then. Certainly, it is not an atmosphere in which rehabilitation could take place.

We must realize that no person is made more fit to function as a member of society through systematic corporal punishment. And despite claims to the contrary, such punishment exists in prisons today. I have seen the scars. We must also realize that prisoners are entitled to every human and moral right as members of free society. Confinement in a penitentiary is certainly punishment enough and is in itself a most extreme act of retribution by society. Any prisoner will tell you that the sexual and psychological tortures one goes through in prison leave their mark stamped indelibly on the individual's psyche.

Prisons—the backbone of the criminal justice system—reek of injustice and inhumanity. They also have a very definite class characteristic—there are very few white collar criminals in penitentiaries. White collar criminals responsible for millions—if not billions—of dollars worth of crime annually are not in prison. Prisons are full of people who have committed \$10 or \$15 robberies; prisons are full of people who told me that in order for them to survive in what they see as a most oppressive economic atmosphere they went outside the law to provide food and shelter for their families. For them, prisons are the final defense in the maintenance of a social order that insures the affluence of certain segments of society at the expense of others.

And exploitation does not stop when one reaches prison—it increases. Prisoners are paid minimal wages—they

perform virtually slave labor for the Government, which receives a handsome profit in the process. The U.S. Penitentiary at Atlanta—the oldest and most experienced are here—has the highest average sentence per prisoner in the Federal system. It is here where the Federal prison industry produces a major share of its products. We are told that there is extensive rehabilitation in the process—rehabilitation that somehow takes place on outdated machinery that has little or nothing in common with machinery in outside industries. We should ask why such an extensive “rehabilitation” program should be in an institution where the average prisoner is serving a 20- or 30-year or life sentence, instead at institutions where prisoners are serving 2- or 3-year sentences and could benefit from training programs. The situation at Atlanta cannot help but make one wonder if prison authorities are more concerned with making a profit from the exploitation of captive and free labor than with the rehabilitation of the prisoner population.

It is my sincere hope that Congress will see fit to pass this legislation. The uprisings and tragedies we have experienced in our Nation's prisons clearly demonstrates the need for a massive overhaul of the system. If we are truly concerned with penal reform, we must treat the causes, and not the symptoms of the problem.

At this time I would like to submit to the record a summary of the revised Omnibus Penal Reform Act.

SUMMARY

The “Omnibus Penal Reform Act” is divided into eight titles. Five sections expand and solidify prisoners' rights, two titles are concerned with reorganization of the United States Board of Parole, and one title restores voting rights of felons once they have successfully completed their sentence. If passed into law, each title would independently represent a major progressive change in penological practices. However, despite this independent nature, each title highly complements the other sections of the measure.

TITLE I MINIMUM STANDARDS

Establishes the National Prison Standards Administration, as an independent agency in the Executive branch. The Administration would promulgate and enforce rules to insure minimum standards in prisons, including:

No discrimination on grounds of race, sex, language, religion, national or social origin, wealth, or political beliefs.

Establishment of living quarters taking into account prisoners age, sexual preference and criminal record; adequate and private sanitary facilities and minimum standards with respect to cubic content of air, floor space heating and ventilation in living quarters.

Adequate medical, psychiatric and dental care; pre-natal care for women.

Minimum standards for food preparation and service.

Restriction on corporal punishment and solitary confinement.

Written regulations of appropriate prison behavior which will be provided to every prisoner upon admission.

Restriction on prison authorities from inspecting incoming mail except for the purpose of detecting contraband. Mail to government officials, courts, or attorneys to be serviced only by employees of the United States Postal Service.

Allowance of at least three visits a week, and that visitors need not be on an approved list.

Unimpeded availability of newspapers, periodicals, radio and television; media not to be restricted for ideological reasons.

Protection of prisoner property.

Comprehensive vocational training, rehabilitative and work release programs.

Restrictions on nature of prison work and establishment of maximum work hours.

Title I also provides up to a five year \$5,000 sentence for prison authorities who deprive or attempt to deprive a prisoner of rights granted under this title. Such a provision provides prisoners with a minimum assurance that their rights will be protected.

TITLE II. MINIMUM WAGES

Provides for minimum wages equal to the highest minimum wage rate in effect under Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for all Federal prisoners working in prison industry. Also gives prisoners the right to form unions for the purpose of collective bargaining regarding their employment.

TITLE III. FAMILY VISITATION

Provides at least 12 days of furlough a year for prisoners with satisfactory conduct records.

TITLE IV. COMMITMENT AND TRANSFER

Instructs the Attorney General to designate as initial place of confinement the institution nearest the person's place of residence suitable for inmates of the prisoner's classification, and stipulates that no transfer shall be made to another place of confinement solely for punitive reasons unrelated to a clear and present danger to the physical safety of the transferred prisoner, other prisoners, or of prison officials and employees.

TITLE V. FEDERAL PRISONERS IN STATE INSTITUTIONS

Provides protection under federal prison regulations for all federal prisoners quartered in state or local institutions.

TITLE VI. REENFRANCHISEMENT

Reenfranchises felons to vote in Federal elections after they have successfully completed their term of sentence, probation or parole.

TITLE VII. PAROLE

Restructures the Parole Board into a national board and five regional boards. This decentralization of parole powers will bring the prisoner closer to the individuals who make parole decisions. Also provides that the boards proportionately reflect the racial and ethnic composition of the prison population.

Gives the prisoner the right to examine all documents that were used in the parole determination hearing. This enables the prisoner to more readily ascertain why parole was denied or why certain restrictions were placed on the parole.

Sets up provisions for goodtime allowances for parole. The longer a parolee maintains good conduct, the shorter the term of parole.

Entitles the parolee to an attorney at revocation hearings and the opportunity to confront and cross-examine witnesses, as well as stipulating that there be a full and complete hearing record.

TITLE VIII. STATE PLANS

Provides federal assistance to the states for improvement of state parole programs and to develop and operate community oriented for the supervision of and assistance to parolees.●

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP JAMES WALSH

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week the people of Cumberland, Md., lost one of their most distinguished citizens. Bishop James Edward Walsh faithfully represented his church as a foreign missionary to China for 40 years, the last 12 of which were spent in a Shanghai prison. He was deeply revered by the Chinese Catholics which he diligently and enthusiastically served, and despite his arrest in 1958 and subsequent incarceration, he never lost his love and respect for the Chinese people.

To a man who sacrificed his personal freedom in the name of religious freedom, no tribute can be too great. Receiving his assignment to China in 1915, Bishop Walsh accepted a monumental challenge which was only to become more difficult as the years progressed. After serving as Superior General of Maryknoll Fathers in Ossining, N.Y., he returned to China in 1948, remaining firmly committed to his task despite the turmoil surrounding the Communist insurgence which was to take place the following year. Though his mission was ordered closed in 1951, he was never discouraged from preaching the gospel of Christ to a people desperately needing a form of security in the midst of unprecedented change in a land so deeply founded in its ancient traditions. He persisted in this courageous work until it led to his arrest in 1958.

Not only will a man of his character be missed among the millions of Chinese and American Catholics who were touched by his energetic preaching, but he will also be remembered by all people who value honest and sincere devotion to a call in which they believe. Perhaps the people of Jiangment in southern China best described the head of the mission by the name they gave him, Wha Lee Sou, meaning pillar of truth.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a copy of an obituary of Bishop Walsh, which was printed in the Washington Star on July 30, 1981.

BISHOP JAMES WALSH DIES, ONCE IMPRISONED IN CHINA

OSSINING, N.Y.—Bishop James Edward Walsh, the last Christian foreign missionary to serve in China and imprisoned there for 12 years, died Wednesday at headquarters of his order, the Maryknoll Fathers. He was 90.

Only the day before, he had been released at his request from St. Agnes hospital in White Plains, N.Y., to return to his room at the seminary here. He previously had expressed a wish to die on home ground.

He had undergone surgery last month for a urinary ailment, and a subsequent infection had forced his return to the hospital last week, but his strength had ebbed.

Walsh, a Maryland native, was released from Shanghai's Ward Road prison in 1970 after serving nearly 12 years of a 20-year sentence. He had been accused of counter-revolutionary activities, including spying for the Vatican and the U.S.—charges he vigorously denied.

When released, the gaunt, aging missionary of 79, clad in rumpled khaki trousers and a faded checkered shirt, walked across Hong Kong's Lo Wu bridge to freedom on July 10, 1970, hailed as a hero by the free world and a modern Rip Van Winkle.

The last of about 7,000 Roman Catholic and Protestant missionaries from the West to be expelled from China, he had received no news reports during his long imprisonment. He had to be told of such events as the moon walk, the election and assassination of the first Catholic president, John F. Kennedy, and the sweeping reforms of the Second Vatican Council.

He said afterward that the reforms, which increased participation of people by allowing them to use their own language in worship instead of Latin, "surprised and pleased me very much because the church is for the people and the clergy are only servants of the people."

Of his imprisonment, he said: "I have no bitterness toward those who tried and condemned me. I love the Chinese people."

But he strongly denied the espionage charges.

"I came to China in 1918 as a priest and missionary for the purpose of preaching the gospel of Christ to the Chinese people. I can tell you in all honesty and sincerity that I have never spent a day during my 40 years on Chinese soil in doing anything but that."

He applauded later American efforts establishing diplomatic relations with China.

"The Chinese have a natural genius for friendship and sociability," he said, adding that "establishing communications with them may bring about a modification of the Chinese government's policies and perhaps eventually be of some help to the church."

The Chinese since have allowed reopening of churches and greater religious freedom.

Walsh was born April 30, 1891, in Cumberland, Md., one of nine children. After finishing college, he worked for two years in a local steel foundry and then at age 21 entered the then-new Maryknoll Seminary with its first class of six young Americans studying to serve in foreign missions.

He was assigned to China three years later as a member of a four-man team of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, popularly known as Maryknoll. One of his companions was the Rev. Francis X. Ford, who also later became a bishop and died in a Chinese prison in Canton in 1952.

Walsh was made a bishop at the age of 36, the first bishop of Jiangment (Kongmoon) in southern China. Chinese Catholics gave

Walsh the name of Wha Lee Sou—Pillar of Truth.

"The task of a missionary," Walsh said when he became bishop, "is to go to a place where he is not wanted but needed, and to remain until he is not needed but wanted." He returned here in 1936 and was elected Maryknoll superior general. He served a 10-year term, returning to China in 1948.

When the communists came to power in 1949, foreign clergy was harassed and pressured to leave. Walsh's bureau was ordered out in 1951.

When Maryknoll officials expressed concern about his safety he showed a bit of Irish temper, saying, "To put up with a little inconvenience at my age is nothing. Besides, I am a little sick and tired of being pushed around on account of my religion." He was arrested in 1958.

He is survived by four sisters. All of them nuns.●

COMMUTER AIRLINES: AN INDUSTRY COMES OF AGE

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, for the last 8 months I have been involved in the search for commuter airlines to replace service in South Dakota communities which have been threatened with termination of all air service by the major carriers. In that time, I have come to realize that the commuter industry is a growing, aggressive one which can offer a real opportunity for improved air service to many communities. The following editorial which appeared in the July 1981 issue of Commuter Air outlines some of the progress that has been made within this industry, particularly in its public perception. I would like to recommend it to all of my colleagues, particularly to those whose districts might, like mine, soon face the necessity of finding replacement air service.

AT THIS POINT IN TIME—COMMUTER: IT'S NOT A DIRTY WORD

Much today is still being said about the word "commuter." Some question its fitness as a proper label for shorthaul, high-frequency air carriers. Others argue it is appropriate and should be given strong buildup in the marketplace.

Those who want to dump it say its popular image is that of a nine-to-five metro train or bus service. They claim it is too restrictive for longer-distance intercity air carrier operations.

Purporters, however, say the name already has been accepted in the marketplace as a proper label for the special brand of community air service these smaller airlines provide. Contending the "bad apple" stigma attached to the name two years ago has disappeared, they point to a "tremendous improvement in stature during the last 12 months" because commuter air carrier operating records have shown remarkable improvement and because the world transportation industry has accepted the name as the logo for this type of air service.

Webster gives "commuter" broad application, saying it means "to travel back and forth regularly," an appropriate definition for commuter airlines whose passengers do just that.

Whatever the name, it must be one accepted and employed by the entire industry to prevent confusion. *Commuter Air* sampled opinions from more than 80 world industry aerospace executives at Paris and from select executive groups in Washington, DC, where there is a high concentration of aerospace officials who commute on a global scale. The survey found:

Most U.S. executives believe "commuter" is an appropriate word; they say it clearly stands for shorthaul, high-frequency feeder service to hub terminals.

All respondents, including the small minority of U.S. executives who believe the name is inadequate, couldn't agree upon a substitute.

Non-U.S. executives reflected the labels for commuter-level service in their particular country. "Regional," "third-level" and "feeder" were the most-used names. They indicated, however, that the U.S. "commuter" label is beginning to appear and gain favor in international official documents. They cite the international aerospace media's use of the term as evidence.

During each interview respondents were asked to offer their preference for alternate names. Those offered by CA were: feeder, third-level, connector, regional, local, air taxi, shuttle, shorthaul, small-regional and community. None received rave notices with shuttle, feeder, connector and regional receiving mention only.

Here are some humorous but significant observations made by survey respondents: "Feeder" conjures up visions of a mother feeding her child... "Shuttle" reminded some of New York's graffiti-adorned subways... "Local" reminded one executive of a smoke-belching milk train... "Regional" was termed meaningless unless applied to governmental population statistics... CAB's term "small-regional" was ridiculed as an unpopular tag used in desperation to satisfy a statistical purpose when all else fails... "Connector," according to one executive, "sounds like some kind of electrical plug."

Thus, from this small venture into opinion-molding executive and passenger views it appears that "commuter" is still top dog among names.

The alleged "unsafe" tag attached to commuters is fast disappearing as well, say respondents to the survey. Many felt commuters are as safe as the large airlines. Only one or two said they were less safe.

Since commuter is no longer a dirty word, perhaps it's time to embellish its image to symbolize those public service qualities exemplified by this special class of carrier—safe, reliable shorthaul air transportation fitted to community needs. ●

GENESIS, REWRITTEN

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many questions raised regarding Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin's recent actions in the Middle East. Because of the questions

that have been raised, I would like to bring the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial, entitled "Genesis, Rewritten," was written by Mr. Sidney Zion, a journalist who often writes about the Middle East. The editorial appeared in the July 31, 1981, edition of the New York Times.

GENESIS, REWRITTEN (By Sidney Zion)

The Middle East memory bank is empty again. Just read the papers, watch the television. The new Book of Genesis begins with the raid on the Iraqi reactor and climaxes with the bombs over Beirut. The world is outraged and the world will not forget. The world has forgotten everything else, and if the American news media is representative, the world does not want any reminders. It is angry with Menachem Begin, it is impatient, it is at wit's end. And so history becomes intolerable. Still, history has its claims, does it not? And a memory bank is the only bank in history that needs a run on it to get back in business. So here are a few facts.

Lebanon. Israel never touched Lebanon until the Palestine Liberation Organization moved in after King Hussein drove it out of Jordan in September 1970. Prime Minister Golda Meir warned the Lebanese Government that Israel would not countenance a new sanctuary for terrorists. Still, Lebanon gave the inch to the P.L.O. and the rest is what we see, the destruction of a nation. The P.L.O., with leftist Lebanese forces, sacked and pillaged Christian cities until Syria, fearing a radical takeover, came in and began slaughtering the Palestinians and their cohorts. After the Syrian "peacekeeping" mission had succeeded in putting the P.L.O. under its control, Syria and the P.L.O. turned their guns on the Christian minority. There are 32,000 Syrian troops in Lebanon and at least three times that many Arabs have died in that land in the last decade thanks to these peacemakers and their Palestinian allies.

During this period, successive Israeli Governments have bombed Palestinian enclaves in Lebanon. Sum up all these Israeli strikes, including the invasion of Lebanon in 1978, including the bombing of Beirut, and still the casualties inflicted by Israel are minuscule next to what the "Arab nation" has done to its own people. The world hardly took note. When more than 90,000 Arabs die by Arab guns and bombs, it's just one of those crazy things. When 300 Arabs die by Israeli fire, it's a Holocaust committed by a Jewish Mad Bomber, Begin. It begins with Begin. Read the papers, watch the television.

Jordan. In September 1970, Hussein killed 10,000 Palestinians and drove the P.L.O. out of Jordan. From that moment on the Jordanian border has been virtually without incident. No P.L.O., no trouble. There is balm in Gilead, but nobody notices. Indeed, President Reagan is asked to press his "client state" Israel to establish a Palestinian entity next door. But not a word is said about leaning on Jordan—a client state if there ever was one—to recognize Israel and join the Camp David Accords.

When it comes to Jordan, the memory bank was closed before it opened. I know people who think it's 2,000 years old. But Jordan was only the name of a river until 1922, when Winston Churchill, then Colonial Secretary, turned its east bank into the Emirate of Transjordan—created an emirate

out of the British Mandatory territory of Palestine. Transjordan was 80 percent of the land mass of Palestine. Transjordan is Palestine. In 1946, by British fiat, Hussein's grandfather Abdullah became King of Transjordan. In 1948, Abdullah changed the name of his country to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. Presto! The Ancient Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. So what? So everything. What was in every respect Palestine became a refugee camp for Palestinian Arabs, a host country for those "driven out" by the Jews. And so it is viewed today. The Hussein family, brought out of Arabia by Churchill, are the only truly non-Palestinians living in Jordan today. Yet the world sees Palestine as wherever the Jews live.

Hussein, who took over in 1953, is considered a benign, embattled monarch. Yet from 1948 until 1967, Jordan not only occupied but annexed the west Bank. Without a scintilla of international authority, without the consent of the West Bank population. And without a whimper from the world.

Egypt. A consensus as big as the Pyramids holds that Israel gave nothing for peace with Egypt. By turning over the Sinai oilfields, which it discovered and developed, Israel merely gave up its economic security. The future will tell whether it surrendered its physical security as well. And all for little more than Anwar el-Sadat's word of honor.

Israel did not, however, agree to turn over the West Bank and Gaza to the P.L.O. For this it is accused of intransigence. But why do it, at least until those who want the territories recognize Israel, not to say sue for peace? Have we forgotten that Hussein lost the West Bank because he went to war against Israel in 1967?

Have we forgotten that only yesterday the Arab world condemned—and still condemns—Sadat for Camp David? If not, why are we continually advised that Begin is the obstacle to peace, that he has isolated Sadat from the Arabs? Does anyone really believe that the Arab world wants a Palestinian state? Israel's neighbors, if they want peace, have a track to follow. They need only walk in Sadat's footsteps.

History is often intolerable—just ask the Jews. It also instructs—just tell the Arabs. ●

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S TAX CUT

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, by now everyone knows that Congress recently enacted the largest tax cut in American history. Not everyone is fully aware of the alternatives that Congress faced on the tax cut issue. I have always favored a responsible, targeted, fair tax cut which would demonstrate the proper concern for reducing the Federal deficit. I voted for such a tax cut when it was offered on the House floor on July 29, 1981.

The fact is that Congress faced three major alternatives on July 29: First the administration proposal which President Reagan advertised in a major televised speech on July 27; second the House Ways and Means

Committee proposal, representing a more cautious approach but essentially paralleling the administration proposal; and third a balanced-budget tax cut offered by senior Representatives DAVID OBEY, MORRIS UDALL, and HENRY REUSS. I supported the Obey-Udall-Reuss tax cut, and I'd like to take a moment to explain why.

The overall size of the tax cut I supported is less than half the administration tax cut, leaving enough revenue in the Federal Treasury to balance the budget in 1982 and provide a \$20 billion surplus in 1982. Under Obey-Udall-Reuss a business tax reduction would have been effected immediately in 1982, while cuts in individual income taxes would have been phased in over 1982 and 1983. The alternative tax cut was designed to provide a 5-percent reduction in marginal tax rates primarily for middle-income families. Also, a series of specific tax reductions would be enacted to address longstanding inequities in the tax code.

Admittedly, this alternative tax cut would use tax policy to achieve certain needed social goals and reforms. The administration proposal also represents a use of the tax cut to advance the interests of certain members of society, whether President Reagan recognizes this or not. In fact, the administration's tax cut disproportionately benefits the wealthy instead of targeting tax relief to lower and middle-income taxpayers. The administration's tax cut in 1982 will give the 5.6 percent of taxpayers who earn more than \$50,000 a year 35 percent of the tax cut. Even worse, 0.2 percent of taxpayers—the one taxpayer in 500 who makes more than \$200,000 a year—will get over 10 percent of the administration's tax cut, or over \$3½ billion.

The Obey-Udall-Reuss substitute also represents certain clear goals for Federal budget policy. For years Congress has been advised that continuing Federal deficits are a contributor to inflation and high interest rates. How-

ever, many of the so-called conservatives who once favored balancing the budget now have found a new theme—supply-side economics. The Reagan administration has minimized the harmful effects of the Federal deficit in order to justify an economic program which guarantees a Federal deficit until the last year of President Reagan's term in office.

Moreover, even the projected balanced budget in 1984 assumes that Congress will enact \$45 billion in future-year spending reductions which the administration has not yet even proposed. Additionally, the administration's projections assume enactment of an unpopular \$10 billion cut in social security benefits which the Republican-controlled Senate has already rejected 96 to 0. Furthermore the Reagan administration has fallen victim to the old political habit of making unrealistic projections about the future performance of the economy. If interest rates, inflation, and unemployment fail to meet the administration's goals of performance, the Reagan tax cuts and defense spending increases will produce the largest budget deficits in American history.

The House Ways and Means Committee tax proposal, though it mirrored the administration tax cut in many respects, foresaw the potentially devastating effects of massive tax cuts on the Federal deficit. For this reason, the Ways and Means Committee sought to guarantee some measure of flexibility in future economic policy by setting a trigger mechanism on the last 10 percent of the 25-percent individual tax cut the administration proposed. It is interesting to note that the administration did not have enough confidence in its own economic projections to accept these projections as conditions for the triggering of the final year of the tax cut.

I give the President credit for his boldness and his political skill in securing adoption of what is clearly the most radically new policy initiative

since the 1960's, or perhaps even the 1930's. Within the last few days Congress has approved the Reagan budget and tax program and time will tell of its success or failure as economic policy. Though I have grave doubts about this new course, we all must hope that it will work.

It strikes me that the primary thrust of President Reagan's appeal on behalf of his program has little to do with economics. As during his Presidential campaign, Mr. Reagan's appeal is based on his attack of the role of the Federal Government. The tax cut has been argued for as a way of diminishing the Government's role in American social and economic life. If you take away the Government's revenues, you limit the Government's policy options for attempting to solve the Nation's problems.

This is fine up to a point. The American public asserted its right to check the growth of Government by electing President Reagan. I am concerned, however, about the President's apparent inability to define what the legitimate role of Government ought to be. I feel most Americans would agree that there are areas of national life where the Government must act firmly. Among these areas are education, transportation, energy policy, health policy, planning of growth and preservation of infrastructure, protection of workers and consumers, employment security, protection of the environment, protection of the elderly, the disabled, and the disadvantaged, and many other tasks for which there must be a public responsibility.

The President has shown his ability to lead an attack on the Government which he now heads. I hope that in future tests of his skills the President's leadership will extend to constructive actions which the Government must take to insure our Nation's political, economic, and social prosperity. ●