

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATIONAL PRO-LIFE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE—A STUDY IN INTEGRITY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1981, Rev. Charles Fiore, O.P., testified before the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate in opposition to the nomination of Judge Sandra Day O'Connor to the U.S. Supreme Court. Father Fiore is chairman of the National Pro-Life Political Action Committee (PAC), a role that he and his Washington representative, Peter Gemma, have filled with integrity and honor.

I have been, and will continue to be, privileged to serve on that organization's advisory board. It was not too long ago that this organization faced a storm of protest because they had targeted pro-abortion advocates for defeat, irregardless of political party affiliation. The heat was on in the kitchen, but this organization stuck to its guns. My own position with regard to this "storm" could only be, both as a physician and a Member of this body, that where the murder of the unborn is concerned—it is just that—murder—and politics goes out the window.

Although Judge O'Connor will probably be confirmed, the National Pro-Life PAC once again took the position of honor and integrity. That is why, for all to know, that I take this opportunity to share Father Fiore's testimony with my colleagues. Testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE REV. CHARLES FIORE, O.P., CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL PRO-LIFE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you as founder and Chairman of the National Pro-Life Political Action Committee, and on behalf of tens of thousands of our supporters in all states and right-to-lifers everywhere, who oppose the nomination of Judge Sandra Day O'Connor to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mrs. O'Connor's nomination by President Reagan has been the occasion of virtually unanimous disappointment on the part of rank-and-file pro-lifers, because it represents a breach of the 1980 Republican Platform on which he ran (and which he more than once privately and publicly affirmed as a candidate), and on the basis of which he convinced millions of blue-collar, traditionally Democratic voters—ethnic Catholics and fundamentalist-evangelical Protestants—to switch parties and vote for him.

As a result, in the first six months of his incumbency, President Reagan may have se-

riously alienated major portions of the "social issues conservatives" who comprised the pro-life/pro-family coalition that helped elect him last November. Those same voters are intently watching these hearings, and will long remember and note well the final "ayes" and "nays" as the full Senate determines Judge O'Connor's qualifications to sit with the Court. As voters they perceive the members of the House and Senate not as party functionaries, but as their representatives first of all; just as they also perceive party platforms and election pledges not as "litmus tests," but as implied contracts to be fulfilled by those elected.

I say these things at the outset, not because they have bearing on Mrs. O'Connor's qualifications, but because they have very much to do with the larger processes of representative government, which are also at stake in these hearings.

The facts of Judge O'Connor's legislative and judicial careers are matters of public record, even though it appears that the Administration paid scant attention to them when evaluating her qualifications for the Supreme Court, even as late as the now-infamous Starr Justice Department memorandum hurriedly compiled a day or so before the nomination was made.

Briefly, as they pertain to the abortion issue, the facts are:

1. As a State Senator in 1970, Mrs. O'Connor twice voted for HB 20, to repeal Arizona's existing abortion statutes—three years before the U.S. Supreme Court legalized abortion-on-demand, throughout the nine months of pregnancy, in all 50 states.

2. In 1973, Senator O'Connor co-sponsored a so-called "family planning" Act (SB 1190) which would have allowed abortions for minors without the consent of parents or guardians. The bill was considered by all observers in Arizona to be an abortion measure, and the Arizona Republic (3/5/73) editorialized, "The bill appears gratuitous—unless energetic promotion of abortion is the eventual goal."

3. In 1974, Senator O'Connor voted against a bill (HCM 2002) to "memorialize" Congress on behalf of passage of a Human Life Amendment to the Constitution protecting the unborn.

4. In 1974, she voted against an amendment to a University of Arizona funding bill that prohibited use of tax-funds for abortions at University hospital, because Mrs. O'Connor claimed it was "non germane" and thus violated the state constitution. However, the bill passed with the amendment, and its constitutionality was upheld by the State Supreme Court.

It seems rather peculiar to us that Mrs. O'Connor, in discussing her legislative record on abortion with Mr. Starr of the Justice Department, could not remember her position on the first three votes, since they all represented dramatic departures from the existing laws and aroused national media attention. Yet she was apparently able to recall the far less significant fourth vote and her precise reason for it. Stranger still, was her attempt in the Starr memorandum to portray herself as a friend and intimate of Dr. Carolyn Gerster, M.D., Phoenix, titular head of the state right-to-life organization, when Dr. Gerster says it was well-

know that she and Mrs. O'Connor had long been in heated opposition on these very votes.

The question looms large over Mrs. O'Connor's qualifications to sit as a member of the Supreme Court: Did she deliberately seek to mislead investigators for the Justice Department and/or the President as to the facts of her legislative record on this vital issue; did she give false or selective information in an attempt to portray her clearly pro-abortion legislative record as something else?

And if she did, what does that say about her ambition to accede to the high Court . . . and her moral strengths once part of it? What price glory?

I raise these blunt and impolite questions because the matter of the right to life of the unborn is fundamental and critical to the health of our society. "The right to life," as also the rights to "liberty and the pursuit of happiness" are not "minor" or peripheral issues in our political process. Nor are they "private" any more than homicide is a "private" act if the unborn are human, as indeed every medico-scientific test affirms.

Because of the complicated and sensitive issues involved, at the very least we expect you to fully explore her philosophy and opinions on this issue of life versus death. If this judge be not guilty of the pro-abortion charge, let her proclaim her innocence loudly and clearly. Indeed, if she has changed her views, National Pro-Life PAC would be first in line to reconsider our opposition to this nomination.

As Professor William Bentley Ball, former Chairman of the Federal Bar Association's Committee on Constitutional Law, and one who has argued a number of religious liberty cases before the U.S. Supreme Court, recently wrote apropos of Mrs. O'Connor's nomination:

"Some zealous supporters of the O'Connor nomination . . . have made the astonishing statement that, on the Supreme Court of the United States, ideology doesn't count. They say . . . that it would be of no significance that a candidate would have an actual and proved record of having voted or acted on behalf of racism or anti-Semitism or any other philosophic point of view profoundly opposed by million of Americans. These concerns are not dispelled by a recital that the candidate is 'personally' opposed to such a point of view. Why the qualifying adverb? Does that not imply that, while the candidate may harbor private disgust over certain practices, he or she does not intend to forgo support of those practices?"

"Philosophy is everything in dealing with the spacious provisions of the First Amendment, the due process clauses, equal protection, and much else in the Constitution. It is perfect nonsense to praise a candidate as a 'strict constructionist' when, in these vital areas of the Constitution, there is really very little language to 'strictly' construe . . ."

"It is likewise meaningless to advance a given candidate as a 'conservative' (or as a 'liberal'). In the matter of Mrs. O'Connor, the label 'conservative' has unfortunately been so employed as to obfuscate a very real issue. The scenario goes like this:

"Comment: 'Mrs. O'Connor is said to be pro-abortion.'

Response: 'Really? But she is a staunch conservative.'

"Just as meaningful would be:

Comment: 'John Smith is said to be a mathematician.'

Response: 'Really? But he is from Chicago.'

"Whether Mrs. O'Connor is labeled a 'conservative' is irrelevant to the question respecting her views on abortion. So would it be on any other subject." (Emphasis added. Cf. Appendix for complete text, "The O'Connor Supreme Court Nomination: A Constitutional Lawyer Comments," from THE WANDERER, St. Paul, MN, Vol. 114, No. 31; July 30, 1981).

"Philosophy is everything . . ." says Professor Ball. And we concur. With these facts of her record in mind, and in the light of President Reagan's pro-life promises before, during and after the campaign, logically only three conclusions can be drawn:

1. Either Sandra Day O'Connor has changed her views, and is no longer a pro-abortion advocate ("personal opposition" does not necessarily translate into "public" opposition to abortion), or

2. President Reagan appointed Mrs. O'Connor without full knowledge about her public record, or

3. President Reagan was fully informed about Mrs. O'Connor's public record as pro-abortion, but chose to disregard it and the solemn pro-life promises he had made.

If, as it appears, Judge O'Connor and some of her supporters have attempted to cloud over or to minimize the importance of her pro-abortion record for the sake of these hearings, what does that say about her record? More, what does it say about her probity and candor?

Far from being unimportant, these questions are absolutely essential in judging the qualifications of one nominated to the Supreme Court of our land.

Mrs. O'Connor, although she has already testified and submitted herself to your queries, technically is still before this Committee, and may be recalled for further questioning by yourselves or other Senators.

She must be asked directly if she has changed her views on abortion since her votes in the Arizona State Senate. She must be asked specifically about each of those votes. She must be asked about *Roe vs. Wade* and *Doe vs. Bolton*, about parental consent to medical procedures on minors, and the other excellent questions Professor Ball raises in his article (*op. cit.*).

Should this Committee and the Senate fail to raise these questions with Judge O'Connor now, as previous Judiciary Committees did not hesitate to question Judges Hanesworth and Carswell on their records and philosophies, her nomination if confirmed will always be tainted, and history will record that the Senate rushed to confirm her for specious reasons and not her legitimate qualifications for the job.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we see no evidence of a change of heart or mind on the part of Judge O'Connor from the pro-abortion stance that dominates her public record. We do not know what questions President Reagan asked Mrs. O'Connor in his private meeting with her, and so we do not know the practical value, if any, of her newfound "personal opposition" to abortion. On the contrary, we find evidence that one week after her conversation with the President (and before her nomination) she gave partial and mis-

leading information on these very issues as they arise in her record, to an investigator for the Attorney General of the United States, at a time when she knew full well that she was being considered among the finalists for this nomination.

I understand Mrs. O'Connor's ambition and desire to become the first woman Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I find her philosophy as exemplified in her record as a legislator and leader in the State Senate of Arizona clearly pro-abortion and so, on the basis of criteria set forth by the Platform of the majority party in the Senate, and by the President who nominated her, she is unqualified.

But all of us in public life must realize at times like these that our judgments are subject to re-examination, first of all by the public record which follows, and ultimately by the one Judge who alone is just, and to whom all of us must finally submit our thoughts, hopes, our words, our deeds, our very lives—all of which and each part of which will be "germane."

Quite simply, gentlemen, abortion goes beyond partisan platforms and political promises—it is morally unjustifiable. For that fundamental reason, we urge all of you—Democrats and Republicans alike—to vote against the nomination of Sandra Day O'Connor to the U.S. Supreme Court.

[From the Wanderer, July 30, 1981]

THE O'CONNOR SUPREME COURT NOMINATION:
A CONSTITUTIONAL LAWYER COMMENTS

(By William Bentley Ball)

As one whose practice is in the field of constitutional law, one thing stands out supremely when a vacancy on the Supreme Court occurs: the replacement should be deliberate, not impulsive. The public interest is not served by a fait accompli, however politically brilliant. The most careful probing and the most measured deliberations are what are called for. Confirm in haste, and we may repent at leisure.

Unhappily, the atmosphere surrounding the nomination of Sandra Day O'Connor to the Supreme Court is one almost of panic. Considering that the liberties of the American people can ride on a single vote in the Supreme Court, any politically or ideologically motivated impatience should be thrust aside and time taken to do the job right. Plainly, there is no need for instantaneous confirmation hearings, and the most painstaking effort should be made to fully know the qualifications—including philosophy—of the candidate. My first plea would be, therefore: Don't rush this nomination through.

My second relates indeed to the matter of "philosophy." Some zealous supporters of the O'Connor nomination (who themselves have notoriety as ideologues) have made the astonishing statement that, on the Supreme Court of the United States, ideology doesn't count. They say, in other words, that it would be of no significance that a candidate would have an actual and proved record of having voted or acted on behalf of racism or anti-Semitism or any other philosophic point of view profoundly opposed by millions of Americans. These concerns are not dispelled by a recital that the candidate is "personally" opposed to such a point of view. Why the qualifying adverb? Does that not imply that, while the candidate may harbor private disgust over certain practices, he or she does not intend to forego support of those practices?

Philosophy is everything in dealing with the spacious provisions of the First Amend-

ment, the due process clauses, equal protection, and much else in the Constitution. It is perfect nonsense to praise a candidate as a "strict constructionist" when, in these vital areas of the Constitution, there is really very little language to "strictly" construe. As to other areas of the Constitution (e.g., Article I, Sect. 4—"The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year . . ."), to speak of "strict construction" is also absurd, since everything is already "constructed."

It is likewise meaningless to advance a given candidate as a "conservative" (or as a "liberal"). In the matter of Mrs. O'Connor, the label "conservative" has unfortunately been so employed as to obfuscate a very real issue. The scenario goes like this:

Comment: "Mrs. O'Connor is said to be pro-abortion."

Response: "Really? But she is a staunch conservative." Just as meaningful would be:

Comment: "John Smith is said to be a mathematician."

Response: "Really? But he is from Chicago."

Whether Mrs. O'Connor is labeled a "conservative" is irrelevant to the question respecting her views on abortion. So would it be on any other subject.

The New York Times editorialized July 12th on "What To Ask Judge O'Connor." The four questions it posed (all "philosophical," by the way) were good. To these many another question need be added. For example:

What are the candidate's views on:

The proper role of administrative agencies and the assumption by them of powers not clearly delegated?

The use by IRS of the tax power in order to mold social views and practices?

The allowable reach of governmental control respecting family life?

Busing for desegregation?

The proper role of government with respect to non-tax-supported private religious schools?

Sex differentiation in private employment?

Freedom of religion and church-state separation?

Broad and bland answers could of course be given to each of these questions, but lack of knowledge or lack of specificity in answers would obviously be useful indices of the capabilities or candor of the candidate. Fair, too—and important—would be questions to the candidate calling for agreement with, disagreement with, and discussion of, major prior decisions of the Supreme Court. Not the slightest impropriety would be involved in, and much could be gained by, public exposition of the candidate's fund of information on these cases, interest in the problems they have posed, and reaction to the judgments made.

Even these few considerations make it clear that the Senate's next job is not to confirm Mrs. O'Connor but instead to find out who she really is—that is, what convictions she possesses on great issues. I thus return to my theme that deliberativeness, not haste, should be the watchword respecting the confirmation inquiry. The fact that a woman is the present candidate must not (as Justice Stewart indicated) be dispositive of choice. It should certainly not jackknife basic and normal processes of selection. At this point, no prejudgment—either way—is thinkable.

Other vacancies may soon arise. The precedent of lightning-fast decisions in the

matter of choosing our Supreme Court Justices would be a bad precedent indeed.

Responses of Mrs. O'Connor to questions posed to her very recently give rise to additional concerns: (a) re Mrs. O'Connor's views concerning overruling of prior decisions, (b) her candor.

As to (a): She takes what appears like a "conservative" position of saying that she would not vote to disturb prior decisions of the court (including the abortion decisions). If it is a fixed principle with her, that prior decisions may not be overruled, then she should be asked whether she would have voted in *Brown v. Board of Education*, to overturn the "separate but equal" doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (or, as far as that goes, the *Dred Scott* decision). If her answer is "yes," then she does not have the above fixed principle. Then she should be asked: "Since you do not, after all, have any real principle against overruling prior decisions, then would you not vote to overrule *Roe v. Wade* (the abortion decision) since you say you are opposed to abortion?"

If her answer is "no," she is plainly not qualified to go on the court because no one should be a Justice of the Supreme Court (as contrasted with lower courts) who would declare himself absolutely bound to follow old prior Supreme Court decisions however bad they may have been.

As to (b): Mrs. O'Connor has seemed to perform, in her Washington interviews, with somewhat less than the candor which the public deserves when it is choosing a Supreme Court Justice. Understandably she should not be asked to commit, in advance, her vote on a particular hypothetical or actual case. But where a candidate for the bench has already taken a public position on an issue of great significance nationally, it is plainly the public's right to know whether the candidate continues to hold that view. If, for example, Mrs. O'Connor had several times voted, in Arizona, in favor of racial segregation, would it be deemed improper to require her to say whether she does, or does not, today repudiate that position? (Not with quibbling about "personally" being opposed to segregation.)

There should be no sense of inevitability about the O'Connor nomination. The nation is not bankrupt in men—or women—of qualifications for the Supreme Court. There are many candidates with unimpeachable qualifications in the United States—with better legal experience, far superior judicial qualifications, and with no blemish on their records of having even remotely supported violations of rights to liberty or to life. This is especially the case when we consider that the lifetime appointment may mean that the appointee will be on the bench for decades.

Finally, a note of mystery on the O'Connor matter. Let us suppose that President Reagan had nominated a person who had had relatively limited law practice experience, had never argued a case before the Supreme Court of the United States, had not in fact ever handled a case of significance, had no heavy trial experience, had no high scholarly qualifications, had a few years as one of a multitude of politicians holding a seat in a state senate, and a few years as a judge (not even on a state supreme court but in a state intermediate appellate court, where political hacks abound) and had never written a noteworthy opinion as such. Would anyone venture to say that here was Supreme Court material? In this case, the media have acclaimed just such a candidate—and one must wonder why. Suppose

that, instead of having had a record indicating acceptance of abortion, such a candidate had a record the other way around—was known as a Moral Majority type? Would the mediocrity—indeed the poverty—of legal background then have been ignored by the media?●

HONORING LOS ANGELES BICENTENNIAL

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1981

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I speak today to honor the 200th anniversary of the founding of the great city of Los Angeles, Calif. The city, originally named "El Pueblo de la Reina de los Angeles"—the pueblo of the Queen of Angels—has come a long way since it was first settled on September 4, 1781, by a band of 44 travelers who spent over 7 months in journey from Mexico. Originally a part of a Spanish colony, and then of Mexico, the city was a Mexican provincial capital, then a frontier boom town, and now the U.S. major commercial center on the west coast.

The city of Los Angeles is truly an international city providing opportunity to Asians, Hispanics of many nationalities, and persons from virtually every part of the globe. Today, as we concern ourselves with the future of our country's immigration policy, it is worthwhile to consider that many of the oldest families in Los Angeles can trace their lineage, as I can, to a time before the West was part of the United States.

A visitor to Los Angeles cannot escape the cultural diversity of the city and its heritage, from the Spanish architecture, and red tile roofs, to the many languages heard on the streets. One need only travel from Olvera Street, famous for its Mexican restaurants and shops, to Century City, a sparkling shopping and office complex of glass, steel, and concrete in order to appreciate the variety.

Los Angeles has not only drawn people from all over the world, but from all over the United States as well, yet they all share the common heritage of looking for greater opportunity. Whether they be actors, engineers, businessmen, electronics specialists, seeking political asylum due to political upheavals, or simply looking for a better life for their children, Los Angeles has offered opportunity to all.

Two hundred years after it was first founded, it is still a young city, willing to try new things and new ways of doing them. We should all raise our sombreros to the people of Los Angeles, for through them we can learn to prosper from cultural diversity. Where else can one buy a kosher burrito from

a street stand run by a Korean immigrant.●

MARITIME DRY BULK TRADE ACT

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to be known as the Maritime Dry Bulk Trade Act.

The purpose of this bill is to promote the U.S.-flag, dry-bulk fleet. Currently, U.S.-flag vessels carry only 1.2 percent of this country's import-export dry-bulk commodities. There are only 19 U.S.-flag, dry-bulk vessels in our fleet. Most of these vessels are over 30 years old. The United States cannot afford to rely totally upon foreign sources to provide the transportation services needed to maintain the flow of such essential dry bulk imports and exports.

The bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to take immediate and positive actions to promote the orderly and rapid growth of the U.S.-flag, dry-bulk fleet in order to transport 40 percent of our dry-bulk imports and exports within 10 years.

The attainment of this 40-percent goal is to be accomplished by directing the Secretary to negotiate bilateral shipping agreements with our trading partners. Included within such agreements will be a requirement that a certain percentage of such cargo, for example 40 percent, must be carried in U.S.-built, U.S.-flag vessels, 40 percent in vessels designated by the trading partner and the remaining 20 percent may be carried by vessels registered in any other country. The Secretary may negotiate a percentage above or below 40 percent, so long as it does not fall below 33½ percent. The 40-40-20 cargo allocation scheme envisioned in this bill is the same as the formula currently being promoted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD]. Whether we like it or not, the rest of the world practices cargo preference. If the interests of this Nation's maritime fleet are to be protected, then some positive action must be taken immediately.

I believe that the bill I am introducing today attempts to promote the U.S.-flag fleet in a reasonable manner. Under my proposal, waivers may be granted during the first 10 years of an agreement so as to allow cross-traders to carry a percentage in excess of their allocated share if the fleets of the trading partners are not yet able to carry their portion of the cargo.

I have also included within this bill the requirement that in order to qualify as a U.S.-flag vessel, the vessel

must not be built or operated with Government subsidy. Although such a requirement may not be popular with some segments of the industry, I believe that the subsidy system has clearly failed to adequately promote our merchant marine and that Congress should not be asked to act favorably upon this legislation without requiring that the industry give something up in exchange. ●

SMALL BUSINESS HURT MOST BY GOVERNMENT SLOW PAY PRACTICES

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Export Opportunities and Special Small Business Problems, one of the most frequent complaints I have heard from small businessmen in my district and around the country is that the Federal Government does not pay its bills on time. Small firms are often forced to wait 90 to 120 days or more for payment of goods and services delivered to Federal agencies. This causes severe cash flow problems for firms already struggling in our current economic climate. It is for this reason that I am cosponsoring H.R. 2036, a bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from California, Representative ROBERT LAGOMARSINO, to correct this important problem.

The basic goal of H.R. 2036 is to require the Federal Government to pay its bills within 30 days after receipt of invoice. If an agency fails to do this, interest charges would be assessed on the amount past due. For meat, groceries and other perishables, payment would be due in less than 30 days as is common practice in those industries. The legislation, therefore, merely requires the Government to do what is standard practice in the private sector. It is important to note that these firms are not looking for additional revenue through the payment of interest. They want their invoices paid on time, and the threat of interest charges is the "stick" that will force Federal money managers to do this.

The need for such legislation has been clearly established. A 1978 report by the General Accounting Office found that the Government paid 39 percent of its bills late. The average delay ran 74 days. While large business firms may be able to carry the Government for this length of time, most small firms cannot. Stories abound of small businessmen and women forced to borrow money to pay their bills to meet their payrolls while owed thousands by the Feds. It is little wonder that many of these firms ul-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

imately conclude that it is just not worth it to sell to the Federal Government. In the end, it is the Government and the taxpayers who will end up the loser through reduced competition.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to reverse this trend in irresponsible payment practices on the part of the Federal agencies. I believe that H.R. 2036 and similar bills introduced in the House and Senate will do this. It will also send a loud and clear message to small businessmen and women across the Nation that this Congress is responsive to their concerns. I strongly urge my colleagues who have not already done so to support H.R. 2036 and work for its speedy enactment.

Also, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent initiative from Jim Boren. As usual, in his own satirical way, Mr. Boren hits the nail on the head.

[From Jim Boren's Mumblepeg: The Voice of the Bureaucrat]

FEDSLOPP: A FEDERAL SLOW-PAYMENT PENALTY PLAN

Federal Float, the orbital movement of past-due bills in the federal government, is a matter of major concern to small businesses throughout the country, and Mumblepeg has a suggestion for bringing an end to the problem. It is Fedslopp, a Federal Slow-Payment Penalty Plan. It could be tagged with the slogan, "Stop FedFloat with Fedslopp."

Agencies of the United States Government now owe small businesses many billions of dollars for goods and services provided in good faith and in a timely and proper manner. According to one study, 39 percent of federal bills are paid late, and the average late bill is 74 days past due. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been floating one small company's bill for five years. In another case a company faced a long delay because the federal agency had simply changed its name but would not respond to billings made out in the agency's old name.

Why are the payments so slow? The fault is not with the payment centers—many of whom can turn out checks within twenty-four hours of receiving authorization. It is for a wide variety of reasons: "Our offices were moved . . .", "The computer was down . . .", "The clearance people were on leave . . .", "Payment authority has been delegated to another office. . . ." The file's been lost. Can you resubmit all the documents?"

Mumblepeg finds such a wide application of its principles of creative nonresponsiveness that it is having difficulty in determining who might best merit the Inataprobu Order of the Bird, its not-so-coveted sculpture of a potbellied featherless bird. While Inataprobu's Twenty-Nine Coordinating Committees are studying the problem of Federal Float, Mumblepeg is proposing the immediate establishment of Fedslopp (Federal Slow-Payment Penalty Plan).

Under Fedslopp, small business would bow to sloppy bill handling by federal agencies for a period of thirty days. After a bill is past due for thirty days, however, the slow-payment penalty plan would go into effect. Bills past due for thirty to sixty days would automatically be increased by "Ten Per Cent Plus Prime". Prime would be based on the established prime rate on the day the check was finally written. Bills sixty

to 180 days past due would be increased each thirty days at the same "Ten Per Cent Plus Prime." When a bill was past due for 180 days, a letter of reprimand would be placed in the personnel file of all persons in the chain of command from the first payment office to and including the head of the agency. Upon receiving the third reprimand, the person would be transferred to a reduced in grade and transferred to some other type of work if such were available.

Mumblepeg may wish to refine its proposal as more research is completed, but it believes that Fedslopp for sloppy bill handling is at least a timid beginning. ●

OPPOSE THE AWACS SALE

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, the proposed sale of the F-15 enhancement and AWACS package to Saudi Arabia is contrary to the best interests of the United States and represents a dangerous threat to the Middle East peace process. As I have stated before, the arguments against the sale are compelling.

I would like to share with my colleagues the following address by Patrick Cosgrave. Dr. Cosgrave was the former special adviser to Margaret Thatcher. His observation that "Israel cannot afford to lose a war" has profound implications, and must be considered during the congressional review of the proposed arms sale to the Saudis:

THE WEST CONFUSES ISRAEL'S INTERESTS WITH ITS OWN DESIRES (By Patrick Cosgrave)

Before 1967 a great many people in this country perceived Israel as a weak, small, and very vulnerable power. It held the sympathy of the American people because of the Holocaust that led to its creation, and our admiration as well for maintaining a fight as a Jewish David against an Arab Goliath. American support for Israel, therefore, was based almost entirely on sentimental, emotional, and even moral reasons.

But after Israel's stunning victory in the 1967 war, we no longer felt toward Israel in the same warm way, with the same feelings of paternalism. This development, perhaps even more so than the later 1973 Arab oil embargo, marked the decline of the West's feelings of intimacy with Israel.

This perception has significantly colored American and European reactions to the actions of the Menachem Begin government in recent months. But it is my fear that in criticizing Israel, we are often confusing two entirely different things: The logic, or perhaps lack of logic, of the policy Israel follows—from its own perspective, and the interests of the Atlantic alliance. We see this, for example, when a Western politician speaks out against the Israeli attack on South Lebanon or on the nuclear reactor in Iraq.

Israel has highly mobilized, standing military forces, and the Arabs know Israel as a country to be a highly effective and highly efficient fighting force. But as one arguing

Israel's case, I would like to emphasize the sheer enormity of the fire power assembled against them, even discounting the military capability of Egypt.

In almost every category—manpower, armored divisions, mechanized infantry divisions, tanks and combat aircraft—the fire-power assembled on or near Israel's Eastern border is more or less equivalent to the power that is assembled in the Western European theater.

Israel cannot lose a war. If Britain had lost World War II to Germany, there would still be a Britain—Britain under German domination, but a Britain whose citizens could imagine that in the foreseeable future, an uprising might restore their independence. Moral and power considerations aside, we cannot deny that after the fall of France, there remained a France of sorts. Even if Germany had won the war, the Vichy government might have negotiated with its conquerors for the restoration of France, and France very much limited in power but still culturally, racially, religiously and identifiably a unit.

But to an Israeli, the loss of a single battle would mean The End—the end of the state, with no further possibility of resuscitation. And more than likely, it would also mean the death of practically every one of its Jewish inhabitants.

I remember talking to Prime Minister Begin just after Sadat's visit to Jerusalem in 1977, and Begin was irritated by the fact that all the praise in the Western newspapers was for Sadat. Begin said in effect that all Sadat risked when he came there was his life. "So what? Any man would risk his life for his country. But in any decision I make about concessions with Sadat, I risk the country."

The Israelis have a very different geopolitical perspective of the world than those of us in London or Washington because their lives are so much more closely on the line. That is why I think it is very dangerous to push Israel too far.

I think it's worth observing that no single one of the Arab-Israeli wars materially affected the interests of the West and the Middle East. They have in their different ways affected the balance of power locally, and of course that balance is of considerable interest and concern to the rest of the world. But none of the wars altered the situation in the Arab world in the way that the fall of the Shah of Iran did.

It seems to me that when we look at recent developments in the Middle East—the war between Iran and Iraq, the fall of the Shah, the transformation of Yemen into a Soviet fortress, and other events which have almost nothing to do with the West Bank—solving the Palestinian problem becomes comparatively less important. Moreover, we see in fact that the only element in the Middle East which is inherently stable is Israel itself.

Therefore any weakening of Israel that does not produce a very definite and tangible return to the West is dangerous—pressing the Israelis to agree with the Egyptians on the West Bank issue, for example.

We complain when Israel strikes pre-emptively, but a country in its strategic situation has no chance of survival unless it strikes pre-emptively.

Take the Iraqi nuclear reactor. The uranium the French provided for that reactor was 93 percent enriched—the fissile material for making bombs. The chemical facilities the Italians provided were exactly the facilities required to turn that into the plutonium required to make bombs.

The United Nations and the British Foreign Office both told the Israelis that the Iraqis were not, as the Israelis thought they were, on the verge of making a bomb. They said that a United Nations inspectorate had been there and studied it and knew that it was a "peaceful" reactor. You simply cannot expect the Israelis to believe that, though. This is the same United Nations which provided an interim force in Lebanon that is a front for the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

Israel will always strike pre-emptively because it cannot risk the first battle. And that is even more true now, since 1973, when Israel had to bear the brunt of the first battle.

So when Israel attacks a nuclear reactor in Iraq or attacks Beirut, it is simply illogical to not take into account the strategic and tactical reasoning behind it, before making value judgments. Israel is not the United States, and we should stop confusing Israel's best interest with our own.

What I fear above all is that in attempting to bring about solutions that are not available and not achievable in the Middle East, we will either weaken Israel to an extent that is profoundly dangerous for our own interests, or secondly, that we will foster excessive optimism in Arab states as Western sympathy for Israel declines. The Arabs could either launch another attack on Israel of its own volition, or the despair created in Israel by a Western-forced withdrawal could prompt her to start a war pre-emptively. Such a war could bring down the entire Middle East.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES APPEL

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Dr. James Ziegler Appel, an internationally esteemed physician, past president of the American Medical Association and family doctor to many of my constituents in Pennsylvania's 16th Congressional District. On September 7, Dr. Appel passed away after a long and distinguished career that spanned nearly 50 years. At the time of his death he still maintained his medical office at the address where he joined his father's practice in 1933.

His life and career were dedicated to the idea that physicians owe more to their community than good medical care. Dr. Appel's community was the world.

During his term as president of the American Medical Association in the mid-1960's, Dr. Appel conferred with President Johnson about the medicare program, which went into effect a few days after his term ended. Dr. Appel was a firm believer that medical treatment should not be denied to those who cannot afford it. In his hometown he ministered to many elderly and indigent, free of charge.

He reported to President Johnson on health care in Southeast Asia after traveling to Vietnam during the

height of the crisis. While serving in a leadership role in the World Health Organization he participated in efforts to wipe out smallpox around the world.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Appel was a leader in his profession who was respected by his colleagues both locally and nationally. He will be missed, but he will not be forgotten. From his inaugural address before the American Medical Association in 1965 he left us with these words:

We cannot have happiness or a fruitful life, and we cannot have freedom unless we pay the price. The price is the acceptance of responsibility.

Sue joins me in expressing our deepest sympathies to his wife and family.●

FORGIVE AND FORGET— LIBERAL STYLE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, liberals in the Senate have for a long time played a peculiar form of forgive and forget with their constituents. Once they were elected to the Senate, liberals would forget their constituents for 5½ years. They would then come home for a 6-months' campaign and persuade their constituents to forgive them. Then those same liberals would come back to Washington to work for the Washington liberal establishment for another 5½ years.

After each election, each liberal Senator would vote for more taxes on his constituents, more regulation of their lives, and more bureaucrats to enforce them. Then they would go back to their constituents, and spend 6 months telling them how much they hated rising taxes, bureaucratic and judicial tyranny, and all the rest. Above all, they would promise that, the next 6 years, they would stop supporting the establishment, and start fighting it. Once again, the voters would forgive them their past errors and send them back to Washington.

This year, a large number of liberals discovered the game was over: The people refused to forgive, because they refused to be forgotten again. In 1980, the American people said that they will no longer forgive a Senator who forgets them.

But some Senators are still playing the same old liberal game. The Cleveland school system is being ruled by a judicial tyrant, Judge Battisti, who is enforcing a busing program opposed by every segment of that city's population and this Congress. The Justice Department has been using taxpayers' money to support and extend Judge Battisti's tyranny. But on November

13, when the Senate voted to deny funds to the Justice Department to push busing, the roll was called and many in the other body voted against the people. They voted for Judge Battisti, and against Cleveland. Fortunately, the Senate witnessed 61 votes to break the probusing filibuster. The people won yesterday.

The lesson of the 1980 landslide was simple: You can no longer vote against the people while serving here in Congress and expect them to vote for you at election time. I was embarrassed to note that it was not only Democrats who ignored this lesson in the November 13 vote. The leader of the probusing forces was a liberal Republican, who insisted that to oppose busing was somehow a violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which specifically condemns busing.

In every State in the Union, the overwhelming majority opposes busing. These gentlemen have chosen to forget that. It will be interesting to see, over the next few years, whether the voters choose to forgive them again.●

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present on the floor of the House of Representatives yesterday for rollcall Nos. 206 and 207. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both H.J. Res. 325, continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1982, and H.R. 4241, military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1982.●

NATIONAL HOME HEALTH CARE WEEK

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution along with Representative BARBER CONABLE, to designate the week beginning October 4, 1981, as "National Home Health Care Week." The home health industry has become a vital and important element in our Nation's health care system, and I think this resolution is an appropriate way to recognize the contributions and encourage further development of home health care.

I am sure that my colleagues are aware that we face a crisis with respect to developing cost-effective, humane, long-term care for our older citizens. This need has never been greater. The 65-and-over population continues to grow faster than the

younger population, and by the year 2000, there will be almost 32 million elderly, and from then on the numbers and proportion of the elderly will rise sharply as the baby-boom population matures. In addressing the health care needs of the elderly population, home health care has been recognized far and wide as an effective and economical alternative to unnecessary institutionalization. At present, there are approximately 5 percent or about 1.2 million persons 65 years of age and older that reside in various types of institutions. These statistics represent an estimated \$10 million being spent in each year for institutionalization, and reports by the General Accounting Office have supported the opinions of many health care authorities that approximately 25 percent of the patient population is treated in facilities excessive to their need. The current economic realities make it imperative that we maximize the utilization of scarce Federal resources. This situation points to the need to avoid the expending of Federal resources for unnecessary institutionalization.

Oddly enough, in view of the budget reductions that we in Congress have enacted over the past few years, provisions have been enacted which expand Federal benefits for home health care. I think this is a positive sign, and I believe Congress is realizing that home health care can be a cost-effective approach in meeting the health care needs of older Americans.

Since the passage of Federal programs which allowed for patients to receive health care in-home, home health care agencies have increased from less than 500 to more than 3,000. Studies have been initiated to try and obtain data to indicate the cost savings attributed to in-home care, but no hard statistics are available. Surely, though, the desire to remain at home is a choice that many elderly persons in need of health care will choose. I applaud those home health care agencies that are making the choice of home health care an available option. I urge your support of this resolution.

H.J. Res. 332 —

Whereas organized home health care services to the elderly and disabled have existed in this country since the last quarter of the 18th century;

Whereas home health care is recognized as an effective and economical alternative to unnecessary institutionalization;

Whereas caring for the ill and disabled in their homes places emphasis on the dignity and independence of the individual receiving these services;

Whereas since the enactment of the Medicare program including skilled nursing services, physical therapy, speech therapy, social services, occupational therapy, and home health aide services, the number of home health agencies providing these services has increased from less than 500 to more than 3,000; and

Whereas many private and charitable organizations provide these and similar serv-

ices to millions of patients each year preventing, postponing and limiting the need for institutionalization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning October 4, 1981, hereby is designated "National Home Health Care Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

TURKEY IS MAKING A CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a brief but important article which recently appeared in the New York Times entitled "Turkish Leader in Plea for Peace with Greece." In a speech delivered last week at a Liberation Day celebration in Izmir, Gen. Kenan Evren, the chief of the National Security Council and the head of state, stated that Turkey "does not claim an inch of its neighbors' land." He stressed his desire for peace with Greece, and expressed his hope that the Aegean Sea "not * * * be a sea of enmity but a sea of peace, which approaches and binds us to each other."

This conciliatory statement is just the latest in a series of positive actions that Turkey has taken in the past few months to promote stability in the eastern Mediterranean. Turkey agreed to arrangements that allowed Greece to return to NATO's military command. Turkey has also strongly encouraged the Turkish Cypriots to be forthcoming in the ongoing intercommunal talks in Cyprus. Only last month, the Turkish Cypriots came forward with an important new proposal that could prove to be the basis for resolving the differences between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities.

Within Turkey itself, the Evren government has taken strong and effective measures to eliminate the senseless violence and terrorism that had taken thousands of lives and caused havoc in the economy. In the more stable climate that now prevails, Turkey has made substantial progress, including reducing its inflation rate from over 100 percent to an estimated level of 40 to 50 percent. Clearly, the stronger Turkey is economically, the more able it will be to play its essential role within NATO.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not point out the Turkish Government's commitment to democracy. General Evren and other senior Turk-

ish officials have repeatedly indicated their intention to return Turkey to civilian rule as soon as possible.

In view of all of these encouraging developments, I believe it is entirely appropriate that the administration has requested a substantial increase in aid to Turkey. Whereas the United States provided a total of \$450 million in aid to Turkey in fiscal year 1981—\$250 million in military aid and \$200 million in economic support fund assistance—the administration has proposed that this amount be increased to \$700 million in fiscal year 1982, including \$400 million in military aid and \$300 million in economic support fund assistance. The United States certainly has an important interest in assisting Turkey's economic recovery, and I therefore urge my colleagues to support these higher aid levels when they vote on the foreign aid bill later this month:

[From the New York Times, Thursday, Sept. 10, 1981]

TURKISH LEADER IN PLEA FOR PEACE WITH GREECE

ANKARA, Sept. 9.—Gen. Kenan Evren, the chief of state, declared today that Turkey "does not claim an inch of its neighbors' land" and wants to live in peace with Greece.

Speaking at Izmir, during Liberation Day celebrations, marking the 59th anniversary of the defeat of the Greek forces by Kemal Ataturk, General Evren said: "We would like this Aegean Sea before us, and where the two countries have common interests, not to be a sea of enmity but a sea of peace, which approaches and binds us to each other."

His speech appeared to be a signal of support for Greece's governing New Democracy Party and a warning to the Socialist opposition party, known as Pasok, in advance of Greek general elections on Oct. 18.

General Evren said that "foreign powers" and "some internal forces, even some politicians acting parallel, with the foreign powers," were responsible for actions aimed at promoting hostility between Greece and Turkey. In Turkey, the term "foreign powers" is generally a euphemism for the Communist bloc or the Soviet Union itself.●

THE PLIGHT OF VIKTOR AND BATSHEVA YELISTRATOV

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to participate in the Congressional Vigil for Soviet Jews this year in an effort that I hope will assist families and individuals who wish to emigrate from the Soviet Union to the country of their choice.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the plight of Viktor and Batsheva Yelistratov. The Yelistratovs first applied for exist visas in 1972 and were denied by the Soviet Government on the grounds that Viktor held a job

with a secret classification. Viktor, consequently, lost his job as a communications engineer and he and Batsheva have been subjected to continued harassment because of their desire to emigrate to the free world.

I have written to Mr. Jack Matlock, Chargé d'Affaires at the American Embassy in Moscow and to Anatoly Dobrynin, Ambassador to the United States from the Soviet Union expressing my deep concern about the emigration and political persecution of the Yelistratovs. The State Department is aware of the Yelistratov's situation and they are on their list of persons who have been denied emigration on numerous occasions. I am hopeful that through these efforts and through the efforts of this Congress that families such as the Yelistratovs will be able to emigrate freely to the Western world.

I encourage all of my colleagues to participate in this Congressional Vigil for Soviet Jews in the hope that this vigil will have a positive effect on human rights in the Soviet Union.●

MONEY MARKET FUNDS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, Jr.

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the debate regarding money market mutual funds and whether or not they should be restricted, Mrs. Henry W. Bryan of 618 Kathleen Avenue, Louisville, Ky., has written to me expressing her opposition to two bills which would restrict the use of these funds. With your permission, I would like to insert in the RECORD, Mrs. Bryan's remarks on this issue now facing Members of Congress. The letter follows:

DEAR MR. HUBBARD:

Two bills which will place restrictions on money market funds have recently been introduced in the House of Representatives. They are H.R. 1916, introduced by Congressman Jim Leach, and H.R. 2591, introduced by Congressman Walter Fauntroy.

I consider these two bills anti-competitive and contrary to the American system of free enterprise. The funds make important contributions to American investors and our entire economy.

For the first time in our history, Americans of diverse economic backgrounds have equal access to the highest available money market returns. Formerly, only those with a minimum of \$100,000 have had that advantage. Isn't this economic discrimination?

The funds are a great incentive to save money and are inflation fighters, especially for widows with modest estates such as I. Over \$100 billion invested in money market funds contributes to meeting America's capital needs. Why take this away?

I do not have a lobby as do the banks and saving and loan associations. But, I am one of the approximate 6 million Americans who are angry and frustrated by the influence of the powerful lobbies in Washington.

Please use your influence to prevent these proposed bills from being adopted.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. HENRY W.) FRANCES S. BRYAN.●

USDA KIDDIE CUISINE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the budget reconciliation process forced us to make some very difficult choices. One of the most far-reaching of those was carried out by the House Committee on Education and Labor in slashing the authorizations of many of the child nutrition programs. The summer cuts have brought about accelerating costs forcing local schools to charge as much as \$1.20 per lunch. Now, to bring about still more "savings," the administration is proposing a regulatory plan of reduced portion sizes and diminished dietary standards. While I can support a child nutrition plan which gives local school districts more flexibility, I do not think it should be instituted at the expense of our children's health.

I am looking forward to participating in the debate now before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education on these meal pattern changes. It is my hope that the administration will be willing to accept the subcommittee's recommendations on the regulations which are worth keeping and those which would merely swap economic advantage for sound nutritional standards.

Ellen Goodman outlines very well the dilemma we face in our review of these proposed standards. Her article appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, September 15, 1981, and it appears below.

REAGAN'S NOUVELLE CUISINE FOR KIDS

(By Ellen Goodman)

BOSTON.—The luncheon was arranged rather neatly. A discreet hamburger sat on half a roll. Six longish French fries lay beside it. Nine green grapes lolled nearby. To the side stood half a glass of milk.

It sounded to me like some forlorn menu for overweight executives. But it wasn't. It was, rather, a prototype of a school lunch, or what may remain of it, after the budget cuts.

We are about to see the full-fledged Nouvelle Reagan Cuisine for Kiddies. Higher costs and smaller portions. No stars, please.

As you may have heard, dinner with the Reagans in the White House has definitely improved these days. When the Reagans dine with the Anwar Sadats on the federal tab, they eat smoked fillet of mountain trout, a roast supreme of duckling a l'orange, a touch of wild rice with raisins, a bit of Brie and chevre, followed by the palate-cleansing melon glacé and fresh raspberries.

But under Reagan, lunch in the school cafeteria is quite another affair: an ounce-and-a-half of meat or meat alternatives, a

half-cup of fruit and vegetables, one serving of bread, six ounces of milk. Yummy in the empty tummy.

FRAC, the Food Research and Action Centers, cooked up the lean-and-hungry lunch described above, by carefully following the new proposals that have come out of the Department of Agriculture.

According to FRAC's Nancy Amidei, the Agriculture people were assigned the task of cutting fat from the budget "without impairing the nutritional value of the meals." But they ended up cutting food.

Under the old requirements, more food was served to older grammar-school kids than younger ones. But under the proposed new rules, the 11-year-olds will get the same amount of meat and vegetables as the 5-year-olds. Even the bread and milk are cut, from eight pieces a week to five, from eight ounces a day to six.

The other changes in rules are even more curious. Ketchup and pickles now qualify as vegetables; tofu (try that on your second grader) now qualifies as a meat; and any school can put its eggs in a cake instead of on a plate.

According to Amidei, the lunches would supply less than one-third of the daily nutritional value and only 17 percent of the calories needed. "We feel this is compromising children's health," she says flatly.

The motto of the Nouvelle Reagan Cuisine—"Eat Light and Like It"—would be fine for the statesmen passing up the Brie. But the Department of Agriculture's own study shows that poor kids get anywhere from one-third to one-half of all their daily nutrients from school lunch.

Of the 27 million children who eat school lunches, 12.6 million get a free or reduced rate. If the meal shrinks just when food stamps are being cut and food prices are on the rise, these kids can't make up the difference at home.

There is also a social effect of the Nouvelle Reagan Cuisine. Middle-class parents, who pay the full amount for lunch, are going to balk at paying more for a snack. As a 10-year-old visitor to FRAC said when she spied the prototype meal, "Yuk! Where's the rest of it?"

In our house, after the price went up last week, the brown bags came back. But if these proposals are approved, there could be a national two-track lunchroom, with only the poorest students going through a highly stigmatized free-lunch line. The end result of that is higher costs, fewer schools in the system, and a program goes on the skids.

There is the taste of irony sprinkled over all this food talk. The lunch program started back in 1946 because of the military. During World War II, the draft board had to reject an enormous number of men suffering from poor nutrition. When the School Lunch Act was passed in 1946, they wrote: "It is declared to be the policy of Congress as a measure of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children."

Today we have another administration that is worried about the Army, worried that an Army of illiterates will end up operating sophisticated multi-billion dollar military equipment. But as Amidei notes, "At this rate we'll have an Army of anemic illiterates."

If the Reagans will pass me a glass of their Domaine Chandon Blanc de Noir, I'll drink to that. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LOS ANGELES BICENTENNIAL

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1981

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California for calling this special order on behalf of the city of Los Angeles and its residents as the celebration of the city's 200th birthday comes to an end.

As a native son of the area, I have a great affection for the city and an active interest in its continued growth and prosperity. Los Angeles is a grand community with a history as festive and colorful as the city is today. No metropolis in the Nation can boast of the qualities that make Los Angeles so special.

The city of Angels is unique in its people, in its industry, in its geography, in its climate and in its lifestyle. Throughout its life, this unique mixture of traits has made it a romantic and magic place.

I believe as we look toward the beginning of the city's third century, we should commit again to working together in a spirit of charity and optimism for the future well-being of the city and its residents. Failure to do so would be to abandon those virtues of the past that made the city what it is today.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Mr. Dixon, for inviting me to participate in this special order honoring the Los Angeles Bicentennial. ●

DIABLO CANYON

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, the current attempt to occupy Diablo Canyon reflects the well-meaning but misguided concern of certain environmentalists and other antinuclear residents. The time has come to distinguish between emotional reaction and logical facts.

As the nuclear energy debate drags on—and the energy crunch continues—California faces a potential dilemma. On the one hand, we have our insatiable energy needs which, if not addressed in timely fashion, will affect our economic well-being. On the other hand, our concerns for the environment and human life have led us to demand that every justifiable safety precaution be taken before allowing a nuclear reactor to operate. Have these sometimes competing considerations been resolved correctly in the case of Diablo Canyon? I think so.

As we examine the issues responsible for this dilemma, let us first address the safety factor. The NRC has reviewed almost every conceivable aspect of the plant during its 8-year review. Before approving the plant, the Commission conducted numerous studies and public hearings on the effect of the nearby Hosgri Fault. Incredibly exhaustive records and inquiries have been made regarding earthquake activity over the past million years, and the plant has been built to withstand the greatest possible quake. The hearing record alone on this plant is over 100,000 pages.

The need for this plant is apparent upon an examination of the economic issues involved. Consumers in California already pay electrical bills 30 percent higher than the national average, primarily because of our heavy dependence on oil. The operation of the two Diablo Canyon units would eliminate the use of 57,000 barrels daily and would reduce consumers' electric bills \$5 billion in the next 5 years alone.

Further delays, as we examine what undoubtedly would be a series of unending questions raised by those who are opposed philosophically to the use of nuclear power, could have serious adverse consequences.

The Department of Energy estimates that electrical reserve margins will be extremely low throughout the West for the remainder of the decade. Even with Diablo Canyon, a drought which affects our hydroelectric capacity could very well mean that our lights will not work. This possibility already has made industry extremely skittish about settling in California. Those companies already here, especially in the Santa Clara Valley and bay area, are expressing increasing concerns over the availability of adequate electrical supplies in the future. If something is not done to alleviate these concerns, we could be facing an economic and social disaster.

When we recognize that the safety issues have been thoroughly examined by leading authorities and contemplate, if we can, the consequences of inadequate electrical supplies, we cannot allow a small group of antinuclear activists to thwart illegally the operation of a plant which is necessary for the greater good.

Diablo Canyon is in compliance with the current rigidly high safety standards and it can save us huge sums each year. Let's get on with it. ●

DANGER OF OPPOSING SOUTH AFRICA'S RUGBY TEAM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the campaign of protest against sporting events that involve South African athletes demonstrates the depth to which South Africa's enemies stoop. Do we really expect to promote peaceful change and true progress in a friendly country by taking aim at its rugby football players? Those who support the campaigns to isolate South Africa are not supporting true progress; they are supporting knowingly or unknowingly, the foreign policy goals of the Soviet Union.

Therefore, I oppose this motion to condemn the rugby tour and would draw your attention to the fact that the campaign against the American appearances of the Springbok team is being coordinated by some of the most active support groups for the Soviet-trained revolutionary terrorists in South Africa.●

SUPPORT FOR HAIG'S TOUGH STANCE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the *Lompoc Record*, a respected newspaper in my district, expresses its support for the tough stance Secretary of State Haig adopted for United States-Soviet relations. As the editorial points out, Secretary Haig laid out a specific, and meaningful, approach for improving relations between our two countries. As the *Lompoc Record* states, it is "A policy of reason."

A POLICY OF REASON

Only supporters of the concept of "Soviet hegemony" can rationally take issue with Secretary of State Alexander Haig's program for improving relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. That does not mean that there will not be many who attack it. There is seldom much rationality these days in foreign affairs. Too often such emotions as fear, greed and pride prevent rational thought.

General Haig offered the Soviet Union four "incentives" which would result from changes in its international wheeling and dealing. The incentives include a reduction in world tensions, a benefit to all nations; diplomatic alternatives to the pursuit of violent change; fair and balanced agreement on arms control; and the possibility of western trade and technology.

From the Kremlin, he said, the U.S. wants "greater Soviet restraint on the use of force . . . greater Soviet respect for the independence of others . . . the Soviets to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

abide by their reciprocal obligations, such as those undertaken in the Helsinki accord."

"These are no more than we demand of any state," Gen. Haig pointed out, "and these are no less than required by the United Nations Charter and international law."

He also pointed out that "the most persistent troubles in U.S.-Soviet relations arise from Soviet intervention in regional conflicts, aggravating tensions and hampering the search for peaceful solutions. Unless we can come to grips with this dimension of Soviet behavior, everything else in our bilateral relationship will be undermined . . ."

Although our Secretary of State adopted a tough stance in his speech, which had been reviewed prior to delivery by both the White House and the Department of Defense, he called no names and made no unsupported charges. In the long run and after finding face-saving ways to appear to the world, the realists in the Kremlin can live with the foreign policy announced for the U.S. Let's hope that there are still realists there.●

REVENUE RULING 81-216

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will delay the implementation of IRS Revenue Ruling 81-216 which severally limits the use of multiple lots of small issue revenue bonds of less than \$1,000,000. Issues structured in this manner are used in my State and others to provide loans for small- and medium-sized businesses. This translates to more jobs. With interest rates as high as they are, I do not want to cut off any mechanism which may help these businesses.

I want to make it clear, however, that this bill is being introduced to provide time for wider discussion of the issue. I want to preserve the good programs but I do not want to protect abusive ones. I know of successful programs in New York State, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Missouri. These would be disallowed under the ruling.

My intent is to provide an opportunity for Members to enter the debate, to find out what programs exist in their States, and for Congress to discuss the issue further with the Internal Revenue Service before valuable jobs programs are eliminated.

The IRS has drawn the ruling too widely. During the moratorium period prescribed by this bill, I am sure we will be able to work out a more equitable rule which will protect public purpose issues and curb those motivated only by greed for they may indeed exist.

I look forward to receiving cosponsors from the many States affected by this unwise revenue ruling.●

September 17, 1981

ROULHAC HAMILTON

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, the death of Roulhac Hamilton was noted in the *Washington Post* today, which reminded me that I want to express publicly my personal feeling of loss on the passing of a good friend and my former, very valued employee.

Roulhac Hamilton was one of the truly great newspaper writers I have ever known. He could take what would otherwise be a very routine news story and make it seem exciting, momentous, and informative. One such story comes to mind when our daughter Jackie represented Ohio as its Cherry Blossom Princess. His colorful reporting of the various events including the selection of the Ohio float as the best in the parade that year was creative and meaningful, especially to our family.

After Roulhac's retirement from the *Columbus Dispatch* in 1976, I asked him to come to work for me as my press aide. It was a rare privilege to work with a man as talented as Roulhac and one who was certainly skilled in his profession.

Following his graduation from the University of North Carolina in 1932, Roulhac worked as a reporter for the *Raleigh, N.C., News and Observer* and for the *Charleston, S.C., News and Courier*. With the outbreak of World War II, he enlisted in the Marines and became a combat correspondent, filing stories from such noted battle sites as Guam and Iwo Jima before being transferred to Tientsin, China.

At the conclusion of World War II, Roulhac came to Washington, D.C., where he worked as a correspondent for a number of out-of-town newspapers and radio stations. In Washington, he established Hamilton-Means Associates, an independent news service. When the *Columbus Dispatch* set up a Washington bureau, Roulhac was hired as bureau chief and chief correspondent.

Following his retirement from the *Dispatch* in 1976, Roulhac agreed to join my staff. He displayed a remarkable writing ability and acute insight into congressional affairs. Roulhac worked for me until deteriorating health made it impossible for him to continue his duties in May of this year. He died on Friday, September 11 in the National Orthopaedic Hospital in Arlington, Va.

Roulhac and his wife, Lillian, became good friends of my wife, Marjorie, and me. Roulhac will be missed by us. We extend our heartfelt sympathy and condolences to his lovely wife, Lillian, and to his daughter, Fay Hamil-

ton Gwynn of Decatur, Ga.; his brother, Dr. Alfred T. Hamilton of Raleigh, N.C.; his grandchildren, John H. and Stacy Ann Gwynn; and his several nieces and nephews. ●

CONDOMINIUM CONVERSION FUELS INFLATION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● **Mr. ROSENTHAL.** Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to my colleagues' attention another example of how the proliferation of condominium conversion contributes to the inflationary cycle in the housing market.

On September 16, 1981, the Washington Post reported on the effects of a Virginia State law which mandates that real estate be assessed, for property tax purposes, according to its highest and best use. Thus, under this law a rental apartment complex would be assessed at its higher market value as a condominium, rather than as a rental building.

This law, in effect, provides new incentive for building owners to convert rental buildings as well as to increase the cost of converted units and continue the displacement of those persons who do not have either the financial means or the inclination to purchase a condominium apartment. Alternatively, if the owner refuses the temptation to convert his building, his only recourse is to increase his tenants' rents to cover the higher tax assessments. Either way, consumers lose out to escalating inflation.

The disastrous effects of this particular State law illustrates the absolute necessity for Federal regulation of the conversion fever now spreading throughout the country. I urge each of my colleagues to closely examine the two bills I recently introduced to remedy the national crisis caused by condominium-cooperative conversions: H.R. 3840 and H.R. 3841.

The Washington Post article follows: [From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1981]

APARTMENT TAXES SOAR TO CONDO RATES IN ARLINGTON

(By Celestine Bohlen)

Arlington has become the first Washington area municipality to tax most rental apartment complexes at higher condominium values, making it still more costly for landlords to resist the profits of condominium conversion.

The change, which is mandated by state law, has increased assessments on some Arlington rental apartments between 30 and 47 percent, compared with an average 18 percent rise in county assessments this year. Some landlords said they will take the county assessor to court, while county politicians who said they are powerless to stop the trend are considering going to the state legislature for special tax breaks for apartment owners.

The condominium craze that has swept Washington and its suburbs in recent years has created a serious housing problem in many communities, as elderly and moderate-income tenants find themselves forced out of their apartments. Maryland, Montgomery County in particular, has enacted legislation to protect tenants. But in Virginia the power of local government is limited, and relatively few restrictions are placed on condominium developers. In Arlington, which has so far lost 20 percent of its rental stock to condos, the new higher assessments come at a particularly difficult time.

"It's causing a serious problem," said County Board Chairman Stephen Detwiler. "It can only encourage landlords to sell to condo converters. It may not be the only factor, but it is one more contributing factor."

"We feel that those projects that wish to continue renting are being penalized," said Elliott Burka, manager of the Fillmore Gardens, where the assessed value jumped from \$7.9 million to \$11.2 million.

"They either have to pass it on to the tenants and raise rents or convert," said Hugh Cregger, attorney for the Fillmore. "It's Catch-22."

The sudden assessment increases came about this year after the Arlington assessor began to appraise apartment complexes on the basis of prices paid in recent years for buildings bought for condominium conversion. The traditional method of valuing rental property relies on the income produced by rents.

By relying on recent sales data, the assessor's office insisted it is conforming to a state law requiring that property be assessed according to its "highest and best use." And if a market is created that directly tests the value of a property—such as a concentration of building sales for condominium conversions—then the assessor is obligated to follow the market trends. The apartment assessments are based on the market value of a comparable building about to be sold to a condominium developer.

So far, the phenomenon of skyrocketing increases in apartment values is limited to Arlington. Other assessors in Washington and its suburbs said they still rely on the income-producing method of calculating the value of rental apartments. "It's our policy to value on current zoning and use, not what it could be," said Robert L. Rudnik, state supervisor of assessments in Montgomery County.

But several assessors said they might be forced to appraise apartments by comparable sales if their communities experience the same rush of condominium conversions seen in Arlington. "If apartment buildings in my region are being gobbled up for condominiums, then that's going to be my market," said Fred Byrne, senior appraiser in the Alexandria assessor's office, where already some smaller apartment buildings are valued according to recent sales.

"It's a disastrous course to take," said John O'Neill, vice president of the local Apartment and Office Building Association. "What [the Arlington assessor] has done is open the door, and sooner or later all assessors are going to pass through the same door."

Attorneys for the landlords oppose Arlington's approach, arguing that rental properties are not actually comparable to buildings sold for condominium conversion. They point out that not all apartments are legally or economically ready for conversion.

"In treating every apartment house as a condo [the assessor], is forgetting that if everyone of these properties came on the market at the same time then you couldn't get any price for them at all," said Gilbert Hahn, Jr., attorney for Charles E. Smith, the developer of Crystal City and a major Arlington landowner who is appealing the new assessments on seven large buildings.

But the more serious question—apparently out of the hands of assessors and local government—is the question of penalizing landlords who have not converted their buildings to condominiums, particularly those who now provide the remaining moderate-income apartments.

"This has a tendency to encourage just the thing that a government oughtn't to encourage," Hahn said. "If people have to pay real estate taxes as though they were condominiums, then there's a tendency to say, 'Fine, let's make them condominiums.'"

For most of the landlords hit by high assessments, the actual dollar increase in the tax bill this year is low, cushioned in part by a drop this year in the county tax rate from \$1.12 to \$.96 per \$100 valuation.

For tenants, the higher tax bills have meant only small rent increases. For example, the higher taxes were responsible for about \$3.10 of an average \$50 rent increase at the 1,318-unit Barcroft Apartments, according to the tax assessor's calculations. Although Barcroft president Thomas DeLashmutt said the added tax burden will not be the deciding factor on the future of the complex, it doesn't help.

"I understand the assessor's position. They're just following the law," said DeLashmutt, "but what concerns me is what happens next year—when they look at the prices apartments are going for this year."

The dilemma posed by taxing rental apartments at condominium prices is comparable to the problem of taxing farmland around high development areas. In the early 1970s, Virginia and other states moved to protect farmland from higher assessments by allowing farmers to pay lower taxes, provided they agreed not to develop the land.

Arlington is not looking at similar remedies for apartments that agree to stay in the rental market. "We all recognize that garden apartments are facing a squeeze," said County board member John Milliken. "We would like to find any way we can to encourage their retention as garden apartments."

"We have a community goal of preserving moderate-income housing," said County Board member Ellen Bozman. "That has to be highest on our list." ●

GARY HYMEL

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1981

● **Mr. HORTON.** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleague from Louisiana, Congresswoman Boggs in paying tribute to one of the House's most dedicated and effective staff members, Gary Hymel.

Keeping the wheels of Government oiled, and maintaining the steady and predictable flow of legislation is a task virtually beyond the ability of any one

single individual. Having said that, I think we can all agree that Gary came very close indeed to accomplishing this in his many years of service. As a key member of the majority whip's office, the majority leader's office and finally the Speaker's office, Gary Hymel demonstrated an uncanny ability to make this institution run "relatively" smoothly. It was with regret that we heard of his decision to leave the Hill. Nevertheless, I join my many colleagues in wishing Gary well.●

IN MEMORY OF FORMER CONGRESSWOMAN CATHERINE NORRELL

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the numbers of my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the truly remarkable life of Catherine Dorris Norrell.

It was in her capacity as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs under President Kennedy that my wife, Cathy, and I first had the pleasure of meeting Catherine Norrell. It was a privilege and a delight to know her. The gift for valuing others runs in the Norrell family, and our friendship with Catherine's daughter, Judy, a lawyer of distinction, has grown stronger over time.

What a bouquet of talents Catherine Norrell was. It is inspiring just to look over the long list of her accomplishments. She was not only a former Member of Congress from Arkansas, she was a musician, a teacher, a college administrator, and a high-ranking official of the State Department. She was a past Worthy Grand Matron of the Order of the Eastern Star in Arkansas, and a member of the Honolulu board of directors of the Salvation Army. She was active in the Baptist Church, the Women's National Democratic Club, the Business and Professional Women's Club, the Foreign Service Officers Association, the Democratic Wives Forum, the Former Members of Congress Club, the Soroptimist Club, and was president, at the time of her husband's death, of the Congressional Club.

William Frank Norrell was a Member of Congress from Arkansas from 1939 to his death in February 1961. During this 22-year period, Catherine served in her husband's office as his staff assistant. When a special election was called after his death, Catherine Norrell's experience, enthusiasm, and capabilities won her the right to sit in her husband's seat in Congress by a hands-down, 2-to-1 margin of votes.

Congresswoman Norrell put herself solidly behind the equal rights amend-

ment by becoming one of its earliest cosponsors. She also served on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

She decided not to seek reelection in 1962. The House's loss was President Kennedy's gain, for in 1963 he appointed her Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs. The country she loved would continue to benefit from Catherine Norrell's unique combination of gifts.

In 1969 she retired as director of the State Department Reception in Honolulu, a post she had been appointed to by President Johnson. While there, she gained another distinction by being elected the first woman deacon in the Baptist Church in Hawaii. The last portion of her rich working life was devoted to chairing the music department at Arkansas A. & M. College.

Catherine Norrell's long and illustrious life could serve as a model for all of us, men and women. When someone we love and admire dies, as Thornton Wilder has written, the highest tribute we can by them "is not grief but gratitude."●

INTEREST RATES

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we witnessed another episode in what seems to be the never-ending game of economic hot potato, as Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volker said, that high interest rates have stayed at near record levels because the financial markets are reacting to the harsh reality of continuing inflation and large Federal budget deficits.

While the wizards of Wall Street and the Reagan administration take turns at blaming each other for this current economic crisis, every segment of American society is facing hardships due to the pressures of high interest rates.

In the first 9 months of this year, over 10,000 businesses have failed and closed their doors, the automobile industry has shown few signs of recovery, and activity in the housing industry is far below normal.

It is no surprise that the business community foresees problems for the Reagan economic program, because their share to the Federal revenue base is declining.

In 1950, 30.5 percent of Federal revenue came from corporate income taxes. It fell to 16 percent in 1970, and 12.4 percent this year. By 1986, it will drop to 8.1 percent, due to the administration's tax cut plan.

The promises of lower inflation, higher defense spending, and reduced

taxes do not equal economic prosperity, instead they equal high interest rates and further economic hardship for the American people.

It is time for the administration, the Federal Reserve Board, and the business community to stop this game of economic hot potato. The American people will not be fooled by this ploy, and they are seeing proof that the arithmetic of Reaganomics just does not add up.●

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN SOCIETY

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received the following letter from the Reverend Jerry L. Klug, pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Paris, Ill. At a time of controversy over budget cuts and the role of the Federal Government in society, his comments cut through the rhetoric and express what I have found to be the overwhelming sentiment of the residents of Illinois' 22d Congressional District (and, I suspect, most Americans).

I urge my colleagues to turn a moment from the professional pressure groups and special interest lobbies to listen to a man who speaks for millions:

GRACE LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Paris, Ill., July 13, 1981.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRANE: For a long time I have felt that the debate over cutting the budget versus a responsible social program is futile. It has become obvious that we can no longer afford free government programs. What I mean is that people quite naturally feel that government grants to help with local projects, and government aid for the needy are funds which reduce the amount we would have to spend on a local level. The truth is that when our tax money goes from the local to the federal through the levels of government and back to the local it costs us more than we can afford for the free program.

May I suggest that some thought be given to establishing local government units (perhaps by counties) to take over whatever federal programs that would be feasible. Instead of a tax cut, allow us to send a portion of our taxes directly to the local unit.

The advantages of such a system would be the continuation of needed social programs with less framework, more flexibility, and less abuse. The result would be less cost. We can no longer afford "free" federal aid, but we can afford to do these jobs ourselves. More responsibility will make better citizens.

Thank you,

JERRY L. KLUG.●

AMERICAN LIBERALS CAN TAKE
CREDIT FOR ELIMINATION OF
HUMAN RIGHTS IN NICARA-
GUA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I can well remember the criticism launched at the Somoza government in Nicaragua by some of my liberal friends in this body. Those critical voices are strangely silent now that the Marxist Sandinistas have seized control of the Nicaraguan Government. Have all of those human rights violations ceased since the Marxist takeover? Does freedom now reign in Nicaragua? Hardly.

My good friend, columnist M. Stanton Evans, brings us up to date on the human rights situation in Nicaragua in an excellent article published last week in the national conservative weekly *Human Events*. He recalls those days during the administration of President Carter when liberal leaders in this Congress were fighting relentlessly to hand over \$75 million in American tax dollars to the new Marxist regime. I can remember those days, too. I was one of those Members—a minority at that time—who opposed that emergency aid. I did not believe, nor do I believe today, that the American taxpayers should be forced to subsidize Marxist dictatorships. Mr. Evans writes:

While all this was going on, we now know the Sandinistas were systematically slaughtering prisoners, extinguishing freedom of the press, setting up brainwashing centers manned by Cubans, and locking up thousands of political opponents. That all of this occurred is now denied by virtually no one, including Karen de Young of the *Post*—by all odds the Sandinistas' chief promoter in the major media.

Mr. Evans points out that systematic violations of human rights continue to occur in Nicaragua and that Cuban Communist influence remains very strong. Since my liberal colleagues were so quick to point out the faults of the pro-American Somoza government which preceded the Sandinista takeover, I think it only appropriate that they take the time to read Mr. Evans' excellent article.

The article follows:

[From *Human Events*, Sept. 12, 1981]
SANDINISTAS DESTROY "RIGHTS" IN
NICARAGUA

(By M. Stanton Evans)

Whatever happened to "human rights" in Nicaragua?

In the days of Anastasio Somoza, there was a continuing uproar in the American government and media about his asserted violations of basic liberties. Because of this alleged repression, the Carter Administration cut off aid to the regime, making no concessions for the fact that it was fighting

tooth and nail against a Castro-supported Marxist revolution.

Thanks largely to that cutoff, the Marxists came to power, installing the present Sandinista government. And, immediately, the subject of "human rights" in Nicaragua was no longer fashionable. The *Washington Post* and others who had backed the Sandinista takeover told us "democracy" was being restored in Nicaragua, while the Carter Administration and its congressional supporters moved to give the Sandinistas \$75 million of U.S. money.

While all this was going on, we now know, the Sandinistas were systematically slaughtering prisoners, extinguishing freedom of the press, setting up brainwashing centers manned by Cubans, and locking up thousands of political opponents. That all of this occurred is now denied by virtually no one, including Karen de Young of the *Post*—by all odds the Sandinistas' chief promoter in the major media.

In a recent write-up of an OAS report on human rights in Nicaragua, Miss de Young was compelled to note the organization's finding of "summary executions" by the Sandinistas, though burying this deep in her story and otherwise trying to downplay its meaning. Her lead managed to attribute "summary executions" not to the incumbent Sandinistas but to the departed Somoza, and she hastened to alibi the Sandinistas' killing with OAS assertion that they occurred in a period of turmoil when the government wasn't to be held accountable.

Miss de Young would have us believe the Sandinista violations weren't too bad and that, if they were, have gotten better. Other authorities, including former officials of the Sandinista government, have a different version. One such is Jose Francisco Cardenal, former vice chairman of the National Legislative Council under the revolutionary government. He escaped from Nicaragua last year because, he says, he could no longer stomach the openly communistic nature of the regime, its suppression of press freedom, or its denial of basic human rights. (See Mr. Cardenal's comments in the August 29 *Human Events*.)

Contrary to the view that killings and repression were mere aberrations in the Sandinista past and that things nowadays have greatly improved, Cardenal charges that torture, imprisonment and political killing in Nicaragua continue unabated. At a recent seminar sponsored on Capitol Hill by the Council on Inter-American Security, he stated that more than 100 political prisoners were slaughtered in Nicaragua as recently as this June, and that the killers were publicly lauded by the commander of the army.

Similar testimony has come from Nevardo Arguello, another former Sandinista official who served in the Nicaraguan Department of Justice and escaped from the country in February. He told the CIS publication *West Watch* that torture is widely practiced in Nicaraguan prisons, that there are thousands of political prisoners, that the country has become a Communist despotism run by the agents of Fidel Castro.

Asked if there were torture under the Sandinistas, Arguello answered:

"Torture? Yes, there is torture. The Human Rights Commission verified the practice of torture in Nicaragua, and I have personal knowledge of it. Torture takes place in camps and in prisons. I talked to many prisoners, because one of my duties at the ministry was to visit prisons. I have wit-

nessed torture, but I will not mention the names of persons who were tortured, because it might cause the authorities to abuse them even more."

"Repression and torture" have also been charged to the Sandinista account by Jose Esteban Gonzalez, who heads the Nicaraguan Commission on Human Rights referred to by Arguello. Gonzalez says there are 8,000 political prisoners in the country, 800 people who have disappeared, and hundreds of cases of killing and torture. He disputes the Sandinista alibi that the executions occurred because of postrevolutionary turmoil. "These executions were not a product of popular fury," he said, "but rather were carried out in prisons whose chiefs are perfectly identifiable."

For making these statements, Gonzalez was imprisoned by the Sandinista government and released only after he allegedly signed a letter retracting the charges and "recognizing his errors." (Gonzalez, however, denies that he has retracted anything.) From all of which it would appear that human rights in Nicaragua are a little less secure today under the Sandinistas than Miss de Young and others of her ilk would have us think.●

NEED FOR NURSES

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when national indicators point toward a critical nursing shortage and a growing demand for adequate health care services, nurse educators, and their colleagues are striving to increase the numbers of registered nurses to meet anticipated needs, to maintain quality in a tight economy, and to prepare their graduates for employment in increasingly complex and professionally rigorous practice settings.

Associate degree nursing programs in the Nation's 50 States, trusts, and territories, produce the largest number of new nursing graduates. This year, 1981, marks the 30th academic year of associate degree nursing programs in the United States. To celebrate the event, the Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National League for Nursing's Council of Associate Degree Programs have undertaken a nationwide project. The project, funded in part by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, focuses on recurring issues which will have an impact on the future of the Nation's health care delivery system. I welcome this opportunity to call attention to the project and to extend my best wishes to all associate degree nurses working to improve the delivery of bedside nursing care.●

SOLIDARITY DAY

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, with Saturday marking the advent of AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland's so-called Solidarity Day, this seems an appropriate occasion to comment on the issue of compulsory union dues used for partisan political purposes.

The news media reports the union has monopolized most of the private chartered buses in the Northeast to bring rally goers into Washington. Once in the city, the marchers will be able to ride free of charge on Washington's Metro System, which was leased for \$65,000 by the AFL-CIO. If the AFL-CIO's several months of planning for this 1-day event is any indication of the time and resources union officials use to make their political statements, think of the moneys they pour into election campaigns.

No doubt largely underwritten by forced union dues, the September 19 rally is supposed to demonstrate widespread union member opposition to the administration's budget—despite the fact union rank and file were almost evenly split in their choice for President last November. Lost amidst Mr. Kirkland's antiadministration rhetoric is the reality that millions of the AFL-CIO's members staunchly support this administration and its economic program.

Every year millions of American workers are forced to support political candidates and causes which they might otherwise oppose. They are compulsory union members—workers who would be fired from their jobs if they did not pay forced dues or fees. Nonetheless, according to a March 1980, survey by the highly respected Opinion Research Corp., 71.5 percent of the American public, including 64.7 percent of union members, oppose forced dues politicking.

Legislation recently introduced in the Senate by JESSE HELMS (S. 1550) and which I introduced in the House (H.R. 4351) would respond to this mandate by prohibiting the use of compulsory union dues for political purposes. These bills would close the current loophole in the Federal Election Campaign Act which allows union officials to use compulsory dues for "in-kind" political services such as mass mailings, phone banks, precinct visits, and get-out-the-vote drives. Of all private organizations in our country, only labor unions can take advantage of this special privilege. That is why I urge my colleagues to give their active support to S. 1550 and H.R. 4351 by cosponsoring the bills. Enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of compulsory dues to subsidize union

officials' pet candidates and ideological causes is a logical step in responding to the wishes of union members and the American public, and insuring the voluntary nature of each person's participation in the political process.●

H.R. 3300—LEGISLATION TO REFORM EXISTING FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS

HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 3300, a bill intended to reform some of the most abused aspects of the Gun Control Act of 1968. Since that time over 160 Members of the House have chosen to join as cosponsors; the Senate version of this legislation, S. 1030, has been cosponsored by well over half the Members of that body.

Last week, the gentleman from Illinois inserted in the Extensions of Remarks a memorandum critical of this legislation, drafted by two junior associates at the firm of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering. The analysis showed little comprehension either of the history of the Gun Control Act, the abuses which necessitate this bill, or the practices at which it is aimed.

Before demonstrating that the memorandum's criticisms are simply invalid, I would briefly point out the activities which provide the basis. The Gun Control Act of 1968 was hurriedly drafted and enacted as three pieces of legislation on two different dates. It contains no small number of idiosyncracies which have let it be used to oppress honest and legitimate citizens, and which are of no assistance against the real criminal. For instance, a person can be convicted on the most technical charge, for an honest mistake, and be subject to 5 years' imprisonment, plus convicted felon status. A private citizen can sell a firearm to a criminal, but not to his brother, with a clean record, who lives in a neighboring State. Persons may be prohibited possession of a firearm but not be prohibited to buy it; while a State conviction on a felony removes the right to own a firearm, a full pardon does not restore any such rights.

These legislative slips have harmed our citizens gravely. Three Senate hearings and one House hearing have documented the severity of the abuses. Enforcing agents, empowered to charge honest, nonviolent citizens for technical violations, have done so with abandon, ignoring the harder cases against dangerous felons. Barely 10 percent of Federal gun arrests are on charges of felon in illegal gun possession, or knowing sale to a felon. The average value of confiscated guns is

\$116—and agents have refused to return seized collectors' items even after the owner was found not guilty of all charges. It is time we stopped these abuses, and that is precisely what my bill is intended to do.

Against these very real abuses, so carefully documented, the memorandum repeatedly poses what law students hear described as "fantasy hypotheticals." These may be suited for demonstrations of wit and sophistry, but hold little weight in the real world.

I. THIS BILL WOULD FOCUS ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS ON ILLEGAL, NOT LEGAL, FIREARM TRANSFERS

The Gun Control Act's sections dealing with interstate sales were intended to prevent persons from purchasing firearms across State lines in a way that circumvented gun laws in their State of residence. All early drafts of this law would have outlawed such transfers where the transfer would have broken the laws of the purchaser's place of residence. All early drafts of this law would have outlawed such transfers where the transfer would have broken the laws of the purchaser's place of residence. This was a rational use of Federal power to assist local law enforcement. Very late in the history of the 1968 law, either in haste or because suitable language could not be agreed upon, this was shifted to a general ban on all purchases from out of State—even where the sale would violate no State law. This made little sense; at most, 10 States had purchase requirements which could be circumvented, yet all 50 States were put under the ban. A hodgepodge of exceptions were provided—some guns could be bought, only if the State of sale was physically contiguous to that of purchase, for instance. My legislation replaces that with a simple and concise rule: No one may purchase a gun from a resident of another State unless the transfer would violate neither the laws of the State where the sale occurs and those of the State in which the purchaser resides. If the transfer would violate the laws of either the place of sale or the place to which the gun is to be taken, it remains a Federal felony.

The memorandum raises two objections. First, it claims permitting such transfers is unworkable since the seller cannot be expected to know the law of the other jurisdiction. The authors are apparently unaware that the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to a mandate contained in the Gun Control Act, compiles such laws into a volume entitled "Your Guide to Firearms Laws," a copy of which is provided every licensed dealer and updated annually.

Second, the memorandum argues that enforcement of bans on sales to "prohibited persons" will be more dif-

difficult. Its argument here is not capable of rational analysis. The authors apparently agree that a dealer making such sales could still be prosecuted. Indeed, H.R. 3300 would retain current provisions of law here. But then they seem to argue that it would be hard to prosecute private persons who make such a sale, were my bill passed, since they might not know they were dealing with a prohibited person. Perhaps the authors of the memorandum are not aware that it is no crime right now for a private person to sell to a prohibited buyer, with the exception of a nonresident. My bill will insert such a prohibition into the law, making enforcement of such a ban possible for the first time. It cannot make prosecution of such sales harder than they would be under current law, since they cannot be persecuted under current law, period.

Additionally, the memorandum objects that allowing loan of firearms to nonresidents, "for lawful purposes" would somehow be offensive. Plainly, if the loan is in violation of the law of the place where it is made, it is not for lawful purposes and would not be permitted. The memorandum raises the strange image of "allowing an otherwise unlawful loan of a gun to a person who intends to roam the streets of New York City" for the "lawful purpose of protecting himself and his fellow citizens." I am tempted to respond that under the laws of New York City, protecting oneself from crime seems to be a crime in itself and thus no "lawful purpose," could exist and that perpetuating laws of this type seems quite agreeable to the philosophy of this memorandum. However, on a more serious level, as we all know, traveling the streets of New York with a firearm for self-protection is in most cases, a crime, unless one has political connections enough to obtain the permit. Without a permit, carrying such would not be use "for a lawful purpose." This may, incidentally, be one reason New York has the highest robbery rate and the second highest overall violent crime rate of American cities with a population over 500,000. (The only city exceeding it in overall violence is Boston, home of the Bartley-Fox mandatory sentence for carrying a firearm without a permit.)

II. THIS BILL WOULD NOT INTERFERE WITH ANY LEGITIMATE STATE INTEREST IN CONTROLLING INTRASTATE FIREARMS ACQUISITION AND USE

My bill would amend current law to provide that State laws which prohibit transportation of a firearm or ammunition through that State shall be null and void so long as the transportation is in interstate commerce through such State, when such firearm is unloaded and not readily accessible. This is designed to protect legitimate hunters and sportsmen who occasionally must pass through a restrictive gun law State in order to get to another

State. On occasion their vehicles have been subjected to local law, even though they had carefully stored their firearms under lock and key and such were unloaded. Against these very unrealistic abuses the memorandum poses a horrible hypothetical involving terrorists who are traveling about the countryside with unloaded and inaccessible firearms. We might observe at the outset that no cases of terrorists traveling about with unloaded, inaccessible firearms have come to light to date, nor are likely to in the future. In the event that any such case should arise, the incipient terrorists would be prosecuted for violation of the neutrality acts, or of 18 U.S.C. 924(b), which provides 10 years' imprisonment for anyone transporting or receiving a firearm in interstate commerce with intent to commit a felony or knowledge that it may be used for such a commission, or conspiracy to commit any of the acts which the group plans. In brief, should this unlikely hypothetical situation ever come to pass, a State misdemeanor gun charge would be the least worry that the perpetrators would have. The problem can be handled quite expeditiously by concrete legislation aimed at particular abuses or intent to abuse, rather than by a general dragnet law which ropes in enormous quantities of the innocent in the unlikely hope that some day one of the guilty may be caught also.

III. THIS BILL WOULD INCREASE, NOT REDUCE, PENALTIES FOR GENUINE GUN-USING CRIMINALS

This memorandum next claims that this bill would reduce penalties for firearm law violators. This section most clearly demonstrates the memorandum's failure to take into account practice in the real world. When the Gun Control Act of 1968 was being debated, a true mandatory minimum sentence for use of firearms in Federal felonies was at first proposed. This would have prevented the granting of probation or parole to any violator who used a firearm in commission of a Federal felony. Before passage, however, the provision was so watered down as to become almost totally useless. In theory, it now provides that whoever uses a firearm to commit a Federal felony or carries a firearm unlawfully during this commission shall receive imprisonment from 1 to 10 years on first offense and 2 to 25 on second offense. But since the 1968 act only restricts of the giving of probation on second offense (and even then does not restrict the granting of parole) it has no real effect. A judge who feels that a serious offense should be punished by 6 months imprisonment would simply give 6-months-plus probation on the underlying charge, plus probation on this second, supposedly mandatory, term of imprisonment.

Under my bill, whoever uses any firearm or destructive device against

the person of another to commit a felony over which the Federal courts have original and exclusive jurisdiction shall receive 1 to 10 years for a first offense and 2 to 25 for a second, and under neither of these shall be eligible for probation, suspended sentence, parole, or furlough before completing the minimum. As an additional guarantee that the law will be used only against genuine hardcore violators who deserve the prison time despite the sympathy of the judge, the bill provides that the mandatory sentence shall not apply if the use of the firearm was to protect his person or property or that of another from commission of a felony.

The memorandum complains initially that existing law makes this sentence consecutive to the sentence on the underlying charge, whereas this bill would permit it to be given concurrently. Presumably the conclusion is that this bill would lessen the impact on the violator. The argument ignores the practical consequences of legislation in the real world. As discussed earlier, making the sentence theoretically consecutive does absolutely nothing since a judge who decides to give probation can still give it. Accordingly, the provision is meaningless. We provide a genuine mandatory sentence for firearm misuse in crime, and whether it comes consecutively or concurrently makes no real difference in terms of its impact upon criminals.

Next the memorandum complains that this would not apply to firearm felonies that are "not within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal courts." This, we assume, would refer to the bill's specification of felonies over which Federal courts "have original and exclusive jurisdiction." The writers of the memorandum apparently have not examined title 18, United States Code, for a definition of what constitutes original and exclusive jurisdiction. 18 U.S.C. § 3231 provides that,

The district courts of the United States shall have the original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the states, of all offenses against the laws of the United States.

In short, of all Federal offenses. Accordingly, this bill makes no real change in the substance of that portion of the law but only brings it into accord with the language of the jurisdictional statute. A bank robbery within the District of Columbia, for instance, would come within the original and exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal courts both as a robbery within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States (18 U.S.C. § 2111) and as a robbery of a bank (18 U.S.C. § 2113).

The memorandum's final criticism of the bill in this area is that the mandatory sentence would not apply to use of a firearm in self-protection. In

particular, the memorandum's drafters seem worried about the provision denying its application to use in defense of property. It would seem that use of a firearm in defense of property would rarely constitute a Federal felony, but the drafters of the memorandum, with their traditional ingenuity, create the image of a hypothetical situation in which a person shoots at someone stealing his mail.

It is apparent upon even a slight examination that this would not come within the mandatory sentence in any event. The person stealing the mail is, it is true, committing a Federal crime; but the individual who fires at him violates no Federal law, as there are no Federal statutes giving special protection to mail thieves. He could accordingly be prosecuted under State and local law, but under no circumstances would ever come within the scope of this mandatory sentence in any event.●

EXPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with several cosponsors, legislation requiring the Export-Import Bank to make loans available to purchasers of American agricultural products.

Farmers throughout the country face prospects of a bin-busting harvest leading to a surplus of grain which is severely depressing prices. The best means of reducing that surplus is to export it at a profit to our farmers. But, we face fierce competition in the agricultural export market from foreign nations who provide low-interest loans for buyers of the agricultural products.

The Export-Import Bank has in the past provided attractive financing to purchasers of American farm products. But, during the past administration, the Export-Import Bank was prohibited from making loans for agricultural sales. Loans, however, did and do continue for the sale of manufactured products.

The legislation I am introducing today will require that the Export-Import Bank make loans available for agricultural export in the same ratio that our agricultural exports bear to our total exports. Exceptions to this requirement would be made when the bank determines and reports to Congress that demand for such loans is not high enough to equal or exceed the ratio required or when the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the level of agricultural exports is or will be adequate without such credit.

Increasing our exports of farm products will not only help our farmers,

but will also provide a significant improvement in our balance-of-payments situation.

Without an increased effort to export our farm products, the farm economy faces a disastrous financial situation because it has done its job too well.

We must reduce the surplus and the best method is to sell it. But, to do that we must provide attractive financing to potential buyers who will turn to the competition if the funding is not available from us. We provide such financing to help our industrial producers compete and it seems only reasonable that the same treatment be accorded our agricultural producers.●

WATER: AN INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT CONCERN

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that is going to be more and more dominant on the national horizon is that of water.

I am taking the liberty of inserting a speech that was made by our colleague, WES WATKINS, about the rural water situation which I recommend to our colleagues.

I am also inserting a column I wrote for the media in my district which touches on the water situation.

We will be hearing a great deal more about water in the future and, obviously, one of those who is going to be leading the way in such endeavors will be our colleague, WES WATKINS, for whom we all have a high regard.

The speech follows:

WES WATKINS' OPENING SPEECH

Thanks very much Marvin, I'm very happy to be here. I hope I am among friends.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I serve on the Agricultural and Rural Development Subcommittee and also on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water. One of the members from California turned to me the other day and said, "You know what, I'm just going to give you a new nickname." My new nickname in the United States Congress is "The Rural Radical." I think we've needed a rural radical around here for a long time.

When I talk about Rural America, I'm talking about more than just agriculture. As Marvin knows, my roots are deep in agriculture. I served as Oklahoma state president of the Future Farmers of America. FFA is probably one of the big motivating factors in my life. I lost everything in the drought of '56 in Oklahoma including the peanut crop I left in the field and some old "banger" cows I ended up selling. But I still love the rural elements and agriculture so much that I was stupid enough to go off and major in agriculture in college. But I do love the climate, surroundings and environment and I cherish my upbringing in the rural community.

I grew up in a little town with about 200 people. I live in Ada, Oklahoma, a town with about 15,000 people. My district spreads about 300 miles along the Red River in Southern Oklahoma from the Texarkana area on the east all the way Marvin's house, which is right below Lawton in the Walters-Randlett area. The largest town has about 22,000 people, so we are considerably spread out there. The Federal government considers any city or town below 50,000 rural. That makes my district all rural and I'm proud of it. When the Legislature began redistricting the Congressional districts, I only asked them to do one thing—don't put me in Tulsa or Oklahoma City. They can spread me out anywhere else in the state but don't get me into those large cities.

I cherish, as I mentioned, the rural element, and yes, I'm calling attention to the cause for rural people. We've been second-class citizens too long. When John Steinbeck wrote the book, "The Grapes of Wrath," he portrayed my family in some respects because four different times my family went to California and back in search of jobs during World War II. My mom worked a shipyard there and I cut grapes, picked cotton and everything else going to California and coming back. We finally came home and settled down south of a little community, Bennington, Oklahoma, where I grew up.

That era John Steinbeck reported marked the largest movement of people ever recorded in the history of our country. In the late forties our country, and probably rightly so, saw fit to write the Marshall Plan to rebuild the economic face of Europe. Twenty years later our country saw fit to write the massive urban renewal program to save the inner cities of this country. The sad and tragic thing is that our country has never seen fit to write a program to rebuild rural America.

We have the Rural Electrification Administration today and I'm happy. I still remember setting the lamp aside and when I flicked on the first electric light in our house. I tell my REA friends that I should disown them. The only job I ever lost was because of Rural Electrification. I was an ice doodler on an ice truck that went out through the country. I was too little to carry the ice, but I could tip it off and I could slide it to the back of the truck.

Then Rural Electric came to town, no, not to town, came to the country. I sold ice one whole summer because it made better ice tea. Then the last summer I tried to sell ice, people had that thing called a refrigerator. I kid the Rural Electric people but it was one of the greatest things.

The second greatest thing that has happened to rural America is rural water. How many times have we seen new homes sprout up in the countryside and some family wanting to live there or some elderly couple wanting to retire there because of rural water. That's the element of rural America that you've played.

I was a home builder and land developer before I came to Congress. I built mainly through FmHA. Not by choice, but because we didn't have much money in rural America. I do not have one mortgage banker in my district. Out of the 25 counties I serve, we don't have one Federal Housing Administration house per county because we do not have investment capital in rural America.

I'm chairman of the Congressional Rural Caucus. I hope you are members of the Caucus. If not, I'm going to ask you today to become members of the Rural Caucus.

There's less than 4 percent of the population living on farms today. That's a problem, but that means we are going to have to work harder to organize. That's our business coming down here—trying to organize the rural people.

One city mayor has more power than we do. That's our problem. We need to organize, we need to speak up and we must let the people know that, "Hey, we are human beings, too." Congressional Rural Caucus has about 125 members in it, that's about 20 more than we had last year so we made a thrust forward. But here's the potential.

There's around 300 members of Congress that have about 50 percent of their people or more that would be considered rural with populations below 50,000. What does that mean? It takes 218 votes to pass or defeat a piece of legislation in the House. If we can just make 218 of these Congressmen conscious of rural America, we could have real impact on legislation.

I know some of you are wondering if we have a staff. We have one person who's helping on the staff right now. Many of the Congressmen are chipping in trying to do as much as possible. We are having a Congressional Rural Caucus banquet on March 31st and I understand that several of you are helping buy a table to help participate, but we have got to have more help. We've got to have shoe leather put down in this town if we are going to do the job that's got to be done.

Frank Tsutres is our executive director. He works hard, but when you only have one person, that's nearly an impossible task to try to get the job done that needs to be done. I'm devoting my staff as much as I possibly can to a large rural segment.

In fact, I'm building in my legislative file a legislative bible, or a Marshall plan for rural America. I may mention that a little later.

Let me indicate some of the things that we are trying to piecemeal in this effort as the chairman of the Congressional Rural Caucus and some of the things we are trying to do. Number one thing: All I ask the Members of Congress is to give us fairness and equity. Fairness and equity—that's not asking too much. I'm willing to balance the budget, but we have to have fairness and equity.

For example, take educational funds for handicapped children. I think our rural children are just as important as urban children. But the rural schools get only 7% of the handicap funds for education. We deserve close to one third of it because one third of the people of this country live in communities of 50,000 or below. Is that fairness and equity?

Look at FHA we mentioned a while ago. Section 203 provides for single family housing. We get less than 10% of these funds in rural America, and that's insured mortgage money. It's usually a very limited amount for a home. Unfortunately, with little money in the budget, the funds in my district are used up within the first quarter of the year.

Also HUD is the Community Development Block Grant money, which helps develop our community areas and our towns. But only 17 percent of that goes to cities and communities of 50,000 and below. Again, we should get about one third of it. Is that fairness and equity?

Let's look at UDAG—Urban Development Action Grants. Working through the subcommittee I formerly served on, we are able to get 25 percent set aside for rural communities. I couldn't get the 33 percent we de-

serve. Only two of us on that subcommittee crusaded or even talked about rural America, and when we asked the other members to be fair and equitable, they were not willing to step across just a little further.

We receive only about 20 percent of the SBA program funds out in rural America. Why? Because many times in our community you have a one-loan-officer bank. He may have someone who helps him a little bit but when he leaves the bank, it may as well be closed for the day as far as loan applications are concerned. These loan officers are not able to go to Oklahoma City six times to get the T's crossed and the I's dotted on SBA loans when they can stay home and make a few cattle loans and a few car loans, and put the rest of it in government bonds. Is that equity? Is that fairness?

The EDA program that I support was originally intended to serve the rural, depressed areas of the country. They've revised the minimum standards until 85 percent of the communities in this country are eligible for EDA assistance. I strongly disapprove of this because I know in Oklahoma City they are using the money to build a Myriad garden when I can't even get money for a water and sewer project in a town that doesn't even have a manufacturing job. Is that fairness and equity? I don't think so.

I'd like to bring us to where we are today. Let's look at the President's budget this way. The President said twice in his speech last week that the budget cuts would be evenhanded and that's all I ask, fairness and equity. But it's like the hen and the pig going down the road and all of a sudden they are confronted with a huge, angry, hungry, lion. The pig turned to the hen and said, "Madam hen, what should we do?" The hen said, "Well, pig, I think we should feed him some sausage and eggs." The pig said, "That's a good idea, but that takes just a little effort from you and that's a major sacrifice from me!" Ladies and gentlemen, let me say this. We are going to make a major sacrifice for rural America. If you don't believe it, look at the front page of The Washington Post this morning. The Administration is looking at taking another \$2 billion out of agriculture. Most of it will probably come out of Farmer's Home someplace.

I just told you about programs we are getting in Rural America. As I told them at the Oklahoma Press Association the other day, I'm willing to go along with most of the programs we are cutting, but there is virtually no private industry in my area and in most of the rural areas that can put the investment capital in there that's necessary to take up the slack.

We've got to have Farmer's Home type loan programs to provide us the investment capital. We've got to have water and sewer programs. Sewer projects and facilities were cut from \$1.1 billion down to \$600 million, and the water program itself was cut over half.

So what do we do? I'm not talking about a hockey stadium or anything like that for some big downtown city, I'm talking about trying to get water to some people in my district who still don't have running water.

I'd like to share with you one of the things we are trying to do. I know you are very interested in supplemental appropriations, and I have agreed to help. This would expand training and technical assistance to the rural water associations. I know you utilize these training funds wisely and provide a tremendous assistance. I've got communities that cannot meet the EPA clean water

requirements. More than 50 systems in Oklahoma are in violation of the EPA standards. How are we going to resolve that? How are we going to meet those standards in rural America? It's going to be tough.

I was talking to Interior Secretary Watt concerning water programs. The Administration plans to cut water development projects back in rural America, you know why? Because their priority is on projects which affect the most people—the urban and suburban projects.

Some of you may know I'm sponsoring a bill called the National Water Utilities Bank. I think we've got to have such a program because we are not going to receive the money from the Federal level. We have to go into the secondary money market just as we have done with rural electric. The only problem is that Dave Stockman wants to cut out the Federal Financing Bank at a time when we need it most.

We are going to push for that bill because I think it's an absolute necessity. It will provide loans and loan guarantees. Loan guarantees are off budget. I think we can't afford to stop providing things like electricity, sewer and water to the people of rural America. If we are in much trouble economically, then I think we should cut out every program in the major cities in this country.

Rural America has a big role in America's economic recovery. People talk about the crisis of this country. The crisis of this country they're talking about is energy. There's hardly any energy produced in the cities—it's produced in rural America. They're talking about the crisis of world hunger. There's no food produced in the cities—it's produced in rural America. They're talking about the water crisis that's right around the corner. There's no water impounded in the major cities, either—the dams are in the country.

Now you look at the three major crises of this world. The only way we are going to solve them is in rural America and they are exacting a big price from us to do it. I think we are ready to try to meet those problems. I think the least the Administration could give us is evenhandedness, fairness and equity in this program.

Yes, I may be called a "Rural Radical," but I may be called a whole lot worse before it is all over. These programs are good for your people and our people and they are absolutely essential. Marvin, I would like to stop at this point unless you have some questions or inquiries you would like to make.

WATER: THE NEXT CRISIS

We get so absorbed in today's crisis that we sometimes forget that there are some long-range things we should be working on more aggressively.

One of these, which will bring tremendous changes for the better, is the development of an inexpensive process for converting salt water to fresh water.

When that happens the deserts of the United States will blossom, as they will in North Africa and elsewhere. And in trouble spots like the Middle East tempers can be reduced at least a little, for almost lost in all of the other stories from the Middle East is the reality that part of the tensions there are caused by water problems.

We are headed for some major water problems, particularly in the West, unless this sea water source is developed. Today's

headlines are about oil; 10 years from now the headlines are likely to be about water.

Even in relatively water-rich Southern Illinois, we will see more and more farms irrigating. We have a few doing it now. After every dry year we have, there will be more farms joining the ranks.

There are four basic methods of desalting water, and the United States has put a total of \$320 million into one of these processes called distillation. There is a general feeling that this process is too expensive to be practical in most situations, and the other three processes are being examined.

This year two demonstration plants for other methods will start in Alamogordo, New Mexico and Virginia Beach, Virginia. Tentatively a third project is scheduled for Louisiana in 1983.

Desalting, however, is not some vague thing that might or might not work in the future. It is working now, but is too expensive to be practical in most situations. There are over 1500 desalting plants in operation around the world. And that number will grow rapidly if we can improve the desalting process.

That takes research. And research costs money, unfortunately.

Within the United States we now produce 100 million costly gallons of fresh water a day out of salt water. But we consume many billions of gallons of water each day.

All nations have a stake in making progress. The United States is working with Mexico and with Israel on specific projects. And many other nations are doing research.

When the day arrives that somewhere a breakthrough is achieved and an inexpensive process is developed for converting salt water to fresh water, it will be one of the most important stories of this century—yet it will probably not be on the front page of most newspapers.

Seventy percent of the earth's surface is covered by water, most of it salt water. It is a tremendous resource which some day will be appreciated much more. We should be hastening that day. ●

HALF A CENTURY

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, although we daily stand in awe of the massive fourth estate operation which exists in Washington, I tend to watch more carefully and respond more rapidly to the news I obtain through that great network of grass roots America called the hometown newspaper.

South Carolina's Sixth Congressional District has a journalistic fraternity, while not as massive and slick as the major metropolitan press, compares with the best when carrying the banner of the First Amendment.

One of the priorities in my Washington and district offices is to closely monitor the daily and weekly newspapers, for they guard the front lines of life in rural and suburban America.

I am especially proud of my own hometown newspaper, the Marlboro Herald-Advocate, a true family-owned, operated, written, and distributed

journal. Recently celebrating 50 years of reporting the news of Bennettsville, S.C., and the surrounding Marlboro County, the William L. Kinney family was the object of an interesting column written by the State news editor of the Florence Morning News, Thom Anderson, an astute member of the media who has long observed life in journalism circles in the Sixth District.

Mr. Anderson's article details the history of the Kinney family, which passed the torch of journalism from one generation to another, while maintaining the highest standards of the profession.

It is with pride that I offer this article for the information of my colleagues in Congress:

HALF A CENTURY

(By Thom Anderson)

It was just over 50 years ago that Mr. and Mrs. William L. Kinney started a newspaper in Bennettsville, one that became the present Marlboro Herald-Advocate.

They turned the paper over to their son, William L. Kinney Jr., 10 years ago, but they have remained active around the paper, and they put out a special section of the Sept. 3 issue to look back over some good years in Bennettsville.

It was sort of an ill-timed blow that caused Kinney and his bride to launch the Marlboro County Herald, which published for the first time on Sept. 1, 1931.

He had graduated from college in 1925, and in 1926 became bookkeeper of the Pee Dee Advocate, a Bennettsville weekly. A few weeks later, the editor left, and Kinney took over that job, too, serving in both capacities.

In 1932, he was to marry on June 18 in Ninety-Six. The paper was sold, but the new owner told Kinney he would be retained. The day before the wedding, just before Kinney was to leave for the wedding the new owner hit town and greeted him with the news that he would not be needed.

This was quite a blow, but the wedding went on anyway, and they went on a honeymoon to the mountains as scheduled, returning to Bennettsville on July 1.

He picked up a temporary job helping close an estate, and the two decided to start their own paper. With \$500 "reluctantly" loaned to Kinney, they started the Marlboro County Herald, a weekly.

The lead story of the first issue of the Marlboro Herald, dated Sept. 1, 1931, carried as lead story an item about Gov. Irba Blackwood holding a meeting in Bennettsville with Marlboro County farmers who favored a possible special session of the Legislature.

There were no pictures on the front, as often was the case then. Other items told of a team called the Tigers edging the Athletics for the local softball title, plans to pave S.C. 9 from Bennettsville to U.S. 1 near Cheraw, election of L. L. Gaddy to the city council, Tom Lewis selling the county's first bale of cotton for the year and F. Gray Craven being the first subscriber to the Herald.

It was printed out of town at first, and they had their troubles, including a wreck in which both were badly injured, but by 1937, they were able to put in their own printing equipment.

Among the people who worked in the back shop, Kinney recalls, was Fletcher Stubbs,

who went into the Army when war broke out and became the first Marlboro County serviceman killed in World War II.

In 1948, the Herald went to twice weekly publication.

And in 1951, there must have been delicious irony in it for the Kinneys as they bought the Pee Dee Advocate, the paper that had fired Kinney at such an inopportune time 20 years earlier.

They combined the papers and continued twice-weekly publication as the Marlboro Herald-Advocate. In 1952 they bought the McColl Messenger.

In 1971, they sold their interest to their son who still publishes the Herald-Advocate, and supposedly retired, something Mrs. Kinney calls "the joke of the last 10 years." They are still around the paper regularly doing what ever is needed.

Kinney looks back with a lot of gratitude and justified pride at the development of his paper. He has served as president of the South Carolina Press Association and the paper has won a lot of awards over the years.

"I trust that I have been able to contribute something along the way and over the years that has made life better for someone who has been a reader of our publications," Kinney wrote. ●

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION HARMS THE DISADVANTAGED

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, throughout the course of our discussions in this body of affirmative action programs, a topic which is too seldom addressed is the impact of racial quotas and other instruments of preferential treatment on those they are purported to aid, minorities. I wish to insert the following article by Dr. Thomas Sowell, black economist and senior fellow at the Hoover Institute, in the RECORD. This is one of several recent articles by Dr. Sowell in which he brings to bear his extensive research on minority groups in America in exposing the fallacy that affirmative action programs are capable of bringing minorities into the mainstream of our economy.

The article follows:

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION HARMS THE DISADVANTAGED

(By Thomas Sowell)

The supreme irony of "affirmative action" is that it demands hard statistical results from others but has none to offer itself. This is the tenth year of numerical "goals and timetables" in employment—quotas, for those who prefer plain English. Yet the actual results of a decade of this controversial program are seldom mentioned.

Before "goals and timetables" were mandated by federal guidelines in 1971, Puerto Rican family income was 60% of the national average. Today it is 50%. Black family income, as a percentage of white family income, has never in the past decade ex-

ceeded the level reached in 1969. Usually, it has been lower.

No doubt there are many factors behind these numbers. But imagine an employer with similar statistical trends trying to explain to EEOC or the courts that it was all due to other circumstances beyond his control. Yet that is what affirmative action proponents are reduced to. The results simply are not there to justify this bitterly divisive program.

Progress has not stopped completely for disadvantaged racial and ethnic groups. But the rate of progress is not as rapid as it was in the equal opportunity phase of the 1960s that preceded affirmative action quotas in the 1970s. Indeed, some proponents of affirmative action cite the slowing down of progress as a reason that this program is needed more than ever.

There are economic as well as statistical reasons for considering affirmative action counterproductive. The incentives created by quota pressures seem to increase the demand for "representatives" of the various groups designated by the government for special consideration. But at the very same time, these pressures make it more dangerous to have such people on the payroll.

Their future pay, promotion, and discharge patterns can easily land the employer in costly legal proceedings, even if he ends up completely vindicated. But the plight of employers is not the central issue. The real problem is that disadvantaged groups can be damaged by the way employers seek to protect themselves.

One way out of the employer's dilemma is to hire minority applicants who are sufficiently above average that their future pay, promotions and discharge patterns are unlikely to be worse than those of the other employees. But while the demand for these unusually well-qualified individuals tends to be increased by affirmative action pressures, the demand is decreased for minority or female applicants who are below average, or who do not have enough of a track record for an employer to take a chance.

Some recently published data on black males illustrates the point. Between 1967 and 1978, the income of college-educated black males rose dramatically, both absolutely and relative to the income of college-educated white males. In 1967, college-educated black males who were in the labor force a few years earned 74 percent of the annual income of their white counterparts. By 1978, this was 98 percent.

But over exactly the same span of time, black males with less education were falling further behind white males with less education. For example, black males who were in the labor force a few years, but who had less than 12 years of schooling, earned 79 percent of the annual income of white males of the same description in 1967. By 1978, that was down to 69 percent.

One may try to explain over-all black/white ratio changes by general economic conditions in the 1970s, rather than by affirmative action. But it is hard to explain diametrically opposite trends among blacks this way.

A more narrowly focused study of 50,000 academics showed a very similar pattern. Those black faculty members who had completed their Ph.D.s in highly ranked departments and who had published were earning more than whites of the same high qualifications. But those black faculty members who had not yet completed their doctorates and had not yet published earned less than their white counterparts. Again, the

demand seems to have been artificially increased for the highly qualified black and artificially decreased for the more average black or the black who had not yet made a track record.

A number of responsible people have said off the record that they are reluctant to take on risks, with either minority or female applicants, because of the time and money that can be lost in legal proceedings if they later have to be discharged or even promoted more slowly. One black woman in a high position, when informed of this reasoning, replied that that was how she herself operated in considering applicants. "I have no time to spend at EEOC or in the courts," she said.

Affirmative action harms disadvantaged groups in other ways. The number of groups covered by this program has successively expanded to the point where it now includes a majority of the American people. George Gilder in his best seller "Wealth and Poverty" estimates the coverage at 70 percent of the population, controlling 75 percent of the country's wealth.

This means that blacks, for example, are lost in a sea of other people. Moreover by requiring employment decisions to be justifiable to third parties, affirmative action increases the importance of paper credentials—which are disproportionately lacking among disadvantaged minority individuals, even when they are perfectly capable of doing the work.

Like many other public policies, affirmative action needs to be judged by what it actually does, not by what it intends or hopes to accomplish. The crucial question is what incentives and constraints it creates—what it rewards and penalizes. We all know what road is paved with good intentions.

Even the supporters of affirmative action seem to sense its bankruptcy. They generally steer discussions as far away as possible from hard facts about the actual results achieved. They talk instead about history, as if this policy were going to be applied to the past instead of to the future. They impugn the motives of those who criticize their efforts, in a manner reminiscent of Sen. Joe McCarthy. In short, anything to evade the grim facts.

Quotas and preferences have been tried in a number of countries. Nowhere has any racial or ethnic group risen from poverty to prosperity by these methods, though many have done so by all sorts of other methods. The Chinese in Southeast Asia, Italians in Argentina, Germans in Brazil, Japanese in the United States, and Jews in various European countries have begun in poverty and ended in affluence, while avoiding politics. Where preferential treatment has been tried, it has not merely failed to achieve its object but has torn countries apart with internal strife. India, Indonesia, Malaysia and Guyana are just some of the places where such efforts have led to bloodshed in the streets.

After 10 years, it is time to ask what affirmative action has achieved for the disadvantaged, and what it has done to this country. ●

STATE DEPARTMENT DECISION TO REFUSE ENTRANCE VISAS TO CUBAN OFFICIALS

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my pleasure with the State Department's decision to refuse entrance visas to Cuban officials who were to participate in the Center for Cuban Studies symposium "The U.S. and Cuba: Prospects for Dialogue."

Yesterday's Washington Post quoted Fidel Castro attacking the Reagan administration as "fascist," "genocidal," and "covered in blood." Today Castro's troops are engaging in battles in Angola, Ethiopia, and other countries in Africa and Latin America.

It would be inconsistent and counterproductive to admit these officials to participate in a pro-Cuba propaganda session in the U.S. Capital. This would have been the wrong signal to send to Havana and to those allies we expect to take a tough stand against Cuban adventurism. More importantly, it would have been misinterpreted by many as a back-door normalization of relations with the Western Hemisphere's most repressive government.

The Reagan administration is to be commended for this wise decision. ●

THE TEDDY GLEASON NYSA-ILA SCHOLARSHIP FUND AND AWARDS CEREMONY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to report that the first annual Teddy Gleason scholarship program has this month named its recipients. A product of the combined efforts of the International Longshoremen's Association and the New York Shipping Association, this program has just granted eight college scholarships to the children of longshoremen from New York and New Jersey: Salvatore Avitabile, John A. Caputo, Christine Kirwan, Lina Liberatore, Thomas A. Moroney, Jr., Hermond E. Palmer, Adrianna M. Rubinic, and Robin Tavares. My congratulations to these outstanding students and their families and it was indeed an honor to participate in the luncheon and meet these outstanding young Americans.

The joint venture that made these scholarships possible represents an important step forward in labor-management cooperation in the maritime industry. Above all, this scholarship pro-

gram is a testimony to the leadership, vision, and imagination of the man after whom it is named: my good friend Teddy Gleason, distinguished president of the International Longshoremen's Association. He worked closely with the New York Shipping Association, led by James Dickman, to create the NYSA-ILA scholarship fund, which provides the wherewithal for the scholarships. When fully implemented in 1984, it will help 32 students, annually, to work toward their college degrees. Mr. Gleason's achievement is typical of his deep and abiding commitment to creating new avenues of opportunity for ILA members and their children. I commend the following account of these scholarship awards to the attention of my colleagues and also want to praise the management association for their progressive attitude toward this program.

PORT LABOR FUND AWARDS FIRST SCHOLARSHIPS TO LONGSHOREMEN DEPENDENTS; ACTION MARKS OPENING OF \$128,000 PROGRAM TO AID 32 STUDENTS ANNUALLY

A newly created labor-management fund that finances four-year college scholarships for dependents of union longshoremen in the Port of New York and New Jersey today announced that the first group of eight students has been selected for its \$4,000 annual awards. They include residents of Northern New Jersey, New York City and Suffolk County on Long Island.

The action by the Teddy Gleason Scholarship Program of the NYSA-ILA Scholarship Fund marks that initial grant by the waterfront industry plan. It was developed under the present three-year collective bargaining agreement between the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO and employers represented here by New York Shipping Association, Inc. and is the only one of its kind in the port industry.

When fully implemented in 1984, the fund will annually assist a total of 32 children of ILA members from the bi-state port region in achieving a college level education at a total outlay of \$128,000 with eight new high school graduates becoming eligible for each of the \$4,000 awards yearly.

Announcement of the winning student candidates was made jointly by the two leading spokesmen for labor and management who helped negotiate the program in contract talks last year. They are ILA President Thomas W. (Teddy) Gleason, for whom the program was named, and James J. Dickman, President of the management association, which represents ship industry employers in the harbor.

The eight students selected for the initial awards by the College Scholarship Service based in Princeton, New Jersey, include the following:

Salvatore Avitabile, son of Mr. and Mrs. Felix Avitabile of 155 Seeley Street, Brooklyn. His father is a member of ILA Local 1 and works as a checker at the Red Hook Terminal in Brooklyn.

John A. Caputo, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Caputo, of 162 Hylan Boulevard, Staten Island. Frank Caputo is a member of ILA Local 1 and is employed as a checker at Howland Hook Marine Terminal on Staten Island.

Christine Kirwan, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Kirwan of 70 Signs Road, Staten Island. Thomas Kirwan is a member

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of ILA Local 1804-1 and is employed at the Consolidated Passenger Ship Terminal on the North River in Manhattan.

Lina Liberatore, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Giacomo Liberatore of 2556 East 23 Street, Brooklyn. Her father is a member of ILA Local 920 and works as a longshoreman at Howland Hook Marine Terminal on Staten Island.

Thomas A. Moroney, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas A. Moroney of Rocky Point, N.Y. The elder Mr. Moroney is a member of ILA Local 1 and is now retired.

Hermund E. Palmer, son of Mrs. Phyllis Palmer and the late Herman Palmer, of 1730 Clinton Place, Teaneck, N.J. His father had been a member of ILA Local 1814 in Brooklyn.

Adrianna M. Rubinic, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Rubinic of 41-42 Cpl Kennedy Street, Bayside, Queens, N.Y. Her father is a member of ILA Local 1804-1 and is employed on Pier 36, East River, Manhattan.

Robin Tavares, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Tavares of 1508 Vauxhall Road, Union, N.J. John Tavares is a member of ILA Local 1235 and is employed as a longshoreman at the Sea-Land Service terminal in Elizabeth.

The award of scholarships by a fund supported by industry contributions and negotiated through a labor contract is a pioneering event in longshore employer-union relations in the port here. However, it's a program that is a likely forerunner for similar development in other Atlantic and Gulf Coast harbors in later years, according to labor and management sources.

Open to dependents of more than 10,000 ILA members in the New York port area on the basis of academic performance and aptitude tests among other determinations, it is available to qualified applicants who wish to continue education in undergraduate, apprentice or training programs in accredited colleges, universities and other institutions.

The union is the largest waterfront organization in the United States. In addition to members in the Port of New York and New Jersey, ILA represents some 40,000 longshoremen in other ports from Canada to Mexico, and upwards of 50,000 additional waterfront workers in the U.S. Great Lakes, eastern Canada and Puerto Rico.

New York Shipping Association is also the largest waterfront management organization in the United States. It represents approximately 135 companies including many of the largest ocean carriers and stevedoring and marine terminal operating companies in the nation.

The activities of the union and NYSA in the bi-state Port of New York and New Jersey involve handling by workers and employers of more than 24 million tons of high value general cargo yearly through company operated facilities. The port is the nation's largest harbor and the 10,000 active longshoremen in the work force here is the largest such group by far in any American port.

The bi-state port covers pier areas Brooklyn, Manhattan and Staten Island within the five boroughs of New York City, and the New Jersey waterfront communities of Newark, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Hoboken, Bayonne, Weehawken and Perth Amboy.●

September 17, 1981

THE HONORABLE MARIO BIAGGI OF NEW YORK REMARKS DURING SPECIAL ORDER FOR GARY HYMEL

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as one who has benefited from knowing Gary Hymel, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great man. True—Gary is leaving the House—but what he leaves behind is one of the most impressive records of service ever accumulated.

For 15 years, Gary Hymel has dedicated himself to the improvement of the House. He has worked for the office of the majority whip, majority leader, and now the Speaker. Gary has made friends on both sides of the aisle by applying the same standards to everyone—be cordial—be cooperative and be fair.

Gary knows this House as well as anyone. His advice was the best around. While we regret it—we do understand his decision to return to private life. However, his departure leaves us with a void that will be hard to fill. Staff people oftentimes do not get the proper recognition for their work, so today I am pleased that we are taking this opportunity to give credit where credit is due. Gary—good luck—good health—and thanks for everything.●

"NATIONAL AUTO POLICY—UNFINISHED BUSINESS"—PART III

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, the final portion of UAW President Doug Fraser's address to the Sixth Annual Automotive News World Congress focuses upon one possible remedy for equalizing international auto trade policies. Domestic content laws are already in effect in virtually all other auto-producing countries. The time may have arrived when we ought to at least air the pros and cons of content legislation as a means of signaling our resolve toward both free trade and fair trade policies.

FINAL PORTION OF UAW DOUG FRASER'S ADDRESS

A local content requirement is needed to preserve employment and shore up the nation's sagging industrial base.

Such content legislation should require that, by 1985, auto companies with yearly sales in excess of 200,000 units have at least 75 percent North American content in their fleet; and that companies with 500,000 units

or more have 90 percent North American content in their fleet.

Local content requirements tied to sales volume should be phased in beginning with the 1983 model year. Credit would be given for exports of parts or vehicles, to allow manufacturers flexibility to rationalize production.

A "manufacturer" for this purpose should be defined by the locus of majority control. For example, Chrysler and Mitsubishi would be counted as two separate companies, since Chrysler does not control Mitsubishi Motors.

The UAW believes that each company has an obligation to generate employment in those countries in which it has substantial sales volume. Sales in North America by VW, Toyota, Nissan, and Honda have long since reached a level at which full-scale assembly can be efficiently accomplished here.

Indeed, by 1980 both Toyota and Nissan had U.S. sales that approached Chrysler's.

Substantial local content cannot be implemented overnight. But the timetable carried out by Volkswagen over the last few years can serve as a clear example for others.

VW began U.S. production in 1978. Now, in addition to its assembly plant in Pennsylvania, it has a stamping plant in West Virginia and a new multi-plant complex in Texas. It is about to open a second assembly plant in Sterling Heights, Michigan. Currently, the North American content of VW Rabbits is approaching 70 percent.

Some may object that our content proposal runs counter to the principles of "free trade." We have long recognized the benefits to humanity that flow from expanded world commerce. The vital role of world trade in fueling postwar economic growth is widely known.

Nor have we forgotten the tragic lessons of the thirties, when a round robin of misguided beggar-thy-neighbor protectionist policies worsened the Great Depression.

But the world has changed a great deal since then. When it comes to autos, with the significant exception, until recently, of the U.S., there is no major nation of the world that practices "free trade" and there has not been for some time. Every major nation bent on industrialization and economic growth has singled out auto as a sector to develop.

Every multinational wishing to do business in the major markets of the world has found it to be a political necessity to set up shop in those markets, to contribute investments and employment in return for access to those markets.

The U.S. can no longer afford to be the world's leading exception, accepting whatever others wish to sell here without expecting any contribution to our depleted economy in return.

If other nations' policies prevent auto trade from becoming a two-way street, our country cannot afford a one-way traffic jam of the unemployed. The fact is, our content proposal would not be significantly disruptive of world commerce; rather, it would assure that other nations trade responsibly.

Our minimum vehicle threshold, before application of any content provision, would permit foreign automakers who sell here in moderate volumes, such as BMW or Fiat, to continue to do so without interference.

The phase-in period contained in our proposal would permit companies to increase domestic content in an orderly and achievable way, on a timetable roughly like the one VW has followed voluntarily.

Moreover, with content set at no more than 90 percent even for the highest volume sellers, the automakers would still be permitted a substantial amount of foreign sourcing; consumers could still derive substantial benefits from further internationalization of production.

Domestic content requirements are already part of two laws that affect U.S. auto companies. First, the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) requirements of the 1975 Energy Policy and Conservation Act include such a provision.

For CAFE standards, models sold in the U.S. with less than 75 percent North American value-added must be averaged separately from those with more than 75 percent content.

This has served in the past to reduce the incentive for U.S. auto companies to ship more small cars and parts here from their overseas operations, and has brought about faster domestic conversion to production of more fuel-efficient vehicles.

Second, the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965 also contains a content provision. It permits zero tariffs on vehicles, parts, and materials when at least 50 percent of their value is derived from domestic production.

As a result of this provision, products merely assembled in Canada from non-North American parts would be charged a tariff when they enter the U.S. Japan has imposed local content requirements for its aerospace purchases. As a condition of its purchase of billions of dollars worth of fighters and patrol planes from Lockheed and McDonnell Douglas, Japan will produce at least 40 percent of their value.

The Boeing Company has also reported that foreign production has become widely required to make sales abroad. To help clinch major sales to Japanese airlines, Boeing made guarantees to source in Japan 15 percent of the multi-billion dollar production value of their new 767 series sold worldwide.

The Japanese government, according to its official sources, negotiated arrangements for three Japanese companies to participate with Boeing and provided a subsidy of almost \$100 million.

A local content law is clearly superior to long term measures which simply limit imports.

The competition among the world's auto companies to provide the American consumer with a wide variety of innovative products built with the most efficient technologies available would be retained. The U.S. producers would continue to be pressured by the discipline of the design and engineering innovations of foreign-based manufacturers.

Local content requirements would, however, lead to increased investment in our country and prevent further disastrous loss of jobs. Such jobs would be not only in motor vehicle assembly, but in the many firms and industries which supply the auto industry.

Many of you in this audience represent companies that supply the auto industry with parts and components. I'd like to ask you to set aside for a moment the natural tendency to see corporations on one side of the table and the UAW on the other.

No doubt we have strong disagreements on certain issues, but on the question of content legislation I think we have a great deal in common.

The idea of content legislation does have support in both labor and business circles. My union advocates content, yet so does

Business Week—hardly a radical publication. Automotive News, which most of you read, endorsed the idea of imposing a content requirement as well.

Today I began sending letters to more than 1,000 parts and supplier companies in the auto industry. In those letters, I'm asking their officers to consider joining with us in the legislative fight on behalf of content legislation.

On this issue, the parts sector and trade unions should have common cause. When General Motors threatens workers with statements it intends to buy or build more components "offshore," your companies may very well be victims as well. When Ford talks about out-sourcing parts overseas, it's your firms as well as our workers who are being blackmailed.

Content legislation not only will address the savaging of the American economy by the Japanese. It will also confront the exporting of American jobs and capital by General Motors and Ford. For years, those companies—whatever their other sins—did do what we're asking of the Japanese.

After World War II, instead of building cars in North America and shipping them to Europe, for example, GM and Ford produced where their market was. They built plants and produced vehicles in Europe for the European market. It would be the height of irresponsibility today for them to reverse that policy and begin producing more vehicle content overseas for the North American market.

The UAW has no intention of allowing them to do so. Nor will the American public tolerate GM or Ford abandoning our shores at the same time those companies seek help from taxpayers and consumers.

Last night you heard Donald Petersen of Ford Motor Company. Like Phil Caldwell, Mr. Petersen has repeatedly threatened to export our jobs unless the UAW reopens the agreement Ford signed committing itself through next September.

You've all probably seen the long row of flags in front of the Glass House at Ford World Headquarters. Now Ford threatens to lower the American flag and raise the colors of countries that distinguish themselves by paying their workers so little they can't afford to buy the products they make. Roger Smith of GM can't seem to get through a speech without making similar threats.

We have no intention of reopening those agreements. Yet, let me make it clear that the UAW fully intends to approach 1982 bargaining in a responsible manner. We are realists. We understand that bargaining doesn't go on in a vacuum—you have to face the economic realities that exist when you go to the table.

I'm hopeful we can work out whatever differences we have with the companies, as we have in past negotiations. The UAW is committed to new approaches at the bargaining table. There is some indication that may well be true of the Big Two as well.

Yet the issue before us today is what can be done now to restore the North American industry to health. There are a number of needed steps, but content legislation is most important. It addresses both the failure of the Japanese to trade responsibly and the threat of GM and Ford to out-source irresponsibly.

The content legislation would be constructed in such a way that companies could rationalize production on an international basis.

We're not urging that every single component that goes into a car sold here be built here. GM, Ford and other multinationals could still have some large volume plants in other countries which would produce parts for cars sold here. In fact, under the legislation we advocate, the U.S. companies currently would meet the content requirements even though they currently import some parts and components for the domestic market.

What the law would do, basically, would prevent domestic manufacturers from launching major efforts to significantly lower domestic content by exporting North American jobs. Who would benefit from content legislation? Just about everyone, in our view.

Consumers would have a wide variety of vehicles to choose from, rather than facing limits with restraints or tariffs or quotas. The consumer also would gain in that American automakers would face the discipline that foreign companies provide in terms of price, design, and product innovation.

Obviously, we believe workers would benefit. Content legislation means jobs—jobs in Detroit and Pittsburgh and Phoenix and Atlanta and all across this country.

Not only would autoworkers benefit, but so would steelworkers, glass workers, electrical workers, rubber workers, etc.

Our towns and cities would benefit from content legislation. Go to Westmoreland, Pennsylvania, and talk to the local merchants about Volkswagen. The union wage VW workers earn gets spent at the local A&P and the hardware store and the coffee shops. The school districts benefit from the tax base as do other units of government there.

Parts suppliers would benefit from content, as I've noted. Their gains, and those of their workers, would not be limited to new vehicle sales, but also would accrue in the replacement market.

Finally, I believe GM and Ford would benefit as well from content legislation, despite the limits it would impose on notions they have about offshore production. They would benefit because the Nissans and Toyotas would have to compete with them on the basis of quality, design, efficiency, price and product innovation, but not on who can pay their workers the least.

Currently, Japan is a country with high productivity in auto, yet it pays its autoworkers as if they worked in an industry with productivity well below Spain, or Italy. High productivity doesn't earn autoworkers decent purchasing power in Japan.

If labor costs are the key factor in international competition, the Japanese will probably experience in auto what occurred in the shipbuilding industry. Other less developed countries exist that are willing to exploit their workers even more.

The Japanese shipbuilding industry has lost market share in a shrinking market because the low-paying shipyards of Korea and Brazil took their markets. Unless a work order can develop that takes wages out of competition by paying workers based on productivity, the unemployment lines of Toledo will have their counterpart in Tokyo, while they work overtime in Taipei.

While the UAW intends to press the fight for content legislation, we are hopeful that representatives of all these groups that would benefit will join us. A coalition of workers, consumers, local governmental officials, parts and supplier firms, and even the auto companies would present a powerful political force on this issue.

In the past few months, my union has received many invitations to "come to the party" from various companies seeking our help. Where it was justified, we did. Now, on an issue which is also justified and which will mean increased investment and job creation here, we're asking them to "come to the party."

Winning content legislation will not be easy. Nor will convincing Washington that we need a coherent auto policy based in part on that legislation.

Other elements of that national economic policy should include the rejection of high interest rates and monetarism; imposition of wage/price restraints to slow inflation; targeted tax and capital formation programs; greater democratization from the shop floor to the corporate boardroom, and expansion rather than cutbacks in job retraining and relocation programs for workers and communities affected by economic dislocations.

There are numerous other initiatives which would help get our depressed industry back on track. I've outlined a program for you tonight that, if implemented, would mean that when you meet next summer at this same World Congress the auto outlook would begin to be brighter.

As a realist, I know some elements of the auto policy I've outlined will not be embraced by the Reagan Administration and the Congress, let alone the automakers themselves.

Winning the content legislation I've proposed tonight will take a very difficult fight. But it's one we can and should make together. If we do, and if we succeed, there probably still will be problems that will keep the champagne corks from popping in the hotel suites at next year's Auto News gathering.

But at least we all won't be crying in our beer over the 39th straight month of depression as all but those of you working for the Japanese automakers probably will do after the session tonight.

Thank you for hearing out my proposals and giving them your consideration.●

MAKING IT MORE SECURE

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following thoughtfully written editorial from the Ventura County Star Free Press on the difficult minimum social security payment issue.

MAKING IT MORE SECURE

Now that the budget and tax bills are in the corral, President Reagan is attempting to lasso a critter with even more political spunk: Social Security.

The president's original proposal was apparently to wipe out the minimum benefit of \$122 a month—which, being paid to everyone who has the required Social Security work record but did not earn enough to be entitled to that amount, is now a sort of "floor" figure. The idea was to save about a billion dollars a year by paying each person with a work record exactly what past earnings entitled—even if it was less than \$122 a month.

For people to whom that would be a real hardship, Mr. Reagan proposed that they be

picked up by the Supplemental Security Income plan—the "gold check" program, a successor to the former old age security plan, which is based on age and need. SSI funding comes from general revenues, not from Social Security tax receipts, so the strain on Social Security would be eased.

The administration's real target is people who held government jobs not covered by Social Security, and who managed a bit of moonlighting in jobs that were covered by Social Security. Some of them now enjoy relatively good government pensions and also get \$122 a month. Others who enjoy the minimum payment are retired, well-to-do people who have a minimal earnings record under Social Security, because their income has been primarily from investments; to them, the \$122 is plain, tax-exempt gravy. The current Washington slang for these two classes is "double-dippers and coupon clippers," and neither of them is a hardship case.

But for many Americans, a minimum Social Security payment is a necessity. A congressional study shows that some 300,000 people, many of them widows, need that money for bare subsistence. These include people who can't qualify for SSI, in part because SSI has a rigid means test which would exclude a widow who happened to have more than \$1,500 in bank deposits or other liquid assets. For these 300,000, who would "fall between the cracks" if the minimum were removed, Mr. Reagan promises compassionate attention, and he should get solid congressional support.

The double-dippers and coupon clippers may not like it, but the Social Security program was designed from the beginning to provide a modest, minimum amount for those who need it. Saving a billion dollars a year, by limiting minimum payments to those in need, would be one essential step toward making the whole Social Security system a bit more secure.●

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in developing a China policy, it is essential that the Reagan administration take into account Taiwan's very strategic location. It must be remembered that Taiwan guards two of the most important waterways in Asia—the Taiwan Straits and the Bashi Channel—and that whoever controls Taiwan controls the gateways to Southeast Asia.

In the article, "Taiwan's Strategic Importance" which appeared in Security, Prof. Chin Sheng-pao states that in order to contain Soviet expansion, it is imperative that Taiwan remain in strong friendly hands. Mr. Chin writes that:

Russia, since its estrangement with China, has been trying to break through U.S. encirclement and, in turn, encircle Communist China. The entrenched presence of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the Soviet camp, Laos'

recent severing of treaties with Peking, and the existence of large, vocal pro-Soviet forces in India and Iran are conclusive evidence that Russia is succeeding in its endeavor.

The professor's arguments are supported by such distinguished leaders as Leonard Unger, the last American Ambassador to the Republic of China, who wrote that:

A hostile government on Taiwan could threaten American friends and allies in North, East, and Southeast Asia. Over time, this could encourage policy shifts in those countries contrary to U.S. interests and diminish American influence in the area.

At this time, I insert Professor Chin's article in the RECORD for my colleagues to peruse at their leisure.

TAIWAN'S STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE

(By Chin Sheng-pao)

(Chin Sheng-pao received his LL.B. and LL.M. from National Cheng Chi University. He was also awarded an M.S. in area studies by the University of London. Chin, who specializes in national security issues, is presently an associate professor of international politics at National Cheng Chi University.)

The United States' decision to abrogate its Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China and recognize Peking provokes the asking of two questions. One, why did the U.S. change its China policy after thirty years; has Taiwan's strategic importance to the U.S. changed so drastically? And two, how does this change in policy affect the security arrangements and strategic balance in the Western Pacific?

These two questions can perhaps best be answered by examining U.S. foreign policy vis-a-vis Russia since WWII and Taiwan's strategic importance after the 1949 Communist takeover of Mainland China.

George Kennan in 1947 published an article entitled "The Sources of Soviet Conduct" in the Foreign Affairs Quarterly stating that Russia can maintain internal stability only by external expansion. To bring about the internal collapse or at least changes in the nature of the Soviet regime, the U.S. must prevent Russia from expanding its sphere of influence.

This containment policy was adopted by Washington, and a series of alliance systems and mutual defense treaties was drawn up and signed to encircle Russia. The result was NATO, CENTO, SEATO, and the mutual defense pacts in the Western Pacific region with Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines.

The U.S.-ROC Mutual Defense Treaty was not signed until 1954. The Korean War brought the Americans and the Chinese Communists into direct conflict, and led to Washington's decision to contain what it saw as Peking's aggression. So instead of revising its China policy after the Communist takeover of the Mainland, Washington simply expanded its sphere of encirclement to include Communist China as well as Russia. By joining forces with the Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan, the U.S. closed up its last gap in the island defense chain in the Western Pacific.

The thinking in Washington at the time was that Communist China, like Russia, must expand externally if it were to maintain internal stability. Mainland China, however, was bordered on the east by the Pacific, the west by the Himalayas, the south by Southeast Asia, and the north by Russia.

Geographical elements alone, especially with Taiwan blocking Communist Chinese access to the Pacific, would make it impossible for Peking to expand east or westward. As for the north and south, if the U.S., armed with SEATO, could prevent Peking from expanding into Southeast Asia, the Communist Chinese would necessarily have to turn toward the north where they would come in direct conflict with Russia.

In the 1960s, a number of scholars including Harvard's John Fairbank came up with another theory. They felt the strong nationalistic feelings in Southeast Asia and the presence of so many overseas Chinese there would deter Peking from expanding southward, especially if American military presence were removed from the area. So if the U.S. withdrew its forces from Southeast Asia, Peking might feel free to move the bulk of its southern divisions north against Russia.

Carrying this thinking one step further, the scholars theorized that if Washington joined forces with Peking in its fight against Russia, it would make containment of Russia even more effective.

This theory gained much support in the United States, especially after the Vietnam debacle in the late '60s when the American people began calling for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia. The theory was later adopted by President Nixon and became the basis of his Nixon Doctrine.

The change in U.S. foreign policy was also influenced by the many new developments in weapons technology. As the U.S. lost its military supremacy over Russia, it chose to substitute quality for quantity in its design and selection of weapons systems. The belief was that in the atomic age, genuine protection could be achieved only by a threat of retaliation on a scale such that it would deter the enemy from initiating an attack.

The introduction of inter-continental ballistic missiles, surface-to-air missiles, and nuclear submarines made obsolete the need to use Taiwan as a refueling station for U.S. long-range bombers or as a base from which U.S. conventional armed forces could launch military support activities.

Thus in view of U.S. rapprochement with Peking, which moved the frontiers of U.S. encirclement of Russia up to Mongolia, Taiwan was no longer needed to contain Communist China. The ROC as a result lost its strategic significance to Washington.

But is this really true? Is Taiwan then strategically unimportant?

Geopolitically speaking, all one has to do is look at a map to know this is not so. Taiwan forms one of the most vital links in the Pacific chain of defense, which stretches from South Korea, through Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, to the Philippines.

But even more important is the fact that Taiwan guards two of the most important waterways in Asia—the Taiwan Straits and the Bashi Channel. Whoever controls Taiwan thus controls the gateways to Southeast Asia.

This is extremely significant in that U.S. encirclement of Russia is not the only containment system in Asia. Russia, since its estrangement with China after the 1950s, has been trying to break through U.S. encirclement, and in turn encircle Communist China. The entrenched presence of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the Soviet camp, Laos' recent severing of treaties with Peking, and the existence of large, vocal pro-Soviet forces in India and Iran are conclusive evidence that Russia is succeeding in its endeavor.

The friendship treaty of November, 1978, between Russia and Vietnam is also significant in that it is Russia's first major foothold in Southeast Asia. But for Russia to be an effective ally in this region, it must be able to deploy its Pacific fleet to support Vietnam in the event of a crisis, as was the case in February, 1979, when Communist Chinese forces invaded Vietnam.

At present, Russian control of the Kurile Islands off Japan allows it to move its Pacific fleet out of Vladivostok. However, to get to Southeast Asia, Vietnam specifically, it must pass through the Taiwan Straits or the Bashi Channel. Without access to these two waterways, the Russian fleet would have to circle around Australia and New Zealand to reach Southeast Asia. Russia's interest in ensuring that these two waterways remain open and that Taiwan does not fall into hostile, i.e. Communist Chinese, hands is thus quite understandable.

Taiwan's so-called "non-importance" is thus valid only in terms of U.S. assessment. And even this is true only insofar as Taiwan remains in friendly, i.e. not Russian, hands, and the U.S. 7th Fleet is allowed to patrol the area.

In fact, Washington would like to see a solution to the two-China problem, so that the safety of the Straits would be guaranteed. As long as Taiwan is separated from China, there is always a chance that something might happen to alter Taiwan's pro-American policy. Until a unification takes place, Washington will abide by the present status quo.

The U.S. and Russian conflict in this area can perhaps be explained as that of a sea power versus a land power, with the U.S. being the sea power and Russia the land power. For the U.S. to gain the upper hand, it must move ashore on to the Asian continent, thereby tightening the noose around Russia. Likewise, the Soviets must break out of U.S. encirclement and move out to sea. All strategic moves made by these two powers are directed toward attaining these ends. They are like two go players trying to outmaneuver and surround each other.

The U.S. in normalizing its relations with Peking has pushed its sphere of influence inland to the Sino-Russian border. America's coup, however, is countered by the growing presence of the Russian navy not only in the Western Pacific, but also in the South China Sea. Russian reconnaissance planes have also been making regular flights into the region since February this year. This is the first time in history that Russian planes have ventured this far south in the Pacific.

Taiwan's importance to both the U.S. and Russia lies in the fact that it is situated on the rim land, where the Asian continent meets the ocean. The island is thus a stepping stone from which the U.S. can launch its moves inland, and conversely where Russia can expand out into the ocean. The U.S. has succeeded in moving inland. This is why they consider Taiwan strategically unimportant.

As far as Communist China, the third major power in the region, is concerned, Taiwan is simply part of China, and a unification of Taiwan with the Mainland must be effected in the not too distant future. Peking is not likely to contemplate an immediate takeover, however, since it does not at present have the power to do so.

A successful invasion would require a blitzkrieg, which could be concluded before Russia or any other country would have time to react or interfere. This would mean

not only a large enough amphibious force to implement the invasion, but air supremacy over the Straits as well. Communist China has neither capability at the moment.

So unless they are assured of a successful invasion, and if nothing happens to aggravate such an attack, the Chinese Communists are quite prepared to accept the status quo. Taiwan, though not in their hands, is at least free from Russian domination.

A Taiwan swayed by Russia, the Communist Chinese fear, would not only allow the Russian fleet to patrol the Chinese Seas, but might even close off the Straits to Peking. This last move would split the Communist Chinese navy in two—one trapped in the South China Sea, the other in the East China and Yellow Seas.

The Taiwan issue is balanced so delicately now, any slight or unexpected change may make the situation explosive. This is why Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, and the Philippines are so concerned that the U.S. make an alternative defense arrangement with the ROC so as to safeguard the security and stability of the area after the 1954 Mutual Defense Treaty is terminated.

This is perhaps also why Russia till now has made no overtures to Taiwan, for fear that any action it might take would set off a chain reaction. As stated by Ralph Clough in his book *Island China*, one of the three things which would provoke Peking to move ahead its unification timetable and thus ignite the Taiwan powder keg would be a move by Russia to invade or ally itself with the ROC.

A second possible provocation, according to Clough, would be Taiwan's development of the nuclear bomb. President Chiang, however, has repeatedly stated that the Nationalist government has no intention of doing so.

The third and potentially most volatile circumstance would be a declaration of independence by Taiwan. Peking would never abide any move to separate Taiwan from China. As long as the government in Taiwan insists that Taiwan is part of China, and as long as the Mainland's military capabilities are not fully developed, the Communist Chinese will do nothing to disturb the status quo.

If something does happen to upset the delicate balance of powers, the change will most probably be to Russia's advantage, since the Russians have the least to lose. The U.S. and Communist China are unlikely to make any moves which will result in such an advantage for the Russians.

Thus, at least for the moment, Taiwan need not fear an outright attack. What it must guard against however is internal subversion instigated by foreign agents. Only in this manner will Peking and Washington achieve what they want without risking Russian interference.

As Leonard Unger, the last American ambassador to the ROC, wrote recently in the *Foreign Policy Quarterly*, Taiwan, far from being strategically insignificant,

... occupies a key position in the Western Pacific-East Asian security system. It lies along important shipping and air lanes that link Japan and Korea to their major oil and commercial connections in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Taiwan in unfriendly hands would represent a potential threat to those links. . . .

"So even though U.S. military experts have concluded that access to Taiwan is not essential to immediate U.S. security interests in the Western Pacific, a hostile govern-

ment on Taiwan could threaten American friends and allies in North, East, and Southeast Asia. Over time, this could encourage policy shifts in those countries contrary to U.S. interests and diminish American influence in the area."●

HUD-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference agreement on H.R. 4034, the HUD-independent agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1982.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I know the difficult circumstances under which these agreements are reached and, given the economic situation we now face, the problems of resolving differences on money bills are more complex than ever. Certainly, all of us are happy that the conference agreement is approximately \$2 billion below the amount which recently passed the House. As the very able chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, the conference agreement is more than \$2.5 billion below the budget request. The bill is within the allocation to the Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies based on the targets contained in the first concurrent budget resolution. According to the chairman, it meets the test of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act. In essence, Mr. Speaker, the conferees have done everything they could possibly do in keeping the bill within the spending limits set by the House as contained in the first concurrent budget resolution. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the subcommittee chairman, Mr. BOLAND, and the very able ranking minority member, Mr. GREEN of New York, not only for doing such an excellent job in bringing to us a reasonable compromise with the other body, but for the expeditious way in which they have proceeded to get this appropriation bill to the President. This is the first appropriation bill that has gone all the way through conference. I hope it is adopted so that the Senate can move with it expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased with the level of appropriations provided for in this conference agreement for our Nation's veterans and their dependents. My colleagues will recall that on March 10 of this year the administration submitted a formal request to the Congress that veterans' benefits and services be reduced by more than \$800 million in outlays during the next fiscal year. Drastic cuts were proposed for the hospital and health care programs for veterans. The proposed cuts in medical accounts

totalled more than \$300 million. Most of the cuts would have involved a reduction of some 5,000 personnel in the hospital and health care system. As Chairman BOLAND has said, anyone who takes the time to visit a VA hospital knows full well the agency can ill afford to take such cuts.

At the time the proposed reductions were submitted to Congress, veterans' leaders throughout the country contacted me and, as a member of the Budget Committee, I offered an amendment during the consideration of the first concurrent budget resolution to restore approximately \$600 million of the cuts proposed by the President for veterans' programs. I received overwhelming support, Mr. Speaker, in committee and, finally, the administration agreed to the restoration of these funds in the so-called Gramm-Latta substitute on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to state that this conference agreement reflects generally the level of benefits and services for veterans that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Budget Committee proposed to the House. There is no question that the funding levels contained in this agreement will provide adequate monetary benefits to all veterans and, in addition, will assure all veterans, both service-connected and nonservice-connected, that their health care needs will be met in fiscal year 1982. The agreement restores \$330 million and 5,181 staff-years proposed to be cut by the President. It will provide more funds for veterans to be treated in community nursing homes, a program, Mr. Speaker, that is very cost effective. Four million dollars has been included to implement the so-called Roberts' scholarship program, a program designed to bring more skilled nurses into our VA hospitals. There is an acute nursing shortage throughout the Nation and this program, when implemented, will allow the VA to begin to recruit more nurses who will be obligated to serve 1 year as a VA nurse for each year he or she receives a scholarship to attend nursing school. We expect to recruit 500 nurses the first year.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill, and I am delighted to support it.

It has been suggested that the President may have to veto this bill because some officials in the administration have advised him that the bill is over in outlays from what the President had proposed. I shall not go into the differences between the administration's estimates and those given to the Appropriations Committee by the Congressional Budget Office, but it is obvious to me that most of the outlays we are talking about are those we are enthusiastically supporting for veter-

ans. We thought it had been agreed to downtown. I understand the White House now has indicated that although the President is not opposed to the amount contained in the agreement for veterans' benefits and services, the restoration of these funds for veterans must come at the expense of a reduction in other departments or agencies. This, in my view, places the Appropriations Committee in an impossible situation. I would agree with Mr. BOLAND when he stated that to our knowledge neither Mr. Stockman nor anyone else in the administration has asked us to offset any amount for veterans' benefits and services. We thought this issue was resolved when we passed the so-called Gramm-Latta substitute to the budget resolution, and I hope the administration will live with the agreement that was reached at that time.

It would be a tragic loss for our veterans for the President to veto this bill. If he should do so, I am sure the veterans of our Nation will be asking the administration some critical questions as to where it really stands on veterans' programs for which we are told there is a strong commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference agreement. I hope the Senate will act on it promptly so it can be submitted to the President in order that he may sign it. If the President does veto the bill, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the chairman to bring it quickly before the House so we can consider a vote to override such veto.●

BLACK COLLEGES FACE SEVERE PROBLEMS

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal carried an article on the effect student aid reductions would have on historically black colleges and universities. Despite the President's "safety net" assurances to the presidents of these institutions, the administration's budget and legislative proposals have the potential of significantly undermining the Federal student assistance programs which provide access to college for low- and middle-income students. As the August 4, 1981 Journal indicates, any diminution in Pell grant assistance will have a severe effect on low-income black students attending historically black institutions because the student is unable to make up lost Federal aid from other sources, and the colleges themselves are extremely dependent on the aid their students receive.

Black colleges and universities play a unique and important role within the higher education community. That

role can only be maintained if Federal student aid, especially Pell grants and the campus-based programs, are not reduced. I hope my colleagues will read this article and keep it in mind when the fiscal year 1982 appropriations bill for education reaches the House floor. Maintaining at least an \$1,800 maximum Pell grant and \$2.65 billion in funding are important as higher education opportunities for a great many Americans.

The article follows:

BLACK COLLEGES GIRD FOR CASH CRISIS FROM REAGAN'S CUTS IN STUDENT AID

(By Anthony Ramirez)

HOLLY SPRINGS, MISS.—William A. McMillan is waiting for the shock wave from Washington to hit. As president of Rust College, a small black institution in this quiet town near the Tennessee border. Mr. McMillan is wondering whether federal cuts in student aid will mean fewer young blacks will enroll here this fall.

"We are hoping for the best," he says, "and preparing for the worst."

For Rust College, the question is far from academic: 100% of the student body receives financial aid.

Rust, which had more than 725 students last year, is similar in its federal dependency to many other black schools. Among the 41 member colleges of the United Negro College Fund, the money-raising agency for many black private institutions, 28 have student bodies in which 90% or more of the students receive aid.

NEEDY SCHOOLS

How federal cuts in education programs will affect black private colleges, almost all of which are in the South, has been largely overlooked in the public and congressional debate. These colleges already have been hurt by years of high inflation, scant endowments, low faculty salaries, critical maintenance long deferred and little state and local government aid.

"These places are running on a shoestring," says Humphrey Doermann, president of a private foundation that has helped raise funds for black colleges. "There isn't much slack left in them, if you start taking dollars out."

Black institutions larger than Rust College also will be hurt, says Elias Blake Jr., president of Atlanta's Clark College, which has an enrollment of about 1,800. "We're all crossing our fingers," he says.

Earlier this year, Congress approved reductions in several aid programs, the most important of which for black private schools is the Pell grant program. It provides flat annual awards to needy students. (Federal loans are less important to students at black colleges because many are from rural areas, where banks usually don't participate in federally subsidized low-interest loans.)

SCRAPING ALONG

For the 1981-82 academic year, which starts in the fall, Congress cut the maximum Pell grant to \$1,670 from \$1,750 a year. Although the \$80 seemingly could be made up elsewhere, black educators fear that summer jobs are so scarce that many students coming from low-income families won't be able to scrape up the extra funds. "They're trying to hold together their education with Scotch tape and baling wire now," says Mr. Blake, who says that sums as small as \$50 can keep some students out of college.

Moreover, Congress may be readying even deeper cuts in future years, although a rise in total program funds is slated for the 1982-83 academic year. That's because an increasing number of eligible students and more government money to cover high-interest costs for federal loan programs may mean Congress will award students steadily dwindling aid over their college careers.

Meantime, Congress decided late last month to authorize a maximum of \$2.65 billion for 1982-83 Pell grants, up about 13% from the year-earlier appropriation of \$2.35 billion. Actual appropriations for the 1982-83 year and the maximum Pell grant award haven't been set yet.

Certain technical changes also are likely to hurt. Congress eliminated, for example, the \$10-per-student administrative allowance to pay for clerical staff at colleges.

At Rust, founded in 1866 and one of the oldest black schools in the U.S., these cuts could cause enrollment to drop 15% or more, Mr. McMillan says. That would deprive the school of much indirect federal money for its \$4.7 million operating budget.

Mr. McMillan says he may have to phase out several small academic departments, cut book-purchase money for the 60,000-volume library to \$100,000 from \$150,000, close down "some" buildings (out of seven major buildings) to save on winter heating bills, and reduce by as much as a third the college's 35 faculty positions.

Students already enrolled at Rust are likely to feel the effects of federal cuts. Jason Jackson, a 19-year-old freshman from Collierville, Tenn., who is majoring in music, is the son of a Memphis, Tenn., sanitation worker and the first in his family of 10 to go to college. He is on 100% financial aid, except for pocket money of \$132 he earned last summer packing eggs at a poultry farm.

"I don't know what I'll do if my aid is cut," he says.

About 80 percent of the student body comes from families with incomes of less than \$9,000, according to Fannie Lampley, the financial aid director. Almost all of the students, she says, receive the maximum \$3,609 award for tuition, room and board, books, and miscellaneous costs—including the Pell grants. Pocket money and other costs bring a student budget to about \$4,000, she estimates. (Some students say they get by with as little as \$100 pocket money in a school year.)

Like other black schools, Rust's faculty and staff salaries are low. Pay for a full professor, according to the administration, is about \$19,000 annually, but one faculty member, who doesn't want to be identified, says the actual top pay is \$14,000.

Faculty and staff are discouraged from attending too many out-of-town conferences—and banned from going by airplane. They are strongly "encouraged" to travel by car or bus. (Staff automobiles are purchased for about \$200 each from Army surplus.) They also are encouraged to stay with friends rather than at hotels.

Rust College's 120-acre campus is attractive; the McCoy administrative building overlooks lawns with a gazebo. There is a new \$1.3 million cafeteria and media complex, and a \$180,000 faculty-staff apartment complex. But several dormitories and other buildings badly need repairs. At Wiff, a women's dormitory, one shower hasn't worked for almost a year. Indeed, bad plumbing has acquainted most students with cold showers. In the school auditorium,

a leaky roof plops water onto the first few rows of seats.

The chemistry laboratories often lack essential—but expensive—equipment and chemicals. In some classes, students have to triple up on books. A freshman English class recently complained that many of their class materials, being photocopies, were hard to read. And many texts are paperbacks, which fall apart faster than hard-bound volumes.

Rust's endowment is small, about \$3.2 million, and there is little in the way of private contributions that might replace federal money. Mr. Doermann, who is president of the Bush Foundation, in St. Paul, Minn., estimates that for every \$2 provided by corporations and foundations for education and other purposes, the federal government spends \$100.

"We're outgunned," he says.

HARD-LUCK STORIES

David L. Beckley, Rust's chief fundraiser, says private giving has been flat for the last few years. Giving totaled \$1.6 million last year—including the usual \$560,000 or so annually from the Methodists, founders of the college—and it isn't expected to rise this year. Taking inflation into account, that means a drop in purchasing power.

"A lot of corporations are telling us that their stock portfolios aren't performing well," Mr. Beckley says. "I expect to be hearing that a lot."

To be sure, the Reagan administration has expressed support for black colleges. It helped increase technical assistance earmarked for black colleges to about \$120 million in the 1981-82 academic year from \$110 million a year earlier.

But the Department of Education, which implements federal policy, apparently has given little thought to black colleges. "If there is a policy, you let me know," says Anita F. Allen, a top official in the Office of Student Financial Assistance.

If federal education cuts dissuade young blacks from black colleges, they may not be able to get into white schools. Many black freshmen come from inferior high schools and are thus educational "salvage operations" requiring much remedial education, says Christopher F. Edley, executive director of the United Negro College Fund. Yet 30 percent of the graduates of black private colleges go on to graduate school, he says.

White institutions probably wouldn't give so much remedial education to blacks, Mr. Edley says. "After all, if blacks don't have a strong regard for the education of black youth," he asks, "who will?"

SOVIET-VIETNAMESE USE OF BIOLOGICAL-CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN ASIA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, once again the true nature of the Soviet and Vietnamese regimes has been revealed by this inhumane use of biological-chemical weapons in Southeast Asia. The administration's evidence that lethal toxins have been savagely used against non-Communist resistance forces will no doubt be elaborated upon in the coming days.

Those of us who have followed the Soviet biological-chemical buildup over the last few years, accompanied by the enhanced ability of Soviet troops to fight under integrated battlefield conditions, are nevertheless shocked that the Soviets continue to use banned weapons in contempt of the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention and the 1925 Geneva protocol against their use.

This is not a new problem concerning use of biological-chemical weapons. The United Nations has already started an investigation into Soviet abuse in this area. Prior Soviet violations have been reported in Afghanistan and by either Soviet or Vietnamese troops in Cambodia and Laos. Additionally, there is the suspect Sverdlovsk incident in which it is alleged that 1,000 Soviet civilians were accidentally killed by an explosion at a Soviet biological-chemical warfare plant. We have heard many firsthand accounts of Soviet attacks with these weapons, although technical/medical analyses have been difficult to undertake for a variety of reasons. Now, however, we have preliminary evidence which confirms our worst suspicions.

I recommend that this new information be turned over to the United Nations for assistance in their ongoing investigation. Furthermore, I recommend that the House Foreign Affairs Committee hold hearings on the Soviet/Vietnamese use of biological-chemical weapons in Asia. These hearings would emphasize the new information developed since our last hearing on the subject on April 24, 1980.●

PROPOSED SALE OF FIVE AWACS TO SAUDI ARABIA

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, it is likely we shall be voting on the largest single arms sale package in U.S. history—the proposed sale to Saudi Arabia of five AWACS and enhancement equipment for the F-15 fighter costing \$8.5 billion.

I recently held a hearing on this ill-conceived proposal in my Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues my opening statement from that hearing.

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN CLARENCE D. LONG

Good Morning. We are today holding an educational hearing on the largest single arms sale package in U.S. history—the proposed sale of five AWACS and enhancement equipment for the F-15 fighter costing \$8.3 billion—to Saudi Arabia. We have assembled some of the most respected experts on both sides to inform the Subcommittee on all aspects of this proposal.

The Administration, invited to defend the sale before this Subcommittee has declined to state its case publicly until prenotification period is over. Such reticence following its own publicity damages the credibility of the Administration and the Congress.

In an effort to convince the Administration to withdraw the proposed sale, on April 27th, I, along with Representative Norm Lent (R-N.Y.) introduced a bipartisan Resolution of Disapproval of the sale because I felt, as I do today, that this sale is contrary to the national interest of the United States. Two hundred fifty three Members—35 more than a majority, have cosponsored the Long-Lent Resolution of Disapproval (H. Con. Res. 118).

I. COMPROMISE

This proposal can neither ensure stable and secure access to regional oil, prevent the spread of Soviet influence, insure the security of friendly states in the region or in any way enhance our credibility in supporting regional security. The sale would expose our most sophisticated technology to capture by the Soviet Union either through bribery, defection, or accident, as did our sales of F-14s to Iran before its downfall. Indeed, this nation had agreed to sell this very AWACS technology to Iran for largely the same reasons now cited by the Administration for the sale to Saudi Arabia. Fortunately, the delivery date came after the revolution. This time we may not be so lucky. Just two months ago, two 707s—the same aircraft which carries the AWACS equipment—were hijacked from Iran, one carrying former President Bani Sadr to France. Some of the American weapons systems compromised in the Iranian Revolution include the F-14 fighter, the Phoenix missile, the Hawk surface-to-air missile, and the TOW antitank missile.

II. COST TO TAXPAYERS

Second, this sale is against U.S. interests because it represents a giant increase in the arms spiral in the Middle East, a spiral funded largely with American dollars. The American taxpayer would ultimately foot the bill as we would be forced to provide additional aid to the Middle East straining our already overburdened foreign aid budget. Foreign military sales credits to Egypt for example, have already increased from 0 in fiscal year 1980 to a proposed \$900 million in fiscal year 1982. Out of the Administration's request of \$4.054 billion for foreign military sales credits in fiscal year 1982, 62.7 percent would go to the Near East (Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Oman, Yemen, Morocco and Tunisia).

III. ARMS RACE

This sale will result in a substantial increase in Saudi offensive potential, resulting in a step up in the arms race all over the Middle East. Saudi Arabia, armed with the AWACS and F-15 technology, will be inexorably pulled into a future Middle East war with potentially devastating results.

This huge step up in the arms race has the potential to kindle World War III.

IV. OFFENSIVE POTENTIAL OF AWACS

The Administration has stated that the AWACS, "help Saudi Arabia to defend itself against regional threats but will not measurably increase Saudi offensive potential." According to Senator John Glenn, however, "even the introduction of a crude airborne command center over North Vietnam multiplied our aircraft kill ratio by a factor of six." In a major exercise conducted at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada, two AWACS were

able to coordinate 134 friendly aircraft and stand off 274 enemy planes. All attempts to attack the AWACS failed.

V. RECORD OF SAUDI COOPERATION

The Saudis have been made out to be a great friend of the United States, yet Saudi Arabia is the major financial supporter of the PLO, has condemned the Camp David agreements, and has opposed the American rescue attempt of the hostages in Iran and even the American response to the Libyan attack recently. The Saudis have refused us basing facilities. The price of their oil has risen from \$2.59 per barrel in January 1973 to \$34 per barrel in January 1981, hardly a moderate increase.

With this sale we are lighting matches over the most explosive area in the world today. If World War III should break out with all its horror, this is the area which could set it off, and the U.S. taxpayer will be paying to induce his own disaster. ●

BEST WISHES TO GARY HYMEL

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 1981

● Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in extending my best wishes to Gary Hymel as he begins his new career.

It's been a real pleasure working with Gary over the years. Gary was a great asset to the Speaker's staff and was also held in high regard by Members on both sides of the aisle.

I always found Gary fair and helpful while at the same time dedicated and loyal to the Speaker. Gary held a difficult and responsible position and he carried out his duties with skill and good judgment.

Again, I congratulate Gary on his fine service to the House and its Members, and extend to him my best wishes for his continued success. ●

ACID RAIN: AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of all of our colleagues an article penned by Robert H. Boyle for the September 21, 1981, issue of *Sports Illustrated*. In "An American Tragedy," Mr. Boyle likens acid rain to a "chemical leprosy" eating away at the face of the U.S."

Mr. Speaker, the article is but another source of evidence detailing for all who choose to read it that acid rain is not a problem confined to the Northeast, that acid rain is not the new cause celebre around which the descendants of Sun Day rally to protect the environmental movement for its own sake, and that acid rain is not a problem that can only be resolved by

pitting no-growth enthusiasts against economic revitalization and expansion. What acid rain is, Mr. Speaker, is a continually worsening problem that threatens our environment, our health, our economic health, and our good relations with our Canadian neighbors. We must meet this threat today, Mr. Speaker, for our failure to do so will make tomorrow's victory harder to achieve and filled with spoils.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD one small part of the article detailing on a State-by-State basis the very real costs that we pay today. From the Northeast to the Southwest, and from the Northwest to the Southeast, our rivers, streams, wildlife, plantlife water supplies, buildings, industry, and our health are daily threatened by the poisons that fall from our skies.

The article follows:

A CONTINENT HEADED FOR DISASTER

Maine: Native brook trout have ceased reproducing in all small lakes over 2,000 feet in altitude. The pH in these lakes is 5 (pHs of less than 5.6 are hazardous to aquatic life). The headwater tributaries of at least five Atlantic salmon rivers are sufficiently acid to jeopardize the lives of young fish.

New Hampshire: "The usual picture of acid-pickled lakes is beginning to emerge," says Ronald Towne, chief water pollution biologist of the state's Water Supply and Pollution Control Commission. "We have lakes with low pH, low alkalinities, no fish or missing year-classes, high aluminum." So far, Towne has found that seven high-altitude lakes he has been able to reach by car are "bad," but he hasn't been able to get funds for a helicopter needed to sample remote waters.

Vermont: Several lakes in the Brooks Wilderness Area of the Green Mountain National Forest have a pH of 4, and two tributaries of the West River, Ball Mountain Brook and Wardsboro Brook have been acidified.

Massachusetts: Acid precipitation is pelting the state—this summer, the pH of a rainstorm in Lawrence was 2.9—and Massachusetts' fisheries and drinking-water supplies are both threatened by disaster. The Quabbin Reservoir, which supplies the Boston area, often registers surface water pH values in the 5s and 4s, according to Alan VanArsdale, head of the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Quality Engineering's Acid Deposition Assessment Program. Other bodies of water that have lost their buffering capacity include the headwaters of the Westfield, Deerfield and Swift rivers; the Wachusett Reservoir, Atkins Reservoir, North Watuppa Pond, the reservoir for Fall River; a series of high-elevation (1,200 to 2,000 feet) ponds and reservoirs in the Berkshires; and the drinking-water ponds in Plymouth County. VanArsdale isn't optimistic about getting the EPA funds needed to investigate or improve the situation. "They're not going beyond step one to start funding activities in the Northeast," he says. "They're waiting till we scream bloody murder."

Rhode Island: Officials are keeping a watch on the Scituate Reservoir system, which serves as the drinking-water supply for nearly half of Rhode Island. The total alkalinity of the reservoir is low, ranging

from three to seven parts per million. The average pH of rain this summer was 3.5.

Connecticut: A dozen lakes have a total alkalinity of less than five parts per million, but Charles Fredette of the state's Department of Environmental Protection terms acid precipitation a "long-range" concern. "We don't have high-altitude lakes like New York or New Hampshire," says Fredette, "and we have relatively good buffering capacity."

New York: It has been documented that 212 Adirondacks lakes and ponds totaling some 10,460 acres are acidified and incapable of supporting fish life. What is infrequently pointed out is that this figure is derived from tests made on only a third of the lakes and ponds. From the same limited sample, another 256 lakes and ponds totaling 63,000 acres were judged to be in danger of losing their fish. The headwaters of the Hudson have been acidified in part. Other sensitive areas in the state include the Tug Hill Plateau to the west of the Adirondacks, the Catskill Mountains, the Shawangunk Mountains, the Hudson Highlands, the Palisades area and Long Island.

New Jersey: Research is just getting under way, but there are "some waters in the northwestern part of the state that show some signs of acidification," says Dr. Dean Arnold of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. According to A. H. Johnson of the University of Pennsylvania, headwaters of streams in the Pine Barrens show signs of acidification from precipitation.

Pennsylvania: "At present many of our mountain streams can no longer support rainbow trout, and some of our first- and second-order streams can't even support the more tolerant brown trout," says Fred Johnson, Water Resources Coordinator of the Pennsylvania Fish Commission. "There are also streams that we can't stock before the trout season begins because of the acidity of the snowmelt. The situation is very serious." A portion of Pennsylvania extending through the central and northern sections of the state routinely has the most acidic rainfall of any large area in the country. The average in the summer is pH 3.8.

West Virginia: A dozen trout streams are too acid to support fish. Moreover, 150 miles of the state's total of 550 miles of native brooktrout streams are considered "threatened," says Don Gasper of the Department of Natural Resources. "The average pH of this 150 miles of streams is 5.5," he says. "In the springtime it dips down to 4.8 or 5 and then climbs up to 6 in September. If the stream pH were to decline a half a pH unit, there would be no more fish. West Virginia is a stream state, and we're talking about losing one-quarter of our heritage," concludes Gasper. "What's coming down is very, very bad. We're really very worried." In addition, stocked streams are also being affected. Gasper says that about 150 miles of these are too acid in the spring to be stocked.

Kentucky: In Cumberland State Park, located in the southern part of the state, acid deposition is leaching heavy metals into watersheds. Lake Nevin in the Bernheim Forest, which is close to the Kentucky-Indiana border, has detectable levels of lead.

North Carolina-Tennessee: The Great Smoky Mountains National Park, which covers 509,000 acres in both states, is taking a battering. The beautiful blue haze that comes from lacquers and oils liberated from the forest canopy is rarely seen. Instead, visibility has been greatly reduced, obscured by an ugly gray haze composed of man-

made particulates, mostly aluminum sulfates. After the Los Angeles basin, the western slope of the southern Appalachians, from Georgia north to Kentucky, has the highest frequency of air stagnation in the U.S.

The average pH of precipitation in the park has gone from 5.3 in 1955 to 4.4 in 1973 and 4.2 in 1980. In the spring, stream pH levels drop to as low as 4.3, and aluminum leaching is ongoing. In Beech Flats Creek zinc and aluminum have reached nearly toxic levels for fish, and rainbow trout in the park contained more than the permissible amount of mercury allowed for human consumption until the Food and Drug Administration raised the level from 0.5 parts per million to 1 in 1979. In lakes lying just outside the park boundary in North Carolina, smallmouth bass have abnormal backbones, generally associated with aluminum toxicity. Amphibians, particularly salamanders, are also threatened. The park contains the greatest diversity of salamanders in the world, including the Plethodontidae, the lungless salamanders that probably evolved in the region.

Georgia: Northeastern Georgia, extending from Raymond County to Pickens County, has low buffering capacity, according to state environmental officials. There have been reports of skeletal deformities in smallmouth bass in Lake Chatuga, a northern reservoir, and officials say there's some indication that these might be the effects of low pH.

Florida: Acid precipitation threatens poorly buffered lakes in the sandy central highlands region that runs the length of the peninsula. According to Dr. P. L. Brezonik, water resources specialist formerly of the University of Florida and now at the University of Minnesota, the acidity of Florida rainfall has increased markedly in the last 25 years. The most acidic rains—with a pH of less than 4.7—fall on the northern two-thirds of the state.

Michigan: Some 16,000 lakes of more than 10 acres each are considered susceptible to acid precipitation. More than half the 8,000 lakes and ponds in the Upper Peninsula have an alkalinity of only about 10 parts per million. The Keeweenaw Peninsula on Lake Superior receives one of the heaviest snowfalls in the U.S., averaging about 12 to 13 feet annually, and the median pH for snowfalls in the winter of 1977-78 was 4.5.

Wisconsin: Twenty-six hundred lakes of more than 20 acres in size are considered very susceptible to acidification because they have a pH of 6 or less and little alkalinity.

Minnesota: The northern part of the state, particularly the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, is susceptible to acidification. In fact, the "Transboundary Air Pollution Interim Report," prepared last February by a group of American and Canadian scientists, noted that "Atmosphere load near the BWCAW is at levels associated with the onset of lake acidification in Scandinavian countries."

Colorado: Acid precipitation is falling on the Rockies northwest of Denver. Drs. William M. Lewis Jr. and Michael C. Grant, environmental biologists at the University of Colorado, accidentally discovered this in 1975 while they were working in the university's mountain research station, 9,000 feet up at Como Creek, adjacent to the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area. In the four years from 1974 to '78 the pH of precipitation dropped at a rapid rate, from 5.4 to 5.0, to 4.8, to 4.7. Then, in August, Dr. John Harte

of the Rocky Mountain Biological Laboratory reported that small lakes and streams in the Elk Mountains near Crested Butte in western Colorado have very high levels of acid. Harte said that the pH of rain and snow in the area had sunk as low as 3.6 in some storms.

Wyoming: The average pH of precipitation falling at Yellowstone National Park was 5.2 in 1980.

Montana: The pH average for precipitation in Glacier National Park was 4.9.

Idaho: The 1980-81 pH average at Craters of the Moon National Monument was 4.8. All these Rocky Mountain averages are for wet deposition only.

New Mexico: Acid precipitation with a pH often in the 4s and occasionally in the 3s has been reported for the Tesque Watersheds in the Santa Fe National Forest.

Arizona: The 1980 pH average for Tombstone was 5.2.

Washington: Twenty-four of 68 lakes sampled in the Olympic Mountains and the Cascades by Drs. Eugene B. Welch and William H. Chamberlain, of the University of Washington, had a pH of less than 6. Seven lakes had a pH of less than 5.5; they all were located in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, due east of Seattle. In a report submitted to the National Park Service, Welch and Chamberlain noted that 70% of the rainfall monitored in Seattle ranged in pH from 5.2 to 4.2.

California: Dr. Doug Lawson, a researcher for the state Air Resources Board, says, "The state has levels of acid precipitation as high as or higher than any place in the country, and we do have areas that are very susceptible in the Sierra Nevada and around Los Angeles where there are exposed granitic surfaces." The pH of drizzle measured by Dr. James Morgan of Cal Tech in 1978 was 2.9. Recently, when scientists flew through smog over Los Angeles, they were unable to conduct tests because acids had corroded their instruments. ●

THE IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. CRANE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our universities are disappearing. The noted scholar and teacher, Prof. Thomas Molnar, added to his formidable reputation as one of the most perceptive thinkers of our time by observing more than 20 years ago that universities were "becoming subcultural and mass-cultural supermarkets where the citizens enroll to receive a document, a kind of identification card, authorizing them to circulate in a bureaucratic society, or, if older, to earn promotion and wage increases."

This prediction has become a reality. For all practical purposes, the university, as it has been understood for over 700 years, no longer exists. This is of profound importance to the Western world, and I highly recommend Professor Molnar's essay to the attention of my colleagues and the American people. It was published in the spring, 1981 edition of the University Bookman.

UNIVERSITIES: AMERICAN, EUROPEAN, THIRD WORLD

(By Thomas Molnar)

The literature and documentation of our educational decline have grown enormously in the last quarter-century, but we have now reached the moment when we may see education in perspective. Perspective in this case means the retrospective and prospective glance—but also a sideways look—to see what happens in other countries and continents where the initial situation was different from ours.

I have been helped in my assessment of the state of education by two factors. One is the awareness that the Sodom-and-Gomorrah morality and public spirit which permeate our existence are due largely to what has been going on in our schools and universities. We always knew it, but since 1968-70 the realization has kept hitting us with a particular force. The other element of my perspective on education is derived from various sojourns in other lands where, in developed as well as so-called underdeveloped countries, I could observe at first hand—while teaching and lecturing—the mentalities, programs, and educational policies.

Next to economic development and growth, education is the most universal demand today, and we may legitimately argue that the two are connected. The industrial revolution and the rise of democracy made universal compulsory schooling necessary, and vice versa: the schooled man asked for well-remunerated work and for the right to share in the political process. After a country's economic and political regime, education has become the third most important measuring rod of progress. Thus it was inevitable for American education to topple from the pedestal where Cardinal Newman had positioned it. In America, together with industry and democracy, education was regarded as part of the secular trinity. It became also inevitable that the masses of candidates for schooling would debase the high ideals of scholarship and culture, and insist on lowering standards until all could reach them. To the student masses, masses of teachers and professors were added, the majority of them with no ideals higher than those of their pupils and students: a job and a life easier than that of their average fellow citizens.

Since the damage done in schools—to minds, to the moral sense, to the cultural patrimony—is not so easy and rapid to detect as in industry, engineering, or medicine, several decades had to pass before we could be fully aware that education attained its two-centuries-old goal, that of educating everybody in the name of identical presuppositions. The failure to recognize what had happened was hidden by the tumultuous character of our democratic industrial civilization: so many channels exist for the education (actually informing) of the citizen that the school proper no longer seemed to be the most important and privileged one. All sort of silly things could be required of the classroom, from driver education to courses in dating, and for a while the explanation was that culture and knowledge may be also, or better, communicated through television, the press, field trips, discussion groups, or simple living. Those who spoke thus obviously had a view of culture dictated by ideology. Following Dewey, they believed that the classroom is not a place for learning but a laboratory for reshaping society, together with other such "laboratories." In modern times, the argument con-

tinued, there is no need for culture which, being a rehash of old events and values, instills in the recipient's mind antidemocratic prejudices.

Roughly a dozen years ago it became evident that education for "living," for the "whole child," for "democracy," for a "better world," etc., had resulted not only in crass ignorance but also in the annihilation of the very values on which this idea was based. After the teaching of history was replaced by "current events," the students lost all curiosity even in the latter. After elective courses were allowed to obliterate the "core curriculum" students and professors began arguing that the liberal arts core was not advantageous for the handicapped and that it did not leave enough room for electives. When students were authorized to "evaluate" their professor, they gave highest rank not to the best teachers but to the rabble-rousers and third-world revolutionaries. When the university opened its doors to all applicants with high-school diplomas (themselves worthless), the demand arose for a further lowering of standards to accommodate the illiterate and the idiot.

I do not think I astonish anybody by citing a few examples of the present level of students and professors. A friend reports from a respectable Catholic university that his students do not understand why B.C. dates decrease and A.D. dates increase. At a prestigious college I met Ph. D.'s. who had never attended a course in ancient history (perhaps TV serials were trusted to instill the requisite knowledge of "great civilizations"). At the college where I teach, modern languages are no longer required, although a colleague on the highest curriculum committee said she would vote for requiring them if "computer language" were also required.

These are some of the antecedents and symptoms. Let us enlarge now our scope and examine the relationship of education and scholarship. Here we witness an enormous paradox. In the past, the two hardly ever proceeded hand in hand, but their link was solid and unbreakable. For example, when late scholastic disciplines and methods were still being taught in universities, even in medical schools, between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, science, philosophy, medicine, and law were detaching themselves from the official current and experimenting with new concepts and processes. Yet the Aristotelians at universities remained freres ennemis with the moderns—the Gassendis, the Harveys, the Mersennes, the Bacons, and the Cartesians. Their debates were not only meaningful; they were mutually enriching. Earlier, the Hellenistic-Roman vogue of Stoicism (practically an official teaching) could enter into dialogue with the emerging Christian scholarship; the neo-Platonic Plotinus had Christian masters and co-disciples, and he in turn influenced Christian mysticism for centuries. In my own school days, the highest scholarship was distilled into high school textbooks, although with some natural delay, since the tasks of schools is not to stand at the frontline of knowledge but to bring up the rearward.

This relationship, evident at all periods, did not go without deep conflicts, as is illustrated in the first centuries or in the seventeenth, to choose examples at random. Budding Christianity realized that it could not acquire genuine respectability until it had established contact (even if partly antagonistic) with prevailing versions of Greek philosophy and scholarship. Justin and Ter-

tullian created the links, St. Augustine later the synthesis. In the seventeenth century the overly sensationalized drama of Galileo merely obscures the elaboration of a synthesis in which the academic doctrine and the new science were to be participants for nearly two more centuries.

Today, scholarship, culture, and the schools are so fragmented that the exponents of each meet only by chance and have nothing to say to one another. Education has become a frivolous yet routine exercise, with curricula decided on the grounds of fashion, economics, and political expediency. Courses in female liberation, various racisms, black, hispanic, Judaic, and other "studies" resist successfully timid attempts, here and there, to maintain a liberal arts core curriculum. Culture is mostly counter-culture, a series of faddish clouds floating above the populace, serving the snobism of the jet set, of international juries, and of big executives who need the culture tag as an apology for their capitalistic wealth.

Yet, all this does not affect real scholarship, its sturdiness and originality. In all periods there are men with inquisitive minds loyally committed to the scholar's life. Such men have always been a very small minority, and it has never made any difference whether they were located among the elite or in some other rank of society. They collaborated even if their lives were spent in relative isolation. Only in modern times has their status changed vis-a-vis society: there arose a class of educated people, aristocratic and bourgeois mostly, knowledgeable enough to serve as recipients of high scholarship in the form of the reading public. Between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, hundreds of scholars, philosophers, scientists, and artists were engaged in fruitful correspondence with "lay" individuals, from the middle and artisan classes, with whom ideas could be exchanged and taste discussed simply because they were cultured, educated, or self-educated, and insatiably curious. When Diderot launched the *Encyclopedie*, a costly as well as politically risky business, two thousand subscribers registered immediately and paid their subscription fees in advance.

This is how scholarly reputations grew and spread beyond small circles, and, incidentally, this is how the general optimism grew that by schooling everybody would become learned and acquire the moral quasi-asceticism and singleness of purpose needed for scholarly studies and interests. The idea was to embrace the entire nineteenth century, although by then there were a number of lucid minds, from Goethe to Burckhardt and Matthew Arnold, who realized that the more culture and scholarship spread, the more semi-educated people would crowd the corridors of academies, newspaper offices, lecture halls, and publishing houses. Nonetheless, the scholar and the artist had by then become accustomed to a large public, the so-called "educated layman" listening to their lectures, discussing their theses, and admiring as well as buying their "products." When the phenomenon of the mass-university appeared first in the United States, then planetwide, the "educated public" grew to its broadest extension, becoming an "official public." The millions in high schools and universities had to take liberal arts courses and had to read thousands of pages of Homer, Plato, Augustine, Descartes, Shakespeare, and Marx. This was the brief honeymoon time between scholars and masses, the time when the scholars and their middlemen, the pro-

fessors and the publishers, still had enough authority to impose their cultural and scholarly ideals on the masses of students and on the so-called public.

The drastic change came in the late Sixties and early Seventies. The student masses, by now a distinct sociological and political category, with their enormous weight as a pressure group, rebelled against their leaders in culture and scholarships, the professors and the curriculum planners, whom they perceived now as oppressors in the Marxist sense of the term. Education, in their view, must not be subordinated to something as vague and reactionary as culture and scholarship, which the students interpreted as the manipulative devices used by the bourgeoisie to control the masses of students through cultural selection. In the true spirit of the Enlightenment and nineteenth-century liberalism, they claimed that "education should be for the masses," but this slogan no longer had anything to do with the watchword from d'Alembert to Trotsky. D'Alembert, it will be recalled, had demanded knowledge for all, and Trotsky believed that in the Communist society the average man would have the genius of Aristotle and Goethe.

Since 1968 the student masses have abandoned even the pretense of high culture, and a decade later, now, we are witnessing the consequences: the self-liquidation of the "educated lay-public," mostly former students. One need only visit some prestigious New York bookstores to become aware of the change. Where there used to be long shelves of philosophy, religion, history, etc., in paperback editions, there is now a small corner devoted to books on the occult, on gardening, on party fun, popular science, and sexual perversions. The unsuspecting browser and buyer are no longer exposed to intellectual challenge; they are fed the kind of mush that, in a parallel process, the college students are made to ingurgitate in their classes under the pretext of education. The paperback editions of scholarly works are forced into the background because even fewer professors require, or dare require, them as compulsory reading. The publishers follow the trend and in part anticipate it. Years ago, on the threshold of decline, they at least insisted that the manuscript submitted to them should be written in a clear style, for the "educated public." Later, this label tended to disappear, and the request by publishers was for books that colleges would order in large quantities. Nowadays, college courses require no "large quantities," and the publishers frankly ask for books for mass circulation and "bestsellers."

All this indicates the coming divorce between education and scholarship. More than twenty years ago I observed in *The Future of Education* that universities were becoming subcultural and mass-cultural supermarkets where the citizens enroll to receive a document, a kind of identification card, authorizing them to circulate in a bureaucratic society, or, if older, to earn promotion and wage increases. I wrote further that serious scholars will find "refuge" in hidden corners of the academy, sought out by members of a future "clandestine elite," where they may work undisturbed. The prediction has become reality, although the scholar, spoiled and often corrupted by five centuries of social and political prominence and influence, lionized by the powerful and the profane, has not yet understood how his status is changing. He will take perhaps decades to realize that the divorce is consum-

mated between him and the public; then he will re-learn to write again for his peers, a kind of secret society, while the public will happily settle for the mediocrities to which it was traditionally attracted. At fairs in the Middle Ages and much later, too, the literature bought by the curious consisted of almanacs, dream interpretations, wondrous travels, famous love stories, great heroes, and how to . . . books about anything from agriculture to love potions. Serious books circulated only among a small elite, the clerks, the erudite, the monks, the humanists. How would today's and tomorrow's Mr. Public know about scholarly books when he visits bookstores or reads popular magazines that do not inform him? Besides, culturally emasculated during his college years, he will not even be interested.

The scholar, on the other hand, never had it so good. To his beneficial isolation from the public and political involvement are added all the modern conveniences; superb libraries, jet flights to international congresses, technical improvements in methods of research and production of material. True, it will be hard for him to give up contact with the public, the residual effect of which will be that his politics and his ideology will be of no interest for the ideamarket. But not hearing Einstein on world peace, Bertrand Russell on communism, or Sartre on everything from homosexuality to Bach's music may be quite a good thing for all concerned.

It has been argued in *The University Bookman* and more recently on French television that the schools have ceased teaching history at a time when the general public's interest in the subject is on the rise. Two observations. There is no such rise of interest but rather a retro-induced nostalgia for old objects. I note every day my students' absolute lack of sense of time, from language structure to historical dates, not because they are young but because this civilization, hedonistic to the core, is entirely now oriented. One can ascertain it even in the case of institutions like the Catholic Church, which has abandoned Latin, large segments of the liturgy, and traditional ways of dressing and behaving. Noted theologians like Karl Rahner (Catholic) or Rudolf Bultmann (Protestant), and unclassifiable but influential ideologues like Teilhard write of the future as the privileged dimension, and engage in the philosophical groundwork of removing the past from man's scope. The vogue of such charlatanism as futurology and prospectivism also suggests the direction of semi-educated interest.

The second observation is that whatever interest in history might be sporadically manifested by some sectors of the public is overwhelmed, neutralized, and crushed by the educational establishment, not only in America but also in Europe, which apes us in a grotesquely servile fashion. On the previously mentioned television debate in Paris, politicians, writers, outstanding historians (P. Goubert, Le Roy Ladurie, F. Braudel) argued that a) history is the collective memory of a nation; b) patriotism cannot be preserved without teaching history; and c) the growing person needs a knowledge of history at all levels of this development—yet the ministers of education and their semi-clandestine staff of decisionmakers continue marginalizing history (and geography). Alas, the debaters failed to understand that an agent far more powerful than any they imagined has been at work against history: the ideology of Western so-

ciety, the naive but now dominant belief that a new man is born whose inner life will respond to psychological manipulation and whose outer life will be sociologically manipulated work and leisure. Call it the hedonistic man, the robot man, or any other strange monster—it is the ideal figure of our civilization's coryphees who shape it every day with their myriad decisions and committee meetings, whether in academic, cultural, or business life.

Otherwise, how could one account for the fact that history (I choose this example, but I could have chosen philosophy, religion, literature, etc.) is not marginalized in France alone, with her centralized instructional system, but also in America with its plethora of private, independent, even religiously orientated high schools and colleges? This is what I read in a brochure published by the *New York Times* as an advertising supplement of "Why Go to College?" There are the following chapter heads in the order listed: a) you'll be prepared for a career; b) you'll have a better chance of getting a job; c) you'll have a better chance of getting a good job; d) you'll have a better chance of earning more; e) you'll be better prepared for a fulfilling life. This last rubric is subdivided into ability to learn on your own, self-discovery, self-confidence, family success, richer leisure, better health, ability to cope, alert citizenship, participation in culture. I leave unmentioned the details of the sugary, publicity-type language of the whole repulsive money-catching device, the therapy-orientation, the cheap style.

Thus at all levels the separation of education from scholarship and culture (other than mass culture and counterculture) has been accomplished by the first superficial hedonistic civilization in history and by the educational bureaucracy with its ideological doctrine that past and permanence must be banned from the new man's purview. The new man is a work-and-leisure directed robot whose existence is divided between the crowded subway, the television set, and the sandy beach two weeks in August.

So far as the scholar and the creator of culture are concerned, we must declare their new fate in many respects superior to the recent one. Nolens volens, they are being detached from servitude to the public at large, and from the engagement in matters not only diversionary but temptingly dishonest. There will be fewer occasions for *la trahison des clercs*. At the same time, and this should be regretted, the scholar, the artist, the litterateur will be deprived of their hinterland, the intelligent reader, whose contribution was to channel their ideas and forms, responding to them in a mutually advantageous way.

It is outside the scope of this essay to try to comprehend the full consequences and long-range effects of these phenomena, but they doubtless represent a major turning point in the educational panorama of the Western world. For the first time, masses of people will be schooled with hardly any contact between them and the true achievements of the life of the mind. This is worse than the mass illiteracy of the past because that was compatible with the lesson of things and with natural wisdom, *la sagesse des nations*. Today's and tomorrow's school masses will float in an urbanized utopia, a culturally homogenized nihil. Nobody can tell me the opposite; my students are advanced specimens of the new race of new men.

Can relief from the educational process be expected anywhere? Since the task of an-

swering this question would be too vast if we included lower grades, we shall concentrate on universities. In Europe, while curricula and methods may vary from one country to another, phenomena similar to those in the United States become increasingly apparent, even if they are not yet the rule. European man still finds himself between two civilizations: the traditional and the robotized. He is still not overwhelmed by the media, perhaps because he sees through technology's deadly tricks and has a healthy skepticism about official, or simply public, proclamations and programs.

On the other hand, the unified educational bureaucracy, now increasingly deprived of the erstwhile deeply cultured educational official (for example the French inspectors with philosophical dimensions), is more single-minded in its ambition to enforce ideological objectives. It also readily yields to overseas influence: permissive methods, emphasis on applied science, elimination of such "old" disciplines as Latin, history, and philosophy. And far more intensively than in this country, Marxist indoctrination, or at least Marxist coloration of political, sociological, and literary matters is widespread.

Yet the separation of education from scholarship and culture has not been consummated in the European curriculum, primarily because of the prestige surrounding the "great man"—the architect and writer, the philosopher and sage (*Wissenschaftler*, *savant*). In countries where the government or the head of state decides on major-scale urban planning or important aspects of cultural policy, the prestige of intellectual achievement remains high, even at school level. However, the traditionally strong relationship, one may even call it a fusion, between school and scholarship is slowly eroding because the high standard of living persuades the powers that be that its preservation depends on the shaping of the consumer, hence on a new culture, on a new curriculum. In Europe, the process that began in the general postwar moral weakening decisively accelerated after 1968 with the creation of universities where ideology and anarchy have reigned ever since.

The situation is somewhat clearer, although not more reassuring, in the universities of the Third World. Clearer because large numbers of grade and high schools are maintained and directed by Christian churches and missionaries, who, in addition to religious education, instill community values in the children, as well as subjects attentive to Western and local realities. Their graduates are generally more respectful of the education they have received than are their Western counterparts. Third World children, in contrast, are aware that education is a great good thing that happens to them, and they put teachers in the same category as ancestral scribes and wisemen, as a source of authority. The situation is clearer also because Third World universities, in theory at least, teach and train such vitally needed personnel as engineers, doctors, agronomists, and public servants. Insofar as they do, they become, quite naturally, technical and vocational schools, nothing more. Insofar as they do not, they are imitation-Western: the courses are heavily politicized, with only a minimum of scholarly content. This condition obtains because the teaching staff consists of locals with diplomas from Western or Communist universities—antagonistic to the West—and of expatriates from the West, mostly young enthusiasts who regard themselves as missionaries

of an ideological cause. The student graduated from such universities acquires only a smattering of serious subjects or of technical preparation. What he mostly acquires is a few crude notions about recent Western cultural fads like existentialism, Third World studies, or "socialism with a human face."

The new elite thus prepared in Asia, Africa, and most of South America, is then hardly competent to carry out tasks in technical and administrative fields and inadequate as well to deal in depth with the tradition of his homeland. Students therefore are neither rooted in the cultural soil of their nation nor capable of helping bring about the necessary modernization. The superficial notions they derive from questionable Western books and other sources only enervate them, supplying them with unrealistic dreams. They have a choice: join the traditional upper class, which is usually corrupt and interested only in preserving its privileges, or become rebels, usually of some Marxist variety. The third choice is to emigrate; hence there are legions of doctors and other professionals from India and South America at Western institutions.

The university staff is no help in this problem. In the course of my last trip through Africa, Asia, and some islands in the Pacific, I was prompted to coin the term "BA in Unemployment" as I was confronted with hordes of students educated for nothing in particular. In a very poor Egypt, the idle young study the Koran at the Al Azhar mosque and law at the national university, both dead-end streets of achievement. In India, the graduates swell the millions of half-employed and the other millions of petty functionaries who shift papers at ministries and banks for eight hours a day. The more ambitious emigrate and never return. In Papua-New Guinea, the teaching staff at the national university at Port Moresby is entirely Australian, ultra-leftist, inciting the native students, who are nominally learning civil administration or medicine, to turn against their government, a "puppet of multi-national companies" and of the "Neocolonialists in Canberra."

Such is, in rough outlines, the state of what used to be called "higher education." Newman's idea of a university is lightyears away in the past. For all intents and purposes the university has ceased to exist; its traditional functions, performed from the twelfth century until about the first third of the twentieth, are no longer recognizable. The conclusion I now reach is not different from what it was in 1961 when *The Future of Education* appeared. Let me briefly recapitulate it. Institutions come into existence, reach their acme, and decay. After some eight centuries, the Western university, later exported planetwide, has closed its doors. What survives is, amidst the rags of glory, a melange of utilitarian recipes and ideological prescriptions; their ingurgitation is a requisite for anyone wishing to qualify for jobs in the huge work-and-leisure market that our societies have become. Their cultural and scholarly value is nil.

But since scholarship and culture are never extinguished, they are now migrating to other as yet undefined corners of our tolerant and prosperous society. Their adepts, not distinguishable from other graduates by an external sign, are the boat-people of scholarship and culture, refugees held together by the invisible bonds of loyalty to high things. It is among them, and in what I called earlier "lay monasteries," that the great achievements of truth and beauty may again mature. ●

ESTATE TAXES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, estate taxes, more appropriately known as death taxes that penalize widows and orphans, have been a severe obstacle to economic mobility and family participation in the small business community.

Fortunately, the recent passage of the Conable-Hance tax bill will go a long way toward eliminating this burdensome tax. By 1987, estates valued at up to \$600,000 will be exempt from Federal estate tax.

While I am very pleased about the enactment of this legislation, I believe that death taxes should be abolished. For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 4238 which would phase out death taxes by 1984. I invite my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this legislation.

In the following column Wilson S. Johnson, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, discusses the impact of present estate tax law on labor-intensive small businesses. Mr. Wilson's eloquent statement in favor of repealing this tax should be of interest to everyone who is concerned about the well-being of the small business community.

SMALL-BUSINESS ANGLE

(By Wilson S. Johnson)

DEATH KNELL FOR DEATH TAXES

A small-business man I know spends 20 percent of his profits for life insurance to be certain there will be enough cash for his survivors to pay estate taxes and still hold on to the family lumber mill.

Another man who owns a soap manufacturing plant in a small, eastern city says his heirs would have to sell out if he didn't spend thousands for insurance now. The soap plant is the major source of employment for the town, and if another company bought it, the plant would probably be closed and the business consolidated elsewhere.

One of the dreams of any person who has built a successful business during his or her lifetime is to pass that business along to other members of the family—a spouse or surviving children and grandchildren. A business is a legacy.

Today federal government policy is forcing the liquidation of hundreds of successful, privately-owned businesses because of the negative impact of estate or "death" taxes. To many people, estate taxes are perceived as a means of forcing the redistribution of enormous amounts of money when wealthy people die. But the truly wealthy have sophisticated ways of estate planning which help them avoid estate taxes. The law hits squarely the small, family business when government policy ought to be to encourage the continuation of a strong, competitive independent business sector.

A recent survey of urban areas conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) revealed that a substantial number of business people responding—par-

ticularly in the northeastern part of the country—either inherited or purchased the company from a member of the family. Urban areas, such as those in the northeast, are already facing severe drains on resources and the negative impact of death taxes on small, independent businesses will add to the problems there and elsewhere in the country.

Analysis of the revenues raised by estate taxes and the economic harm being done to the labor-intensive small-business community suggests that the death tax should be abolished and the relative small number of tax dollars lost be raised by alternate means. ●

BELLMAWR, N.J., VFW POST 7410
CELEBRATES 35TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, a very special anniversary will take place in my congressional district. I wish to share with my colleagues this special event.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Bellmawr Post 7410 will be celebrating their 35th anniversary. This post is one of which their membership can be very proud. They have actively served their community in these past years and when called upon have willingly supported any civic activity.

I am certain that my colleagues will join in my tribute to this outstanding post and its members, and wish them all a very happy anniversary. ●

* * * AND SOME DON'T

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite an example of the type of unnecessary Pentagon spending which could be cut. It is a disgusting contrast which finds us in the Congress supporting spending like that described in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* editorial, while at the same time we reduce our Government-subsidized school lunch program to 1½ ounces of meat per day. While one Government subsidy supports the expensive dining of generals at the Pentagon, another subsidy for our children is too small for more than a paltry snack. The editorial follows:

[From the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*]

If you belong to the "in" crowd, you can get a good steak dinner at the Pentagon for a bit under \$3.

There are five dining rooms at the Pentagon, some more exclusive than others. If you're Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, for instance, you're eligible for the

steak and you can eat it in the Chairman's Dining Room, operated for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The secretary's salary is \$69,630 a year. Does he need to eat subsidized steak?

Prices in the Pentagon's dining rooms reflect only the price of the food; enlisted personnel cook it, serve it and clean up afterward. The taxpayers pay their salaries.

High-level Pentagon officials make a convincing case for having a private dining room or two. They host foreign dignitaries, and private, secure facilities are necessary. But why five dining rooms? And why, exactly, does that mean the food should be cheap?

The very least the Pentagon should do is raise the prices to the level of other restaurants. Better still, the officials could hire civilian personnel, freeing the soldiers for more important (and less admiral-pampering) work. Other civilians are employed at the Pentagon, many in high-security positions. There is no good reason why civilians couldn't also serve food.

The other reason officials cite for using military personnel is that they are available for after-hours duty. Many restaurants are open day and night, too, so that's a weak argument at best.

There's no princely sum by Pentagon standards involved here—it only costs taxpayers \$1 million or so a year to feed generals and their friends and associates so cheaply. But a million is a million is a million * * * how many more wasted millions are hidden in the defense budget? It's time to get out the sharpest ax in Washington, and use it judiciously but decisively. And the first chop should come down on the generals' breadline. ●

**THE BALANCED BUDGET
AMENDMENT: NEEDED NOW
MORE THAN EVER**

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the September edition of *Dollars & Sense*, the monthly periodical of the National Taxpayers Union, featured an excellent article entitled, "The Balanced Budget Amendment: Needed Now More Than Ever," authored by the respected chairman of the National Taxpayers Union, James Dale Davidson. I recommend this article to each Member of the House and particularly to those who have not yet given their support to the balanced budget amendment effort.

As Mr. Davidson indicates, the effort to gain congressional approval of a balanced budget constitutional amendment is apparently languishing. There are many factors contributing to this apparent waning of interest in a balanced budget amendment including the administration's public pledge of a balanced budget in fiscal year 1984 and the enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 which reduced projected Federal spending by \$37.1 billion.

Now, however, is not the time to relax efforts to secure full congress-

sional approval of a balanced budget amendment. The Federal deficit this year will be more than \$60 billion and the deficit may be more than \$60 billion next year as well. The public debt is increasing constantly and will soon be more than \$1 trillion. Additionally, record high real interest rates, the result of massive Federal credit demands produced by continuing deficit spending and restrictive monetary policy, are destroying the basic fabric of the Nation's economy and forcing thousands upon thousands of businessmen and farmers to stare economic failure in the face.

James Dale Davidson is right. The balanced budget amendment is needed now more than ever.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, "The Balanced Budget Amendment: Needed Now More Than Ever," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

**THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT: NEEDED
NOW MORE THAN EVER**

(By James Dale Davidson)

A few months ago, I had the good fortune to attend an anniversary celebration of William F. Buckley's "Firing Line" program.

It wasn't an exclusive party; every former guest was invited. Among those who turned up was California Governor Jerry Brown, erstwhile supporter of the Balanced Budget Amendment and sometime presidential candidate. Governor Brown was in an expansive mood and wanted to talk about the current status of the amendment drive. Although he didn't say so directly, I got the strong impression that he had lost interest in following the effort himself. After I spent a few minutes detailing our frustrations in trying to get additional states to call for a limited constitutional convention, Brown said, "Well, Davidson, you've got a tough job. Nobody's interested in the Balanced Budget Amendment."

Governor Brown went off to sample the barbecued shrimp, and I was left to think about his comment. I didn't like it. But the more I have thought of it since, the more I can understand why a politician would feel that way. When you get right down to it, a Balanced Budget Amendment is something which is good for the society as whole. And not that many people feel passionately about what is everyone's business. As the old adage puts it, "Everybody's business is nobody's business."

At times it has seemed as though nobody outside a few NTU members really cared whether we achieve a Balanced Budget Amendment or not. It has proven gruesomely difficult to raise the relatively piddling sums required to make our program succeed. Meanwhile, vast amounts are being raised and spent on projects to install second-rate ballet companies in small towns, or to build another tier of seats in a university stadium—efforts which won't make one iota of difference to the long term survival of our economy.

The Balanced Budget Amendment does make a difference. It matters now, more than ever. Without an amendment, it is quite unlikely that President Reagan, with all the political prowess he brings to the job, will be able to balance the budget by the end of his term. And if Reagan can't do it, who could? The answer is that it is not a matter to be left on the shoulders of one man. We need a sound fiscal policy and a

sound economy, no matter who is in the White House. A balanced budget amendment would not guarantee it. However, it would make it much more likely.

Very few people today really believe that the budget is likely to be balanced in the future. Just look at the level of current interest rates. If investors at home and abroad were convinced that federal borrowing was going to be dramatically curtailed in the future, they would be rushing to buy federal securities now, and thus lock in a high real rate of return. They are not. In spite of several false rallies in the bond markets, we are some distance away from anything which could be considered "low" interest rates. Rates on 91-day Treasury bills averaged 14.9 percent in July. They averaged 15.46 percent in the first two August sales. The Administration had predicted that rates would average 12.55 percent.

Unnecessarily high interest rates now make future budget balancing more difficult, for two reasons. High rates discourage investment and economic growth. High interest rates keep stock prices low, and shrink the capital value of almost every productive asset. Other things being equal, a business which is worth \$1,000,000 when interest rates are at 10 percent will be worth only \$500,000 when interest rates move to 20 percent on a longterm basis. This dramatically changes incentives. Interest rates which cut capital gains in half are as stunting in their effects as tax rates which confiscate half of what investors would otherwise have made. In other words, many of the incentive effects of President Reagan's much-needed tax cuts might evaporate if interest rates remain high.

According to the Administration's projections, the economy will grow by 3.4 percent in real terms next year. Each one-percent-age point overstatement in this projection will widen the budget deficit by \$8 billion. The current federal borrowing requirement is already in the neighborhood of \$100 billion—an amount approximately equal to the total addition to private savings. Rational investors who project even higher borrowing requirements will insist on high rates to purchase long-term government obligations.

This brings us to the second reason why high interest rates now make future budget balancing more difficult. They increase the carrying charge on our massive national debt. The explicit debt is now about one trillion dollars. Luckily for taxpayers, some of this debt bears long maturities, at low interest rates of years ago. But most of the debt turns over every three to four years. Every one-percent-age-point of interest rate raises the carrying cost of the national debt by up to \$10 billion, depending on the mix between short and long-term obligations. In any event, the difference between financing a trillion dollar debt at 15 percent and financing the same debt at 7.5 percent is enormous and obvious. Great budget savings could be achieved if interest rates fell.

What is the best way to make interest rates fall? Assure the world that the budget will be balanced in the future. The best (and perhaps the only way) to do so is to pass a Balanced Budget Amendment. Such an amendment, if it were approved by the Congress today, could not be ratified for at least two years. Even in the best of circumstances it would take the states that long to act. But markets would not wait two years to respond. Shrewd and even not-so-shrewd investors would react immediately to the prospect of lower federal borrowing in the future by purchasing long-term federal debt

today. Bond prices would rise. Not only the federal government, but other borrowers would benefit from lower interest rates. The incentive to invest would spurt upward as the cost of money fell, and the capital value of any given income went up (the \$500,000 business might be worth \$1,000,000 again). This would increase the prospect for meeting optimistic growth targets for the economy. It would reduce the federal budget—automatically—and at low political cost.

Such a development would be good for everyone. It's a matter which I still think is worth getting excited about. I hope you feel that way too. ●

REBECCA H. SINGER, A WOMAN OF VISION AND VIRTUE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to pay tribute to the memory of a remarkable woman, Rebbitzin Rebecca H. Singer, who passed away on June 29.

For 30 years, Rebbitzin Rebecca H. Singer had assisted her husband, Rabbi Dr. Joseph I. Singer, in serving the congregation of the Manhattan Beach Jewish Center. Their work together, inspired by their strong faith, devotion, and love, bore rich fruits in the community.

Devoted to her husband and family, Mrs. Singer raised two wonderful children, Alexander T. Singer and Vivian Susan Singer, in our community. But she also found the time to work tirelessly, not only for her family, but for the good causes to which she was devoted throughout her life.

As the daughter of one of the most learned and renowned Rabbis and scholars of our era, Rabbi Dr. Chaim Heller, Mrs. Singer was well versed in the law and tradition of Judaism. She was known for her scholarly knowledge and also for her gentle wisdom, and her interest in helping anyone in need. During her three decades of service in Brooklyn, the energy, kindness, and devotion which marked all her activities gained her the respect and love of the Jewish community.

As the Rebbitzin she served as adviser to the center's sisterhood. Mrs. Singer recognized the importance of this organization in providing the women of the congregation with religious, educational, and social opportunities that would foster their sense of belonging to a community of shared interests and mutual support.

Mrs. Singer was an ardent supporter of Israel who inspired others to join her and her husband in their efforts to insure the existence and survival of the State of Israel, and to promote the growth of Israel's philanthropic and educational institutions.

During my years representing Manhattan Beach in the New York State

Assembly and then in the Congress, I had the good fortune to come to know Mrs. Singer well. Being invited to dinner in her home was an opportunity to experience the real warmth and strength of a model Jewish home. For Mrs. Singer epitomized, to me, the ideal of the Jewish wife and mother. She was the "Valiant Woman" described in the Scriptures;

"For her worth is far above rubies.

The heart of her husband trusteth in her . . .

She will render him good, and not evil all the days of her life . . .

She hath opened her hand to the needy, and stretched out her hand to the poor . . .

She hath opened her mouth to wisdom, and the law of clemency is on her tongue. . .

Her children rose up, and called her blessed: her husband, and he praised her. . .

The woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised."

Mr. Speaker, with the death of Mrs. Singer, I have lost a valued friend, a woman of vision and virtue. ●

THE POTENTIAL OF WIND ENERGY

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. HEFTEL. Mr. Speaker, It has been more than a year since the Wind Energy Systems Act was enacted by the 96th Congress. Though budget cuts have forced a reassessment of many of the more ambitious goals in the act, the wind program at the Department of Energy has made significant progress in advancing the state of the art. A number of successful wind turbine demonstration projects are now in operation in Hawaii, Washington State, and California, for example. A national wind resource assessment program is collecting data and analyzing sites for future demonstrations and commercial wind farms. Finally, a growing number of electric utilities throughout the Nation are making plans to integrate wind energy into their systems. I am encouraged by this progress and confident that wind energy will make an important contribution to America's energy future.

This past week, the Washington Post published an article which assesses the problems and potential of wind energy systems from a local and national perspective. I have had the article reprinted for our colleagues and hope that they will find it of interest. I believe strongly in the future of wind power and hope that continued progress will be made in developing its enormous potential in the coming months and years.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1981]

WINDMILLS AND UTILITY BILLS

(By Phil McCombs)

Walter F. Szymczewski proudly showed off the windmill he recently built for \$7,000 in the back yard of his Maryland home. It was a hot, muggy afternoon and the windmill was not turning because there was no wind. There had not been any for some days.

This did not bother Szymczewski. He built the four-blade, 30-foot-high machine for fun as an experiment—"took the gamble to find out what it would actually do." In fact, it has shaved a little off his electricity bill already, even though summer is the worst possible season in the Washington area for wind and windmills.

"This cloudy, rainy weather is bad. All you get is these up and down drafts, these little spotty currents," Szymczewski said. "That won't drive a windmill. You need a whole [weather] front movement. Usually that begins in late September, and the wind is steadier all through the winter."

Over the course of a year, Szymczewski hopes, the wind will provide one-third to one-half the electric power used in his modest house in Severn, Md.

To the west of Washington in Clarksburg, Md., Montgomery County police officer Karl W. Plitt, 34, installed a sleek, white Ener-tech windmill on a 50-foot telephone pole in his back yard. Results so far: a \$90 saving on his electricity bill in two months.

Small-time windmill experimenters like these are sprinkled throughout the Washington area, and some energy experts believe they are in the vanguard of what will become a significant national effort to reap the wind.

A new study by Worldwatch Institute, a Washington think tank, estimates that wind power could supply 20-to-30 percent of the electricity in many countries by the early part of the next century. The study said that there are 3.8 million homes and 370,000 farms in areas of the United States where the wind is strong and steady enough to make wind-powered electric generation feasible.

In some of those areas, utility companies are taking an early interest in wind power. Southern California Edison, for example, has set a corporate goal of generating 30 percent of its electricity from such sources as sun and wind, according to Douglas C. Bauer, senior vice president of the Edison Electric Institute, which represents utility companies.

Bauer said other companies are examining the potential of wind power, but are concerned about its reliability as a new technology fueled by sometimes fickle winds.

While man has used windmills for grinding corn and drawing water for hundreds of years, electricity-generating windmills that utility companies plan to use in groups on "windfalls" are so huge that they present new technological problems.

Operations at a huge U.S. Department of Energy experimental windmill in North Carolina, for example, had to be curtailed after nearby residents complained that the 200-foot blades on the 2,000-kilowatt machine made an annoying swishing noise.

The winds in Washington generally are not steady and strong enough to justify installing a windmill, according to Energy Department spokesman Jay Vivari.

"The most important thing is to find an area with a high annual mean wind speed," he said. "Chicago, the windy city, is lousy.

The wind blows like mad but it's not good on an annual basis. All through the Appalachians is good . . . all the way up through New England . . . A dynamite area is the Texas panhandle, western Kansas, central Wyoming."

Vivari said that as a rule of thumb you need an annual average wind speed of 10 knots (roughly 11.5 m.p.h.) for a windmill to be a good investment. The highest such wind speed in Maryland listed in "The Wind Power Book," by Jack Park, is 9.6 knots at Baltimore-Washington International Airport. The figure at Fort Meade, which is near Szymczewski's house, is only 4.4 knots. The highest figure listed in Virginia is 8.8 knots at Norfolk, and in the District of Columbia, 7.5 knots at Bolling Air Force Base.

To encourage the development of alternative energy sources, Congress authorized a 40 percent tax credit for the purchase and installation of windmills—in Szymczewski's case, worth \$2,800, which he is able to take over two tax years.

It is not clear, however, how much longer that will last. Reagan administration economists are thinking of trying to eliminate the credit in order to increase tax revenues. They are also seeking to slash DOE outlays on wind energy promotion and development, although the Energy Department will continue to do research in the area, according to Vivari.

The Reagan theory is that if wind power is economically feasible, the private sector will develop it with little aid from government.

In another earlier effort to encourage the development of wind power, Congress in 1978 mandated that utility companies must allow individual home owners and other small wind-power originators to hook into their power grids and must pay them a fair rate for any extra electricity generated. Public service commissions in the Washington area and most other parts of the country are still deciding the terms under which these transactions will take place.

So far, four big electric utilities in the Washington-Baltimore area report only six of their millions of customers have installed windmills and wired them into the utility company power grids since the 1978 congressional action.

Potomac Edison Co.'s Donald Whipp said: "It's in the experimental stage. It's too early to make any assumptions on the ultimate impact."

Szymczewski is not one of the six. His house is wired to receive electricity from Baltimore Gas & Electric Co., or he can shut off that power source and use his own windmill-generated power, which he stores in more than 200 batteries. Because his windmill is not wired into the BG&E power grid, Szymczewski cannot use the two sources simultaneously, nor can he sell his excess power to the company.

It was the simultaneous use and buyback that the 1978 congressional legislation made possible. The idea was to eliminate the need for expensive storage batteries, which were needed to make home owner windmill systems run smoothly but the cost of which was prohibitive.

Szymczewski, 66, a retired precision sheet-metal worker, was lucky and bought his batteries cheap when the telephone company got rid of them. Now, they would have cost him more than \$40,000.

Plitt, the Montgomery County police officer, does have his windmill wired into the Potomac Edison power grid. This means that when his windmill is working and deliv-

ering power to the house, Plitt's Potomac Edison electric meter runs slower. If a storm drove the windmill furiously at night when Plitt's house was using little power, the electric meter might actually run backward, although this has not happened yet.

Plitt bought his house in a subdivision in rural Clarksburg with wind power in mind. The modern, comfortable house is situated near the top of a high ridge at the end of a long valley—"an ideal wind site."

The Plitts paid \$10,000 for their sleek machine, which is perched atop a 50-foot telephone pole in their back yard, and for a solar hot-water system that complements it. After the tax credit, the total bill came to only \$6,000 for the two systems, and a study of their first electricity bill indicates that they saved about \$90 already—or half what the two-month bill would have been.

The house has electric heating, which in the past cost \$300 every two months during the winter. Now they hope these bills will be under \$100 since winter is a time when the wind across their ridge blows strong and steady.

The Plitts' machine was manufactured by Enertech, a Vermont firm that has sold more than 700 windmills to become the country's largest manufacturer of electricity-generating windmills.

Enertech board chairman Ned Coffin said a 1.8 kilowatt machine like the Plitts' should provide 200-to-500 kilowatt hours of electricity a month at a good wind site. The average American home uses about 1,000 kilowatt hours a month.

Coffin said Bendix Corp. recently bought a 30 percent share of the fledgling windmill company.

Plitt discovered one disturbing aspect of his new relationship with the power company: because of safety requirements, he cannot use his windmill when the power company system falls in a storm or for some other reason. This is to prevent the windmill from "backfeeding" power into the company system and electrocuting line repairmen.

It is a problem for Plitt because having a backup system for power outages was one thought behind his getting a windmill in the first place. With some expensive rewiring that will prevent backfeeding, Plitt thinks he can solve the problem to the company's satisfaction.

All the big Washington-area electric utilities—Potomac Electric Power Co., Virginia Electric and Power Co., Potomac Edison and BG&E—have this same safety requirement.

The desire for energy independence goes beyond windmills for both Plitt and Szymczewski. They both have wood stoves and Szymczewski has not paid a cent for heating oil in five years. He gathers his firewood for free.

"This country is in trouble, that's why I had to do this," he said. "I was priced out of the heating market. There's nothing new about wind generators . . . You just have to have an interest in wanting to better your environment, living conditions. A hundred years ago, every man had to feed his family off the land." ●

DEFENSE DOLLARS: STRAIGHT TO YOUR WAIST

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote to Secretary of Defense Weinberger, urging him to convert the personnel in the Department of Defense executive dining rooms from military to civilian and to more nearly reflect the cost of the meals. By doing this, American tax dollars would be more accurately aimed at their target: the defense of the United States.

I believe that a change in personnel policy at all restaurant facilities in the Department of Defense is not only feasible, but necessary. As the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Hon. Melvin Price said:

To provide the kind of improvements in defense that we both desire will require a sustained effort over an extended period of years, and we will only be able to retain public support for that sustained effort if we can show that the funds are spent wisely and managed prudently.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer recently editorialized this issue in the following article:

AND SOME DON'T

If you belong to the "in" crowd, you can get a good steak dinner at the Pentagon for a bit under \$3.

There are five dining rooms at the Pentagon, some more exclusive than others. If you're Secretary of Defense Casper Weinberger, for instance, you're eligible for the steak and you can eat it in the Chairman's Dining Room, operated for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The secretary's salary is \$69,630 a year. Does he need to eat subsidized steak?

Prices in the Pentagon's dining rooms reflect only the price of the food; enlisted personnel cook it, serve it and clean up afterward. The taxpayers pay their salaries.

High-level Pentagon officials make a convincing case for having a private dining room or two. They host foreign dignitaries, and private, secure facilities are necessary. But why five dining rooms? And why, exactly, does that mean the food should be cheap?

The very least the Pentagon should do is raise prices to the level of other restaurants. Better still, officials could hire civilian personnel, freeing the soldiers for more important (and less admiral-pampering) work. Other civilians are employed at the Pentagon, many in high-security positions. There is no good reason why civilians couldn't also serve food.

The other reason officials cite for using military personnel is that they are available for after-hours duty. Many restaurants are open day and night, too, so that's a weak argument at best.

There's no princely sum by Pentagon standards involved here—it only costs taxpayers \$1 million or so a year to feed generals and their friends and associates so cheaply. But a million is a million is a million . . . how many more wasted millions are hidden in the defense budget? It's time to get out the sharpest ax in Washington, and

use it judiciously but decisively. And the first chop should come down on the generals' breadline.●

A TRIBUTE TO GLORIA AND BOB TAYLOR

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct privilege of representing a district that is not only beautiful to the eye, but is world renowned for one of its products—California wine. Although I share with some of my colleagues many of the larger vineyards and wineries, there are many smaller ones of which I am equally proud. I would like to take a few moments in the next few days to tell you about what is most certainly one of the oldest art forms in the world. I think the people in my district would agree when I say the making of wine is a work of art.

Probably one of the smallest vineyards in my district belongs to Gloria and Bob Taylor of Livermore, Calif. Although they do not operate a full-fledged winery, last year they sold 33 tons of Grey Riesling to the Wente Winery, also of Livermore.

The Taylors moved to a farm outside of Livermore 4 years ago. Since that time they have become the owners and tenders of 10 acres of grape vines that produce the luscious white grape used in the Wente Bros. superb Grey Riesling wine.

Although Bob Taylor works as a geochemist at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Gloria is a full-time farmer. Up at 6 a.m., she tends the grapes with the help of their two sons, Noah and Aaron. The Taylors are a recent addition to the longstanding tradition of California winegrowers and winemakers.

An article about the Taylors follows:

(By Joan Kinney)

Gloria and Bob Taylor, with their sons Aaron and Noah, moved from town to an old farmhouse on the outskirts of town in June 1977.

The property, the old Connally farm on South Livermore Avenue, a little south of the Livermore Civic Center, consisted of 13 acres with a house and outbuildings.

The house, which had been built back around 1895, had been a rental for six years prior to the Taylors' coming and was in bad shape. They spent their first years there restoring the house. They stripped it down to the studs, siding and floor; numbered all of the woodwork; then rearranged the plumbing, installed insulation, changed some rooms, and put the place back together.

Then the Taylors turned their attention to the land, to making it a working vineyard. Wente Brothers Winery agreed to buy the grapes. The winery did all of the preliminary work, the preparing of the field, the planting, etc. Ten acres of Grey Riesling were planted.

Bob's work at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, where he's a geochemist in solar and oil shale research, limited the time he could spend in the vineyard, so Gloria had to do most of this work.

She would rise at 6 a.m. and would prune for more than an hour, vine by vine. "It's really a nice peaceful thing to do," she says. Bob gave her a Sony, and she would listen to a Bach concerto or her French lessons while she pruned. The pruning took two months. "I got good at doing deep knee bends. I developed good legs."

Their first crop was coming along in 1980 when the starlings hit. The Taylors resorted to various devices to fend off the birds, but nothing worked. The starlings consumed the whole grape crop, so it seemed, and one day Gloria gave up.

The next day Ernest and Philip Wente came by. It's time to start picking, they announced. Pick what? There's nothing left, Gloria replied. Oh, yes, there are grapes left, the Wentes said.

The crop amounted to a ton and a half, with two-thirds having been lost to the birds. A ton and a half was far from great, but it was a beginning.

This year, everything went well. One hundred twenty friends helped the Taylors with the picking on August 23. They harvested thirty-three tons. According to the Taylors, a vineyard that produces four to five tons per acre is considered excellent. In light of the fact that this was only the second year of their crop, they regard the thirty-three tons as an exceptional yield.

They give some of the credit to the Wentes. "The Wentes are marvelous to work with," Gloria says. "Whenever we have any question or concern, they come right over to help us." She speaks of them as being not only fine professionals, but fine people. "The Wentes are well liked by their employees. You get the impression that things are run very nicely."

Gloria says, "We toy with the idea of making wine and having a tasting room. Open only to cyclists. We have no plans for a paved parking lot."

Like Bob, who holds a doctorate, Gloria is college-educated, with a degree. The Taylors were active in city politics during the 1960's and early 1970's. They participated in the growth control SAVE Initiative, Gloria as a board member of the organization. They belong to the Sierra Club. Gloria is a professional artist, and she has served on the Livermore Beautification Committee and Livermore Design Review Committee.

"I consider myself now a farmer," Gloria Taylor says.

"To be a farmer was not one of my dreams. It just happened. Fortunately, I love it. A day isn't complete that I don't go out to check the vines, taste a grape, scratch around in the soil.

"One of the things that happens is you become so aware of the weather—what direction the wind is blowing, how warm it is, how this year compares to last. It sharpens your senses."

Noah Taylor, who now is age 18, has written a little essay describing how he felt about moving from town to a farm:

THE FARM

(By Noah Taylor, June 1980)

I always thought my parents were crazy, or at least a little different. But the day they came home and said, "Now we're farmers," I didn't believe them. Stunned momentarily, I regained my head only to hear it again, "We're farmers!"

The farm was four miles out of town, down an old dusty road, near a vineyard. My parents said it was beautiful, but I needed a crystal ball to see through the haze. "What's beautiful?" I asked. "The farm," they both said simultaneously. Farm, I can't see it through all the garbage!

Well, all is good on the farm. The house is great after four months of hard work and slavery. We have a vineyard, red barn, chickens, rabbits, and everything you could ask for to escape suburbia in a suburban town. It's a real feeling of self-achievement, and it brought our family closer together.●

SECRETARY WATT'S ACTIONS CONTRADICT HIS OATH OF OFFICE

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the conduct of Secretary James Watt this past week at the Governors' Conference. Apparently Secretary Watt realizes his policies are faltering and his popularity is plummeting. But rather than change his mistaken policies, he is trying to recoup by giving the States everything they ever wanted regardless of the expense to our environment. His actions crassly contradict the oath of office he took when he became Secretary of the Interior.

I am very concerned about the changing complexion of our Nation's environmental policies. The degradation of our natural resources and environment are too great a price to pay for implementation of the Reagan administration's development policies, especially those affecting land use. The Department of the Interior should defend the National Government's water rights and legitimate environmental interests, not place them on the auction block. It does not take much talent or fortitude to cave in to "State's rights" claims, as Mr. Watt has done. It is time the administration stepped back from Secretary Watt's policies and reviewed them dispassionately.

I was disappointed to hear President Reagan remark during a recent press gathering that he thought Secretary Watt was doing a good job in the face of attacks from environmental extremists.

Now what bothers me about the President's statement is not the fact that he supports James Watt. This is to be expected because Secretary Watt is the ball carrier for the administration's environmental policies. What really bothers me is the fact that our President has fallen into the trap of using the loaded phrase "environmental extremists." Those who oppose the policies of Secretary Watt, and I am

one of them, are now labeled environmental extremists not just by Secretary Watt but by the President as well.

Characterizing someone as an extremist is a convenient way to brush off criticism and make it appear that only a few are in opposition, which obviously isn't the case.

Many Members of Congress and vast numbers of Americans oppose Secretary Watt's policies. To dismiss our concerns as "extremism" is both irresponsible and a disservice to many concerned Americans. ●

PHARMACIST OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. KENT HANCE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. HANCE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I take this opportunity to congratulate Lonnie F. Hollingsworth, Sr., R.Ph., of my district in Lubbock, Tex., for having been selected as the Texas "Pharmacist of the Year" for 1981. Lonnie is well deserving of this prestigious award as evidenced in the following article which appeared in Texas Pharmacy (July 1981), "Meet TPA's 1981 Pharmacist of the Year":

When one considers the attributes that the "Pharmacist of the Year" should have, many ideas flash through the mind. Although devotion to pharmacy is of primary importance, the person's willingness to serve community, state and country must also be considered, along with a deep and abiding devotion to service of fellowman.

The 1981 Texas "Pharmacist of the Year" began his education in Wellington, Texas, graduating with honors there in 1949. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1950-54 in Korea as Storekeeper First Class. After his honorable discharge, he attended The University of Texas College of Pharmacy, graduating first in his class with highest honors in 1957. During his student days his activities included Phi Delta Chi, Phi Eta Sigma (Freshman Honor Society) and Rho Chi. He remains an alumni member of Phi Delta Chi and a lifetime member of the Texas Ex-Students Association.

You do not have to talk at length with the 1981 POY recipient before you learn of his love of his community and all of West Texas. Included in the many ways he has served his city are such diverse areas as Lubbock City Councilman 1968-72 and Lubbock Mayor Pro-Tem 1972-74, City Council representative to the Lubbock Drug Abuse Council 1969-70, Planning and Zoning Commissioner 1967-68, director of the Texas Municipal League 1968-69, and chairman of the Lubbock Power and Light Electric Utility Board. He has also served his community by working with the Multiple Sclerosis Society, Boy Scouts, his church, the Shriners, Lions Club and Elks, just to name a few.

The recipient has served his fellow pharmacists by being a tireless, enthusiastic participant in many phases of the profession. He is currently secretary-treasurer of West Texas Pharmaceutical Association, member of the Executive Committee of the Texas

Pharmaceutical Education and Research Foundation and member of the Executive Committee of National Association of Retail Druggists. He has been a member of Texas Pharmaceutical Association for 22 years, has chaired several committees and held many offices in his professional organizations, including the presidency of TPA, WTPA and Lubbock Area Pharmaceutical Association.

The diversity of his business interests and his hobbies shows that he is a well-rounded individual. He is president of L&H Pharmacies, Inc., a member of the Board of the Lubbock Security National Bank, owner of rentals and investment businesses, president of 3 Points Corporation and president of L&H Horseshoe, Inc. His non-business interests include hunting, coin collecting, gun collecting, private aviation and sports.

An extremely important part of the Pharmacist of the Year's life revolves around his lovely wife, Nancy, and their two children, Heather Lea and Lonnie, Jr. Heather is now an actress living in New York City, and Lonnie, Jr., a May graduate of The University of Texas at Austin, will soon be entering law school. May we present to you Texas Pharmaceutical Association's 1981 "Pharmacist of the Year" . . . Lonnie F. Hollingsworth. ●

A CLOUD IN THE ACADEMIC SKY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to a rather ominous sign on the horizon of higher education. Policy statements developed by the National Governors Association staff and supported by certain State higher education executives would establish a new role in the Federal-postsecondary institution relationship for the States.

State control and review of the Federal student aid allocations, research grants, and discretionary grant funds is unacceptable to the colleges and universities and, I hope, to the Congress. My colleagues should look closely at this issue and its potential harm to higher education. I urge them to read the July 27, 1981, Chicago Tribune editorial, which I am inserting in the RECORD.

A CLOUD IN THE ACADEMIC SKY

One small but ominous cloud in the skies of academia is a policy statement drafted by the staff of the National Governors' Association. This document recommends that state agencies be empowered to review and act on all federal funds coming to public universities and colleges, and to review and comment on federal aid to private schools. The Board of Higher Education and its staff in Springfield would pass on a wide variety of academic funds: student aid, research grants, health education subsidies, etc.

The Reagan administration prides itself on reducing controls in Washington, with its shift of emphasis from categorical to block grants. But universities will find life more rather than less complicated if an array of

elected and appointed state officials stand between them and any federal dollars headed their way.

Here in Illinois, neither executive nor legislative officials have wanted control over federal grants to higher education. The General Assembly has repeatedly rejected proposals that it reappropriate all federal moneys coming to state schools. The Board of Higher Education and its staff have not coveted the powers (and problems) that the National Governors' Association draft would push towards them.

The good practice here in Illinois has been that if a university or college succeeds in grantmanship in Washington, it may collect its money without state intervention—with the understanding, of course, that state funds cannot be assumed to be available to carry on after the federal money is spent. That practice avoids the temptation to make federal grants into political footballs at Springfield.

It may not be surprising that some governors and state higher education executives want additional power over federal grants to universities. But it is not in the public interest that they should have it. Higher education does best with a minimum of political interference. ●

EXPORTS OF HAZARDOUS PRODUCTS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, once again the delicate moral and political issue of "reverse dumping" has arisen. The Reagan Commerce Department seems to be trying to eliminate the requirements, built up after many years of study and negotiation, that foreign governments be notified before U.S. companies export hazardous products.

In 1978, the Commerce, Consumer, and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, which I chair, held hearings on the problems resulting from the export, particularly to Third World countries, of products such as pesticides, birth control devices, pharmaceutical drugs and other products determined to be dangerous to the health or safety of Americans. After careful study, President Carter issued Executive Order 12264 shortly before leaving office requiring that foreign governments be informed that such products were being exported to their country so that they could take whatever steps they deemed appropriate. President Reagan reversed the order shortly after taking office and called for further study. It now seems the Commerce Department wants to effectively eliminate the notice requirement still contained in several statutes. As the Washington Post said in an editorial in the September 12, 1981 issue: "An effective international notification system does not now exist. Until it does . . . America's unilateral con-

controls should be kept in place." I submit for the RECORD an article from the September 9, 1981, Washington Post and the editorial referred to.

The material follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 9, 1981]

EASING OF HAZARDOUS EXPORTS STUDIED

MOST NOTIFICATION RULES MAY BE CANCELED

(By Caroline E. Mayer)

The Reagan administration is drafting plans to ease the way for U.S. companies to export hazardous goods that have been banned or restricted in this country.

In a draft policy statement obtained by The Washington Post, high-ranking officials at the State and Commerce departments are proposing the elimination of almost all rules that now require manufacturers to notify foreign governments before they ship goods abroad that have been deemed too dangerous for widespread use in the United States.

The types of products and materials that may be affected by the new policy range from such tightly regulated chemicals as PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) and chlorofluorocarbons to banned pesticides such as DDT, lindane and endrin. Consumer products that also have been banned, such as children's sleepwear treated with the flame-retardant chemical Tris, may also be affected.

According to the draft statement, a policy change is needed because the current preexport notification rules "have placed U.S. exports at a competitive disadvantage."

Noting that the United States is "the only country currently requiring notification of the export of hazardous substances," the draft concludes that such rules should be replaced by a broader information and education campaign.

Instead of notifying foreign governments at least once a year when a shipment of banned or restricted goods is to be exported, the Reagan officials propose simply providing "brief summary information" to either foreign governments or international organizations when U.S. government agencies ban or restrict a product's use, even though that notice may be years before that product is exported to another country.

"In the long run, international information sharing will have more beneficial results for the U.S. than procedures requiring specific export notifications. . . . A unified, international approach will provide a more comprehensive basis for importing nations to make decisions without jeopardizing the competitive position of U.S. exporters."

The proposed policy change may require some amendments to existing laws, according to the draft report.

State and Commerce Department officials, upset that the draft report had become public, cautioned that the policy is only a draft and could be changed before it is sent to President Reagan. Commerce Department officials said they hope to complete the report within a month.

One official involved in writing the report said there was a great deal of internal debate in both agencies over the proposed policy, with several staff members arguing that it does not protect the public's health and safety and the environment.

The two departments themselves are locked in a dispute over just who should be notified about U.S. regulatory actions to ban a product.

State Department officials argue that they should notify individual governments about each action, while Commerce officials

contend that such information should go only to international organizations, such as the United Nations.

Commerce argues that it is not the U.S. government's role to keep all other foreign governments informed about hazardous products; instead, it is up to the United States merely to furnish the information to an agency so any interested government would be able to obtain it.

The policy recommendations on hazardous exports was requested by Reagan last February when he struck down an executive order issued by President Carter just five days before he left office. That order sharply restricted the export of products that either have been banned or whose use has been restricted in this country. Among other things, the order would require anyone exporting such products to obtain an export license from the Commerce Department before such goods were shipped abroad.

Despite the revocation, exporters are still required in many cases to notify U.S. government agencies before they export tightly regulated chemicals, banned products, pesticides that are not registered in the United States and medical devices that do not comply with U.S. standards. In turn, these agencies proceed to notify the officials in the foreign country for which these products are destined, either directly or through the State Department.

"In no case can it be documented under the existing shipment specific notification system that a foreign government has taken specific regulatory action in response to notification of a U.S. export," the draft report says in explaining why the current rules should be dropped.

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1981]

EXPORTS ARE ALSO IMPORTS

Yet another leaked draft from inside the administration shows the Commerce and State departments to be at work on a proposal to eliminate the requirement that foreign governments be notified before U.S. companies export hazardous products. Should the plan be forwarded to the president and adopted, it would undo a sensible compromise policy agreed to only a year ago.

There are many who believe that this country should forbid the export of substances—pesticides, drugs, consumer products, chemicals for instance—banned or tightly restricted in this country. This ignores the reality that the risks and benefits involved in a regulatory decision vary greatly among countries. The classic case is DepoProvera, a cheap, long lasting, effective contraceptive banned here because of possible long-term health risks. In many developing countries where skyrocketing population growth has created great hardship, the balancing of risks and benefits yields a different judgment.

A sensible policy not only must accommodate these differences; it also must encompass a number of economic, political and environmental interests that point in conflicting directions. The policy must not interfere too greatly with trade by American companies. But it must recognize that, as the world's dominant economy, this country bears a measure of ethical responsibility. Moreover, unregulated hazardous exports can quickly generate a backlash of hostility and resentment damaging to U.S. foreign policy. This happened a few years ago when American companies tried to export toxic wastes to poor countries in Africa and the Caribbean.

Finally, a good policy must recognize that the earth is much smaller than it seems: banned substances that are exported have an uncanny way of coming home again—via air, water and especially food. For example, residues of banned pesticides—some of them with severe health effects—have found their way back to American kitchens on bananas, sugar, tea, tomatoes, coffee and many other imports.

The compromise eventually agreed to by Jimmy Carter and Congress allows exports of dangerous substances only after the importing country is notified of the risks involved. It is not a perfect solution, but it is the best balancing of these various interests yet put forward. Businesses have complained because of delays and paper work, but these are modest in comparison with the benefits. The draft plan's argument that current controls should be dropped because a "unified, international approach" would be better is a fancy way of saying, let's do nothing. An effective international notification system does not now exist. Until it does—and this country should continue to support its creation—America's unilateral controls should be kept in place.●

TRIBUTE TO LUTHER FLECK OF BLACKWOOD, N.J.

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Luther Fleck of 225 Marshall Avenue in Blackwood, N.J., was the recent recipient of the Silver Lifesaving Medal for heroism. The medal was officially presented to him by Vice Adm. R. I. Price of the U.S. Coast Guard. I believe that Mr. Fleck's lifesaving actions are of interest to my colleagues.

While strolling on the Steel Pier in Atlantic City, Mr. Fleck spotted a man and small child struggling for survival in the cold surf below. With no concern for himself and without the assistance of lifesaving equipment, Mr. Fleck dove into the water, 50 feet below, and held the two above the waves until help arrived.

The results of such valiant efforts were the survival of the man and his son. Unfortunately, Mr. Fleck sustained internal injuries due to the pounding of the waves and the strain of the rescue.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally and publicly commend Mr. Fleck for his unselfish and heroic act. It is indeed the actions of a man like Mr. Fleck which are exemplary of the brotherhood of man.●

INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION
PROTECTION ACT

HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Intelligence Information Protection Act. My legislation, which is identical to S. 1235 sponsored in the other body by Senator D'AMATO, would substantially ease the deleterious impact that Freedom of Information Act requirements have had on the CIA.

Although the intelligence community remains our Nation's first line of defense, the effectiveness of the CIA in particular has been severely compromised by materials procured under the Freedom of Information Act. CIA methods have been publicized; CIA operations have been undermined. Perhaps most importantly, the perception now exists among allied intelligence agencies and potential sources alike that identities cannot be protected and information kept secret. This should perhaps come as no surprise, Mr. Speaker, given the fact that, under present law, the CIA recently spent \$300,000 to comply with a Freedom of Information Act request from Philip Agee, the notorious former CIA officer whose admitted intent is to destroy the Agency.

Specifically, my bill exempts from the Freedom of Information Act all materials involving personnel selection, training, reorientation, internal operations, office management, and organization of the CIA. Additionally, all materials concerning special activities, clandestine collection, and covert operations are exempted. The right of individuals to obtain personnel files would not be affected, nor would the application of the Privacy Act be altered.

Mr. Speaker, the general issue of Freedom of Information Act reform is currently being debated both in Congress and within the administration. My bill is intended as a contribution to this necessary debate, and as an effort to restore to our intelligence community the ability to effectively carry out its crucial responsibilities. I would therefore welcome the cosponsorship of our colleagues.

At this time, I would like to commend to the attention of the Members of the House, an article by Jack Valenti which underscores the need for the kind of legislation I am proposing:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 13, 1981]

TOO FREE WITH OUR INFORMATION

(By Jack Valenti)

I spent some time recently in Western Europe chatting with key European officials, including several in the intelligence services of Great Britain and France. They seem persistently nonplussed by peculiar-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ities in the American spirit, centered mostly on our Freedom of Information (FOI) Act and the porous quality it confers on the FBI and the CIA.

As one foreign official put it to me, "I daresay none of my colleagues today would pass on to the Americans sensitive data about the work of our operatives on the Continent—or even hint at anything which would identify agents we have in the field. It would be suicide for our people. It is already deadly to your own."

Another said, "How on earth can you possibly collect and hold intelligence which may slip into foul hands simply because someone you do not know writes in and asks for information? How you can have an intelligence organization that routinely gives away its files passes my understanding."

It isn't enough, they complain, that material extracted from the FBI and CIA with Freedom of Information requests is put through a sifter that supposedly culls out secret material. They point out that people are processing so many requests that human error makes it literally impossible to expunge all that is not designed to be made public. Slippage is inevitable—and when it happens, the irretrievable occurs.

The intent of the FOI Act is laudable. Light thrown on dark crannies of the government usually illuminates a good many practices that should be corrected. But a balance is required, say these Europeans.

CASUAL MADNESS

It is one thing, they point out, to probe the Department of Labor or Transportation for information, but to uncork the files of the FBI and the CIA is a kind of casual, and they hope momentary, madness.

The FBI received some 18,800 requests for information in 1979, and the CIA recorded some 14,000 requests since 1975. No one can be certain how many of the CIA requests come from foreign governments operating through cover names. And there is a difference between sending along a file of newspaper clippings, and parceling out documents with lines blacked out, with no one in the Agency quite certain that all that should be excised has been.

Most people would acknowledge that criminals, both organized and unorganized, are filing requests by the long ton to the FBI to learn what the feds may have on them that might be embarrassing or damaging—and to act on what they learn. Fragments of information are as valuable as the complete dossier.

Unhappily, some past events have convinced a good many people that the FBI and the CIA skulk about doing rude acts not countenanced by our own laws. Public suspicion about two enterprises, without whose vigilance we might be more anxious than we are now about our future security, stirs our unease.

In the war against terrorism in Europe, the intelligence services of the West Europeans find it necessary to foresee violent designs before they are hatched. The only known method to do that is to collect information so that if a design is forming it may be thwarted before it occurs—or at the very least to pick up the spoor of those sponsoring the skulduggery before they kill somebody.

AN INSTITUTIONALIZED LEAK

What the public doesn't know, and probably cannot know until it is too late, is how well our police and intelligence services are prepared to act before some violent deed is done. We have so institutionalized the

September 17, 1981

"leak" in this country that nothing is truly safe from prying eyes. Granted that we may too often stamp Top Secret on a formula for dried milk; granted also that much of what is delivered to someone asking for information is valueless. But it is nonetheless true that in handling literally thousands of requests, brief lapses in scrutiny run throughout the whole costly process.

It is not the cost of handling these requests that should cause us concern. It is the disposition of crucial material, often collected at great risk from sources who believe it is sacrosanct, who suddenly discover to their horror and fear that it is not. All of which causes our colleagues in Europe to shake their heads.

This unease among our friends is not evidence of paranoia. As William Burroughs put it, "A paranoid is a man in possession of all the facts."

The work of the FBI and the CIA is by nature shadowy. But they labor to ensure the security of the nation. Most Americans assume that work is going forward with dispatch, skill and diligence. But many European friends of this country are uneasy not so much about the quality of the labor, but of the impermanence of its safety.

One can only pray that the Congress and its oversight committees can figure out some common-sense balance which places off-limits sensitive information which is now leaked or routinely given away. There is legitimacy in the phrase "national security information."●

NURSES' DISCONTENT MUST BE
ADDRESSED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the problem of quality health care in this country continues to plague us in many areas of the country where adequate health care personnel are needed. The problem of nurses is particularly compelling and points directly to the need for greater cooperation between health care advocates in an era of decreasing Federal dollars.

There are currently 1.4 million registered nurses in the United States. Yet, only 400,000 of them choose to work full time in hospitals. In my own city of New York, the problem is even more acute—the current levels of 5,600 RN's must increase by 1,000 in order to continue even a minimal level of patient care.

Dissatisfaction with the low level of pay, grueling hours, and lack of adequate training programs to upgrade job skills have prompted many women to leave the field. At the same time, the number of nursing graduates are decreasing, creating 100,000 nursing vacancies in the United States—or 72 full-time positions in each hospital.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have been actively involved in efforts to improve the working conditions of all levels of nursing as well as programs

to upgrade nursing. In New York City, I have spearheaded collective efforts between vocational education, adult education, local school officials, and the Health and Hospitals Corp. which administers municipal hospitals to develop programs to train licensed practical nurses.

Licensed practical nurses, or LPN's as they are known, provide essential support services in hospitals which are vital to any effective health care system. The need for them is well documented. A fall 1980 Bureau of Labor Statistics report notes a current as well as projected scarcity of LPN's to serve the hospitalized. Providing upgraded training within their present employment framework is likely to encourage LPN's to remain in the field and hopefully, encourage training that would upgrade their own professional positions.

The future of our health professions depends upon increased cooperative efforts between the public and private sectors to maximize resources. Adequate funding for nurse training and scholarship programs is essential and I pledge to continue my efforts to combat future attempts to reduce or eliminate these vitally important programs. Nurses deserve our support as much as they do not deserve continued discontent. ●

SOLAR BANK SAVED

HON. NORMAN E. D'AMOURS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. D'AMOURS. Mr. Speaker, few changes this administration has made have been as marked, or potentially as shortsighted as their energy policy. Choosing to rely exclusively on tax credits, they have thus far refused to issue regulations implementing the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank, and have, in fact, proposed its elimination. Despite the overwhelming congressional support for the bank in the 96th Congress and reports from both the GAO and OTA indicating fully supporting its creation, they have steadfastly blocked it.

Therefore, I am exceptionally pleased that the conference report on H.R. 4034, the HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill, contains \$25 million for the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank. Although this sum is very modest, it will most certainly provide funding for pilot projects which should certainly demonstrate once again the need for the bank. Perhaps more importantly, the report contains language directing the Secretary of HUD to issue regulations implementing the bank at the earliest possible date.

Colman McCarthy, the noted Washington Post columnist, recently wrote

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a column very accurately depicting the Reagan administration's shortsighted attitude toward solar energy. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and commend it to my colleagues. It is especially appropriate today as we consider legislation that initiates this most important of solar energy proposals, the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank:

THE REAGAN SOLAR ECLIPSE

(By Colman McCarthy)

QUONOCONTAUG, R.I.—Along Ocean View Lane, from which the view of the Atlantic sparkles with the blue waters and bluer sky of Block Island sound, those looking inland can enjoy scenery of a different but still stirring beauty. On the roof of the corner home of Jim Byrne, a retired insurance man, are two solar collector plates.

They are modest in design and purpose. Ten feet by five feet, their heat absorption pipes lead into the house to a water tank that uses the stored energy when needed.

What's beautiful about this solar device is not only that it is one of many in this remote village and, nationally, one of about 350,000 currently on American homes, but that Jim Byrne is in his 80s. He is an old-timer who has rejected the tired old wasteful ways of the oil conglomerates and their one-note opposition to renewable energy like solar. Instead, in his 80s, Byrne is going with the future.

Much of the rest of the country appears ready to join him. A Gallup Poll last year reported that solar development was the choice of 31 percent of the public to meet the country's energy needs. Oil and natural gas were the preferred options of only 14 percent, and nuclear power sputtered in last with 8 percent.

Warmed by the sunlight in this popular support, Congress last year raised the residential solar tax credit from 15 to 40 percent. In many states, further credits have been enacted. Offering leadership that was unappreciated at the time, Jimmy Carter announced in a 1979 presidential message—the first ever on solar energy—a national goal of using solar and renewable resources for 20 percent of the nation's energy needs by 2000. The new federal Solar Energy Research Institute had a budget of \$100 million and a director, Denis Hayes, who was both a sophisticated scientist and a seasoned advocate.

With this kind of support and attention, solarists had reason to bask a bit. But no sooner had this sunny day begun than the Reagan administration charged in with plans for a partial eclipse—and in many places a total one.

It wanted to eliminate the Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Bank, one of the main parts of the Carter solar program. The bank was to have provided \$1 billion worth of subsidies through 1984 to builders and owners of both residential and commercial structures. The administration has yet to kill the bank. Its fate is now in the hands of House and Senate appropriations committees that are about to decide whether to give it \$150 million for the next three years. The Solar Lobby, a Washington group, says the bank "is the only federal program to help lower-middle income people in making energy conservation improvements to their homes."

Falling to break the bank, in June the administration fired Denis Hayes and cut the institute's staff from 850 to 580. On his last

day, Hayes served the nation well with his candor: "The shifts in the energy budget have been described by administration spokesmen as pure exercises to trim the federal budget. That is a manifest lie." If saving money were the goal, Hayes said, "the nuclear budget would not be increased by 36 percent while the solar budget was slashed 67 percent."

From the evidence, it is hard not to agree with Hayes that this administration "has declared open war on solar energy." If there is any comfort to be taken it is that this will be a war that the president's energy generals can win only in their sunless strategy rooms. They argue, with free enterprise slogans, that the future of solar should be decided in the marketplace: as oil prices rise, consumers will go to the solar equipment companies that provide savings in energy. Solar must compete on its own, without subsidies from energy banks.

This is a tidy theory, except that citizens and businesses are so burdened paying this month's gas and electric bills that they have little or nothing left over for the high capital outlay needed for solar. "You could charge \$100 a barrel for oil," said Suzette Tapper of the Solar Lobby, "and that only makes people less able to afford solar." The theory also overlooks the immense sums the government provides to subsidize conventional fuels—one study puts the figure minimally at \$220 billion from 1923 to 1978. This is free-ride enterprise.

As solar energy becomes politicized, perhaps President Reagan should climb the roof of the White House. A solar hot water system, like the one on Jim Byrne's house in Quonochontaug, was installed there two years ago. Last week, a White House official said it was working just fine. ●

JEWISH NEW YEAR

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind my fellow colleagues that beginning with sundown on September 28 through sunset of October 8, the Jews of the world will begin the celebration of the Jewish New Year. These 10 high holy days commencing with Rosh Hashanah mark a period of penitence culminating in Yom Kippur. These holy days, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, are the most solemn days of the Jewish calendar.

These days involve reflection on the creation of the world, of God's covenant with Israel, and the events of our own lives for the past year.

Rosh Hashanah is the time of remembrance. It challenges one to assess the past and future, and the meaning of all that surrounds us. But it is also a day of hope, for it provides an opportunity to not only repent misdeeds but to renew one's commitment so that by Yom Kippur, the Divine Tribunal will enscribe one's name in the book of life.

As Jews throughout the world gather in their synagogues, we will ex-

perience again the strength of our faith and traditions, and ponder the ancient question: "Who shall live and who shall die?"

We will recall the ancient and modern persecution of our people, particularly the holocaust which claimed 6 million men, women, and children. It will strengthen our determination that never again must such an event be allowed to happen.

We will remember the miraculous birth of the Jewish State in Israel, an oasis of democracy in a sea of dictatorships, a place where the exile has found a home, and where the very desert has been made to bloom.

We will rejoice that thousands of Jews from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe will worship for the first time in freedom. But we will mourn that tens of thousands of others who remain locked in the gulags of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe yearning for the freedom of Jerusalem, while the embattled Jewish minority in Syria struggles to survive and wrench from its oppressive Government the right to emigrate.

As we end the holy days with the solemn fasting and prayers of Yom Kippur, let us also renew our commitment to work "to loosen the fetters of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke, and to let the oppressed go free."

Mr. Speaker, may I wish to you and to all my colleagues a happy new year of peace, freedom, and justice—and may this be the year of deliverance for the people of Israel throughout the world from all their enemies.●

THE REAGAN POTENTIAL

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this year in Washington has been different from any time seen in Washington since Mr. Roosevelt's first term. For the first time since 1932, the cutting of taxes and the reduction of the Federal budget are major topics discussed every day in Government rather than just occasionally. Dan Smoot pointed out recently that President Reagan has this marvelous opportunity to bring our Government back to being the constitutional Republic that was intended by our forefathers. Passage of appropriate legislation to pare down the tyranny of the judiciary and the size of our Government can take place under President Reagan, if he will but seize the opportunity. Dan Smoot's article appeared in the Review of the News for July 8, 1981. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues as a very timely discussion:

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT ON THE REAGAN POTENTIAL

I believe a majority of Americans fear and dislike socialism, but our failure to utilize constitutional remedies has rendered us unable even to slow down the socialist revolution that is smothering our Republic, much less stop it and roll it back.

The Constitution is not law of the land for the people to obey. It is law for government to obey. It specifies powers which the federal government may and may not exercise, and a few powers denied the states—summing up in the last article of the Bill of Rights by saying that all powers not mentioned are reserved to the states or to the people.

Even if the President, all Members of Congress, all judges on the Supreme Court, and every other person living in the United States, want the federal government to take certain action, the government cannot legally do so unless the Constitution makes a grant of power authorizing such action. The only legal way out of the impasse is for Congress and the people to amend the Constitution by due process, giving the federal government whatever additional power the people want it to have.

Some raise doubts about the meaning of key passages in the Constitution, but there should be few real doubts for those who have studied its origin. Inherent in our Constitution is the ancient principle that the intent of the original law-giver is the law. If judges or other government agents can change the Constitution instead of obeying it as is, or can with impunity ignore its provisions, a written constitution is a mockery of the noble ideal of limited constitutional government. With regard to our Constitution, the original law-giver was the Constitutional Convention; with regard to an Amendment, the Congress that proposed it was the law-giver. There are records, made by these law-givers, revealing their intent; and their intent is the law.

In any event, it is a mistake to try to find out what the Constitution means by reading federal court decisions. The courts have perverted the Constitution, burying its original meanings in millions of murky paragraphs that confuse rather than clarify.

The Constitution does not give the Supreme Court the power of final arbiter to determine what the Constitution means. That much power given to the Court would have made it constitutionally what it has unconstitutionally become: a judicial oligarchy that can do to the people and their institutions anything a majority of the justices pleases. The original law-givers, the Founding Fathers, were so afraid of judicial tyranny that they made the Supreme Court the weakest of the three federal branches. It was given very limited, and relatively insignificant, original jurisdiction; no appellate jurisdiction except at the pleasure of Congress; and, no means to enforce its decisions.

All this being obvious, is it not strange that Congress permits federal courts to violate not only the Constitution but also specific laws of Congress?

SOME PROBLEMS AND REMEDIES

The First Amendment prohibits the federal government from interfering with the free exercise of religion. In 1962, the Supreme Court subverted this provision and used it to outlaw the free exercise of religion in public schools. Today, 19 years later, the decision still stands, serving as a precedent for other decisions. From time to time, some Members of Congress suggest a Con-

stitutional Amendment to permit prayer in public schools. Yet this wrongly implies that the Supreme Court was right in the first place, and it would give the federal courts constitutional authority to supervise religious activity in public schools.

During the past 17 years, many Members of Congress have been whining about federal courts violating federal laws to order busing for racial balance in public schools. Some Members have proposed a Constitutional Amendment to prohibit such forced busing. Again, the implications are serious!

There are, of course, other remedies. Congressman Lawrence P. McDonald (D.-Georgia) tried to bring impeachment proceedings against a federal judge in Louisiana who, overturning a state judge's decision, ordered three white girls to be bused miles away from their neighborhood school to attend a mostly Negro school. In Tyler, Texas, a federal judge has recently handed down decisions that will require crushing increases in school taxes, and create other monumental problems, while hurting rather than helping children. Again, impeachment has been suggested.

But there is a better constitutional remedy than impeachment to handle such federal judges who are more destructive of our governmental system than the Communists have ever managed to be. There is little likelihood of an impeachment succeeding. If it did succeed, it would at best remove one undesirable federal judge, and, perhaps, scare others; whereas, there are legions of federal judges who need to be reined in sharply and abruptly. With regard to school matters, prayer or busing, all we need is an Act of Congress saying that federal courts have no appellate jurisdiction in cases involving the operation of schools. That would end the matter and leave it to the states and to the people.

Our failure to utilize proper constitutional remedies has rendered us unable even to slow down the socialist revolution, much less stop it and roll it back. We have now reached a turning point; we are at a crossroads of history. During the Reagan Administration, we will either make a turn upward toward restoring America as a prosperous, independent, constitutional republic, or we will accelerate our speed downward through economic collapse and anarchy toward the degenerate position of servitude in an international socialist dictatorship.

At this juncture, Ronald Reagan has a more glorious opportunity to do what is right for America, and is freer to do it, than any other President in the century. For almost 20 years before being elected, he talked publicly about what the federal government should do; and what he said should be done is what the people voted for when they elected him. Hence, he has the clearest public mandate a President has ever had; and he does not have to worry about re-election. Reagan could go down in history as our greatest President: the one who saved our Republic from oblivion. The people are ready; the time is right; and, the President has the special qualification needed: He is superlative in communicating with the public on television. Since he was shot—because of his manly behavior throughout that experience—he has become a towering personal hero of the kind our nation has needed for a long time.

MR. REAGAN AND THE REPUBLIC

Nonetheless, I do not think any of Reagan's legislative proposals to date will do enough good. The President and his men

talk of trimming waste and dishonesty out of such programs as federal Welfare and Food Stamps, but promise that the government will honor its responsibility to help the genuinely needy and deserving. Argument over who is genuinely needy and deserving has been going on since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt, but no answers have ever been found. Moreover, the federal government has no responsibility in this problem.

Reagan has begun to yield to the vicious lobbying combine which warns him not to try to take food away from the poor in order to give guns to the military. A President who respects his oath of office to uphold the Constitution should spurn such dishonest impertinence, and waste no time on discussions about how much of the federal Budget should be spent on the military and how much on aid to the poor. Raising and supporting armies to defend the nation is a specific power and a duty that the Constitution puts upon the federal government. But all of the federal income redistribution programs are illegal, because there is no grant of power in the Constitution for them.

The awesome governmental power to take property away from some citizens for redistribution to others is among the many powers not specified in the Constitution, and, therefore, reserved to the states or to the people. Reagan, in promising to reform the income redistribution programs, is saying, in effect, that it is all right for the federal government to operate unconstitutional programs if it administers them honestly and efficiently. Such nullifying of constitutional restraints by ignoring them can be more damaging to the cause of liberty than are waste and malfeasance.

Reagan cannot possibly cut enough fat and corruption out of illegal federal programs fast enough to have any perceptible effect on the raging inferno that is consuming our civilization—the inferno of inflation, together with all of its attendant evils: social disintegration, growing anarchy, and a withering national defense that makes us every day less capable of defending our homeland against burgeoning Soviet military power.

We are so near the abyss that prudent pruning, tactful trimming, and rousing rhetoric will do little good. We must have radical measures—radical, in the sense of getting to the root of the matter. Our failure to utilize constitutional remedies has rendered us unable even to slow down the socialist revolution, much less stop it and roll it back. This will be the essence of Reagan's failure, if he falls. If he hopes to succeed, he must mount a massive offensive, geared not to the old pre-Eisenhower Republican Party's idea of frugal spending, but to the radical ideal of restoring constitutional government in the United States.

In the America of today, the most radical of all political proposals is the proposal to restore American constitutional government. That would mean eliminating hundreds, probably thousands, of federal programs and agencies which are illegal because nothing in the Constitution authorizes their activities.

How and where could Reagan begin? If he had begun in his Inaugural Address, it would have been easier for him; but it is still not too late. He should begin now where he should have begun in January—where the problems are greatest and where success would be the most stimulating to public morale. He should ask Congress to abolish all federal Welfare programs (not including,

at the outset, the O.A.S.I. and Medicare portions of Social Security, for which special taxes were levied upon participants).

The Welfare programs should be abolished primarily because they are illegal, there being no constitutional authority for such federal programs; but, in explaining the proposal, the President should include pragmatic reasons for getting the federal government out of Welfare activities. It is easy to make a case against federal Welfare programs. Nixon did it in 1968, pointing out that \$250 billion spent on federal Welfare since the 1930s had actually harmed the poor. Nixon promised reforms. But, in office, he proposed reforms that would have tripled Welfare rolls. Hubert Humphrey, Nixon's Democrat opponent in 1968, also condemned federal Welfare and promised reforms. His proposed reforms were worse than Nixon's.

It is easy, for instance, to make a case against the Food Stamp program, which began in 1964 as an illegal program to dispose of agricultural surplus, and became, during the first term of Richard Nixon, a monstrously corrupt and corrupting misuse of public money. It seems apparent that millions of dollars' worth of Food Stamps are used as street money to buy booze, illegal drugs, and the services of prostitutes and pervers; that millions of dollars' worth of Food Stamps are counterfeited; that thousands of individuals racketeer in Food Stamps by getting them under a multiplicity of false identities.

CONSTITUTIONAL SOLUTION FOR REAGAN

In asking Congress to abolish the federal Welfare programs, the President should ask for a simultaneous across-the-board income-tax reduction totaling, per annum, the cost of all the federal programs being eliminated. That would leave in the states more money than the federals have been spending in the states on the programs, because it would save what is now being wasted through inefficiency and corruption, and what is now being spent in Washington on federal administration.

The President should explain to the people that if they want their money spent on Food Stamps, or any other kinds of Welfare, they should make arrangements to do it the way they want it done: privately, or through state or local governments—the federal government having no valid authority to make such decisions.

The President should also ask Congress to abolish a host of other types of unconstitutional operations, such as foreign aid, the Peace Corps, E.P.A., O.S.H.A., C.E.T.A., the Legal Services Corporation, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, and farm price supports. As each one of these is abolished, the savings should be passed immediately to taxpayers in an across-the-board income-tax reduction; or should be added to appropriations for national defense; or should be used for reducing the National Debt.

After all of that had been accomplished, the country would be in such fine shape and the people in such confident spirits that it would be possible for the President to take the final step toward restoration of constitutional government, by doing something about the illegal Social Security and Medicare programs. The acceptable way out of the Social Security-Medicare morass is to stop its expansion at once with no one else taken into the system. Then retrench, by removing from the system all participants not close to getting retirement benefits; remove them by paying them back, with interest,

everything that has ever been paid into their Social Security accounts. Persons already retired or about eligible to retire on Social Security should be left as is until they die.

This would virtually end the Social Security operation in about 25 years—and during those 25 years it could be fully funded to keep its promises to participants because of the hundreds of billions of dollars saved by elimination of all other income redistribution activities.

Though it would not be as quick and easy as I have made it sound, Ronald Reagan could save our Republic by reestablishing constitutional government, if he put all of his prestige, influence, power, and talent to work on the job. ●

IN DEFENSE OF THE DEATH PENALTY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, recently Beth Fallon, a very fine reporter for the New York Daily News, wrote a column on the need to restore the death penalty. I wish to place this column in the RECORD for the close consideration of my colleagues.

It is important to note that the writer herself was not an advocate of the death penalty—until she realized that our present criminal justice system was not meting out sufficient penalties for those committing heinous crimes, criminals as she points out, like Mark David Chapman and Sirhan Sirhan.

As a sponsor of legislation to restore the death penalty I find myself in full agreement with Ms. Fallon's comment and believe that we must work for speedy enactment of legislation to restore capital punishment for heinous crimes. The urgency is even greater when one considers the sharp 9.4-percent increase in crime during 1980 as accumulated by the FBI.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the column entitled, "Murder Is Forever—So Should Be Its Punishment":

MURDER IS FOREVER, SO SHOULD BE ITS PUNISHMENT

(By Beth Fallon)

Mark David Chapman read his passage from "The Catcher in the Rye," but I didn't have to listen to it, so I didn't. I watched while the Son of Sam blew the lid off a courtroom for his own amusement, and I am watching with astonishment as Sirhan Sirhan announces his flight plans to Libya, which he says will follow his proposed release by the California parole board in 1984. Some instinct of revulsion kept me from giving Chapman one more body at his moment in the sun, the moment his sick soul killed John Lennon to achieve. So, just this once, I passed.

It probably should get me thrown out of the reporters' union, but I couldn't stomach another courtroom display, another "20 to

life" sentence, another realization that another killer, crazed or sane, may very well walk these streets again in our lifetime. The victim will of course remain in the ground. His is a real death sentence.

This brings us to the death penalty. I have always been against the death penalty for one quite simple reason, and one only: What if you're wrong, and it's the wrong person? That sort of injustice, even in relatively rare cases, is too appalling. Think if it were your life, if you were the one they made the mistake about. And so life imprisonment, real, Birdman-of-Alcatraz life, seems to me a good solution. If you take a life, you give your life on a rock somewhere, not tortured, but caged. Punished. A life for a life.

But today, it appears, there is no real life imprisonment. California speaks of treating Sirhan Sirhan "like any other murderer." If they get out after 17 years with good behavior, he should get out in the same way. New York may do the same with Chapman. I see their logic but would like to attack their premise. Why is any first-degree murderer getting out after 17 years. Is that the permanent trade arrangement? I kill somebody, and give you eight years, or 12 or 17 in exchange?

That is not a good arrangement. John Lennon will still be dead 20 years from now, and may be quite forgotten by everyone but the wife, the grown son, and the little boy now five years old. Some parole board may feel that their loss, and society's loss and outrage, has been sufficiently made recompense by Mark David Chapman. He may have become sane in the meantime, not just legally sane but really sane. He may read even better books than "The Catcher in the Rye." But John Lennon will still be dead.

Bobby Kennedy will still be dead in 1984, and the fate of this nation was changed, perhaps materially, by one bullet to one passionate, contentious brain. And Sirhan Sirhan has flight plans?

The underlying impulse in recent sentencing laws seems to be that the death penalty is too cruel. The Supreme Court attacked it not as too cruel, but as too infrequently and arbitrarily applied in many states, thus a species of the "cruel and unusual punishment" forbidden by the Constitution. Because some states have wished to show mercy to some killers, but not all—and some states have executed a much larger proportion of black killers, for instance, than white killers convicted—the death penalty now is applied quite rarely, never in some states.

But if death is judged too cruel, so is real life imprisonment. Too cruel, people say, to lock up a 21-year-old for 40 or 50 or 60 years. Too cruel. Well, it is cruel, and there is little enough mercy in the world for me to be suggesting that nobody ever get any, but I would like to suggest this.

It is also cruel to pump the body of a man you don't know full of bullets, whether you leave just a family mourning, or a whole nation mourning, or the entire world mourning. It is the ultimate unsocial, impious act—to enlarge yourself by the death of another, whether for money or fame or for safety or for "love." It is a cruelty that lasts forever.

So should be the punishment. If society has not got the means and the guts to imprison people for life in appropriate cases, the death penalty should be restored. There is no possible doubt in Chapman's case, or Sirhan's. A life for a life is not "cruel." It is justice. ●

SOLIDARITY DAY: A RECOMMITMENT TO HUMAN VALUES

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the meaning of Solidarity Day can best be symbolized by saying it is now time to defend the great strides in social progress which Americans have helped to build, and to move forward toward a society which embraces the ideals of fairness and compassion. I wish to submit to my colleagues an excerpt from a statement by AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland for Labor Day 1981, which epitomizes the aspirations of America's workers and why Solidarity Day is so important.

LABOR'S "CENTURY OF STRUGGLE" YIELDED GAINS FOR ALL SOCIETY

"We want more of the opportunities to cultivate our better natures."

This was part of Samuel Gompers answer to the question, "what does labor want?"

That was in 1893, twelve years after the founding of the national labor center that became the AFL-CIO, whose 100th anniversary we celebrate this year.

"More of the opportunities to cultivate our better natures." This is still what labor wants on Labor Day 1981.

Looking back on our century of struggle and sacrifice, we take pride in the gains American workers have made through their unions. Those gains have not been restricted to a narrow interest group in our society. In fact, all Americans have benefitted from the higher wages, expanded consumer purchasing power, and improved working conditions that unions have fought for.

Our entire society is better off because of labor's victories in the struggle for free public education, social security, unemployment insurance, civil rights laws, voting rights, and many other milestones in our progress toward a more humane and just society.

Some people don't agree and never have. They think our better natures are best cultivated in the economic jungle. They believe in the survival of the fittest. Unfortunately, people who share that view have captured the White House and have cowed a compliant Congress.

They are suspicious of government programs to feed the hungry, educate the young, secure dignity for the elderly, care for the sick, safeguard the rights of minorities, protect consumers, and defend the environment from plunder.

Their philosophy has been summed up by their budget director, David Stockman: "No one is entitled to anything from the government."

This breathtaking statement is remarkable for its candor. It joins the issue—the fundamental issue confronting the American people. What is the purpose of government? What is the relationship between the government and the people?

The Administration projects a picture of government as an alien force sitting on the backs of the people, holding them down, repressing their productive energies.

At the AFL-CIO, we believe government is, in Abe Lincoln's words, "by, for, and of the people." In a democracy the people have

the right to shape their government into an instrument that meets their needs.

Now we are told by the Administration that the people's government is the people's enemy.

We are also told the way to get the government off the backs of the people is to slash the people's programs and give a high tax cut to big corporations and wealthy individuals.

We are told that our government will become more responsive to the people's needs by transferring the people's resources to the rich and powerful. They, in turn, will invest these resources wisely, without government interference, and thereby create new jobs, improve productivity, and ultimately return more tax dollars to the federal treasury.

Presumably, these wealthy and wise men bear no responsibility for our nation's economic problems, and therefore can be trusted to make the right economic decisions for the rest of us—if only we leave them alone and allow the free market to work its magic.

This doctrine has a new name—"supply-side economics." We have always known it by another name—the "trickle-down theory." But while the theory is not really new, this is the first time we have been asked to gamble so much on it. We are asked to risk our jobs, our mortgages, our children's education, our social security, and even our national defense.

This is not a gamble the AFL-CIO is prepared to take. We have too great a stake in the American way of life—which we have helped to build—to put it in jeopardy.

We intend to make ourselves heard. On Sept. 19—which we call Solidarity Day—tens of thousands of trade unionists and our allies will go to Washington to express our deep concern over the direction in which our nation is headed.

We will protest the Administration's efforts to dismantle the social programs that reflect humane and compassionate government. We will exercise our constitutional right of petition to assert our demands for jobs and justice. We will march in the spirit of the great abolitionist Frederick Douglass, who said:

"If there is no struggle, there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom, and yet deprecate agitation, are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waves."

This Labor Day 1981 is a time for all Americans to reflect on the contributions of working people to the nation's progress. It is also a time to reflect on the stake all of us have in preserving that progress.

Despite the grave challenges we face, we are not discouraged. Looking back on our first one hundred years of achievement, we realize that we have faced harder problems than we face today. We have faced worse odds. But we have survived, and we have overcome.

Today, we have a challenge not only to the nation's achievement since the New Deal, but to the trade union movement itself. We intend to meet that challenge, confident that, in their fundamental decency, the American people will not consent to the destruction of one of their fundamental institutions. ●

CONGRESSIONAL VIGIL FOR
SOVIET JEWRY—FINKELSTEIN
FAMILY

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to take part in the congressional vigil for Soviet Jewry. I commend Congressman BARNES for his leadership role in this vigil, and I welcome the involvement of many of our colleagues in this worthy effort.

I am deeply troubled, in fact angered, by increasing reports that the Jewish cultural movement, and those who seek freer emigration from the Soviet Union are being harassed, arbitrarily imprisoned, and their community forcefully disbanded. I take this opportunity to inform the House of the unjust treatment of the Finkelstein family of Vilnius by Soviet authorities and their agents. Eitan Finkelstein first applied for emigration status for his family in 1971. Since then, Eitan, his wife Alexandra, and their young daughter Miriam, have suffered greatly due to that simple, legal request for exit visas.

Following Eitan's application in 1971, he has encountered tremendous difficulty in gaining employment. Due to the need to provide for his family, he has no alternative but to accept menial, low-paying jobs. Accounts reaching the United States relate that the Finkelstein family faces daily financial hardship. To add to such woes, KGB agents have searched the family's apartment on numerous occasions hoping to suppress the activities of the Jewish Cultural Symposium to which Eitan contributes. For the record, I would like to quote a recent letter from Eitan Finkelstein to a relative in New York.

As a first hand observer of the life of Soviet Jewry for the last 15 years and as a direct participant of many important events in this life, I declare that a cultural genocide of the Jews is being conducted in the Soviet Union.

The severe crackdown on dissident and refusnik activities in recent years lends credence to Eitan Finkelstein's tragic assessment.

Now, more than ever, we in Congress must commit ourselves to defending the right of these brave people to emigrate from tyranny. We must commit ourselves and our Government to protesting, whenever necessary, the Soviets' violation of the most basic human rights. Truly, such action is fully consistent with the best traditions of our Nation. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IT IS TIME TO PUT THE PAY
CAP ISSUE ON THE FRONT
BURNER

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the pay cap issue has now reached crisis proportions. The ability of government to function smoothly and effectively is being seriously threatened.

The retirement rate for Federal executives in the 55- to 59-year-old age group was 15.5 percent in March 1978, 28.9 percent in March 1979, 74.6 percent in March 1980, and 94.7 percent in August 1980. I can imagine what the percentage will be next month when we have top managers making no more than the GS-14 subordinate.

According to statistical information documented by the General Accounting Office, the cost of paying a salary pension to a senior executive who retires early, plus the salary of a replacement for the executive amounts to \$67,573 per retiree in actual dollar losses for the Government within a 3-year period. Raising executive salaries would actually be cost effective.

Several enlightened editorials have addressed this subject in recent date, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1981]

FAIRNESS AND FEDERAL PAY

Congress, in its July budget reconciliation battle, slapped a 4.8 percent ceiling on pay raises for 1.4 million Federal white-collar workers. President Reagan, who issued his recommendation at that level this week, could have suggested a lower figure, or no raises at all. In that sense the recommendation illuminated a larger point: Federal pay schedules have become awesomely confused, complicated and unfair, to the detriment of the nation as well as Government employees.

For example, in 1969 Congress approved the idea of "comparability"—wages and benefits for Federal jobs should match those for similar private jobs. One aim was to establish a survey of wages and benefits in 91 private jobs as a basis for setting pay, thus diminishing the influence of politics.

But Federal pay has not come up to the survey levels for a few years. This year's survey indicated that white-collar employees need an average 15.1 percent raise—far in excess of the President's 4.8 percent recommendation, even taking into consideration that Federal workers get about 4 percent more in fringe benefits and somewhat more job security than private workers.

A ceiling on top salaries in the highest executive category, GS-18, creates another kind of unfairness. In addition to squeezing those executives financially, it compresses the whole pay scale. As a result, with the proposed schedule, there will be about 45,000 Federal employees in grade levels 14, 15, 16 and 17 whose pay will be at the maximum amount allowed, around \$51,000. Thus a manager may be making no more than subordinates two or three ranks below him.

Consider the effect that would have in a police department, or an electronics company.

Congress could act to raise pay levels and make the system fairer, but doing so would require a Congressional pay raise. Senior executive pay is linked to that of Congress. And for the moment a Congressional pay raise is a back-burner item, since members of Congress fear any such move would generate a storm of public protest.

Yet the twin problems of too little pay and too much compression deserve attention. Government workers face the same food prices, interest rates and college costs as everyone else, and they are losing ground. The best of them, when treated unfairly, do what anyone else would do: they quit.

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1981]

THAW-TIME FOR TOP FEDERAL PAY

Most Federal white-collar workers were less than giddy a few weeks ago when President Reagan proposed an annual pay raise for them of 4.8 percent. But the news this week that he would like the same raise for senior government executives must be music to the frozen little ears of these employees, who have not seen an extra penny—not one—in four years. After all this time, they deserve a break today.

True, their current salaries may not be the stuff of which poverty is made. But when you freeze everyone's pay at the top for four years, the crowd bumping against the ceiling gets thicker, incentives get thinner and valuable experience and talents vanish into retirement, which at prevailing pension rates can prove more lucrative than staying on the job.

That's hardly the formula for top-flight management in government, which is why Congress should support the administration's recommendation to end the freeze and to offer the same modest rate of increase proposed for all other federal white-collar workers. It is not a matter of "comparability" with whatever a worker's supposed counterpart in private business may be earning, but with whatever others down through the federal ranks may be getting.

Still better, of course, would be a federal pay structure that took into consideration 1) regional differences in costs of living and pay scales and 2)—would you believe?—the value of the work performed by each employee. That may be too much to ask, but then, who is footing the bill, and how much is too much to pay?

PAY CEILING CREATES BRAIN DRAIN AT THE
TOP

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE
(By Douglas B. Feaver)

Top federal personnel officials are becoming increasingly concerned that the ceiling on federal pay is causing too many top career employees to retire and creating serious morale problems for those who stay.

"I'm not sure that the attrition rate is higher than it should be," said George Nesterzuck. "I'm more concerned with the loss of quality. We're losing a lot of corporate memory." Nesterzuck, a Reagan appointee, is the new chief of the Office of Personnel Management's Executive Personnel and Management Group.

At the end of August, 1980, the most recent 12-month period for which OPM has developed statistics, 95 percent of eligible federal employees receiving the maximum

federal salary had retired whether they were GS15s or in the Senior Executive Service. In January, 1979, only 28 percent of people in the same category had retired.

The Senior Executive Service, created by the Carter administration to give status and bonuses to the top federal jobholders, has 6,500 positions. There were 930 retirements from SES from July, 1979, to March, 1981.

Nesterczuk said that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense, have been particularly hard hit by the recent retirements of specialists who have found better paying jobs in the private sector.

Pay for federal employes has been frozen at \$50,112.50 since Oct. 1, 1979 and before that was capped at \$47,500 on Feb. 20, 1977. President Reagan promised a salary increase during the campaign, but the answer to the question of when now seems tied to undefined improvement in the economy.

Another factor in the retirements, according to several federal officials, is that pensions for federal employes are being regularly boosted with cost-of-living increases. Pensions are based on the top salary earned, and if that salary is static there is no reason to delay retirement.

When the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 set up the SES, up to half its members were supposed to be eligible for annual bonuses for good work. Congress intervened after one year and cut the limit to 25 percent. Then OPM got into the act and cut it to 20 percent and added the requirement that bonuses be distributed throughout all parts of the agencies. The amount of the bonus was supposed to be limited to 20 percent of salary, but has averaged out to about 11 percent.

Senior civil servants throughout the government complain about "the cap" during interviews on any subject. "The feeling of unfairness grows and it's very corrosive," a top aide in the Office of Management and Budget said.

"What makes me angry," said a top official at Treasury, "is that the guy I'm working for and six people working for me are all getting the same salary. Private industry would never tolerate a salary schedule like that."

The pay ceiling for federal employes is tied to the pay ceiling for congressmen and, as Nesterczuk pointed out, it doesn't sell too well in Broken Bow, Okla., when some one making \$50,000 a year is voted a taxpayer-financed raise.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AGED 55-59 RETIRING

12-month average ending	January 1979 (percent)	January 1980 (percent)	August 1980 (percent)
Employes at pay ceiling.....	28	52	95
Employes not at pay ceiling.....	28	35	49

Source: Office of Personnel Management.

"There are some GS15s or SESers in the field who may be the highest paid people in the community," said Nesterczuk. "They become an issue just because of that, and members of Congress have to be sensitive to that."

At the same time, SES members are learning that the outside world sometimes values them more highly than the taxpayers.

C. William Fischer served at OMB, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Energy Department before concluding his federal career as an assistant secretary in the Education Department.

He had the right to remain in the SES, although he conceded in a telephone interview that "because of my close identification with the Carter administration it was unrealistic to expect I would get an assignment of equal responsibility." But, he said, "if greater rewards financially were there I probably would have stayed."

Instead, he took one of many offers he was made: a job as vice president for budget and finance at the University of Colorado that pays "about \$60,000." He gets to teach, which he said he enjoys, and has good fringe benefits and he's only 49.

Nesterczuk said that OPM has done some polling of senior employes and has learned that almost 80 percent of them regard their jobs as "satisfying," but that about the same percentage are contemplating retirement.

That, he said, "is an indication of a severe morale problem."●

INSTITUTIONAL INVESTORS SUBJECT OF CONCERN

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, many of us watched with interest and concern this past summer as various corporate giants battled for control of Conoco, the Nation's ninth largest oil company. On July 21, I wrote a letter to the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, David Clanton, expressing my concern over the degree to which certain institutional investors now dominate the ownership of many of our leading energy companies.

Citing the bidding war between Mobil and Du Pont for control of Conoco as a case in point, I noted that 36 institutional investors showed up in the lists of top shareholders at two or more of the three companies involved. In fact, I noted that 20 investors, mostly financial institutions, were listed among the top shareholders of all three companies.

The complete text of my letter to Mr. Clanton appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 23, 1981.

Now it appears I was not the only one concerned about the central role played by institutional investors in the Conoco takeover. According to an article in the September 1981 issue of Dun's Business Month magazine, the chairman of the board of Conoco, Ralph E. Bailey, also is troubled by the impact of large institutional investors.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the complete text of the article from Dun's.

CONOCO: THE BITTER AND THE SWEET

Chairman Ralph E. Bailey of hotly pursued Conoco, Inc. feels "privileged and excited about participating in the creation of a unique and extraordinary company"—the merging of his firm into du Pont, victor over Seagram Co. and Mobil Corp. in a titanic tender war.

Nevertheless, Bailey blasted current takeover laws, which permit institutional shares to be tendered "whenever the opportunity for a few dollars profit arises." He warned that Washington's "relaxed attitude" toward mergers can only lead to more Conocolike tender offers, with "speculative interests playing on margin."

Noting that 70 percent of Conoco's stock was held by institutions, half of it in the hands of the top twenty institutional buyers, Bailey asserted: "We have more than 70,000 shareholders, but not more than thirty people determined our fate." Under the present system, "the first 51 percent of the stockholders get favorably treated, and the rest get left holding the bag," he complained. Moreover, "majority control can be acquired at a price that doesn't recognize the intrinsic value of the company."

Indeed, paying \$7.5 billion for 55% of the nation's ninth-largest oil company and second-largest producer of coal, du Pont had itself quite a buy. For \$98 a share, about twice what Conoco stock was selling at when Seagram started the frenetic bidding last June, du Pont corralled Conoco's considerable petroleum, natural gas and coal assets, which analysts valued at \$120-to-\$150 a share. Now those coveted assets will be melded into du Pont to create a \$31-billion oil, coal and chemical colossus and become the country's seventh-largest company, just behind Ford Motor Co.

For du Pont, which has had to pay high prices for the petroleum that goes into 80% of its products, Conoco brings an in-house supply around 420 million barrels of domestic oil reserves. Conoco also has a stake in the North Sea, proven reserves of 5.7 trillion cubic feet of natural gas worldwide and 14.3 billion tons of coal.

Wall Street speculated that du Pont might deal Conoco's coal operations to Seagram in return for the distiller's 20% of du Pont stock, which nearly rivals that of the du Pont family. But Conoco's Bailey called the notion "utter nonsense." At a post-mortem press conference, there was one question for which Bailey had no appropriate answer: "How does it feel to be an \$18-billion [revenues] subsidiary of a \$13-billion company?"●

LET THEM EAT EGGS, BUTTER, AND CHEESE

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I commented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about this administration's attempt to rewrite the lunch program. Today I cite another problem. In June, 20 of our colleagues signed a letter to Secretary of Agriculture John Block urging him to expedite the implementation of the food bank demonstration projects. These projects, which were signed into law last December, are an integral part of the Agriculture Act of 1980.

I was very disappointed to learn that Secretary Block did not choose to maximize the potential of these projects. The law allows for up to seven

food banks to be selected for the demonstration projects. Yet, in spite of mounting surpluses and costly storage, Secretary Block has elected to choose only two or three food banks to participate.

In other countries of the world, people starve to death while animals roam the streets. But this is due in part to religious beliefs. In this country it seems that the Federal Government is willing to buy butter, cheese, and milk at artificially high prices, pay millions upon millions to store it, and then sell it at a discount to foreign countries or allow it to diminish in quality until it is no longer fit for human consumption. Meanwhile, the poor and elderly people of this country are malnourished and, in some cases, literally starving to death.

This situation cannot be blamed on religious beliefs: The only obvious reason here is stupidity. There is no excuse for one senior citizen in this country to go to bed hungry at night. There is no excuse for one child to go to school hungry, unable to learn. We must do everything possible to distribute these surplus commodities to the poor and the needy. Food banks can help. These organizations distribute food to a wide variety of people from runaways and orphans to halfway houses and shelters for the indigent.

The "let them eat cake" attitude that seems to be prevailing in this administration cannot continue. In the case of food bank demonstration projects, let them eat eggs, butter, and cheese.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer recently published the following editorial and I commend it to my colleagues.

SOME GO HUNGRY

Surplus dairy products are piling up in government warehouses. Some spoils. The Department of Agriculture commonly sells some to foreign countries for whatever it can get—half what it paid farmers for the surplus, or less. But can the hungry in American cities and towns stand in the government-subsidized food line? Not yet.

Budget cutbacks or no, the government has obligated itself to purchase many different types of farm surpluses, keeping market prices high so farmers aren't forced to sell their produce at a loss. Price supports are of arguable benefit to the country as a whole, but one easily observable result is that the government winds up owning millions of tons of butter, cheese and other farm products.

Butter, for instance, is selling for a little more than \$1 a pound wholesale in the world market. The government paid American farmers \$1.50 a pound for 220 million pounds; it froze and stored the butter for two years, then it sold the butter to New Zealand last month for 70 cents a pound. Uncle Sam was out of pocket \$160 million for the butter and \$8 million in storage costs.

The Agriculture Department has no figures on the amount of food spoilage in its warehouses; "spoiled" is not in its vocabulary. When a stored commodity gets old—it may or may not be chemically "spoiled"—

the department "downgrades" it and sells it for animal fodder or, in some instances, just throws it out.

There must be a way to get this food to the needy before it is wasted. Various charities would undoubtedly be happy to distribute it, assuming it weren't festooned with layers of government red tape, and that it came in manageable sizes. One local food distribution charity noted it came by a 60-pound block of surplus butter not too many years ago in a roundabout way, and had innumerable problems just cutting it down to usable size. The Agriculture Department does handle small sizes; it's more a matter of matching the need to the commodity.

Representative Donald J. Pease, D-13, of Oberlin, has pursued the problem of gross waste of both food and money for months now. He reports that, after substantial prodding, the department has begun stirring itself to life on the federal food bank program, which in theory could begin to move some of the surplus commodities into the stomachs of America's poor. Pease should continue the pressure—his cause is a good one.

As the federal budget is cut, as welfare benefits shrink and living costs expand, as women, children and senior citizens fall off the aid wagon and through the holes in President Reagan's safety net, it becomes increasingly important for the government to use those resources it has to help those who need it most. The impractical, wasteful ways of the past must be stopped. The Reagan administration must burn away the red tape and get this food to where it will do the most good—to those who need it to survive. ●

HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, this is day 240 of the Reagan administration and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs remains vacant. Two months ago, Mr. Stoessel, the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, appeared before the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations.

At that time, I listed the numerous instances where the Reagan administration had circumvented the intent and the spirit of congressionally mandated human rights laws. Since then, the masquerade has continued. For example:

The Reagan administration with great fanfare declared that quiet diplomacy will be the hallmark of its human rights policies. Yet we have had the spectacle of the Vice President of the United States telling Marcos of the Philippines that: "We love your adherence to democratic principles and to the democratic process." This is a statement that appalls anyone with any knowledge of the Philippines. We have the further spectacle of the Ambassador to the United Nations traveling to Latin America,

visiting countries that are among the worst violators of human rights in the world and leaving the clear impression that the Reagan administration is more interested in winning the favors of these repressive regimes than in condemning their brutal violations of human rights.

On the question of southern Africa, by voice and vote, the Reagan administration has made it abundantly clear on whose side it is when it comes to the odious policies of the South African Government.

Claiming there have been "improvements" in human rights conditions, the Reagan administration is seeking to sell weapons to Uruguay—a country that has been universally condemned as one of the worst violators of human rights in Latin America.

Again, I urge the administration to follow the letter, intent, and spirit of the human rights laws and not take every opportunity to circumvent those laws. ●

LABOR'S AGENDA UNDER ATTACK

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, workingmen and workingwomen from throughout Connecticut will join their brothers and sisters in the American labor movement in an historic march on Washington this Saturday. I welcome them to the Nation's Capital, and I stand with them in their efforts to redress the costly, hurtful, and inequitable antiworker attitudes and policies of the Reagan administration.

I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by labor's renewed determination to engage our Nation's workers in the tough fights sure to come over this Government's social and economic policies. I know what is at stake; I read the signals from the Labor Department and the other policy centers of this administration, and I know that only a united, informed, and assertive labor movement will be able to achieve success in its inevitable confrontations with a White House unabashedly committed to breaking the hard-won co-equal status of unions, to withdrawing Government's assistance for the members of society squeezed by high inflation and spreading joblessness, to weakening protections against unsafe working conditions.

There is much justification for the "solidarity" that will be on display here Saturday, and much promise. In three areas, in particular, Mr. Speaker, I pledge to our visitors and to all workingmen and workingwomen a continued battle against the antilabor policies of this insensitive administration:

(a) Tax and budget proposals pressed by the President have been largely unsympathetic to middle-income workers, burdensome to the working poor, and slanted to give unfair benefit to the wealthy. Budget cuts in student loan and grant programs, the Economic Development Administration, energy assistance, health, housing, and mass transportation support will weaken the working family's ability to cope with continued high inflation. Tax cuts that target their greatest benefits to those in the \$50,000-plus income brackets and virtually ignore the average wage earner will only deepen the economic divisions in our country. And a locked-in tax-cutting program that, combined with a massive military spending buildup over the next 4 years, will guarantee substantial budget deficits for the foreseeable future means continued uncertainty on Wall Street, continued upward pressure on interest rates, and a continued squeeze on workers.

(b) Social security was a victory for labor in the years after the Great Depression, and that victory is now under challenge by administration proposals that would strip away roughly one-fourth of the system's earned benefits—far in excess of adjustments needed to insure its long-term solvency. Administration efforts to eliminate the system's \$122 "minimum benefit" will, if not stopped by Congress, cut deeply into the monthly payments to at least 2 million retired workers; Reagan plans to abruptly lop 40 percent off the early retirement pension would affect millions more men and women now in their early sixties and late fifties. For the majority of workers who rely on social security for the greatest share of their retirement income, the administration's proposals were unnecessarily severe—and plainly insensitive.

(c) Warning signs of the widening rift between Government and workers have appeared in Reagan administration plans to rewrite—or simply decline to enforce—regulations affecting the health and safety of workers in a variety of occupations. And these signals of unconcern could not come at a worse time; just as efforts have intensified to weaken the Occupational Safety and Health Act, new information has recently been published about the millions of workers exposed to hazardous industrial chemicals over the years, and more and more medical evidence has been gathered linking a variety of illnesses to poor working conditions. One study alone by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health and a research unit of the AFL-CIO has just told of the exposure of 1,100 workers in Augusta, Ga., 9 years ago to known cancer-causing agents—an exposure the workers

themselves are only now being told about.

There is good sense in some efforts to modify workplace regulations—particularly in areas where commonsense could more efficiently replace burdensome paperwork and retain strong guarantees of public safety and health. But occupational safety rules have saved countless lives of coal miners and assembly line workers over the years; any attempt to streamline those rules must be carried out with care and deliberation, and with certainty that public and worker health will not be compromised.

I will be watching the unfolding of this administration's labor record, Mr. Speaker. I hope that this Saturday's march and the growing awareness of the attitudes this President and his advisers have displayed in recent months will elicit a new understanding in Washington of the problems—and dreams—of our Nation's workers. I share those dreams, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue to fight for their realization in the resolutions of this House and the laws of this great Nation. ●

THE ROLE OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL—PART I

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, here in Washington, Count Hans Huyn of the West German Bundestag delivered an address which sheds valuable light upon the function of the Socialist International in European and world affairs. Count Huyn has a clear understanding based upon his extensive knowledge of key individuals and key events. What he has to say is of particular importance in the wake of recent demonstrations of the strength of the leftist threat in West Germany.

THE ROLE OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL—PART I

A few words first on the origins and organization of the Socialist International—the third Socialist International was formed in Frankfurt on July 3, 1951, following on from its two predecessors, as a loose association of socialist and social democratic parties.

According to the statute of 1976, the Socialist International is supposed to strengthen the ties between the member parties and coordinate political ideas and actions. The International includes parties from 47 countries with about 50 million members. The Congress, which is the highest organ of the SI, meets every two years. The SI Bureau meets every two months and calls a party leader conference at least once a year. The current president is Willy Brandt.

To many people, particularly in America, Willy Brandt is mainly known as a symbol of free Berlin. Others remember him as the German Chancellor who initiated the agreements with East Germany and he is cur-

rently heard of mainly as the chairman of the German Social Democratic Party, the SPD.

However, the SPD is not Willy Brandt's political home ground. Anyone who knows his history and has followed his political development can say with some certainty that if Willy Brandt were faced with the question of choosing between democratic solidarity and socialist solidarity, he would in all probability decide in favour of the socialists. Willy Brandt led the SPD to the left. His election as president of the Socialist International gave him a new, easily controllable instrument, which can be applied in a variety of ways to efface the boundaries between the social democrats and the communists.

The Karlsbad conference of the European communist parties in April 1967 gave precise instructions to its members on how to infiltrate the socialist and social democratic parties and use cooperation to gain their compliance. The priority objective is to split the Atlantic alliance and to separate Europe from the United States.

The final communiqué from the Karlsbad communist conference, however, is of particular importance for other reasons. The communist parties were enlisted for a new type of popular front politics. This concerns popular front cooperation between communists and socialists of all shades of opinion in Europe but not only in the classical form of a popular front—a communist/socialist government alliance in one country. It really involves cooperation extending beyond frontiers between socialist and communist parties for the attainment of precisely defined objectives. The final communiqué states: "The Karlsbad conference, in full awareness of its great responsibility, appeals to the working class, to the socialist and social democratic parties, to the trade unions, to the believers of all persuasions, to the intellectuals, to the younger generation and all peace loving forces. It appeals to them to unite and develop widespread campaigns and mass activities in every country and at the continental level for collective security in Europe. . . . New and positive tendencies are appearing in the socialist and social democratic movements, which in some countries of Western Europe are openly in favour of international détente and cooperation with the communists. . . . We turn to the socialist and social democratic parties, which have a great influence in the European labour movement and have government responsibilities in a large number of European states. The experience of decades has shown that joint action between communists and socialists gives the working class a decisive influence on political life and gathers around it those of the community who are interested in maintaining peace and in political and social change."

As far as the communists are concerned, the main object of popular front politics is to use alliances with other and related political groups to overcome their own isolation. Their object is to come to power with the help of other socialists. As far back as the 16th February 1957, one of the leading SED officials, Hermann Matern, member of the East Berlin Politburo declared: "The efforts to obtain unity of action serve the main problem, the struggle for power. Unity of action only for unity's sake has no particular importance."

The communist popular front strategy is derived from the Bolshevik demand for a united front, the unity of action of the working class, which was first comprehensively defined in the so-called United Front

Thesis of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the 18th December 1921. Only a few months later, a conference took place in Berlin in which socialists from Western countries and communists took part. The Belgian socialist Vandervelde declared: "They appeal for the unity of all, they propose effecting a united front but they do not disguise their background intention of embracing us first in order to suffocate or poison us later."

The socialists and communists in France made an alliance in July 1934. A few months later, the French communist party chairman, Maurice Thorez demanded the extension of unity of action from the working class into the bourgeois camp under the concept "popular front". Thorez made no secret of the fact that he understood this as meaning complete subjection to the political objectives of the Soviet Union. In the summer of 1935, at the seventh Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, he declared: "Our views are only shared by a minority of the working class at the moment. However, this minority can and must control the majority of the antifascist people and bring them step by step through their own experience to the point where they recognize that it is necessary to found a Soviet Republic."

At this seventh World Congress of the Communist International, the newly elected General Secretary of the Comintern, Georgi Dimitrov, expressly recognized popular front politics and referred to it as the tactic of the "Trojan horse".

The popular front in Spain was formed on the French model and to meet the requirements of the Communist International. One year later, in 1936, the call for a German popular front was signed in Paris by Wilhelm Pieck, Walter Ulbricht, Herbert Wehner and Willy Brandt.

[It should be noted that, in the period following World War II, Pieck and Ulbricht became Soviet puppet rulers of East Germany, while their companions rose to positions of leadership in West Germany.]

Moscow continued its communist popular front strategy even after 1945. The objective is always the same and can be read even today in the official lectures on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, published by a group of authors under Professor Afanasyev, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet: "Part of the tactics of the communist party is to deceive the social democratic forces in the labour movement and other bourgeois elements, to tack with the wind and operate tactics which by these means lead to the victory of communism."

In this way, Moscow ensures its dominance in Eastern Europe. The socialists and social democrats always hold the ladder for the communists. In the Soviet occupied zone of Germany, the Social Democratic and Communist Parties united on the 22nd April 1946 to form the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED). In Hungary, the socialists fused with the communists in August 1948 to form the United Hungarian Workers Party. In Czechoslovakia, the social democrats joined with the Communist Party on the 17th April 1949. In Poland, the United Polish Workers Party was formed at the beginning of 1947 from the two socialist parties. All other parties were forbidden, absorbed or remained only as a facade. The communist strategy for taking power was also fixed for the free states of Europe. The Karlsbad Conference of the European Communist Parties in April 1967 showed the way

to a new form of popular front cooperation extending beyond frontiers.

On the 24th April 1978 in Helsinki, the chief coordinator of the Western policies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Boris Ponomarev, addressed the Socialist International and in his speech told the "comrades" quite bluntly what he wanted from them: "Our party has supported and continues to support cooperation with social democrats, particularly in questions of peace and détente. . . . The struggle against militarism is one of the most characteristic traditions of the International Labour Movement. Communists and social democrats now have sufficient influence to permit them to do a great deal towards preserving peace".

During the visit by a delegation of the Socialist International to Moscow in the Autumn of 1979, the Finnish ex-Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa clarified the position of the Western socialists relative to "comrade" Brezhnev with these words: "We know your devotion to the politics of peace." They agreed with Moscow's proposal to undertake all the steps necessary to support the "détente process" and to increase their activities in the struggle for disarmament. One of the Soviet demands was that vital NATO re-equipment with American Long Range Tactical Nuclear Force missiles should be rejected.●

REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS EARMARKED FOR CYPRUS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues correspondence I have had with the Department of State regarding the proposed reprogramming of economic support fund (ESF) moneys earmarked for Cyprus to help fund the creation of the Sinai Multinational Force and Observers (MFO).

This would have been the second reprogramming of funds from the Cyprus account and would have delayed the development of a scholarship program for Cypriot students. In recent years, Cypriot students have had numerous scholarship opportunities in Eastern bloc countries but fewer, and far more expensive, opportunities in Western countries. The scholarship program is to supplement important ongoing humanitarian programs we support on Cyprus. It now appears, however, that the administration will be able to fund the MFO without reprogramming funds from Cyprus.

The correspondence follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1981.

HON. ALEXANDER M. HAIG, Jr.,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am concerned about the recent notification to the Congress of your intention to reprogram \$1.5 million from the funds earmarked for Cyprus to help fund the creation of a multi-

national peacekeeping force for the Sinai. This would be the second reprogramming from the funds earmarked for Cyprus in fiscal year 1981. Earlier, you advised the Congress of a reprogramming of \$1 million from Cyprus for use in Liberia.

Because of these reprogrammings, an important scholarship program for Cypriots, which both the Executive branch and the Congress supported for funding this year, apparently could not be undertaken. The scholarship program in this case could not begin until sometime in fiscal year 1982, provided funds are available then.

The proposed reprogramming of funds raises some questions which I would like answered:

(1) Given the fact that the Economic Support Fund money for Cyprus over the last several years has been earmarked in legislation, why were these earmarked funds used for reprogramming when other, unearmarked fiscal year 1981 funds were available which could not be used for their originally intended uses in fiscal year 1981?

(2) Why was it not possible to reprogram to the Sinai account some of the Fiscal Year 1981 money that was part of the \$28 million which you announced earlier this month would be returned to the Treasury?

(3) What positive impact do you see this action having at a time when Special Ambassador Bartholomew and other officials are seeking to promote serious Cyprus negotiations?

(4) Why is it in the national interest to delay the funding of a scholarship program for Cypriot students at a time when the Soviet Union and its allies are determined to have as many Cypriots as possible receive free education in East Bloc countries?

I fully realize the need for some flexibility in meeting unforeseen circumstances which arise after programs are authorized for a given fiscal year and the need for authority to reprogram from all programs, including earmarked programs. But I believe all available unmarked funds should be considered for reprogramming before tapping, for the second time, a program in the sensitive Eastern Mediterranean region.

I appreciate your consideration of this matter and look forward to hearing from you.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 2, 1981.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Secretary has asked that I respond to your letter of August 12 expressing concern over our intention to reprogram \$1.5 million from funds earmarked for Cyprus to help fund the creation of the Sinai Multinational Force and Observers (MFO).

When we proposed the second reprogramming from Cyprus in July we did so only because there appeared to be no alternative. We were confronted with the need to provide funding during fiscal year 1981 to assure the timely establishment of the MFO, and Economic Support Funds (ESF) were the only feasible source under the Foreign Assistance Act. The amount of unobligated funds available this late in the fiscal year is extremely limited.

In reviewing the potentially available funds it appeared there was some question whether arrangements with the Government of Cyprus for the planned scholarship program could be completed in time to obli-

gate the remaining \$1.5 million by the end of the fiscal year. The bulk of the funds for Cyprus, which were designated for the housing program, had already been obligated. It was decided that this \$1.5 million, along with other unobligated funds designated for other programs, should be transferred to the Peacekeeping Operations account and made available for the MFO.

Since that decision the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee has requested that no funds be made available for the MFO until hearings are held in September. Taking into account your strong interest in this matter, we have taken advantage of the time now available to review once again the status of ESF programs worldwide to see if there are changed circumstances in other countries which could obviate the need to transfer Cyprus funds. It now appears that we will be able to fund the MFO without reprogramming from Cyprus. The relevant committees will be advised of the final reprogramming actions through normal channels.

As you note, there is a need for some flexibility in meeting unforeseen circumstances. Moreover, I fully concur that all unmarked funds need to be considered before tapping Cyprus a second time. This was, and is, being done. More generally this issue well illustrates the problems created by reprogramming. There is seldom a way that emergency needs such as the MFO can be met without incurring problems in other country programs. This is one reason we have requested a special requirements fund under the Economic Support Funds account to provide for such situations. We hope we can count on your support for this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD FAIRBANKS,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.●

LUCILLE BANKS ROBINSON
MILLER

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in this Chamber today to call to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievements and contribution to the Nation's Capital rendered by my constituent, Lucille Banks Robinson Miller.

The achievements of Madam Miller, as she is affectionately known, are worthy of recognition by this body and, indeed, the people of this Nation, as they have been premised on the commandment of our Lord to love thy neighbor as thyself—this Madam Miller has done all her life.

She began her career in the field of gospel music 29 years ago, and became the second female disc jockey in the District of Columbia. Her love of life and neighbor is exhibited through her song—exhibited to such a degree that she has moved hundreds of people to join with her in an effort to assist those in need in our city. The result has been the formation of the Love Club which is administered through

WYCB radio where Madam Miller is director of public relations. The only requirement for membership in the club is that you wish to devote time in helping your neighbor. The Love Club under the direction of Lucille Banks Robinson Miller has provided food for the hungry, encouragement for our youth, and an uplifting of spirit for those in the throes of depression and hopelessness.

On Saturday, September 19, Madam Miller will be officially honored by the District's Shaw Community Food Project Committee at a prayer breakfast to be held at the District of Columbia Stadium-Armory Complex. As she has so many times in the past—the count is now over 200 such occasions, including receiving the key to our city—she will receive recognition for her efforts on behalf of our community.

Let me conclude by saying how proud I am to be able to share Madam Miller's work of love with this body; and let me also express my own deep gratitude, and that of all residents of the District of Columbia, for her selfless devotion of time and talent on behalf of the betterment of the lives of those in need in our community.

So that you and the people of this great country may know fully of Mrs. Miller's untiring ministry of love, I am furnishing for inclusion in the RECORD a newspaper article from the "District Weekly" section of today's Washington Post for review.

The article follows:

POPULAR GOSPEL BROADCASTER IS STILL
SPREADING HER LOVE
(By Leah Y. Latimer)

For Madame Lucille Banks Robinson Miller, inspiration comes in the middle of the night. "God gives me all of my thoughts at night," declared Miller, the popular hostess on Washington's "inspirational" AM music station WYCB.

And so it happened that the 70-year-old Miller decided to battle drugs and crime around 7th and T Streets NW, having driven past the drug-riddled corner earlier in the day. Miller and 175 listeners marched through the Northwest drug corridor in July, singing and praying for the sinners' salvation. That was several weeks before District police began their latest crackdown on drug trafficking.

Another night, after she heard that a local girls' home needed graduation outfits for five of its students, Miller recalled, "something told me to bring those girls down to the station."

The next day she told listeners: "I'm not begging cause I've got God to help me. But I know there are enough Love Club members to get five dresses, five pairs of stockings and five pairs of shoes." Enough donations were made to buy each girl three outfits.

And it was Saturday night 18 months ago, Miller said, when she awakened with her most fruitful idea.

"I'm organizing the Love Club" she announced that Sunday on her morning program. "There are no dues and no rules. The only requirement is that you love God and your brother."

"The lines lit up," said Miller. She estimates that 10,000 radio listeners have sent in application forms to join the radio club whose goal is helping the needy.

"You can't imagine the hundreds of calls I get from persons who are depressed, or lonely or hungry," said Miller. "They have confidence in me because they know I'm for real."

Miller was born and raised in Washington and, in her life time, she has touched the lives of politicians, ministers, musicians, school administrators, community leaders and youth.

Many know her from her 28 years on Washington airwaves. She was the second female religious broadcaster in Washington when she began her career on WUST. She later became a hostess on WOL before going to WYCB in 1978. She is now on the air Saturday and Sunday inspiring her listeners with traditional gospel music. Her trademark is a soft, slow drawl and perfect pronunciation.

A tall, stately woman who often drapes herself in chiffon and oversized hats, Miller is one of the most visible people among the Washington church-going and religious music-loving community. She taught music and performed with local gospel groups in Washington churches for 40 years. She gained a reputation as Washington's mistress of ceremony, a weekend hostess for church programs, community fundraisers, religious concerts and political prayer breakfasts.

She gave the invocation at Effi Barry's spring luncheon for Nancy Reagan and Barbara Bush. She broadcast the dedication services for Bible Way's \$3 million complex earlier this month. On Oct. 3 she'll host a day-long concert fundraiser for the United Planning Organization at Howard University's Cramton Auditorium.

This Saturday, an expected 200 people will pay \$15 a ticket to honor the woman affectionately called Madame Miller at the Shaw Community Center's fundraising prayer breakfast at the RFK Stadium clubhouse.

Because of her many fundraising efforts and appearances, Miller has worked closely, at one time or another, with almost every black minister in the city.

"Mrs. Miller has the ability to pull people together and inspire a sense of unity in them," said City Councilman Jerry Moore, pastor of the 19th Street Baptist Church (NW).

Two years ago, Miller was named WYCB's community relations director and in February, the station sponsored a birthday gala for her at the 19th Street Baptist Church. Guests included Moore and Del. Walter Fauntroy. According to Andrew Rowe, who directs the D.C. Choral Ensemble, "It was an extravaganza. Everybody who was anybody was there."

Miller's small Northwest apartment bears the proof of appreciation. Plaques, awards, certificates and photos of Miller with everyone from Mayor Marion Barry to Nancy Reagan adorn the walls' book cases, and furniture. Barry gave her the key to the city in August.

Miller grew up in Northwest Washington and says she married young against her mother's wishes. Her first marriage ended shortly after it began and she worked as a domestic to support herself before the birth of a son. She remarried four times over the years and has two other sons.

During the Depression, she put herself through Howard University's school of music.

"I went to school morning and night, walked in the rain and cold . . . until I finished school. That's why I don't have any sympathy for the young people today."

However, the piano and voice lessons she gave Washington youth taught more than the scales. "Ask any of my students what they learned," she said without modesty.

Rowe, a recording artist and a popular gospel performer, was 5 years old when Miller gave him his first piano lesson. "She also taught morals, discipline, charm and etiquette," Rowe said.

"If someone would come into her class and just sit down, she would make them go back out. They would have to come back in and say, 'Good afternoon, Mrs. Miller and class,'" recalled Shirley Ables of the Joy Gospel Singers, whose three children were taught by Miller. "They couldn't just slump down either. They had to sit with shoulders back."

Miller retired from teaching last year as her public appearances and WYCB responsibilities made life too hectic, she said. But former students and their parents lament the decision.

"If Mrs. Miller would go back to teaching today and she charged \$100," said Ables, who works at a Southeast preschool, "I would borrow that and put my daughter back in." ●

TMI: A PLAN THAT DOESN'T WORK

HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, last week, in Kansas City, the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) announced that it is recommending to its members, investor-owned electric utility companies, that they collectively contribute \$192 million, over the next 6 years, to the cleanup at Three Mile Island unit 2. I am pleased that EEI has finally recognized that a resolution of the TMI-2 cleanup funding problem is in the best interests of its members.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, the costs to the entire utility industry from failing to make a commitment to assist in the TMI-2 cleanup are far greater than the actual cost of the cleanup. Utilities will save more money by helping to pay for the cleanup than by continuing to ignore it and take the battering of the financial and investment community.

These costs from inaction come in the form of increased "risk premiums" investors attach to the interest rates on the utilities' necessary borrowings. Much of this risk premium has been attributed to TMI; to the prospect that Metropolitan Edison may go bankrupt, to the continuing lack of a TMI-2 cleanup funding solution, and to the seriously underinsured nature of the nuclear utility industry as pointed out by the accident.

These costs are no secret to utility executives. Economic analyses showing the costs of TMI have been prepared. Representatives of Wall Street investment houses have testified before the Congress. The economic self-interest of the utility industry has led chief executive officers to offer financial assistance to the TMI-2 cleanup. However, this fact does not in any way diminish the importance of the utility industry's acknowledgement of this economic self-interest. After 2½ years of waiting, I will be the first to welcome their participation. I will also be among the first to state that their interests demand that they contribute more.

The effectiveness of the utility industry contributions is intimately linked to the TMI-2 cleanup cost-sharing formula espoused by EEI in Kansas City. If this overall cost-sharing formula fails to work; that is, other parts of it are not implemented, the industry will continue to experience negative economic effects from TMI. As such, EEI's recommendation to its members, and it is only a recommendation, must be viewed within the broader context of the plan EEI endorsed.

This plan also calls for participation in the cleanup by the Federal Government, the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and the ratepayers of the General Public Utility Corp. system (GPU), the owners of Three Mile Island. Just like the tires on your car, if you're missing one of them, the whole thing does not go forward. What are the prospects that the parts of the package will come through?

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION

The plan calls for \$190 million from the Federal Government over the next 6 years to help pay for the cleanup at TMI-2. This money has been called various things, but it is most often referred to as research and development money from the Department of Energy. I agree that there are R. & D. opportunities present at TMI-2. So does DOE and OMB. They have put a price tag on it: \$75 million over 3 years. The administration's fiscal year 1982 request for \$37.5 million is part of that 3-year plan.

While it is obvious that there might be requests in the future for greater amounts for TMI R. & D., it is not clear to me that the administration, at a time when it is trying to make additional budget cuts of billions of dollars, will be anxious to increase its R. & D. effort at TMI over 150 percent.

The likelihood of a Federal contribution of \$190 million is made even more dubious when it is realized that every dollar spent on TMI research and development only reduces the cost of the cleanup by about 33 cents. Much of what has been identified as R. & D. has nothing to do with the cleanup.

This R. & D. program includes conducting waste vitrification experiments, examining the damaged reactor core at laboratories across the country, and generally collecting data. The R. & D. program, by and large, is not directly involved in the TMI-2 cleanup.

If this 3-to-1 ratio were to hold up for any expanded R. & D. program the Federal Government would have to spend \$570 million over 6 years to make its \$190 million cleanup contribution under the EEI-backed clean-cost-sharing plan. I find it very difficult to believe that this administration and this Congress would feel that this level of expenditure could be justified. Using the analogy of a car's tires as the four parts of this TMI-2 cleanup funding proposal, I would have to say that this tire has a bad leak.

GPU RATEPAYERS

Another tire on the program calls for the ratepayers of the General Public Utility system to pay \$245 million toward the cleanup over 6 years. It is obvious to me that for any cost-sharing plan to work, it must include the GPU ratepayers. Even though they are the only innocent victims of the accident at TMI, the hard reality is that if they don't pay part of the cleanup bill, they will be forced to pay it all one way or another. I am afraid, however, that in its present form, the \$245 million ratepayer tire of the plan has some broken glass in its path.

Since the accident at TMI in March 1979, the undamaged unit 1 has not been allowed to restart pending a new licensing hearing process. That process is now nearly complete and unit 1 is expected to be back in operation early next year. The cost of purchasing power to replace that which would otherwise have been produced at unit 1 has been much more expensive than unit 1 generated electricity. Consequently, the restart of unit 1 will bring with it less costly power. The cost-sharing plan supported by EEI would take the energy savings from a unit 1 restart and divert it to the unit 2 cleanup. Unfortunately, it's not quite that simple.

First, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PaPUC) has made clear its intent to reduce rates to GPU customers when unit 1 comes back on line to reflect the lower cost of power to the ratepayer. Obviously the PaPUC could reassess its past position that the ratepayers will not pay for the cost of the cleanup, as I believe it inevitably will, but it would be a mistake to ignore the potential barrier to this part of the cost-sharing formula.

Second, and more damaging, the General Accounting Office has concluded,

The restart of TMI-1 in early 1982 will produce some relief to GPU but is likely to

have little effect on the availability of cleanup funds.

GAO points out a number of competing requirements for the funds generated by a TMI-1 restart—assuming the rates are not reduced—which are necessary for GPU to avoid bankruptcy. This GAO conclusion flies right in the face of the EEI-backed plan. While I believe the ratepayers must ultimately be part of the TMI-2 cleanup funding plan, backers of this particular proposal's method of obtaining ratepayer participation will soon be desperately looking for a tire patching kit.

PENNSYLVANIA AND NEW JERSEY CONTRIBUTION

As the Pennsylvania delegation ad hoc TMI task force earlier pointed out, the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey have been profiting from the accident at Three Mile Island. This profit has come from a windfall in the gross receipts taxes the States collect in each ratepayer's monthly electric bill. Essentially, the States collect the gross receipts tax as a percentage of the monthly electric bill. Since replacement power is more expensive than that previously generated at TMI, ratepayers' monthly bills have gone up appreciably. Consequently, the fixed percentage of the electric bill levied through the gross receipts tax nets the States more money than they would have received had the accident not occurred.

Legislation has been introduced in Pennsylvania in past sessions to remit these windfall profits to the company or its ratepayers, but has never passed the State Legislature. The EEI plan calls on the State of Pennsylvania to make a \$5 million annual contribution, for 6 years, for the cleanup of TMI-2. In addition, New Jersey is to provide a \$2.5 million contribution to the cleanup.

It is appropriate that these States at least divert to the cleanup the windfall they have received through the gross receipts tax. The Governor of Pennsylvania has committed to provide help in this. While this commitment still requires positive legislative action by both States' legislatures, this tire of the EEI-backed program may survive.

UTILITY INDUSTRY CONTRIBUTION

Having looked at the other three tires of this cost-sharing package, we need to bring our attention back to the first: EEI's recommendation that its members contribute \$192 million over 6 years to the cleanup. As I earlier pointed out, the electric utility industry has every reason to want to assist in the TMI-2 cleanup. But, can the industry provide this money in the manner recommended by its trade association? On closer examination, in its present form, even this tire of the plan is missing some of its tread.

Apparently, the EEI-recommended contribution is totally voluntary.

While a formula for allocating the industry's contribution was part of EEI's suggestion, it is up to each individual utility to decide if it wants to send a check to GPU or to some intermediary. Utilities get their money from their ratepayers with the approval of their State regulators. As such, if a utility wants its contribution to come from its customers, it will have to file a rate increase request with its State regulatory body. It is not inconceivable to me that the regulators in some States will not allow the utility's TMI-2 contribution in its rates to its customers. Consequently, the utility will have to decide whether it wants to make its contribution from its earnings before dividends. This would have the effect of diverting money from the stockholders of these utilities to GPU.

At a time when utilities are attempting to raise additional revenue for their own needs by selling millions of new shares of common stock, they may perceive that making a contribution to GPU with dividend money might be counterproductive to their effort to gain more stockholders. On the other hand, if they do divert dividend money in this manner, they will do so with the full understanding that they may be inviting legislation from their stockholders for giving away assets of the utility. Given the totally voluntary nature of the TMI-2 cleanup contributions from utilities, it is possible that some utilities will decide not to follow EEI's suggestion. If this happens, the stockholders of contributing utilities will have even stronger legal and equity arguments as to the disposition of their utilities' assets.

A number of utilities will no doubt do as EEI has recommended. But, under these circumstances, we should also not be surprised if some utilities do not. The greater the number of utilities which opt out of a contribution to TMI-2, the less the industry as a whole will provide for the cleanup. This tire of the overall cost-sharing formula is, therefore, missing some tread at the outset. How long it will run without a problem cannot now be predicted.

If we try to use a spare tire on this wheel by requiring, by legislation, utility contributions without a visible benefit, like insurance for cleanup costs in case of a future accident, we might encounter constitutional problems of a taking of property without due process. CRS has prepared an analysis which questions the constitutionality of this approach. If any such questions arise, this may slow the vehicle down without necessarily puncturing the tire. Meanwhile, the problem at TMI goes unresolved.

SUMMARY

In the final analysis, the condition of any one of the "tires" of the plan is contingent upon each of the others. If one goes flat, the vehicle will not go

forward. In looking at the TMI-2 cost-sharing plan endorsed by EEI last week, I am afraid I see one tire already leaking air, one about to go over some glass, and one with very little tread. Consequently, I must conclude that, important as the EEI recommendation is, I would not bet on its getting to its destination as long as it is mounted to the overall plan endorsed by EEI in Kansas City. With this plan, you can not get there from here. ●

U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS ASSOCIATION

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, before the recess, my colleagues Congresswomen LINDY BOGGS and VIRGINIA SMITH circulated to the Members an analysis by Dr. J. B. Penn of Economic Perspectives, Inc., of the proposed sugar program which was apparently done for the sugar producer industry. I note with great interest a review of the Penn analysis by Schnitker Associates, Washington-based economic consultants, which finds five major defects in this analysis. These defects are:

First, it understates the importance and viability of the world market.

Second, it demonstrates a lack of understanding of how a U.S. program would affect the world market.

Third, it seriously underestimates the exposure of the U.S. Government to budget outlays under S. 884.

Fourth, the assessment of the impact on consumers is simply wrong.

Fifth, the analysis in this report is inconsistent with EPI's August 1981 analysis of the European Community's sugar program.

I would like to call the Schnitker review to the attention of my colleagues. The review follows:

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. CANE SUGAR REFINERS ASSOCIATION

REVIEW OF EPI SUGAR PROGRAM ANALYSIS

You asked that we review a report published in June by Economic Perspectives, Inc. The report was titled "An Analysis of the Sugar Program Proposal in Senate Bill S. 884." Much of the report is descriptive or historical material on the U.S. sweetener market, the International Sugar Agreement, the USDA Draft Impact Analysis, and S. 884. When the authors proceed beyond description, however, they stumble and fall. We think their analysis has 5 major defects:

1. It understates the importance and viability of the world market.

2. It demonstrates a lack of understanding of how a U.S. program would affect the world market.

3. It seriously underestimates the exposure of the U.S. government to budget outlays under S. 884.

4. The assessment of the impact on consumers is simply wrong.

5. The analysis in this report is inconsistent with EPI's August 1981 analysis of the European Community's Sugar program.

THE WORLD MARKET

EPI's analysis relies in part on resurrection of that tired old hobgoblin—the volatile, unfree, thinly-traded, unstable, world sugar market. In fact, the similarities among the world markets for sugar and other agricultural commodities are more striking than the differences. For example, 1980-81 crop year statistics from F. O. Licht and USDA indicate that total world exports of sugar as a percent of world production are greater than those of wheat or coarse grains (corn, barley, etc.):

World trade as a percent of world production	
Wheat	22
Coarse grain.....	16
Soybeans	31
Cotton.....	35
Sugar.....	32

World sugar exports in 1980-81 were 28 mmt (million metric tons). Of that amount, trade within the European Community represented 1 mmt, Cuban exports to Comecon countries were 4.5 mmt, and trade under various other special arrangements may have been as much as 4.5 mmt. That left a free market of 18 mmt, more than 20 percent of world production and 65 percent of world trade.

One should not forget that much of world trade in wheat and coarse grains also occurs under special arrangements. World exports of those commodities in 1980-81 were about 215 mmt. The USSR, China, and Mexico alone have trade agreements with exporting countries covering 40 mmt per year or nearly 20 percent of world trade.

Finally, the true definition of "world market" should include any sugar, wheat, etc., that is priced in relation to the world price. This leads to our second point.

EFFECT ON U.S. PROGRAM ON WORLD MARKET

After incorrectly arguing that the world market is chronically unstable because of its small size and residual nature, the EPI analysts proceed to argue that a U.S. program that would further reduce the size of world market would actually "be consistent with efforts to stabilize world prices" (p. 12). Not only is this incorrect, it also flies in the face of established U.S. trade policy for sugar and other commodities.

U.S. posture in most commodity trade negotiations has been to favor widening of international markets. In fact, the principal (i.e., first) objective of the International Sugar Agreement is "to raise the level of international trade in sugar", a point conveniently ignored in EPI's discussion of the ISA.

U.S. policy makers, from the State Department and USDA to the CFTC, have consistently recognized that a large freely traded market with many participants is more likely to be "stable" than a market distorted by preferential trading arrangements, domestic subsidies to consumption and production, and export subsidies. When a sugar producing country holds down domestic prices during a period of high world prices, that subsidy to consumption is destabilizing; supplies have been diverted from the world market and world sugar prices have been increased. Similarly, when a sugar importing country such as the U.S. maintains domestic prices above the world

market in order to stimulate home production, imports fall and the size of the world market is reduced. These are destabilizing actions that depress world prices.

EPI's curious conclusion that the domestic program proposed in S. 884 will help stabilize world prices seems to arise from their creative definition of "stability." Early on they make the point that the effects of "price swings in the world market... (are) a relatively new development" for U.S. producers. This is true as far as it goes. Since the 1930's U.S. sugar producers have rarely been forced to adjust to declining world prices, but they have always benefited from prices above domestic support levels. The Senate Committee's bill is little different from its predecessors in this regard: producers will be protected from low prices and will reap substantial gains if world prices rise above the domestic support price. In short, "stability" means a floor but no ceiling.

FORFEITURES AND THE BUDGET

Misconceptions about how the world market operates are of little moment, however, when stacked up against EPI's optimistic discussion of the likely budgetary impact of the Senate Committee's bill. The view that the Administration could "use import fees to avoid any incentive to forfeit sugar under loan" (p. 12) leads to the cheery conclusion that "no significant amount of forfeitures would be expected during any year of the FY 1982-FY 1986 period" (p. 12).

EPI analysts arrived at this conclusion by relying on USDA supply, demand and price forecasts that were farfetched when they were published. USDA assumed that world production and consumption in 1981-82 would be in rough balance, and that the season average price in the world market would be over 26 cents per pound. EPI should have sensed that something was amiss since the ISO price had already fallen below 16 cents before their report was published.

This altogether too rosy view of world prices led EPI to the conclusion that loan forfeitures could be limited and budget exposure minimized. There is, however, no guarantee that the Administration will be able to keep the market price high enough to prevent both large forfeitures and large budget outlays. As shown below, the U.S. market price for raw sugar would have to be at least 23.56 cents per pound to prevent loan forfeiture under a program that mandates a 19.6 cent loan rate. Even loan rates of 18.0 cents or 16.5 cents could result in government ownership of sugar, unless crop failures reduce world production. Requiring that processors pay interest on forfeiture would, however, significantly improve the government's chances of avoiding budget outlays at loan levels of 16.5 or 18 cents.

MARKET PRICE FOR RAW SUGAR REQUIRED AT ALTERNATIVE LOAN RATES

(Cents per pound)			
National average loan rate.....	16.50	18.00	19.60
National average freight cost.....	1.00	1.00	1.00
Interest at 16.5 percent for 11 months.....	2.50	2.72	2.96
Required domestic spot price.....	20.00	21.72	23.56

Any of these price objectives could be difficult to achieve continuously. The world spot price for raw sugar is now near 12 cents per pound. If values get as low as 10 cents per pound in the next year or two, the Ad-

ministration would be unable to attain even a 20 cent price objective because Section 22 import fees cannot exceed 50 percent ad valorem. The calculation is as follows:

[Cents per pound]

World price	10.00
Section 22 import fee	5.00
Maximum duty.....	2.81
Transportation, insurance, and handling (USDA estimate).....	1.77
Total.....	19.58

This would provide no margin of safety to ensure redemption of the loan.

Even with a higher world price, there could easily be periods when domestic prices were below the objective if the future import fee adjustment mechanism is modeled on that in the proclamation currently in effect. That mechanism allows U.S. prices to get as much as one cent above or below the objective before making a "within quarter adjustment." This approach was chosen because for practical purposes any attempt at greater fine-tuning of the domestic price would disrupt the market.

In light of these facts, it is quite possible that if world market prices were to decline another two cents from current levels in the next two years, and if interest rates remain high, a 16.5 cent loan program of the type we had in the past would probably result in forfeitures of sugar to the government. Quantities are difficult to predict, but it would be reasonable to expect them to be on the same order of magnitude as in the past—200,000-500,000 tons. The first year budget outlay, should 500,000 tons be forfeited, would be \$165 million—hardly the insignificant amount forecast by EPI.

CONSUMER COSTS

What does the Senate Committee's bill mean for consumers? EPI points once again to price stability, arguing in essence that prices above world market levels will keep the CPI steady but ignoring completely the salutary impact on the CPI of lower sugar prices (p. 8). This leads them to one last bizarre conclusion: higher domestic sugar prices will "have a beneficial impact on consumer food and sweetener expenditures" (p. 12). Do those words mean beneficial for consumers, as implied, or for products?

HAVING IT BOTH WAYS

Finally, in a subsequent report on European Community sugar policy,¹ EPI takes a different analytical tack. More precisely, EPI tacks in both directions at the same time:

High internal sugar prices are bad in the EC but good in the U.S.;

High internal sugar prices are bad for EC consumers, but good for U.S. consumers;

EC support policies destabilize the world market while a U.S. program would stabilize it; and

EC export subsidies are bad but U.S. export subsidies are good.

One cannot have it both ways. The sugar price support program in S. 884 is qualitatively the same as the EC sugar price support program, except that the latter actually holds down internal sugar prices when the world market rises above the EC support level and the U.S. program would not. ■

¹Impact of European Economic Community Sugar Subsidies on U.S. and World Sugar Markets, August 19, 1981.

THE MALIGNED MORAL
MAJORITY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Newsweek magazine recently permitted Reverend Falwell to respond to the allegations of the critics of both himself and the Moral Majority, Inc., in its "My Turn," page 17 of the September 21, 1981, issue. In this column, Reverend Falwell strips away all the verbiage and smokescreen that have surrounded the statements of the church and political liberals who are outraged that church fundamentalists and conservatives are now organized and speaking out on the issues. In other words, there is a lot of sour grapes going around. I commend this item to the attention of my colleagues who are really interested in learning the truth about Reverend Falwell and the Moral Majority.

"MY TURN"—JERRY FALWELL

"An unconditional right to say what one pleases about public affairs is what I consider to be the minimum guarantee of the First Amendment." The author of that remark was not a "right-wing, fundamentalist" preacher, but the late Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black.

When liberals first began attacking the Moral Majority, they said we had no right to speak out. When it was pointed out that the liberal agenda was well represented in the 1960s and '70s in the government, in the streets and in liberal churches, the liberals conceded that while we had the right to speak, it was wrong for us to try to "impose" our moral viewpoint on everyone else.

Of course, there was nothing wrong, so far as liberals were concerned, with "imposing" their own views, whether those views had to do with civil rights, the Vietnam War, busing, the eradication of voluntary school prayer or the extermination of unborn babies through abortion. Liberals could impose their views because liberals were right! And they call us arrogant!

Freedom: The Moral Majority was founded in June 1979 to address four basic issues. First, we are pro-life. We believe all human life is valuable and deserving of legal protection, whether it be born or unborn, black or white, rich or poor, handicapped or normal, old or young. Second, we are pro-traditional-family. While homosexuals should be free to live together if they wish, we oppose any law that would grant to homosexual couples the status of "family" or qualify them as a legitimate minority. They are not a legitimate minority because theirs is a chosen life-style. Third, we are pro-morality, meaning that we oppose the illegal-drug traffic and the spread of pornography. Fourth, we are pro-American, and that means we stand for a strong national defense, believing that freedom is the ultimate moral issue. We also support the nation of Israel and Jewish people everywhere. Those who spread the myth that we are anti-Semitic don't know what they are talking about.

To suggest that I am a modern-day Pavlov who, upon ringing my bell, causes millions of Americans to salivate to whatever politi-

cal tune I am playing is as illogical as it is ludicrous.

The Moral Majority has touched a sensitive nerve in the American people. Many Americans are sick and tired of the way their government has been run. They are tired of being told that their values and beliefs don't matter and that only those values held by government bureaucrats and liberal preachers are worthy of adoption in the area of public policy. Our people are the previously inactive, turned-off voters who believed that who wins an election doesn't matter. The 1980 election showed that people can make a difference.

It is not the religious conservatives in this country who have politicized the Gospel. It is the liberal in the church and in the government who has turned the basic moral values that were the foundation of this country into political issues. Until recently, most people agreed that abortion is murder, that homosexual practice is perversion and that pornography is the exploitation of women and men. Now the liberals tell us these are political issues, not moral ones, and when we oppose their attempts to legislate and adjudicate what they believe, we are called "ayatollahs" who want to line people up against the wall and shoot them. Our goal is to line people up, all right, but at the polls! This is still a nation of majority rule. Although we do and should protect minority rights, we should not do so in a way that renders the majority impotent.

The Moral Majority is not a Christian or a religious organization (however, as a fundamentalist, I personally object to categorizing fundamentalists as bellicose and anti-intellectual). We are made up of fundamentalists, evangelicals, Roman Catholics, conservative Jews, Mormons and even persons of no religious belief who share our concerns about the issues we address.

We believe that people can disagree with us and not be relegated to an "immoral minority." We believe a person can be just as good a Catholic, a fundamentalist, a Jew, a Mormon or whatever, and disagree with us on any or all our issues.

We do not endorse political candidates, nor do we have a "hit list." We do not judge the quality of a person's relationship to God based on his or her voting record.

The Founding Fathers, contrary to what our liberal friends believe, wanted to preserve and encourage the church, not to restrict it or its influence. For them, the separation of church and state was a check on the government, not the church. The First Amendment prohibits the government from establishing a church (as had been done in England). It does not prohibit the churches from doing anything, except collecting taxes. Any person who suggests that separation of church and state requires more than this—that it requires churches to remain silent on "political issues" or preachers to be neutral on candidates or religious organizations to pursue only "spiritual goals"—is simply grinding his own ax rather than reading the law.

Rights. Let's remember that all law is the imposition of someone's morality to the exclusion of someone else's morality. We have laws against murder, rape, incest, cannibalism and stealing. No doubt, there are murderers, rapists, practitioners of incest, cannibals and thieves who are upset that their "rights" have been denied. But in order to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare, it was deemed necessary to pass such laws.

New York Democratic Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan has said, "We are a blessed

people, but we are not invincibly elect and we must shape our future as we have our past." I can think of no better way to state the outlook and purpose of the Moral Majority.

There is something worse than war, and worse even than speaking out. It is silence! The grossest immorality has been perpetuated not by those who carried it out, but by those who remained silent and did nothing. We may not always be right, but we will never stand accused of doing nothing.●

CHANGE IN COMMAND BY THE
BRITISH IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the 122-member bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on Irish Affairs, I wish to advise my colleagues of a most significant development which occurred yesterday.

Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, in the course of a major reshuffling of her Cabinet, announced that James Prior, formerly a key official in the Employment Ministry, would assume the all-important position of Secretary of State for Northern Ireland. Mr. Prior replaces Humphrey Atkins who held the position for more than 2 years.

While some press accounts indicate that Mr. Prior took the assignment with some reluctance—other analysts believe that a main reason why he chose to take it was based on assurances that he would be able to exert some degree of independence in his work as the highest British official in the north.

I hope the British Government will use this occasion to begin some long-needed modifications and reforms to their archaic policies in Northern Ireland. Central to these modifications should be a full reevaluation of their policy of direct rule in Northern Ireland. I have advocated as part of an overall political solution in Northern Ireland that the British Government declare its intention to withdraw their entire presence from Northern Ireland, including their 12,000 troops—in a phased and orderly manner. In addition, I still hope that the British Government may bring more flexibility to their policy in dealing with the hunger strike crisis.

I extend my very best wishes to Mr. Prior as he assumes this difficult and challenging position. I stand prepared to work with the new Secretary of State in pursuit of the goals of peace, justice, and freedom for Northern Ireland.●

EXTENSION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

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

This weekend I will attend a seminar in Los Angeles, sponsored by Black Women's Forum, Inc., whereby the discussion will focus on the importance of the extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. If we are to unite in one enduring cause this year, certainly the extension of the Voting Rights Act must be one of them.

This act does something special; it affirms the right of minorities to register and vote at the election polls and prevents the evidence of racial discrimination in the process.

Many blacks in this country died to uphold this special right to vote, and thus we must continue to safeguard this constitutional privilege for minorities—which is the cornerstone of all free democracies.

A great man passed away this month by the name of Roy Wilkins. Through his tireless efforts he helped pave the way for greater opportunities for blacks. He pushed for legislative reme-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

dies offering blacks an opportunity to break out of the pervasive circle of discrimination so evidenced in this time. I can think of no better tribute to this man, and other great leaders in the civil rights forum, than by supporting congressional approval of the Voting Rights Act.●

"CELEBRITY ROAST" TO HONOR REV. JOSEPH MALIK

HON. LYLE WILLIAMS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 20, 1981, a group of my constituents are saluting a man who has served his community and his church well for a number of years. It will be my pleasure to attend a "celebrity roast" for the Reverend Joseph Malik of Warren, Ohio, and to celebrate with his friends his full and useful life.

REV. JOSEPH MALIK, OF WARREN, OHIO,
HONORED

Rev. Joseph A. Malik was born November 17, 1926, in Youngstown, Ohio. He attended St. Casimir Grade School, Ursuline High School, Youngstown; John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio; St. Mary's College, St. Mary, Kentucky; and St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland, Ohio. He was ordained by the

late Bishop Emmett Walsh on May 30, 1952. Father Malik had four brothers, two of whom are living, and two sisters, one of whom is living.

Father Malik came to St. Mary's Parish in Warren as pastor in 1970 and in 1974 was named dean of Trumbull County Catholic Clergy. Prior to coming to Warren, Father Malik served as assistant at St. Joseph, Ash-tabula, Ohio from 1952-1967, as Pastor of St. Andrew, Kingsville, Ohio, from 1967-1970.

Father Malik has served in numerous capacities throughout the Youngstown Diocese: Chaplain of the Trumbull N.C.C.W., L.C.B.A., Catholic Daughters; Honorary Chairman Catholic Social Services of Trumbull County; Catholic Clergy Chairman of the United Fund; Board of Managers, Y.M.C.A.; Children Services Board; Children Rehabilitation Board; Trumbull Hospital Corporation Board, Rotary International, and moderator for the Trumbull County Naim Club. Father Malik has also served on the Diocesan Priest Senate, Liturgy Commission, Diocesan School Board, and the Trumbull County Task Force on Crime.

Sir Knight, Father Malik joined the Knights of Columbus in January 1953, and is a member of Warren Council No. 620. He was exemplified into the Fourth Degree on April 28, 1957, in Youngstown, Ohio, under the direction of the Late Former Master John E. Johnston. He is a member of Bishop McFadden Assembly. Sir Knight, Father Malik, has served as Faithful Friar of the Eastern District of Ohio, Fourth Degree, since September, 1975, and as Chaplain of Warren Council No. 620 since January 1972.●