

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION'S SPENDING HABITS VERSUS ITS BUDGET PLAN

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a disturbing article which appeared in the New York Times on the flamboyant lifestyle of the President, his staff, members of the Cabinet and his close friends.

Mr. Speaker, I am in no way bringing this article to the attention of my colleagues to imply that there should be no pomp or ceremony associated with the Office of the President. Similarly, I am not advocating restricting Government officials' use of their own money.

However, it seems to me that the merrymaking, frivolity and lifestyles of many key officials have gone too far. My candid assessment of the situation is that the administration, at best, can be categorized as going overboard and, at worst, as being insensitive and hypocritical about the dire economic situation that plagues Americans.

Mr. Speaker, on one hand, we have the President telling the country how bad off we are economically and how all of us will have to tighten our belts. He then unleashed David Stockman and his budget ax on minorities, the poor and disadvantaged of our Nation.

Then, on the other hand, we have the President, key staffers and some Cabinet members living in lavish homes. They give and attend extravagant parties complete with all the status symbols of the elite in our society while still tooting the horn of fiscal conservatism. It is the classic "do as I say but not as I do" scenario.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more ludicrous and totally abominable is the fact that one of the President's "kitchen cabinet" members is quoted in the New York Times article as saying that he believes Americans enjoy viewing the luxurious Washington way of life of the Reagan administration. Mr. Speaker, I for one, do not. I know that my constituents, many of those who will be dropped from the food stamp program in the next few days, do not either.

I cannot believe that this individual is as politically naive as his statement suggests. I believe, rather, that he and other administration officials who con-

tinue in this excessive merrymaking while the poor and working classes struggle to survive under the budget cuts are callous hypocrites. For them, the rhetoric about concern for the poor and that invisible safety net are nothing more than cocktail chit-chat.

Mr. Speaker, as we and the poor of this Nation brace for another round of budget cuts from the President, I think we should keep in mind the budget cutting rhetoric of the Reagan administration versus the lifestyle they embrace. No where is it more evident that the poor have become passe and the rich the "in crowd" than in the Reagan administration.

At this time, I would like to ask my colleagues to read an article which appeared in the New York Times entitled, "Reagan Aides Show Capital Luxury Style" written by Lynn Rosellini.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 16, 1981]
REAGAN AIDES SHOW CAPITAL LUXURY STYLE
(By Lynn Rosellini)

WASHINGTON, Aug. 15.—William French Smith tied on his black tie, stepped into a chauffeured sedan and went to a party one night not long ago.

The evening was marked by strolling musicians, silver candelabra, trees strung with Christmas lights and a dinner for 250 under a green-and-white-striped tent on the Mall. In addition to the Attorney General, there were lots of other Cabinet members, White House officials and important Republicans, which is not surprising.

SPENDING THEIR OWN MONEY

In Ronald Reagan's Washington, many Republicans go to parties six nights a week. They also ride about town in chauffeured limousines. They live in the most expensive sections of town and have vacation homes in California and Maine.

As officials, advisers and friends of President Reagan, they endorse austerity in Federal spending, but in their personal lives many of the most visible Administration players have shown a fondness for conspicuous spending of their own money in their first six months in Washington.

When they arrived here last January, the Reagan Republicans, many of them successful in business and industry, brought with them their accustomed way of life, one that emphasizes good living and the use of social occasions to smooth professional relations.

Signs of the new luxury are everywhere: in the jewelry, clothes, cars, homes and restaurants favored by the newcomers.

James A. Baker 3d, White House chief of staff, lives in a \$715,000 house. Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary of Defense, has a \$707,000 house with a swimming pool. Treasury Secretary Donald T. Regan attended 28 social functions in one 30-day period recently. Nancy Reagan and her friend Betsy Bloomingdale wear designer gowns and elaborate jewelry.

"This is a fun Administration," says Robert K. Gray, co-chairman of the 1981 Presidential Inaugural Committee. "This

President enjoys his position, and so do those around him. They work hard during the day and they like to have a good time at night."

And that, in part, makes them different not only from the recently departed members of the Carter Administration but also from other Republicans who have come to Washington. In the past, Republican Presidents often found it difficult to lure fellow party members to take Government jobs. But the Reagan Republicans seem to enjoy Washington whirl more than their predecessors.

And if members of the new Administration feel any conflict between their personal luxuries and public sector's belt-tightening, no one is apologizing.

"The preponderance of these people are self-made," said Charles Z. Wick, a member of Mr. Reagan's "kitchen cabinet" and director of the International Communications Agency. "They followed the American dream."

AMERICANS SAID TO ENJOY WATCHING

Mr. Wick said he thought that economically pinched Americans of today enjoyed viewing the luxurious Washington way of life of the Reagan Administration members, much as Americans who suffered in the Depression enjoyed watching Hollywood stars in the movies.

"During the Depression," said Mr. Wick, "when people were selling apples and factories were still and guys were jumping out windows because they lost everything, people would go to the movies. They loved those glamour pictures showing people driving beautiful cars and women in beautiful gowns, showing that people were living the glamorous good life."

That many members of the Reagan team live the good life is reflected almost daily in the social pages of local newspapers. Although July is normally a slow period in Washington's social calendar, the last month included an array of entertainments:

The black-tie dinner on the Mall was held in honor of Senator Paul Laxalt of Nevada, who ran the Reagan campaign. Mr. Gray, the host, served cold tenderloin of beef and provided fans powered by an electric generator to cool his guests.

A lawn party, a Western-style barbecue for 300 at the \$765,265 home of Raymond J. Donovan, Secretary of Labor, was marked by two bands, a mechanical bull, open pits of sizzling beef and pork and guests in cowboy hats. Vice President Bush and David A. Stockman, the budget director, were there.

A birthday party for Mrs. Reagan was thrown by her old California friends. They rented a Virginia plantation, chartered a bus, hired a country music band and flew in food from Chasen's restaurant in Beverly Hills. Drinks were served on the bus by Frank Sinatra.

The gifts presented at such occasions are elaborate and sometimes public spirited, too. Mrs. Reagan's friends chipped in \$3,900 to repair a local swimming pool for the handicapped as a birthday present. Senator Laxalt received a \$1,000 check to help pay for an elephant to be given to the National Zoo.

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

Setting the tone for the Administration are the President and his wife. In Mr. Reagan's White House, their mark is seen in the return of white-tie formality at diplomatic receptions, in the color guard that precedes the Reagans and their guests of honor at state dinners, in the elaborate menus and the growing fleet of White House limousines.

After initial published reports on the new Reagan style, the White House has attempted to play down the Reagans' free-spending image. For example, a proposal to buy a new Presidential yacht was scuttled a few months ago after it was deemed symbolically inappropriate. But if the Reagans themselves are sensitive about their image, others connected with the Administration are not.

"I've never noticed anybody in past Administrations divesting themselves of their assets and giving them to the poor," observed Jean Smith, wife of the Attorney General. "I don't think it's any different from any other Administration."

In some ways, Mrs. Smith is correct. Even the Carter Administration, known for its homespun style, included wealthy men such as Bert Lance, the budget director, and Harold M. Williams, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

EXPENSIVE HOMES

Yet the predominant impression made by the newcomers remains one of wealth. Many of them, for instance, bought homes in the area's most expensive neighborhoods. Peter McCoy, Mrs. Reagan's chief of staff, paid \$460,000 for his home in Spring Valley, a section of the capital. Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr. paid \$415,000 for a house just over the District of Columbia line in Maryland.

Others have more than one house. Donald Regan has homes in Virginia, New Jersey, and Florida. Lee Annenberg, the chief of protocol, and her husband, Walter, have a suite at the Watergate Hotel, which they share with a maid and a butler, plus a mansion on Philadelphia's Main Line, a chalet in Sun Valley, Idaho, and a 250-acre desert estate in Palm Springs, Calif.

Many of the Reagans' wealthy California friends—the Justin Darts, Alfred Bloomingdales, Armand Deutsches, Earle Jorgensens and William Wilsons—either maintain apartments or rent hotel suites at the Watergate complex for their frequent visits.

In fashion, the tone is set by Mrs. Reagan and Mrs. Bloomingdale. Mrs. Reagan arrived here last January with a \$25,000 inaugural wardrobe that included a \$10,000 dress and a \$1,650 handbag. Since then, such luxuries have become the First Lady's signature.

Her Los Angeles manicurist, Jessica Vartoughian, has visited the White House to do her nails, and her hairdresser, Julius Bengtsson, has traveled abroad with her to do her hair.

When Mrs. Reagan attended the wedding of Prince Charles in London recently her entourage included Mr. Bengtsson and a nurse, and her baggage included hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of jewelry borrowed from Bulgari, the international jewelers, four hatboxes and about 20 dresses, including eight ball gowns.

Many Reagan Republicans will spend part of August in California or in Northeastern coastal resorts. When they return in September, one of the first events on their social schedules will be a frontier extravaganza planned by Mr. Gray. The dance will

be held outdoors on a square overlooking the C. & O. Canal in Georgetown.

"I'm going to have Western music and bales of hay," said Mr. Gray the other day. "It's terribly important, if you're going to have a party, that you do something besides feed people." ●

BRIDGING THE GAP FOR SURVIVAL

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of people in my home city of Newark will join in a day of workshops this Friday on surviving under the Reagan administration budget cuts.

The day-long conference, entitled "Bridging the Gap for Survival," is a citywide effort of over 65 social service and community agencies to inform the young, the elderly, and the low-income residents of Newark about how the Federal budget reductions will directly affect their lives.

In a city that faces a disturbing crime rate, double-digit unemployment and a shortage of decent, affordable housing, the Reagan administration's extreme cutbacks in social programs are having an extremely cruel effect. But the citizens of Newark, through this conference, are proving that even the Reagan administration's callous attitude toward the cities of America will not dampen their spirit.

This conference is a grassroots response to the policies that have brought us the following:

There are 7.6 million people in America who cannot find jobs. This is an unemployment rate of 7.2 percent at a time when the Reagan budget eliminated 300,000 CETA jobs and trimmed job training programs.

Joblessness among black Americans has reached 15 percent, and among black teenagers it is an unbelievable 50 percent.

The 3 million Americans who receive minimum social security benefits each month will have to get along without them, as it now stands. While some will be able to survive, at least 500,000—mostly elderly women living alone—will find it almost impossible to exist.

College will become an impossible dream for over 1 million high school students of middle-income families denied guaranteed student loans.

About 100,000 families in need of decent housing will have to wait indefinitely for the public housing that they were promised by the Federal Government.

About 1 million Americans living on the edge of poverty will no longer be eligible for food stamps because of budget cutbacks.

Roughly 3 million schoolchildren may have to drop out of school lunch

programs because the Federal Government will reduce its support by \$1.6 billion.

The conference will try to counteract these cutbacks by having social service agencies and groups work more closely together to close the gaps in the services they offer. It also will try to close the generation gap to encourage our younger citizens to learn from the wisdom of our senior citizens.

The conference workshops will focus on seven chief areas of concern: Crime prevention; health maintenance; social services to help individuals and families obtain food, clothing, and shelter; educational opportunities; employment training; income maintenance; and tenant rights and responsibilities. The underlying theme throughout all of the workshops will be improving conditions where people live, specifically in public housing. The motivation behind this extremely important conference is the Newark Day Center, New Jersey's oldest social service agency which has been a vital force for helping disadvantaged people since 1803. The Newark Day Center's Executive Director Trish Morris has worked with the conference chairpersons Virginia Scott and George Branch to reach out to all people in Newark who are concerned about the city's survival. The conference is the fourth step in a five-stop plan initiated by the Newark Day Center last spring to inform people about how they can fight back against the threat of poverty and feelings of despair.

For my part, I pledge to continue to oppose cruel and unnecessary cutbacks in essential human services because when we stop investing in people, our cities and our Nation will have no future at all. I am proud to have been asked to be honorary chairperson at Friday's conference because I am very proud of the people associated with it. I believe they will serve as an example to other cities in these most difficult times. ●

AMENDMENT TO PROTECT FORMER AGENTS

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 4 I will offer an amendment to protect the identities of former intelligence agents and operatives from unauthorized disclosures. By protecting former agents, my amendment will strengthen this legislation in three vital ways: First, it will protect former agents from possible harm as a result of the disclosure of their true identities; second, it will protect active operatives who may have assumed the former agent's posi-

tion; and third, it will protect the entire intelligence network which may have been established by a former agent and passed on to the former agent's successor.●

EXCISE TAX REFORM ACT

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to join with my colleagues BOB MATSUI and JOHN ROUSSELOT in the introduction today of legislation to correct a glaring inequity in our system of collecting excise taxes. This bill, H.R. 4545, is the product of over 2 years of development, and shifts the focus of legislative activity from the Appropriations Committee on which I serve to the Ways and Means Committee where it must ultimately be resolved.

Excise taxes are collected by the Federal Government on a variety of manufactured goods, such as motor vehicles, tires, coal, sporting goods, firearms, distilled spirits, and tobacco products. We collect approximately \$11 billion of our revenues from the producers of certain commodities. These taxes are imposed on the products from the time of shipment from the place of production. Those subject to this type of tax must report bi-monthly on shipments and consequent tax liability and are required to make their tax payment within a relatively short time thereafter, ranging from 3 to 25 days, depending upon the type of commodity which is being taxed. The producer normally pays the tax before receiving revenue from the purchase of the product. This system imposes a harsh burden, particularly on small business; particularly in times of high interest rates; particularly in times of recession.

The genesis of this bill was a proposal by the Treasury Department 2 years ago to require the payment of the excise taxes for tobacco and liquor industries by an electronic funds transfer system further decreasing the amount of time between production of the goods and the payment of the taxes. The initiative by the Treasury Department galvanized the first coalition of taxpayers interested in the reform of the excise tax collection system. The support from a range of interests affected by the excise taxes and the cooperation among my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee enabled us to successfully block the Treasury proposal on the funding bill. Unfortunately, this has become an annual—occasionally semiannual—effort by all the affected industries.

Our success in the appropriations process, however, encouraged us to develop a permanent change in the excise tax collection system which will make the collection period uniform for all products subject to an excise tax, and to extend the time of collection so as to conform more nearly to the period of time which is normally associated with the receipt of payments by the manufacturers.

As introduced, the Excise Tax Reform Act seeks to free taxpayers from the burden of prepayment of this tax, which often necessitates borrowing funds and seeks also to reduce the volume of costly paperwork involved. It would cut paperwork in half by requiring only 12 reports annually in place of the 24 now required. It would also, when fully in effect, grant excise taxpayers 90 days from the end of each month to pay the tax on that month's shipments.

Clearly, a tax bill of this nature will have an impact on the collection of Federal revenues, but the only money which will be lost to the Government will be the interest costs which the Government will have to pay on funds borrowed in order to cover the interruption of revenues required by this bill. The same amount of taxes will be collected, and the bill does not take effect until fiscal year 1983 when there are prospects for an improved fiscal picture. Once the transition period is over, Federal revenues from the excise taxes will be equal to the amount now collected. Indeed, there are persuasive arguments to suggest, as in the arguments for supply side tax cuts, that the effect of this bill would be to actually increase revenues. Furthermore, I believe that the elimination of a system that requires certain businesses to pay a tax on their products before they have had a reasonable opportunity to receive revenue from sales would have beneficial effects on investment, employment, and price levels.

I am pleased that my colleagues BOB MATSUI and JOHN ROUSSELOT will be taking the lead on this issue in the Ways and Means Committee. Few members of the committee are more respected for their ability than my friends from California. They are committed to a fair system of taxation, one that does not seek to collect taxes before the business has made any money from its products. It is time for this issue to be resolved, and in a manner which reduces the burden upon our businesses. I urge you to support the work of BOB and JOHN in the committee so that this bill receives an early hearing and favorable consideration. I also urge you to join with us in sponsoring this legislation, H.R. 4545.●

PHOTOVOLTAICS—ARE THE JAPANESE GETTING AHEAD AGAIN?

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, with talk of more budget cuts by the administration and the elimination of the Department of Energy, I found the article below on U.S. cutbacks in photovoltaic research appearing in the Christian Science Monitor particularly timely.

We are amazed at the leaps and bounds taken by the Japanese since World War II in the quality and competitiveness of their products, particularly in the area of electronics. And yet the current administration proposes to phase out the photovoltaics research and development efforts underway in this country, an area in which we have traditionally excelled and in which the Japanese are rapidly overtaking us.

Will we ask the Japanese to voluntarily curtail their trade with the United States while espousing free market ideology in the area of photovoltaics as we did with the automobile industry? I hope we do not ask the American public to accept mediocre and expensive energy alternatives simply because we have not chosen to support them. The Government can play an effective role in our energy future by providing flexibility and a range of options for further research and development by the private sector; I hope it will.

I hope my colleagues take a few minutes to consider the ramifications of actions which may appear to be straightforward budget cutting, but which have much greater implications for future U.S. trade and available energy options.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 20, 1981]

U.S. CUTS IN SOLAR CELL FUNDING MAY LET JAPAN TAKE THE LEAD
(By David F. Salisbury)

DENVER.—When solar cells, perhaps the most revolutionary energy source under development in the laboratories of the world, come of age, will they be stamped "Made in USA" or "Japan Inc."?

This is the biggest question raised by the Reagan administration's cutbacks in the federal solar cell (photovoltaics, or PV) program. The administration has pushed for an overall reduction in this program of more than 60 percent, down to \$63 million in 1982. Congress has restored \$30 million to the program, but the White House is expected to try to return the budget to the lower level. And, according to Department of Energy (DOE) sources, the budgetary ax will cut even deeper in 1983.

"By 1984 we're looking at a \$10 million per year program of university research,"

predicts one DOE solar official gloomily. He could talk only off the record because he and his colleagues have been ordered not to discuss their programs with the press.

Many experts consider photovoltaics the most revolutionary of the solar technologies. They have several reasons. Solar cells are second cousins to the transistor. They convert light into electricity without any moving parts, or pollution.

Like the transistor, if the technical problems can be solved, it should be possible to produce the cells quite inexpensively. Since the Arab oil embargo, the price of electricity produced by solar cells has fallen from \$1,000 per peak watt to \$10 a watt. And if the cost can be cut to \$2 a watt, PV will be economically competitive with conventional electric power. Further cost reductions, if possible to less than \$1 a watt, would make electricity from the sun a real energy bargain.

Testament to PV's potential is the fact that, in the United States, the big oil companies have moved aggressively into the field. Overseas, the Japanese government has made it a major element in their national energy program, and Saudi Arabia also has an extremely ambitious effort under way.

Until now, the US has held a clear lead in solar cell development. They are an American invention, having been developed as part of the space program. Following the Arab oil embargo, the US government initiated a major program to adapt this space age technology to terrestrial use.

Many materials have been found that convert light into electricity, and the US has been exploring a dozen different approaches simultaneously. Federal purchases of photovoltaic arrays helped fledgling companies start up production lines and reduce the cost of these cells.

Japan, starting from behind, adopted a different strategy. "The Japanese have undemocratically chosen what—in their best judgment—are the most promising processes," explains Steven Strong, president of Solar Design Associates. As a result, they have caught up and passed the US on one promising new approach, amorphous silicon.

With the current US cutbacks, Japan, for the first time, will "have the advantage of spending a higher total number of government and business dollars (on PV research than the US)," observes Jack Stone, a photovoltaics expert at the Solar Energy Research Institute.

As a result, "the Japanese will blow over us like a typhoon," predicts Mr. Strong, who has designed several photovoltaic homes. This view is shared by Rodale Press, publisher of the Organic Gardening magazine and a booster of alternative energy sources.

Not all experts in the field agree with so dire an assessment, however. "The Japanese are probably not as far ahead as we think. We get a lot of press reports and rumors which are probably exaggerated," says one DOE official.

At the same time, there is a feeling that, while the devastation of the federal program will significantly slow the pace of development of photovoltaics in the US, the private PV industry is healthy enough to go it alone. Several years ago, the amount of private investment in PV surpassed federal spending here. The administration's rationale for the massive federal cutbacks is that private enterprise can do the job better.

There is at least an element of truth in this assessment. "I have been very pleased with the private sector response to the cut-

backs. Several new corporations are getting in. It's still looking good from that point of view," reports Paul Maycock, who recently resigned as head of the DOE photovoltaics program.

Despite the cutbacks, Mr. Maycock foresees a very competitive world market, with the leadership alternating between the US, Japan, and, perhaps, other countries. "American firms currently have 90 percent world market while the Japanese have close to 0. This is a considerable advantage to overcome," he points out.

"We have the technological edge. We should have more confidence in American enterprise," says the director of one large privately funded laboratory. However, he admits they have hedged their investment by entering into a joint venture with a Japanese company, something several large US firms involved in this technology have done.

Most of the heads of private PV efforts, while praising much of the federal program, feel that certain aspects, particularly those involving "commercialization," now can be gradually phased out. However, a number are not enthusiastic about the manner in which the current cutbacks are being made.

"From what I hear through the grapevine, the cuts are not being made with enough selectivity," says one laboratory director. Too much basic research and development is being cut and too many commercialization programs are being redefined and kept, he objects. As a result, the reduction in what he considers the most useful and appropriate federal efforts are greater than he would like.

Until now, the US has been taking a low-risk approach to solar cell development. By funding research into a large number of approaches in parallel, when any given approach does not pan out, the overall rate of progress is not slowed substantially.

As result of the cutbacks, the range of federally funded research is being cut back radically. The result is greater risk of failure. If the cutbacks had come two years ago the government would have dropped work on amorphous silicon, the approach which now, because of an unexpected breakthrough, looks so promising that the Japanese have focused almost exclusively on it, points out one researcher.

In addition, as many as one-third of the researchers in the field are being forced to look for funding from private sources or turn to another area, experts say. Many, perhaps two-thirds of these, will be able to continue their work if they wish to.

However, research teams are being broken up and valuable experience splintered. Furthermore, uncertainty over the future will adversely affect those who continue to work on government grants.

"It's irritating to be in this country, working on a technology where overseas everyone envies us our leadership but which your own government fails completely to recognize," observes Joseph Lindmayer, head of Solarex.

He objects to the manner in which the cutbacks have been made as much or more than their substance. "The cuts are too much, too fast. And, at the same time, the administration is making negative statements about PV, and I have already lost one contract as a result," he complains.

He and a number of other photovoltaic entrepreneurs fear that this cutback will be viewed by U.S. investors and by foreign nations as a vote of no confidence in the technology. ●

STATE DEPARTMENT IS RIGHT IN DENYING CUBAN VISAS

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, after 22 years, it is a national disgrace that Fidel Castro still controls a country only 90 miles from America's shores and is able to project military power with impunity throughout Africa, and Central and South America. In 1975, Castro dispatched nearly 20,000 troops to assist pro-Marxist forces assume control in Angola. Shortly thereafter, Castro mounted a campaign in Ethiopia with an additional 20,000 troops. Within the past 6 years, and in 17 countries throughout Africa and the Middle East, Castro's 50,000-man Afrika Korps has conducted a Communist crusade of terror while the United States stood by idly, appearing impotent to meet the challenge.

Closer to home, Cuban anti-American activity ranges throughout the Caribbean Basin. Cuba itself has been transformed into a Soviet base servicing Soviet reconnaissance aircraft, electronic intelligence, and a sophisticated electronic listening post monitoring U.S. military communications. The Soviet naval presence in Cuba, the 3,000-man Soviet combat brigade, Soviet pilots flying Cuban aircraft, and the KGB's direct control of Cuban intelligence are further evidence of Soviet dominance of Cuba and the danger the regime represents to the United States.

On the mainland of the Americas, Castro has aided the Sandinistas in Nicaragua and is actively assisting the overthrow of pro-Western governments in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala.

In spite of a clear pattern of aggression, the U.S. Government has attempted to normalize relations with Cuba throughout this period. In fact, one of the first foreign policy initiatives of the Carter administration was the promotion of normalization. Influential Members of both the House and the Senate gave their support to this process and many traveled to Havana as symbolic gestures of renewed relations.

Recent actions by the State Department, however, indicate that the Reagan administration does not intend to proceed in the same direction.

On September 16, the State Department announced that visa applications by four members of the Cuban Ministry of Foreign Affairs, including Ricardo Alarcon, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, were denied. The four were to participate in the Center for Cuban

Studies symposium, "The U.S. and Cuba: Prospects for Dialogue," to be held this week in House and Senate Office Buildings. The purpose of the symposium was to promote the normalization of relations with Cuba.

The visas were denied under section 212827 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, which authorizes such action on foreign policy grounds. A spokesman for the State Department said that the visas were rejected "to reflect opposition to Cuban intervention and promotion of armed violence in Central America, Africa, and elsewhere."

Mr. Speaker, I applaud these actions. The time for talking normalization with Cuba is over. Now is the time to begin a policy reflecting the fact that the Cuban people can and should be set free from Castro's dictatorship. Let us hope that the administration's recent action is only the beginning of a series of steps designed to achieve that end.●

NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS DISABILITY REFORM ACT OF 1981

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the National Guard Technicians Disability Reform Act of 1981 (H.R. 4542) which is designed to correct a grave injustice in existing Federal retirement laws.

National Guard technicians are civilian employees of the Defense Department who provide the continuing core of specialized professional and skilled services needed to maintain equipment and other support at readiness levels. As a condition of employment, these technicians must also be members of their National Guard components on the same basis as other guardsmen.

If a technician is unable to meet the full requirements of the annual military physical, he automatically loses his civilian employment. But, because the disqualification is not made based on his or her civilian employment, the technician is ineligible for any benefits although both civilian and military co-workers would be eligible for some form of disability benefits in similar situations.

My proposed legislation would remedy this inequity. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there are several approaches that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service could recommend to Congress to deal with this unfair situation but I believe that this bill represents a reasonable approach and hope it can serve as a basis for a careful inquiry by that distinguished committee.●

THE CONCANNON VINEYARD

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the other day I took a few moments to talk about a family in my district that grows grapes which are made into wine. In an area rich with wineries, like the Livermore Valley, we have many beautiful vineyards, and charming wineries. One of those is the Concannon Vineyard, which will celebrate its 100th anniversary in just 2 years.

The Concannon Vineyards have been in the family for three generations. James Concannon; his son, Joseph; and his grandsons, Joseph, Jr. and James have all contributed to the family tradition.

Many wine critics have expressed their pleasure at the wines of the Concannon Vineyards. The vineyard has always been innovative in its winemaking, and has introduced superior wines from grapes that had never before been grown in this country.

I am including an article on the Concannon Vineyards, and want to personally commend this institution for its continued dedication to the tradition of fine California wines.

CONCANNON NEARS CENTURY MARK

In two years, in 1983, Livermore's Concannon Vineyard will be one century old.

In that time, three generations of Concannons have run the winery. First there was James, born in Ireland in 1847. A self-educated immigrant, he got into winemaking through friendship with San Francisco's first archbishop, producing sacramental wines originally, then expanding into the premium table wine field. His son Joseph carried on, followed by Joseph's sons Joseph Jr. and James.

"It should be no surprise that wines often reflect the character of the people producing them," wrote wine columnist Richard Paul Hinkle in a September 1979 edition of the San Francisco Examiner, thus beginning a column about the Concannon Vineyard.

He characterized the Concannons as people of "defined character" who produce wines "of definition." Speaking of the wines being made today, Hinkle observed, "Jim Concannon is a man of moderation. His wines reflect his low-key, hardworking, tasteful approach to life. You'll not see the splash of expensive advertising from the Concannons. There will be no trumpets to announce the arrival of a Concannon wine."

The winery has been a highly innovative one ("quietly so," observed Hinkle). In 1970, it bought cuttings of the Russian grape Rkatsiteli (pronounced rah-kot-suh-tel'ee) from the University of California at Davis and planted an experimental one-acre plot, which began bearing in 1973. The wine produced that year was the first American wine of this grape. According to Hinkle, Concannon's first Rkatsitelis "did not display a defined character," but such character has emerged since, with the maturation of the vines.

Of special pride to Concannon has been Petite Sirah. Concannon was the first

winery in the United States to produce a varietal wine from this grape, releasing it in 1964. Besides being a big success for Concannon, the wine made people rethink a long-held attitude about Livermore Valley vineyards in general, that they were capable of producing premium white wines but not red wines of similar quality.

Hinkle wrote that Concannon's Petite Sirah showed a defined character right from the start. "While many Petite Sirahs reflect the supposedly coarse nature of the grape, the Concannon Petite Sirahs have been broad, soft wines of superb flavor. . . .

"A clue to the character of the Concannon Petite Sirahs lies in the fact that at the core of the wines are grapes from head-pruned vines planted on their own roots in 1911. Those vines have thrived in the rocky ground nearly as long as the Concannons, and continue to produce fine wines, without fanfare but not without distinction. In that respect, they are much like the Concannons themselves."

Following the death of Joseph Jr. in 1978, James found it necessary to seek additional financial and managerial resources. He established a partnership with Agustin Huneus, a well-known wine producer. James has continued as president of the vineyard. The partnership has provided opportunity for expansion. Contracts have been signed with vineyards in several areas that produce grapes comparable to those grown in the 200-acre Concannon Vineyard on Tesla Road. The winery plans to closely supervise the growing of these grapes.

Recently, Sergio Traverso was named vice-president and winemaker. Traverso, holder of a doctorate from the University of California at Davis, was winemaker at Domaine Chandon in Yountville during the mid 1970's, followed by employment as oenologist-winemaker at Sterling Vineyards in Calistoga.

Speaking of Concannon Vineyard's future direction, a brochure put out by the winery says Concannon and Huneus both place great emphasis on wines being identified with a sense of place and of origin. "They feel certain that the nationwide interest in wine will continue to grow and that consumers will more and more frequently associate the quality of a wine with the region in which its grapes are grown. Mr. Concannon and Mr. Huneus intend to expand on Concannon Vineyard's reputation as the premier winery of the Livermore Valley."●

PROTESTERS GIVE VOICE TO THEIR ANGER AND FEARS

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, on September 19, 1981, 250,000 people gathered at the steps of the Capitol to protest Reagan's economic program and to assert demands for economic and social justice. Challenging the President's assertion that his economic program is based on a "mandate" that he received from the American people, senior citizens, factory workers, municipal employees and others of all ages and races denounced the cuts in education and social programs, and

defended agencies under attack, such as OSHA. The fears and concerns of several of the demonstrators were printed in the following Washington Post article, of September 20, entitled "Protesters Give Voice to Their Anger and Fears":

PROTESTERS GIVE VOICE TO THEIR ANGER AND FEARS

(By Judith Valente and Tom Sherwood)

Ron Wellman, 56, Army veteran, diehard Republican and Pennsylvania maintenance worker, stood near the Washington Monument yesterday, getting ready for the Solidarity Day rally, his Western-style string tie flying in the breeze, and a plaid polyester jacket on his back.

Wellman was a long way from home, home being near Erie, Pa., just outside Edinboro State College where he shovels snow in winter and cleans up the school grounds in summer to feed his family.

When America picked a president last year, Wellman voted for Ronald Reagan because he was "100 percent" for a stronger national defense. Wellman said he wanted to see the Russians put in their place and lazy Americans taken off welfare. But now Wellman says he is perplexed.

All he says he sees coming from the Reagan administration is that "the poor people, the little people, are getting ripped off, and this administration is favoring the rich."

Just this complaint brought Wellman and thousands like him to Washington yesterday—people who work on assembly lines, sew clothes, pick crops, transport food and clean streets and government buildings—to tell Reagan that the little people still form the backbone of this nation and that they are being hurt.

Even from those who had once enthusiastically supported Reagan, from burly steelworkers and young Hispanic busboys to elderly ladies who place the union label on thousands of garments each year, the message was clear.

"We got sold out," said Thomas Ramsey, a sugar hauler who had traveled all night Friday by bus from South Bay, Fla., with 46 fellow sugar industry workers to participate in the Solidarity Day protest.

Ramsey says he remembers vividly the television ads during the presidential campaign last year that highlighted Reagan's years as a union organizer for the Screen Actors' Guild, and now he says he resents the fact that most of the benefits of Reagan's tax package will go to the wealthy.

"He's taking bread out of the mouths of the American people," said Ramsey, who has a wife and two children. "... If they want to cut the budget and fix everything up in the economy, why don't they start with the politicians. Some of them are making \$80,000, \$90,000 a year and they ain't doin' anything. Me, I work seven days a week, 12 hours a day in our busy season from October to March, and I'm makin' \$17,000 a year."

Though Ramsey is only 30 and far from retirement age, he wore a red, white and blue sign that said, "Organized Labor is Opposed to Social Security Cuts."

But bricklayer Ernest DiFranco, 61, of Pittsburgh, is close to retirement and doesn't like Reagan's proposal to cut benefits sharply for people retiring in the future at 62 instead of 65.

"I've been picking up bricks every day of my life for 40 years," said the silver-haired DiFranco, son of Italian immigrants. "I

don't want to work until I'm 68 or 70. I might not make it. I might be six feet under by the time I get to receive my benefits. My back is broke now," he added as he joined a crowd of miners and state and municipal employees boarding a Metro train at RFK Stadium.

"I paid into Social Security for 40 years; it's mine, not his," said 68-year-old Woodrow Wellington, a retired maintenance man from Newark, Del., as he sat in the shade by the Washington Monument in a ten-gallon hat and cashmere jacket. Wellington, who carries his AFL-CIO lifetime membership card in his pocket and calls himself a "hard-line Democrat," said it irks him that Reagan often played up his past as a union organizer during the presidential campaign.

"He made out like he was this big labor person. But I don't think he ever done much work but play with that toy pistol on Death Valley Days," Wellington drawled.

Many other protesters yesterday voiced concern about Reagan's various deregulation proposals, especially those that they say would severely weaken the occupational safety standards.

For evidence, Bill Haynes, a Long Island, N.Y., painter, shows his wrists. They have been burned red and are peeling from constant contact with paint removing chemicals, he says.

"A lot of us [in the International Brotherhood of Painters and Tradesmen] work in painting where we have to go on scaffolding, in sandblasting and handling toxic materials," said Haynes, who, like other painters, marched along Constitution Avenue wearing a hard hat. "Without OSHA [Occupational Safety and Health Administration] behind us, our jobs could become even more dangerous."

Many in the crowd, especially young blacks and Hispanics, said they had benefited from federal job training and other government-funded programs, such as national defense student loans, and had provided community service in return.

John Richardson, 30, had a Comprehensive Employment and Training Act job cleaning up trash from back yards and vacant lots and exterminating rats in tenements in New York City's Harlem. But this year, several of those jobs, including his, were abolished, he said, even though health problems in Harlem remain as severe as ever.

"You can't imagine how many cases there are of rats crawling into cribs and biting babies. ... We were really needed," he said of the CETA workers. Many of them had been in the program as long as five years and some even got married thinking they would have a steady income. "But there's no security now," Richardson said.

As the afternoon wore on and the signs and banners were discarded and the crowd began to dwindle, many of those who had arrived in the morning full of enthusiasm, ended the day with mixed feelings about how effective their message had been.

"We should have been here during the week to shut down Washington," said Ron Weissen, president of a steelworkers' local in Homestead, Pa. "We came to show union support, but it's not going to change a thing, really."

But said John Patterson of Local 1842 of the Machinists union in Pittsburgh, "If this march doesn't work, we'll be back again." ●

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF PAUL F. BURNUM

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, Tuscaloosa County, in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, suffered a great loss recently with the death of Paul F. Burnum, 79, of Tuscaloosa. It is my privilege today to offer a tribute to the memory of this wonderful man.

Not many people achieve the measure of admiration and respect that Paul F. Burnum enjoyed. He earned that admiration and respect because he genuinely cared about people and about the welfare of his community.

He was a rarity—a man who had the vitality and know-how to be extremely effective in getting things done, yet warmth and sensitivity that made him a beloved leader.

Burnum, a native of Cullman, graduated from the University of Alabama in 1923 and was the first football coach at Barbour County High School. He also coached at Tuscaloosa High School, leading the football team to a 42-0-1 record from 1925 through 1929. He also was a pioneer in women's athletics, coaching the girls' basketball team during his tenure at Tuscaloosa High.

After coaching high school sports, Burnum served 13 years as an assistant coach at the University of Alabama, where he tutored a soon-to-be famous end, Paul "Bear" Bryant, whom he helped recruit out of Arkansas.

"We as a community and a school lost a dear friend, an outstanding human being," said Coach Bryant when told of Burnum's death. Continuing on he added, "Personally, I will miss Coach Burnum in many, many ways. He was very loyal to me and to Alabama and helpful to both of us for many years."

Paul F. Burnum will be remembered for many outstanding achievements and accomplishments. He built the first lighted football field in Alabama, organized the first Quarterback Club in Tuscaloosa, serving as president of it for 2 years and director for 3.

He served as president of the Exchange Club for 2 years, was a member of the board of directors of the Tuscaloosa Chamber of Commerce 2 years, and a member of the A-Club at the university.

Continuing on in his vein of always helping others, Burnum served as chairman of the Advance Drive for the Red Cross 1 year, chairman for the YMCA fund drive 1 year, and organized the "Back the Bear" Club that raised funds for lighting Bryant-Denny Stadium in Tuscaloosa.

I am pleased to know that this year Coach Burnum has been nominated for induction into the Alabama Sports Hall of Fame. I can think of no other individual who is worthy and deserving of this honor and recognition.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Susie Burnum, Tuscaloosa; a son, Dr. John Burnum, Tuscaloosa; a daughter, Mrs. Paula Sue Burnum Hayes, Tuscaloosa; three grandsons, Paul Hayes, Andrew Wilson Hayes and John Moseley Hayes, all of Tuscaloosa; four granddaughters, Susan Burnum, Birmingham, Lessie Burnum, Tuscaloosa, Fran Burnum Griffin, Birmingham, and Susanna B. Hayes, Tuscaloosa; three sisters, Mrs. Alma Oswald, Haverton, Pa. Mrs. T. A. Smith, Cullman, and Mrs. Thelma Roberts, Bessemer; and a number of nieces and nephews.

Paul F. Burnum's life should serve as a memorial to him for all time in Tuscaloosa, Tuscaloosa County, and the State of Alabama, for he truly devoted it to serving the people that he loved and cared for. He left many fond memories and I am sure that this fine, outstanding gentleman will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to share this tribute with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. He will be deeply missed by me and all others who were touched by his wonderful life.●

ROY WILKINS; 1901-81

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 1981

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, the individuals who have made our country great were those who perceived our people's ideals and worked in unique ways to achieve in our society a more perfect realization of these ideals. Roy Wilkins was such a man.

Grandson of a man who had suffered the worst perversion of our Nation's goals—slavery—Roy Wilkins became the leader of an organization which sought to rid our society of all vestiges of this terrible institution. Wilkins fought lynching, segregation, and discrimination in order to improve a society born of the ideals of equality and democracy for all citizens. From 1957 until 1977, he led the NAACP in combating racism in its many manifestations, in his own dignified and compelling manner.

Roy Wilkins lived to see great strides for blacks and for our society as a whole. He saw an end to formal condonation of separate treatment of the races, through Brown against Board of Education and the civil rights acts of the sixties, events which he was instrumental in bringing to pass.

Throughout his career, he faced frustration, derision, and dissension,

but he maintained his support for the system within which he worked. Possessed with a remarkable faith and optimism, he rejected violent and separatist approaches to the problems of blacks, and set a sterling example of what can be accomplished within the established political and legal system to improve our imperfect society.

All of us are the beneficiaries of the more equal society which Roy Wilkins helped to create. Thus all of us must help to bear the responsibility which such benefits carry—to assure that we continue to work toward perfecting our Nation, and to guarantee that minorities are provided equal opportunities to live, vote, work, and enjoy freedom in our society. We must regretfully bury Roy Wilkins, but let us forever preserve his memory and pursue his enduring ideals.●

HALSEY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH CELEBRATES ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction and pride that I bring to the attention of the Congress the 150th anniversary of the Halsey United Methodist Church near Grand Blanc, Mich.

The membership at Halsey United Methodist Church, located at Baldwin and Halsey Roads in Grand Blanc Township, Mich., is very much aware of the early pioneers and ministers who made it possible for people to enjoy worship there. To walk into the building is to become aware of the work and worship of people of years gone by. It is a history of involvement by a community as they seek to worship God.

Like many churches, Halsey started out as a stop on a circuit. The first minister to preach in Grand Blanc was Reverend Gilruth, a Methodist circuit rider. He preached his first sermon there in 1831. Services and meetings were held in log houses or barns as the occasion required. Later meetings were held in the Smith, Butler, and Halsey schoolhouses. Some walked to church, others rode in wagons drawn by oxen. The pioneer community believed that unless the Sabbath was respected, the settlement would not prosper.

In 1837 a log cabin school was built, the first Halsey school. This was a one-room building with two windows in the south side and one window in the east, and was built in the woods a short distance from the present church site. Services were held here for 11 years, until 1848, when a new schoolhouse was built on the site of what is now known as Halsey Park.

Union church services and Sunday school were held in this building for 37 years. We owe so much to these early pioneer Christian men and women who worshiped together for 54 years, first in their homes, then in the log schoolhouse, and later in the frame schoolhouse which many of our present-day members attended in their youth.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles Case, who were early pioneers and leaders of the religious and school life of the community, lived on what is now known as the Arthur Somers farm, corner of the Baldwin and Halsey Roads. They deeded land for a new church to the Methodist Society on June 22, 1885. The society purchased the unused Congregational Church, located at the corner of South Saginaw and Holly Roads, for the sum of \$100. The men of the Halsey community helped to take down the church, move it several miles to its present site, and rebuild it, using the old lumber and furnishing additional new material where it was needed to build the church steeple. Church sheds were built behind the church to shelter the horses, buggies and wagons which brought the worshipers to church. Each family furnished the lumber for their own shed. The church was finished and dedicated in 1886.

For nearly 10 years union services were held in the church, Methodist one Sunday and Congregational on the next, with the services finally taken over by the Methodists. In 1906 the remaining Congregational members transferred their membership to the church in Newark, located nearly 3 miles south, just off Holly Road.

For many years the church was part of a three- and then two-church ministry, and was the center of the religious and social life of the community. Improvements in the building have been made at various intervals. In 1926 a kitchen was added, in 1941 a basement and dining room. A woodshed had been added to the church to hold the cord of wood used to build fires in the two stoves used to heat the sanctuary. The woodshed became a cloakroom when the oil furnace was installed. A major building effort took place in 1957, when, through the combined work of all the people in the church, a parsonage was built. Like the early reassembling and adding on to the church building itself, this required the participation of many people.

Halsey United Methodist Church remains as a community church, just beyond the edge of greater Flint and its suburbs. It serves an increasingly suburban, yet still rural area between Grand Blanc and Holly. It is known for its community events, for ice cream socials and dinners. Yet it serves the community in other ways. It was one of the early churches in the midfifties to support the UNICEF col-

lection drives. It has contributed to area projects such as the Dort-Oak Park project in Flint, and been involved in supporting the United Methodist retirement homes. Members have a pardonable pride in the knowledge that their church is one of the pioneer churches in Genesee County, as well as the State of Michigan.

Plans are now being made for a special celebration in observance of the 150th anniversary. Heritage Sunday was held on September 20, when old photographs, historical data, and memorabilia were exhibited. Homecoming Sunday will be September 27 when former pastors and former church members and friends are invited to return for a worship service and dinner. On October 4 the congregation will celebrate Futures Sunday as church members look forward to challenges and opportunities in the future. ●

DESEGREGATION PLAINTIFF NOW AGAINST BUSING

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent newspaper column by Dick Feagler of the Cleveland Press that should be of great interest. The article describes how Robert Anthony Reed III, the student who was the plaintiff in the Cleveland school desegregation case, has decided he is against court-ordered busing. He has seen firsthand the harmful effects that forced busing has wrought upon the once proud Cleveland public school system.

His decision is also noteworthy because the House Judiciary Committee is currently holding hearings on the impact of court-ordered busing. I hope that the committee and other Members take note of the article which follows:

[From the Cleveland Press, September 21, 1981]

DESEGREGATION PLAINTIFF NOW AGAINST BUSING

(By Dick Feagler)

Robert Anthony Reed III, the student who was the plaintiff in the Cleveland school desegregation case, has decided he is against forced busing. He telephoned me to say he wanted to meet and talk about it.

"Maybe it's a story for you," he said. "I'm even thinking about supporting Rep. Ron Mott's anti-busing amendment. I wanted to tell you about it because you interviewed me before."

In 1976 I had interviewed Reed when the NAACP won its desegregation case against the school system.

In 1973 Reed was named the first plaintiff in the suit. Fourteen other persons, including his brother Darryl and mother, Wyona Reed Willis, were also named to represent all black people similarly affected.

At that time, the family lived in a single-family home in a modest, working-class, well-tended area of Garfield Heights but within the Cleveland school district.

Previously the Reeds lived in the Glenville area of Cleveland, where Robert attended Iowa-Maple and Hazeldell Elementary Schools.

When the suit was filed, Reed was attending Robert H. Jamison Junior High School, which was 99.6% black. He asked to be transferred to A. B. Hart Junior High School because it was integrated and he believed it was a better school.

However, the school district's attendance bureau turned down the transfer request. In a furor, Mrs. Willis marched into the NAACP office to file a complaint.

When Federal Judge Frank J. Battisti found the schools guilty of segregation in 1976, Reed said, "I feel good that they won the case. The lawyers did all the work but I feel good about it."

The changes that the lawsuit caused did not affect Reed. He was graduated from John Adams High School and has worked at a succession of part-time jobs while trying to decide what to do with his life.

He is 22 years old now and is saving money from his part-time job at a downtown fast-food restaurant to take more courses in computer programming. He divides his time between his parents' house in Bedford Heights and a bachelor apartment in Cleveland.

"I've watched the busing going on and I don't think it's the right answer," he told me.

"I don't think it's good for kids of any color to leave their neighborhoods and go to strange schools. It's tough enough being a kid without that kind of pressure."

"I'd support an anti-busing amendment as long as it wasn't racist. I think there's a better way to right past wrongs besides busing."

"For instance, suppose they took all this money wasted on busing and used it to build fine schools and other institutions in the black community. That would help make up for the fact that the community had been deprived," he said.

"Then they could open those schools to all. White kids would know they were the finest places in the city and would be free to enroll," he said.

"That makes more sense to me than busing. Especially now that the kids are riding RTA. Listen, it's hard enough for adults like me to ride RTA," he said.

Reflecting on his role in the desegregation case, Reed said, "Philosophically speaking, if a person is responsible for starting a situation (that turns) out bad, he should rectify it, if able."

"I feel I am able to assist in helping solve some of the problems happening in the schools."

Reed said he has tried to talk about his ideas with area congressmen.

"They are all in Washington so all I got to talk to was their aides," he said.

He says he also discussed his views with NAACP lawyers.

"They just listened to me," he said. "But they didn't say much." ●

CONDEMNATION OF UNESCO'S NEW WORLD INFORMATION ORDER

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it is with disappointment that I note that House Resolution 142 sponsored by Congressman SHAMANSKY and Congresswoman FENWICK, was deleted from the list of bills to be considered yesterday. As you know, the resolution expressed the House's objection to UNESCO's proposed New World Information Order which could stop the free flow of information that is so necessary to the survival of freedom and democracy. It is true that the Beard amendment to the State Department appropriations bill had already put down the House's firm objections to the New World Information Order, but that particular bill was not passed as a whole, and hence I feel it necessary to reiterate our objections on this particular issue: we must make sure that UNESCO has not the least shadow of a doubt about our attitude to this latest assault on the free world.

The Beard amendment to the State Department appropriations bill is of fundamental importance, and must be included when appropriations to the State Department are finally made. The New World Information Order makes a travesty of human rights. Freedom of thought and expression is a fundamental human right, the curtailment of which would be the first step toward the eradication of all human rights. The United States has, since its birth, been a beacon of human rights in an otherwise desolate world. Thus we cannot condone, much less be a party to, UNESCO's sinister designs on the freedom of the world press.

UNESCO has long been the seat of such mischiefmaking: were we to withhold funding from UNESCO, it would not be without precedent. The United States withheld funding from UNESCO in 1975 and 1976 because of the blatantly leftist course that organization was then taking. Now it wants to tell us what we may or may not think, say, or read. Enough of this nonsense. Let us answer the New World Information Order with a loud and resounding, "No!"

We know what forces are behind UNESCO's latest suggestion—and it is but a subtle extension of the never-ending war they are waging against us. The Soviets are of the opinion that we Americans will sell them the rope which they will use to hang us with. In recent years there has been a grim sense of truthfulness to this remark: we have continually looked the other

way when something threatening was done; we have tried to explain and excuse actions that are inexplicable and inexcusable, and all the time we have treated with them as if they were our moral equals. Well, no more of this! Until such time as Representative BEARD's amendment is incorporated into a bill passed by Congress, we must continue to reaffirm our opposition to the New World Information Order in every way possible. In so doing we will disprove the aforementioned Soviet opinion of us, and show the world that we are prepared to stand up and defend that which is right.●

UNESCO: BLAME ENOUGH FOR
ALL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week during consideration of H.R. 3518, the Department of State authorizations, we considered amendments dealing with the New World Information Order and the role of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in this area. The amendment sought to block the U.S. contribution to UNESCO if that organization acted to restrict the freedom of the international press or sought to enforce a code of journalistic ethics. I voted against that amendment, and would like to explain why.

Freedom of speech, a free press, the free and open exchange of ideas and information are the basis of a just society. These concepts are the cornerstone of our Nation and are the elements of freedom that we seek for all of mankind. Where these elements are absent, mischief and evil have occurred and humanity's potential is lost.

Censorship is the extreme form of the abrogation of these rights and is unfortunately practiced in many countries today. As was pointed out in the debate last week, the Communist bloc countries are especially guilty of censorship and the denial of a host of other basic human rights. I join my colleagues in the condemnation of these practices. But it is not a Communist-inspired move toward censorship that, by itself, has led to our current policy problems.

Flows of information are the currents of political, economic, and social power. Many developing countries have felt denied information vital to their development needs while being flooded with other information which is extraneous and even detrimental to the accomplishment of these needs. From the perspective of these countries, the developed world is insensitive to their needs and goals.

It is, in many instances, easier for a developing country to obtain reruns of "I Love Lucy" in their language than it is to obtain educational programming. Resource development companies in developed countries have more complete satellite remote sensing data than is available to the developing country being surveyed. And the news sources for the developing countries are not found in the developing world, but are developed-country sources such as UPI, BBC, Reuters, and the rest.

This last element is the key to the problems that we have been encountering over the last 5 years. Just as people in this country complain about our overemphasis on negative news—fires, disasters, and so forth—many developing countries object to a seeming emphasis on the negative. Floods, famines, revolutions, and the failings of incompetent leaders are reported more often than success stories; at least this is the position of many developing nations.

What these countries want is more positive reporting, called by some development journalism, akin to the reporting in the metropolitan and features sections of our newspapers. But without their own news agency and the money and equipment to make it work, the developing world remains dependent again on the developed countries.

In 1976, the issue came to a head at the UNESCO meeting in Nairobi. The Communist countries and totalitarian nations in the world began to formally press for conditions to be placed on information entering and leaving a country. Many nonaligned countries, long frustrated with what they saw as an imbalance in global information flows, joined this effort. The United States was certain to lose a democratic vote, test vote, and successfully had the issue tabled by promising to take steps to aid developing countries in their information and communications efforts.

By the time of the next UNESCO meeting in 1978, little had been done and the information issues were raised again. The U.S. position became inflexible as we dug in our heels to thwart what we had cast as a Soviet move toward global censorship. Lost were legitimate grievances of imbalances of information flows. Lost was the ability to exploit the differences of opinions and policies that run through the nonaligned movement. Again promises were made and a disastrous policy setback was avoided.

In 1979, the World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC) was held to divide the broadcast spectrum among different uses and different countries. The developed countries had much at stake since the allocations resulting from this Conference remain in effect for 20 years. After

some initial rancor, we managed to again gain a consensus and avoided another potential setback, although many of the issues have yet to be resolved at a series of regional meetings.

Then we have the latest UNESCO meeting at which the New World Information Order and a journalistic code were presented again. This time the debate heated up, fueled by the impatience of the nonaligned countries and the mischief of the Soviets. We dusted off our old policies and our old newspaper editorials and avoided disaster again. And we once again avoided a great opportunity.

Since 1977, I have been pressing for a different U.S. position on this issue. I have proposed that we make our information and communications technologies available to developing countries to assist their development efforts and gain their good will so that we are able to accomplish something more than avoiding disasters at international meetings. I firmly believe that if we had made a genuine and visible effort following the 1976 UNESCO meeting, we would not be having to debate the issues we are taking up today.

We could have linked developing country centers of knowledge, via satellite, with our centers. We could have trained developing country workers in remote sensing data interpretation on a larger scale and made the imagery available to them. We could have helped meet developing country broadcast spectrum needs by doing a better job of helping them aggregate users and develop time-sharing arrangements. We have done much to dispel the mixture of envy and suspicion with which these countries view the developed world's domination in this field, envy and suspicion which strengthen the Soviet position.

We would also have gained an economic advantage. Sixty percent of the world's population lives in the developing world. This market will be seeking increasingly sophisticated goods and technologies, such as communications technologies, in the coming decades. A sensitivity to the needs of these countries and a record as a reliable supplier of goods and training will reap tremendous economic rewards in the near future. The Japanese have noted this and recently gave a telephone transmission facility to Sri Lanka, a key nonaligned country, both politically and geographically.

Instead of seizing this opportunity to do good by doing right, we are continuing to adhere to a policy that presents us with increasing headaches. Instead of aggressively seeking to deny the Soviets a support base in the nonaligned movement, we debate policies that will provide them with a propaganda victory to be used amongst those countries. Instead of finding

new ways of fighting this threat to our cherished values of free speech and a free press, we are working within boundaries set by our aggressors.

Much of the cause of our current dilemma originates from our own insensitivity and lack of imaginative policy. I am reminded of a passage from an essay by Paul Valery, "The Greatness and Decline of Europe," written in 1927:

More than one nation is deeply convinced that, in and of itself, it is pre-eminent, the elect of the endless future, the only nation capable of aspiring . . . to the supreme development of whatever potentialities it arrogates to itself. Each finds an argument in the past or the possible. None likes to regard its troubles as its legitimate offspring.

Until this country begins to recognize the need for new policies in the area of international communications, we will be stuck with our present narrow range of options. And the real threat to our basic freedoms will grow.●

THE PEACE CORPS AT 20

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today, President John F. Kennedy signed the Peace Corps Act into law. I would like to take a few moments to congratulate the Peace Corps' thousands of current and former volunteers and staff. They have given the world 20 years of selfless service, and have improved the lives of millions, both directly and through the people they have lived with, worked with, and taught.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, which provides funding for the Peace Corps, I have had several opportunities to visit Peace Corps volunteers and staff in the field, in Africa, Asia, and Central and South America. I have been very favorably impressed by the abilities and dedication of these people, and by their willingness to give up comfortable Western lives to go live in the villages of the Third World and try to make a difference in the ways the world's poorest people survive.

It seems to me that there is no more cost-effective way to help people to better their daily lives than working with them at the local level in the critical areas of health, nutrition, agriculture, and education. And this work cannot be done without a knowledge of the languages, cultures, and conditions within which changes and improvements must take place. Indeed, in my experience, Peace Corps people are the only official U.S. representatives abroad who speak the languages and dialects and live in the cultures

and conditions of the people our development assistance programs are meant to help.

And, Mr. Speaker, having had this very special experience, Peace Corps people come home, bringing their new knowledge of and sensitivity to the real problems and needs of the developing world to share with the rest of us. They are a unique national resource, helping to broaden our awareness of an increasingly interdependent world.

I would again like to congratulate the Peace Corps for its 20 years' service, and I wish it 20 years more, or however long it takes to finish the job.●

SELF-HELP AND SELF-RELIANCE

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the drastic reduction in Federal support for social programs indicates dismal days ahead for many Americans who depended on these programs. Alternatives must be sought as we attempt to cope with the effects of the Federal budget reductions. To accomplish this, new modes of promoting social change will have to be explored. One of the modes that may not be new but perhaps has not been developed as productively as it should is the church.

Churches are becoming more concerned about their communities. They are sponsoring day care facilities, senior citizen centers, after school tutorial programs, job referral/place-ment services, and housing programs.

This view of the church as an instrument for social change can be seen with crystal clarity when we look at the St. Paul's Community Baptist Church and the pastor, Rev. Johnny R. Youngblood. A New York Times article which appeared on September 5, 1981, highlights the work of Reverend Youngblood and his church in the east New York section of Brooklyn, N.Y. This article is being submitted for my colleagues' attention.

IN POVERTY, A CHURCH IS THRIVING

(By Kenneth A. Briggs)

Although he had injured his right leg the day before in a touch-football game and was limping noticeably in his office, the Rev. Johnny R. Youngblood had shown no sign of difficulty moving about during the service at St. Paul's Community Baptist Church in Brooklyn. It is part of his self-image as someone who must lead by example.

"In black religion, the element of contagion must be considered," he said, his shirt still damp with perspiration from the energy expended during the 45-minute sermon. "I don't want people to see me hopping to the pulpit. If I'm seen in need, they're in need. If I'm seen healthy, they're healthy."

Articulate, energetic and strong-willed, Mr. Youngblood is still maturing professionally, reaching for the top of his form. He stands in the tradition of the black preacher, the figure W. E. B. DuBois, the educator, called the most original character in the centuries of American Black history.

Seven years ago, at the early ministerial age of 26, Mr. Youngblood was unanimously elected by the 72 church members as the pastor of St. Paul's. At the time, the struggling church, founded in 1927, was meeting in a brownstone on Prospect Place in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn.

WORD FROM THE LORD

"We had our backs to the wall," said William Brandon, president of the church deacons, recalling the depths to which the congregation had fallen, "so we decided to just turn him loose and see what happened."

A lot happened. Today the church has 1,200 members, more than half of whom tithe, donating a tenth of their income. Two years ago it moved into a spacious former synagogue on Hendrix Street in the East New York section. Even with two services and seating capacity for nearly 600, overflow crowds are frequent. They come to hear the choir and to see each other, but mostly to hear Mr. Youngblood.

"There is no substitute for preaching," he said. "I don't care what else a preacher does in the community or what causes he promotes, the people want to know on Sunday morning whether there's a word from the Lord."

A RENEWED RESPECT

St. Paul's has plans for ambitious social projects, including a private junior high school, a meeting place for tenant groups and a center for the elderly. Like many black churches, it is feeling a new sense of urgency, spurred by expectations that the Reagan Administration's cuts in social programs will bring new hardship and scarcity into their neighborhoods.

"Mr. Reagan will do a lot to fill the churches," Mr. Youngblood said wryly. "In the black church, we really preach for survival. When folks have no other resources, God is always there."

Though social activists have criticized some black preachers for counseling passivity and spiritual escapism in the face of racial oppression, the leadership of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and hundreds of other black ministers in the civil-rights movement helped bring the church renewed respect. And after the social programs of the Great Society had mostly come and gone, many blacks noted that the church was still there—65,000 places of worship in the United States—as a bulwark of black community life.

Mr. Youngblood stated the case in his own terms. "Dr. King," he said, "helped us to see that there is much more to our work than preaching and praying."

His success has brought him to a new challenge in his ministry. He is at the helm of a growing, vibrant institution in the midst of a neighborhood of poverty, drug abuse and street crime. Against the tide, the church has prospered both in numbers and income; each month's expenditures exceed \$25,000, and its buildings are fully paid for.

He is increasingly regarded as a leader on a broader scale. One sign is his enlarged role in the East Brooklyn Churches, a coalition of 29 churches organized by the Industrial Areas Foundation, a group formed by the late social activist Saul Alinsky. Recently, 425 people from the churches met at St.

Paul's and the host pastor gave the keynote address.

"It provides the tools to implement Christian theory," Mr. Youngblood said of the coalition. "We talk about love, power and Christian confrontation."

"He is a key pastor," said Mike Gecan, the professional staff member for the organization. "The church's long-term survival depends on what happens to the neighborhood. There are many churches in Brooklyn sitting in the midst of devastation."

"We came into the community to help," Mr. Youngblood remarked during a stroll through a building that the church is renovating as its junior high school. "We are right at home in the graveyard."

He foresees the school as a place where Christian values can permeate a sound educational program, where children will be subject to discipline and inculcated with manners. Mr. Youngblood, who holds an undergraduate degree from Dillard University in New Orleans and a Master of Divinity degree from Colgate Rochester Divinity School in Rochester, places great emphasis on education as a chief means to combat poverty.

Each September, at the start of the school year, he takes time during the services to underscore the benefits of schooling. Youngsters are encouraged to bring their report cards to church after each grading period. The minister reads grades aloud and, he noted with delight, "I'm even getting some of the bad ones now."

The church also has its own scholarship fund, which a growing number of members are using to help finance college education.

Recognition is a staple of life in the congregation. The church is a place to be somebody, a haven of dignity where to be a deacon or deaconess is a position of honor. Mr. Youngblood presides over the creation of a community of people who he believes can be helped to feel worthy and important in the midst of everyday stresses.

He acknowledges the academic achievers, and in the next breath speaks in the language of less-educated people, sprinkling his messages with the "y'alls" and "ain'ts" of street talk. "The trick," he said, "is to push education without saying that God only likes folks who have one."

Mr. Youngblood said he believed he must guard against complacency and egotism after having done so much, so soon. "If I have the power people say I have," he said, "then I don't want to know about it."

He believes that dark days are ahead, particularly for poor people. "My first responsibility to people is to let them know someone genuinely cares for them," he said ruefully, "and then to be willing to create alternative ways of helping."

"Washington will hear from the black church," he said. "We've got to teach and preach something in the meantime. It's not the first time we've been under this kind of a regime. We know how to survive in a storm." ●

MARKED MEN

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, ever since he took office, Secretary of the Interior Watt has been the

victim of hysterical and unjustified criticism from special interest groups. The critics have accused the Secretary of all sorts of diabolical crimes against the environment without showing any evidence of the supposed destruction.

However, the time may be at hand when many "environmentalists" are willing to step back from their non-stop rhetoric and examine the facts. I do not believe that anyone would mistake the New Republic for a conservative, prodevelopment publication. Yet, its publisher's comments on Mr. Watt's performance stand in stark contrast to the vast majority of ranting about the Secretary, as evidenced in the following column from the September 9, 1981, issue of the New Republic. I would urge some of my colleagues who have themselves been involved in the rhetoric to investigate Mr. Peretz' remarks for a more balanced view of Mr. Watt from a well-known liberal individual's views.

The column follows:

MARKED MEN

Even though Secretary of the Interior James Watt believes the end of the world is near he moved last week to guarantee that the extinction of the humpback whale does not happen first. This has won Watt the favor of environmentalists, something he has not had before. Many of these same folk were pleasantly surprised to note that he'd also come down hard on the commercial water users of the Wetlands Water District in California, insisting that they at least pay the costs of what they use. This is something they don't want to do, and have taken Watt to court in order not to. The Environmental Defense Fund has entered the case on his behalf. In many other places, however, the fund is plaintiff against the secretary—in one instance representing 12 grizzlies whom his policies are alleged to endanger. I'm just back from a riding and rafting expedition in Wyoming, the fifth-largest state, with a population that barely entitles it to its single seat in the House of Representatives; and it wasn't until this trip that I fully understood the incredulity a Dutch journalist friend recently expresses at the common worry of liberals that the U.S. is being used up. And he'd only traveled through the south Atlantic states. What would he think of this hysteria about the exhaustion of unspoiled America if he'd seen the empty vastness of Wyoming or Idaho or Montana or Arizona, or, for that matter, upstate New York? In six days and 60 miles of far and wide as the eye can wander we saw two backpackers, one herd of sheep, and one shepherd. No more than others do I want the physical patrimony of America despoiled. But there are difficult trade-offs between benefit and beauty, need and nature. Some of the more strenuous partisans of the pristine come from the places like Los Angeles and Washington, and, indeed, it is nice to have huge stretches of the country preserved pure for the ten days every two or three years one likes to play Lewis and Clark. But this can mean hardship and restrictions on the locals. Watt has tried to address some grievances of these people. He is also and most controversially in favor of the exploitation of oil and minerals in selected wilderness areas. Rigs in the Badger National Park won't look pretty, but no one contemplates more than

a few. Moreover, it may be that, as with other instances of abundance, we'd care more for our wilderness if we had less. ●

ON SOLIDARITY DAY

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, thousands of laborers convened in Washington for a day of protests and speeches against the latest attempts to roll back bloated Federal budgets. Their convocation was a worthy exercise in participatory democracy, but it was led by leaders who presume to understand what the working citizen of America is concerned about.

I suggest that this is not true.

Every year, the percentage of laborers who belong to a union declines. Between 1978 and 1980, union membership dropped by 652,000. Compared to the total U.S. labor force of 106.8 million, union membership constitutes only 20.8 percent of the work force.

It should also be pointed out that the two biggest unions promoting Saturday's solidarity day activities, the Machinists and Aerospace Workers and the United Auto Workers, suffered the greatest membership declines. The Machinists lost 19.1 percent of their membership, while the UAW declined by 9.5 percent in 2 years. All of this, by the way, happened before Ronald Reagan had even been sworn in as President.

One must wonder. If union leadership were doing such a great job of providing for their members, why have so many union members chosen to leave?

Additionally, as any good political scientist can tell you, the percentage of rank-and-file union members who vote for the candidates endorsed by their centralized leaders is declining.

All of which leads one to solidly suspect that the union membership is not being very adequately represented by their leadership.

Organized labor serves a definite and constructive purpose through the many functions it performs. Unionism is one of the most sacrosanct ways that people can assure themselves of human and political rights. Unfortunately, American union leadership acts as a lobby group without the ideological support of its contributing constituents.

No one seems to know, or at least no one seems to want to state for the record, how much money was spent by the AFL-CIO on Saturday. We do know, however, that all of the hundreds of thousands of dollars were financed through the mandatory contributions of the average union member,

who wishes only to provide a living for his family and to see himself prosper and advance.

These are the same union members who, in a poll financed by the Committee on Political Education (COPE), declared a 65-percent preference for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. By a 3-to-1 margin, these workers blamed Government for the economy's malaise. Even Lane Kirkland, the most stalwart old-line liberal in the labor movement, concedes that he received a great deal of mail from members who said that they supported President Reagan last November.

If the AFL-CIO wishes to lobby, why do they not lobby in favor of a balanced budget amendment, which is what their own membership desires?

And now, in Saturday's Washington Post, we find that union leadership is once again thumbing their collective noses at the union member.

The unions in America are expected to contribute \$1 million to the Democratic National Committee's annual budget this year. Thus far, the drive has produced \$445,000 in contributions and commitments, and no one seems to have any doubt that the \$1 million goal will be achieved.

Each union president is expected to kick in \$15,000 in "hard money" and \$100,000 in "soft" money to the DNC. "Hard" money is defined as money which can be utilized for Federal candidates, while "soft" money is defined as that used for operating expenses, voter registration drives, and other activities not aimed specifically at the election of a particular candidate. It is thoroughly legal under Federal election law.

But one has to wonder what the average laborer thinks of it all, and whether this is the way he really wants to see his money spent. After all, this \$1 million will be financed through the mandatory "contributions" of union members—Republican and Democrat alike.

Mr. Speaker, I have met a great many working men and women, members of unions. They are good and decent people. Some are conservative and some are liberal. Some are Democrats and some are Republicans.

The point is that organized labor is not one homogeneous group, monolithically dedicated to opposing President Reagan's economic recovery program. Only the leadership is, but the rank and file is forced to contribute to these activities.

Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the concerns of the working men and women of this country. They are tired of enduring a sluggish economy, persistent inflation and high interest rates. They want only to achieve that most common of American dreams—to leave their children more than they themselves started out in life with.

The economic factors we face are consequences of 40 years of untarnished and unchecked Government growth.

Despite the fact that Ronald Reagan has been in office for less than 10 months; despite the fact that his economic program does not even begin until next month, we are asked to believe that he is the one who shoulders the blame for this economic morass.

Those who organized Saturday's solidarity demonstration must believe the American people to be fools. A truly cognizant union leadership marches with its membership, not against it.

America's labor force is unrepresented by those who organized Saturday's demonstration, and they are solid in their determination to see President Reagan's economic recovery program succeed. ●

CONGRESSMAN LABELS EASTERN SHORE MIGRANT CAMPS "TRAVESTY"

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 19, 1981, the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, chaired by our very able colleague and my close friend, HENRY GONZALEZ, held a series of field hearings and tours of migrant farmworker camps that are located within a few hours of this Capitol Building.

What they found is appalling beyond belief in this day and age. Unheated corrugated metal barracks supplied with water labeled as unsafe for drinking because it was nitrate-poisoned, and communal kitchens that featured stopped up sinks and squadrons of buzzing flies surely deserve to be labeled a "travesty," as indeed they were by Congressman GONZALEZ.

These conditions are only slightly short of slavery. I commend Congressman GONZALEZ for leading us to this blot on the American way of life. I commend him for the rightness and justice of his efforts to end such misery. I also commend him for the personal risk that I believe he and the staff of the subcommittee undertook in uncovering for all Americans this "travesty."

Ward Sinclair of the Washington Post has written an article about what Congressman GONZALEZ saw. The words themselves are vivid and convey a most disgusting and abominable situation that we must correct. They merely scratch the surface for as terrible as the events conveyed by this story might be, the stark reality is that he could have told more. He has spared our sensitivities but he has not

spared us the intellectual terror that we must all experience in knowing that camps like these still exist to prey upon the poor, the downtrodden, the weak and the newcomer to our shores. Those who have fled terror elsewhere should not, in this land of freedom and liberty, hope and justice, be forced to endure such degradation and inhumanities.

I have attached the story Ward Sinclair has written. I urge each Member to read and reflect upon it.

EASTERN SHORE FARM CAMPS DISTURB TEXAS CONGRESSMAN

(By Ward Sinclair)

WESTOVER, Md.—Representative Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex.) was disturbed by the condemned water, the ramshackle housing, the lack of cooking and sanitary facilities he'd been seeing all day, but it took the case of the Catholic nun to tell the whole story.

As Gonzalez toured the controversial Westover migrant farm worker camp in Somerset County as part of a day-long investigative tour of farm labor housing on the Delmarva Peninsula, Sister Jane Houtman was outside looking in—labeled an "agitator" by the camp's owners and blocked from entering.

The Texas congressman came to the Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia Saturday on the first leg of what he intends to be a full-scale national study aimed at pushing farmers and the federal government toward quick improvement in housing for migrant farm laborers.

The incident involving Sister Jane, a nurse to migrants on the shore for seven years who has been critical of the growers, capsulized what Gonzalez heard all day long from workers and others—that housing problems are only one facet of a constant grappling between labor and management, a constant clashing of wills over what is right for the migrants.

Sister Jane and other nurses from the Daughters of the Holy Spirit have wrangled with farmers for months over conditions in the camp. Finally, the 12 owners of Westover decided that she and the other nurses will not be allowed on the camp next season because of their "agitation" among migrants.

For all that, there was at least one new development. Gonzalez and staffers from the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee heard farmers on the Delmarva Peninsula, where more than 6,000 migrants worked in vegetable fields this summer, admit for the first time that the housing they provide is inadequate.

The Somerset farmers and Philip McCaleb, a Belle Haven, Va., grower and chairman of the Virginia Migrant and Seasonal Farm Worker Commission, conceded they have problems, but urged Gonzalez and his housing and community development subcommittee to ease their quandary over federal regulations.

"Housing is a major problem," said McCaleb, "and it contributes as much as anything to other problems, such as health . . . Farmers don't pay enough attention to housing. They don't see housing as a productive investment."

He and Somerset farmers Edwin Long and Dennett Butler complained—and Gonzalez readily agreed—that requirements of the Farmers Home Administration are so complex and unrealistic that few farmers are

willing to take advantage of the long-term loans available at 1 per cent interest for migrant housing.

But they hardly needed to concede there was a problem, after what Gonzalez had found in his day of visiting labor camps and taking testimony at a hearing in Melfa, Va. At one point, after visiting Haitian refugees in a desolate Maryland camp, the congressman shook his head and lamented "the unbelievable travesty."

That was at the Wanex and Groton camp near Hurlock, in Dorchester County. A type-written notice, taped to a wall by the county health department, warned in three languages that under no condition should babies drink the nitrate-poisoned water. All water used for drinking must be boiled. Clean bottled water is available to workers willing to pay, the notice said.

At the John N. Wright Jr. Canning Co. labor camp at Federalsburg, Md., a crew of Mexican-American cucumber harvesters told Gonzalez that the early fall coolness has made living difficult in their unheated corrugated metal barracks. The congressman was visibly touched after a woman from Texas recognized him and pleaded for help.

"God is watching you," she told him in Spanish as her six young children milled about. She complained about heat in the summer, cold in the fall and no sunlight in the one-story metal buildings. "You need to do something," she said. "People want to work, but they need help—these conditions are not good."

At the nearby Washington Cemetery Road camp, Haitians played a spirited game of dominoes in the yard as fellow workers crowded around. Women were cooking beans and hot chocolate in an open-air communal kitchen, featuring a stopped-up sink and squadrons of buzzing flies.

At Westover, Gonzalez and aides negotiated with camp manager Bill Webster for more than 30 minutes before being allowed to see some of the two dozen buildings, once part of a holding pen for German prisoners during World War II.

At the Farmex camp at Tasley, Va., he found more of the same—workers and children huddling in unheated, unlighted rooms; pools of water dotting the common yard; filthy latrines and rustic cooking facilities.

At Melfa, Gonzalez took testimony from farmers, from workers representing Mexican-American, Haitian and American black migrants, a Catholic priest, and nurses from the Delmarva Rural Ministries, who provide health care for migrant and seasonal workers on the peninsula.

Sister Jane and Linda K. Miller, nursing coordinator for the ministries, stressed that it is impossible to separate housing from overall migrant problems of health and safety. "As much as 30 percent of our nursing encounters document illness and trauma that are directly related to camp conditions," Miller said.

The nun, however, laid it on the line. As overwhelming as the problems seem, Sister Jane said, "people tolerate their situation because they want to work." She said better housing would quickly alleviate some other migrant woes.

But, she added, the problem of caring for the migrant is everyone's and "basic attitudes" won't change until people begin to speak out. For her part, the nun said, "I cannot remain silent." The audience, including grower McCaleb, broke into applause. ●

FEDERAL HEALTH PLANNING SYSTEM

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I, along with several of my colleagues, have introduced a bill today that would bring an end to the Federal role in health planning. The bill would repeal titles XV and XVI of the Public Health Service Act effective September 30, 1982.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Federal health planning program, I have had the opportunity to study it carefully, and I have been disturbed at what I have found. The 7 years that have passed since the creation of the program in Public Law 93-641 have made it clear that the program has failed, and the law should be repealed. The result of the law has not been planning, but regulation. The predominant activity is the certificate-of-need process, which is not a planning tool, but a means to control the health care system.

The 93d Congress envisioned a community based planning system with decisionmaking and control at the local and State level. Instead, the current system is dominated by the Federal Government. Federal funds finance the program. Federal regulations and standards control every aspect of the State and local agencies' activities. All decisions are ultimately made by the Federal Government. This is national, not local, planning, and regulation. The State and local agencies exist only to carry out Federal mandates.

The focus in health planning has been cost containment, but there is no reliable evidence to show that any money has been saved. In fact, other studies indicate that the CON process actually increases health care costs. One study found that, over a 2-year period, delays in the CON process added \$25 million to the cost of projects under review. Another study showed that applying for a CON was also expensive, and added ultimately to the cost of the project.

Cost problems are further aggravated because health planning is anticompetitive. Its emphasis is on constricting the health care system, not expanding the number of participants. In effect, it is a franchising system that favors and protects existing entities by making it difficult for new providers to enter the market.

The law sets out goals of improving the accessibility and availability of health care; however, the current system has failed in this also. The emphasis has been entirely on reducing

the number of beds, services, and hospitals. Cutting back resources does not improve accessibility and availability.

Another reason for the failure of the system is that it has tried to provide a single Federal solution to diverse health care needs and problems. In a State like Alabama, the health problems of a large city are very different from those of a rural area. Only a flexible, community based planning program, the antithesis of Public Law 93-641, could accommodate these legitimate differences.

Finally, health planning has been an expensive program. In the first 6 years of its existence from 1975 up through 1980, the program cost the taxpayers almost \$729 million, including \$157.7 million in 1980 alone. And this does not include the hidden cost of higher insurance and medical bills caused when providers have to recoup the dollars the CON program has cost them.

Apparently a majority of our colleagues both in the House and Senate agree that, at a minimum, curbs must be placed on this program. Provisions of the recently enacted Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act reflect a loss of faith in the ability of the health planning system to achieve the goals Congress had in mind when the program was created. However, although I am pleased that role of Federal health planning has been somewhat circumscribed, I see no justification in retaining the program even at a reduced level.

For the general reasons I stated earlier, along with several stories related to me concerning specific incidents of bureaucratic bungling, I believe repeal of this program must be pursued. We know it is not working, so why prolong the agony? ●

MICHAEL V. DiSALLE

HON. ED WEBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. WEBER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on September 15, our Nation lost one of its most devoted public servants, Michael Vincent DiSalle.

From his humble birth, the son of immigrant parents, "Mike"—as he was always known—grew up to be the only Toledoan ever to be elected Governor of the State of Ohio.

My first and most lasting recollection of Mike DiSalle comes from a time when he was mayor of the city of Toledo. As part of my high school civics course, I attended a meeting of the city council at which he presided. I can recall the polite, good humored, yet forceful way in which he managed that meeting.

In addition, to his years of service to the people of Toledo and later the

State of Ohio, Mike DiSalle also served the Nation as Director of the Office of Price Stabilization during the administration of President Harry Truman. He earned the respect of all those who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, as Representative of the Ninth Congressional District, and on behalf of my constituents, I join the numerous personal and political friends of Michael Vincent DiSalle in this recognition of his public service and express our sympathy to Mrs. DiSalle and the members of his family.●

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO RELATIVE TO H.R. 3215

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in April of this year I introduced H.R. 3215, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the 10-year averaging of lump-sum distributions from deferred compensation plans of State and local governments. The need for this legislation was first brought to my attention by Mr. Abe Goldman of Sacramento, Calif. At this time, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the county of Sacramento in support of this measure.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 81-937

WHEREAS Congressman Vic Fazio has introduced into the Congress H.R. 3215 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the ten-year averaging of lump-sum distribution plans of State and local governments; and

WHEREAS the bill applies to those deferred compensation plans established under section 457, Internal Revenue Code; and

WHEREAS such plans are available to State and local governmental employees throughout the country; and

WHEREAS because section 457 plans are not classified as "trusts" in the legal sense, members currently are denied the use of ten-year averaging for lump-sum distribution; and

WHEREAS the use of ten-year averaging is available to private sector qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plans; and

WHEREAS this proposal simply seeks to equalize the treatment for public sector plans to use ten-year averaging in an identical manner to private sector plans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors is in support of this legislation; be it further

Resolved and ordered, That the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Congressman Fazio and members of the Congressional delegation representing Sacramento County.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

On a motion by Supervisor Bryan, seconded by Supervisor Johnson, the foregoing resolution was passed and adopted by the BOARD OF SUPERVISORS of the County of Sacramento, State of California, this 11th day of August, 1981.●

ARIZONA LEGISLATURE URGES COMPLETION OF CAP

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit to the House a recently approved memorial by the Arizona State Legislature urging the commitment of the Secretary of the Interior to the completion of the central Arizona project.

Last week I had the pleasure of meeting with Secretary Watt in Arizona to discuss the future of this vital program. During 3 days of discussions and hearings, the Secretary continually expressed his support for both the Tucson Aqueduct and the completion of CAP. I hope that the Congress will show the same interest and concern for the long-term objectives of our growing State.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
September 16, 1981.

HON. ELDON RUDD
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS,
STATE OF ARIZONA,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR ELDON: The Arizona State Thirty-fifth Legislature, First Special Session, 1981, unanimously adopted House Concurrent Memorial 2001, urging the Secretary of the Interior to support the Central Arizona Project and approve and expedite the construction of the Tucson Aqueduct.

The members of the Arizona State Legislature have asked me to transmit the enclosed copy of this Memorial to you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ROSE MOFFORD,
Secretary of State.

Enclosure.

STATE OF ARIZONA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Rose Mofford, Secretary of State, State of Arizona, do hereby certify that the annexed document is a true, correct, and complete copy of House Concurrent Memorial 2001, Arizona State Legislature, Thirty-fifth Legislature, First Special Session, 1981, urging the Secretary of the Interior to support the Central Arizona project and approve and expedite the construction of the Tucson Aqueduct; that I am the official of the State of Arizona in custody and control of the original of said document and the legal keeper thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at Phoenix, the Capital, this 16th day of September, 1981.

ROSE MOFFORD,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 2001

A CONCURRENT MEMORIAL URGING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SUPPORT THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT AND APPROVE AND EXPEDITE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TUCSON AQUEDUCT

To the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Honorable James Watt: Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Whereas, it is of the greatest importance to the citizens of the State of Arizona that the Central Arizona Project be completed with as few delays as possible; and

Whereas, the resolution of the groundwater overdraft problem in southern Arizona depends to a significant extent upon the provision of Central Arizona Project water to the area; and

Whereas, this delivery of water cannot occur until the Tucson Aqueduct phase has been completed; and

Whereas, it is therefore essential that construction of the facilities needed to bring Central Arizona Project water to the Tucson metropolitan area be completed as soon as possible; and

Whereas, completion of the facilities needed to bring Central Arizona Project water to the Tucson metropolitan area cannot be accomplished until the size and the location of the terminus of the Tucson Aqueduct have been determined; and

Whereas, completion of the Tucson Aqueduct is contingent upon continued federal funding of the Central Arizona Project. Wherefore, your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring, prays:

1. That the Secretary of the Interior of the United States continue his support of the Central Arizona Project.

2. That he direct the United States Bureau of Reclamation to determine the size and the location of the terminus of the Tucson Aqueduct.

3. That construction of the Tucson Aqueduct be completed at the earliest possible time.

4. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Memorial to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and to each Member of the Arizona Congressional Delegation.

Unanimously adopted by the house September 3, 1981.

Unanimously adopted by the senate September 4, 1981.

Filed in the Office of the Secretary of State September 4, 1981.●

MRS. ERMA SHEARER,
DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the occasion of a milestone which I believe to be of significance. I refer to the 50th anniversary in public service of my constituent, Erma Shearer.

Mrs. Shearer began her service as an employee of Berks County, Pa., in May 1930. Discounting a short period during a maternity leave, she has continuously served the people of Berks

County, and served them exceedingly well, since that date. September 30, 1981, will mark Mrs. Shearer's golden anniversary of service to the county and I am sure the Members of the House will want to join with me in noting this achievement and in both congratulating and commending Mrs. Shearer.

We live in an era when public service is often deprecated. However, Mrs. Shearer's career is testimony to the fact that there are many fine, conscientious men and women whose lives are dedicated to improving the welfare of our society and the operations of our governments. Mrs. Shearer's record is unprecedented in the history of Berks County, Pa., and perhaps, in that of the Nation.

I hope the Members of the House will join with me in saluting Mrs. Erma Shearer not only on her longevity as a public servant but also on a job well done. It seems to me that Mrs. Shearer's career should serve as an example for all of us in public service. I commend her on her devotion to the public welfare and extend to her congratulations and all good wishes. ●

FOOD PROGRAM'S ADVOCATES FEAR CUTBACKS WILL WIPE OUT GAINS IN NUTRITION

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● **Mr. RICHMOND.** Mr. Speaker, much of the gains in the Nation's fight against hunger and malnutrition, which was uncovered in shocking amounts during the late 1960's, may soon be lost. It is unfortunate with the new wave of fiscal austerity and regulatory reform that many Americans, especially young children from poor families will be shortchanged. The long-term health consequences of shortchanging Americans on nutrition will no doubt show up in increased health care costs years later.

The demise of the food assistance programs in the United States may be rooted in the misperceptions harbored by many people in this country. Critics of these programs cite the fraud and abuse as justification for reducing Federal funding in this area. In the past few years, Congress has made significant progress in reducing the waste, fraud, and abuse in the food stamp program. This effort to root out any real fraud or perception that fraud may be occurring will continue. At the same time, Congress must not jeopardize the health of Americans who must depend on Federal assistance for their very survival for what can only be short-term savings.

I share with my colleagues this critical review of the food programs in the United States by Gregory Jaynes.

The article follows:

[The New York Times, Sept. 18, 1981]

FOOD PROGRAM'S ADVOCATES FEAR CUTBACKS WILL WIPE OUT GAINS IN NUTRITION (By Gregory Jaynes)

ATLANTA.—In 1967, six pediatricians were dispatched to the South on a search for hunger, and they found it in appalling quantity. Ten years later a second medical team came here for a look and concluded that although the diet of America's poor would still displease nutritionists, there was food in the icebox. The doctors agreed that in the decade that had passed, the corner would not have been turned without huge increases in the budget for Federal food aid programs.

Since 1967, the budget for such programs has risen about 3,000 percent, from \$585.5 million to about \$16 billion. However, in the fiscal year that begins Oct. 1, the programs will be cut by \$3 billion, a move that would, among other things, disqualify one million of the 23 million Americans now receiving food stamps and reduce the amount of food stamps for the remaining recipients by about 10 percent.

The cuts were proposed by President Reagan and approved by Congress as part of their effort to hold down Federal spending with an eye to improving the national economy and, by extension, the lot of all Americans. But critics contend that the result will be increased hunger and malnutrition.

FRUSTRATION AND FURY

"We are frustrated, furious, frantic, disbelieving that people would cut back on these programs," said Nancy Amidei, director of the Food Research and Action Center, a law firm and advocacy center in Washington that specializes in Federal food programs. "God knows there are a lot of people who still go without food, who still go hungry, but God knows it's a whole lot better than it was 13 years ago."

Just how much better has not been solidly documented, however. In 1969 the Harvard University psychiatrist Robert Coles could write a book called "Still Hungry in America," published on the heels of an extensive national survey on nutrition, but today no comprehensive picture of the state of America's bellies exists. Advocates of food programs say the United States Government, which at present has an overseas food aid program that amounts to \$1.6 billion, knows more about hunger in the Third World than it knows about empty iceboxes here.

For its part, the Reagan Administration says "safety nets" built into the systems will catch acute needs for food and other social services. Administration officials argue that families who will lose their food stamps altogether earn as much as \$14,000 a year and are well able to get by without Government help, and that those who will have their benefits reduced will still receive enough assistance so that they will not go hungry.

Since there has been no systematic examination in recent years of hunger in America and the ability of Federal programs to relieve the problem, the effect of the budget cuts cannot be known until after they take effect.

Widescale hunger, apparently, was of little concern to any administration until the beginning of World War II, when thousands of young men too malnourished to be drafted came under the stethoscopes of military service physicians. A committee on nutrition for national defense was established. Nutritional standards were worked out, and for a short while there was a fledg-

ling and not all that successful food stamp program. In 1946, a school lunch act was passed as a measure of national security.

Over the years, the Agriculture Department had a commodities program that relied on national surpluses and county bureaucrats to get food to the poor. Sometimes it worked, and sometimes it did not. Its effectiveness was never extensively measured. But all the while, the authority to do something about hunger and malnutrition in America lay on the books, as a measure of national security, and it was this authority that President Kennedy, after having seen the distended bellies of West Virginia while campaigning in 1960, seized to set up the food stamp program in 1961. It was 1967, however, before the issue touched a national nerve.

That was when the Field Foundation, a nonprofit research organization based in New York, sent the first team of pediatricians here. The doctors examined several thousand children across the South.

"Wherever we went and wherever we looked," they reported back to Congress, "we saw children in significant numbers who were hungry and sick, children for whom hunger is a daily fact of life, and sickness in many forms, an inevitability. The children we saw were more than just malnourished. They were hungry, weak, apathetic."

FINDINGS ON NUTRITION

That Congressional testimony led to the establishment of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. Its mandate was to determine the amount of hunger and malnutrition in the United States. In 1968, the most extensive survey this country has ever conducted on nutrition was begun by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. About 47,000 people were examined. The findings, along with some independent surveys of the time, were that millions—some estimates went as high as 35 million—of Americans suffered from serious vitamin deficiencies.

Some researchers read the data and determined that as many as 10 million Americans were hungry, and others said the estimate was high. The only thing everyone agreed upon was that malnutrition and little or no income were related. Every year thereafter substantially more funds were found to feed and shore up the incomes of the poor, and country and western singers began warbling about people on welfare driving Cadillacs.

When the Field Foundation sent its second medical team here for a survey in 1977, along with teams to Appalachian Kentucky, the Bronx, Mexican-American ghettos of Texas, migrant work camps in Central Florida and coastal South Carolina the overall conclusion was encouraging.

"Our first and overwhelming impression is that there are far fewer grossly malnourished people in this country today than there were 10 years ago," the teams reported. "Malnutrition has become a subtler problem. In the Mississippi Delta, in the coal fields of Appalachia and in coastal South Carolina, where visitors 10 years ago could quickly see large numbers of stunted, apathetic children with swollen stomachs and the dull eyes and poorly healing wounds characteristic of malnutrition, such children are not now to be seen in such numbers. Even in areas which did not command national attention 10 years ago, many poor people now have food and look better off."

"In fact, the facts of life for Americans living in poverty remain as dark or darker than they were 10 years ago. But in the area of food there is a difference. The food stamp program, the nutritional component of Head Start, school lunch and breakfast programs, and, to a lesser extent, the women-infant-children feeding programs, have made the difference."

A CRITICAL IMPERATIVE

In 1979, the foundation said, "While only the barest subsistence needs are being met by Federal food programs, those programs are proving a critical imperative to the nation's health." The organization also lamented that "the nation continues to be plagued with a lack of sophisticated data about its nutritional well-being." According to health officials in Washington, there has not been another Federal survey the scope of the one conducted in the late 1960's because of the enormous cost, and because there has not been enough political or popular pressure to justify mounting another one.

Food program advocacy groups these days monitor two continuing studies, one by the national Center for Disease Control here and the other by the National Center for Health Statistics in Washington, both of which in the last decade have indicated continuing improvement in nutrition across the country.

The Atlanta center says its studies lately have caused more concern for anemia and obesity than for hunger.

MORE POUND OVERWEIGHT

In the second quarter of 1980, the period for which the most recent statistics are available, the center determined that of 58,000 records from public clinics in 25 states, 14.8 percent of people of all ages had symptoms of anemia, and that of 61,000 records from the same sources, 3.4 percent of the people were significantly underweight, and 9.7 percent were significantly overweight. Since the records come from public clinics, most of the patients examined tend to be from low-income families.

The surveys by the National Center for Health Statistics, which do not deal specifically with the poor, have, according to Director Robert Murphy, "found virtually no one with classical signs of starvation." Results from the center's 1980 survey will not be available until later this year, but he said there was some indication that the population was becoming more anemic.

Elsewhere, independent researchers report that while cases of starvation are isolated and rare, households where the head of the family is poor and poorly educated are where much of the anemia, obesity and vitamin deficiency occur in the United States.

AREAS WITH WORST DIETS

Some of the worst diets in the nation, according to researchers, exist in the American Indian populations of the South and the Southwest, the migrant labor camps of central Florida and rural black communities from Texas across the Southeast to the Atlantic.

Nonetheless, in interviews here and elsewhere in the country, social workers and advocates of food programs said that bad diets were better than none, and they expressed bitterness about a national conservatism that would move against the impoverished.

Here in Atlanta, the executive director of the Georgia Coalition Against Hunger, Sandra Robertson, said, "In a sorry economy, people need to blame somebody, and

what this Administration did was clearly see that poor people are the problem."

In Georgia, Mrs. Robertson said, 25,000 recipients will be "knocked off food stamps immediately," and 30,000 recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children will come off the rolls Oct. 1. "Another 10,000 will get drastically reduced benefits," she said.

"Malnutrition and hunger still affects a lot of people and a lot of families," Steve Suits, director of the Southern Regional Council, an organization with deep roots in the civil rights movement, was saying in his Atlanta office the other day. "But it just doesn't grip the national conscience anymore."

"South of this town, south of Montgomery, you see and hear people who'll tell you when they last ate and they'll show you there's not much in the pie safe. We just gave the folks the proverbial half a loaf."

Mr. Suits said he felt that "we saved some lives with the infant feeding programs; we gave some hope with school lunches." He added, "But we didn't have the national resolve to keep it up. I don't think I'm exaggerating too much to think we've abandoned it in the name of the national good. I read they're going to cut another \$40-to-\$60-billion, and it doesn't take Solomon's wisdom to figure out where they'll start."

A DIFFERENT VIEW

Critics of this country's welfare system in general, and the food stamp program in particular, take a view far different from Mr. Suits'.

The most prominent, Ronald Reagan, said earlier this year that the program was begun to "insure adequate nutrition for America's needy families" and that it went on to function as "a generalized income transfer program" unrelated to nutritional needs.

Less prominent critics argue, with reason, that the program has been a breeding ground for fraud and abuse, and polls earlier this year showed that food stamps were rated the most unpopular welfare program by a wide margin.

But south of Montgomery, just as Mr. Suits said, there are people who will open their refrigerators and show what little is there to social workers, and who will explain that the refrigerator would contain nothing if not for food stamps. Lowndes County, Alabama, one of the 20 poorest of the 3,142 counties in the country, is just such a place, and Mattie Lee Moorer, a volunteer for Vista, and Sadie Wallace, who lives in a tumbledown shack with five children aged 4 to 19, carried out just such an exercise the other day.

A BARE KITCHEN

Mrs. Wallace, who receives \$225 in food stamps each month, feeds her family on that, and on what she can grow, and on what her neighbors give her. Mrs. Moorer happened to visit toward the end of the month, four days before Mrs. Wallace's food stamps were due, and so the kitchen was pretty bare. Mrs. Moorer found two pounds of bologna, about two pounds of frozen peas, half a loaf of bread, two packs of Kool-Aid and about two cups of sugar.

Both women seemed to think that what Mrs. Wallace had on hand, plus a little bit of credit down at the country grocery, would feed a family of six over the next four days. Mrs. Moorer told Mrs. Wallace that harder times were coming, though, and told her to plant her fall garden early.

"You can get your turnips, your collard greens and your snap beans in," said Mrs.

Moorer, "and that's things you won't have to buy. A lot of things we ain't been doing, we better start to do. I see more bad diets coming. I see folk not able to get the foods they should eat. One or two foods ain't enough. But one or two might be all, wintertime that is." ●

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, U.S.A. RESOLUTION ON THE EMERGING PATTERN OF NATIONAL POLICY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, what we have come to call Reaganomics and the impact of the administration's conservatism on the future of our citizens are key conversation topics today in the House of Representatives. As the budget cuts become more of a reality, the President's austere economic plan and new conservative public policy also have become the subjects of increasing concern and action by the poor and working class citizens.

Recently, Rev. Robert I. Miller of the Eliza Bryant Center in Cleveland brought to my attention a resolution drafted by the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. The resolution is characteristic of the kind of comments many of us are hearing increasingly on the President's economic plan.

Mr. Speaker, the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. resolution is an accurate barometer of the mood of the poor and working class in this Nation on Reaganomics. Additionally, it analyzes and projects the effects of this administration's policies on the vital needs of this large but seemingly forgotten sector of our population.

This inclusive document touches on such pertinent issues as public lands policies, human services budget cuts, energy, and military escalation. It is my opinion that the voices of the people who are the victims of the budget and the shift in governmental priorities are becoming more audible. We need to listen to them.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the General Assembly resolution of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. entitled, "The Emerging Pattern of National Policy" in the RECORD.

[From the Presbyterian Layman, June/July 1981]

GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON "THE EMERGING PATTERN OF NATIONAL POLICY"

The Advisory Council on Church and Society submitted the following resolution on "The Emerging Patterns of National Policy." It was approved by the General Assembly with revisions as recommended by the Assembly Committee on Social Justice and Human Rights of Persons.

Whereas the 192nd General Assembly (1980) expressed its commitment "to the inalienable right of every person of basic access to food and sustaining nutrition" and urged Congress "to maintain at least the existing level of support of the domestic programs in nutrition, housing, education, welfare, social security and employment"; and

Whereas the 191st General Assembly (1979) in its action on "Tax Cutting and U.S. Budget Priorities" urged "the subordination of narrow, short-sighted, self-serving considerations to an insistence upon society's responsibility for conditions whereby such basic needs of all citizens as jobs, housing, education, and health care can be satisfactorily met"; and

Whereas the 191st General Assembly (1979) further urged in budgeting decisions "priority consideration to the employment, health, welfare, education and other needs of the poor, the aged, children and the disabled"; and

Whereas the 188th General Assembly (1976) commended for study, "Economic Justice Within Environmental Limits" and emphasized the importance of church dialogue on economic policies in the United States, with special attention to ethical questions; and

Whereas the changes in national policy proposed by the President and his administration clearly violate the criteria adopted by previous General Assemblies cited above; and

Whereas the Governing Board of the National Council of Churches has prepared and adopted a paper entitled, "The Re-Making of America? A Message to the Churches," which analyzes the reversal of economic policies and the gravity of its implications, therefore, the 193rd General Assembly (1981):

1. Receive and commit for study the Message to the Churches prepared by the Governing Board of the National Council of Churches entitled: "The Re-Making of America?" (appended);

2. Calls upon the Program Agency to make copies of the above Message available to congregations and to provide resources for utilization by congregations in their consideration of various points of view of the significant changes in national policy proposed by the current administration;

3. Requests the Advisory Council on Church and Society and the Program Agency to continue to analyze the development of national policy in the light of concerns expressed by the General Assembly; and to prepare program resources, studies, and policy recommendations as appropriate in order to assist judicatories, churches and church members to understand and respond effectively to the issues of justice in the life of the nation and the world.

THE RE-MAKING OF AMERICA?

A Message To the Churches from the Governing Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

In thousands of news stories and editorials the public record of the dramatic changes in national policy proposed by President Ronald Reagan and his administration has been written in the past few months. The Governing Board of the National Council of Churches, on the basis of that record, calls to the attention of member communions that these proposals "to get America back on track" represent not merely a shift of emphasis—a little less here or a little more there. They are, rather, a reversal of direction for this country as a whole, and threat-

en the vision of America as the model and embodiment of a just and humane society.

I.

Consider the following evidences of that reversal:

A. The new Administration asks us to annul an understanding of America's government as responsible in a fundamental way "to promote the general welfare."

Since the havoc of the Great Depression, administrations of both parties have recognized an ultimate responsibility in the federal government to promote the conditions in which all members of this society have enough to eat, a decent place to live, a basic education, and the necessities of a minimum standard of living, not as a matter of charity but of entitlement.

That goal has never been attained, but for half a century the nation has been moving toward it—until now. The policy of the new administration is not just to cut back on human services, but to deny that people are entitled to them. By its budget recommendations, which eliminate many human service programs and sharply curtail others, it seeks not to slow the nation's progress toward the goal but to reverse its commitment. When inflation has rendered the current "poverty level" obsolete, to cut back even farther to a so-called "safety net" for the "truly needy" is to abandon the working poor to hopelessness and destitution, particularly in a time of limited economic growth. It is a turn backward from the effort to build an economic floor for the whole society to a former time when America was officially indifferent to the suffering of those whose best efforts were not enough.

B. The new administration asks us to turn back from an understanding of America's public lands as held primarily for public enjoyment.

Since at least the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, the policy of the nation has been to build and hold a public possession of national parks and forests, of clean air and pure waters, for current enjoyment and as a legacy for future generations. The new administration would turn back from that goal to a bygone era when the continent and its riches were seen as the rightful booty of those who were able to exploit them for their private gain.

Giving away the public inheritance to private entrepreneurs is more than an about-face. It is an offering to "the sheer, naked, untrammelled greed that once made this country great." And no future change of heart can reverse the destruction of this legacy. In a similar approach to the common riches of the sea, the new administration abruptly withdrew from participation in the final consideration of the International Law of the Sea Treaty, seven years in the making, in order "to improve assured access for private industry to mine the deep sea bed"—an access already assured. These examples of administration solicitude for the "truly greedy" stand in stark contrast to its lack of solicitude for the poor, as expressed in the doctrine of "no entitlement to human services."

C. The new administration asks us to slow America's movement toward a safe, efficient and renewable energy future.

Faced with sharply increasing costs and the need to shape an energy future not dependent on oil, the nation has been moving slowly but certainly toward policies and programs to promote conservation, more efficient use of energy, and the development of alternative sources that will be renewable or

reliable over a long period. That movement is to be reversed. The new administration's budget virtually eliminates residential weatherization programs and the Solar Energy Conservation Bank, and substantially reduces energy assistance programs for the poor. Energy Secretary Edwards has announced, with regard to fossil fuels, "The voters have sent a clear message to us in Washington: Produce, produce, produce." Pushing aside concern over the possible perils of nuclear energy generation and the problem of nuclear waste disposal, the administration seeks to reduce support for renewable energy technologies and expand support for nuclear energy. Ignoring the specter of excess capacity now clouding the future of the nation's utilities, Secretary Edwards resolutely asserts that "we need to get the nuclear power industry back on track."

D. The new administration asks us to mute America's advocacy for the rights of all human beings everywhere.

Concern for human freedom and inalienable rights has been a constant theme of the United States. Particularly since the organization of the United Nations in 1945, America has been one of the leading exponents of concern for human rights everywhere in the world, even though its own actions were not always what they should have been. The previous administration attempted to make human rights a primary operative foundation of the nation's foreign policy, but now that effort is to be abandoned.

It is not simply that America will relinquish its leadership in championing human rights—imperfect as it may have been. It is not simply that this nation will relax its efforts and subsidize to a common level of low concern. Rather, in a significant reversal, the new administration asks the nation to lead the retreat from international commitment to the realization and protection of human rights, and to abandon the nations and peoples that have shared America's commitment and hoped in America's constancy.

Among other consequences of this reversal, the United States would shore up repressive regimes around the world by military assistance; recede from arms sanctions against South Africa, and repeal the Clark Amendment banning covert aid to guerrilla forces inside Angola.

The positive concern for human rights has been replaced by a selective preoccupation with "terrorism." When concern about terrorism—admittedly a serious problem—becomes the rationale for supporting repression in other nations, many Americans can only feel anxious about their own nation, remembering the hysteria of the McCarthy era when "national security" was invoked to justify the repression of dissidents in the United States.

E. The new administration asks us to turn from America's search for peace through negotiation in order to seek it through military predominance.

Since the end of World War II and the concurrent beginning of the nuclear age, this nation has attempted to seek and maintain peace through diplomatic rather than military means, through multilateral more than unilateral channels, through negotiation rather than coercion (the exception of Vietnam notwithstanding). It has relied on the concept of "mutual assured destruction" to provide an uneasy umbrella for this fragile enterprise in the world—the assurance that the consequences of nuclear exchange

are too devastatingly costly for any nation to risk it. Now all that is to be reversed. Nuclear superiority and the capacity to project overwhelming military power anywhere in the world are proposed as basic national policies. Resources that previously contributed, however inadequately, to efforts to improve life are now to be diverted to produce more weapons of death, increasing inflation and accelerating the international arms race. The United States and the Soviet Union both have more than enough strategic nuclear warheads to kill the earth's people several times over, yet further weapons escalation is proposed.

Reversing an increasing willingness to see the world in its real diversity and pluralism, the new administration is determined to turn away from the uneasy detente of the past decade and revive the distorted vision of the bi-polar Cold War world, in which all adverse occurrences, at home or abroad, are attributed to the machinations of a single force—Communism. Turning from the growing satisfaction of being one of a world-wide community of nations, this administration proposes to make America "Number One" in the world. Not number one in literacy, life expectancy, or assistance to less developed nations. Not number one in freedom from infant mortality, drug addiction, crime or suicide. But rather number one in military dominance, in the ability to impose our will on others or to kill multitudes in the attempt.

There are real dangers in the world, and the behavior of other nations sometimes threatens peace and justice—witness Afghanistan. Those dangers are not lessened by this nation's turning from the path of patient strength.

II.

There have been numerous criticisms of the particular elements in these and other changes of direction proposed by the new administration, pointing out the specific pain and peril each imposes. But the overriding moral and political issue for the nation is not so much in the specific proposals as the pattern that they pose, in the vision of America and its values that lies behind them. Congressman Michel is correct: "The issue is not one of figures but philosophy . . . who we are and where we're going." In the new Administration's philosophy, the nation confronts a cross-roads choice between alternative visions of the meaning and purpose of America.

The alternative vision of who we are as a nation held out by the new Administration has been embedded in a budget, distracting many from its true dimensions. Its sweeping changes are proposed to meet an economic emergency purportedly created by runaway government spending and unbearable tax burdens—in this wealthiest of nations that now collects a smaller portion of its wealth in taxes and spends a smaller percentage of it for public purposes than any European democracy! To remedy this alleged condition, however, the Reagan philosophy requires not a cut in government spending so much as a massive transfer of public money from people assistance to military procurement—the most massive such shift in peacetime history. It further proposes not so much a reduction in taxes as a use of the tax system to effect a substantial redistribution of wealth to those already wealthy. Together, these two changes quite simply mean the use of the nation's government to serve the interests of those who least need help at the expense of those who need it most.

All of this is offered in the name of an economic theory not so much untested as repudiated. It was once called the "trickle down" system. It is not a radically new and imaginative solution to America's social and economic problems, but, with the other elements of the administration's philosophy, a replay of an old and seductive vision of what America is all about, a vision that has been present from the beginning and still competes tenaciously for the nation's soul.

What are the elements of this vision? From the first, there were those who saw America as a rich treasure waiting to be exploited for the benefit of those daring enough and strong enough to take it. They came first for gold, for spices, for furs, for tobacco; then for land and iron and silver and copper and trees. In this vision of America, the fittest survive and prosper, and there is little room for public purpose since it interferes with private gain. Compassion is a weakness in the competitive struggle of each against all, and charity is the voluntary option of individuals. Government is at best a necessary evil which must be strong enough to protect privilege from assault but kept weak to impose public responsibility on private prerogative. In this vision, America is seen principally as Empire—"Manifest Destiny," "54-40 or Fight," "Remember the Maine"—with a mission to extend its power and commerce throughout the continent, the hemisphere, the world.

But another vision of America has been present from the beginning also. This second alternative vision has deep roots in religious faith and biblical images of divine intent and human possibility. The precious possession of Pilgrims and padres, it was a vision of creating in the New World a new model of human community—the New Jerusalem—free from the oppression and misery that entrenched power and privilege perpetuated in the Old World they had fled.

In this America, it was envisioned, government would promote the common welfare and secure the blessings of liberty for all. The dignity and worth of each person would be respected and protected as a matter of policy as well as piety and each person's potential would be developed to the fullest. Justice and compassion would reign in alabaster cities that stretched from sea to shining sea, and the bountiful resources of a favored land would be thankfully received and gladly shared with the whole human family, as the nurturing providence of the Creator meant them to be. This America would be known in the world for its compassion, its deep desire for peace and justice, its commitment to human rights and human decency. It would stand as a beacon and a model, a city set on a hill, its power stemming from the irresistible example of a just, caring and peaceful people sharing life and treasure generously with all the people of earth.

This vision of America has never been fully realized, but it has never been abandoned. It has been of immense significance to the rest of the world, where echoes and adaptations of it are seen in the revolutions and the constitutions of many nations. It has been a constant magnet in this nation's domestic life, drawing it away from slavery and sweatshops, chain-gangs, and lynch mobs toward broader opportunity, deeper compassion, fuller equality and greater justice for all.

III.

These alternative visions of America have vied for supremacy throughout the nation's history. Both have been given religious

sanction in different ways and at different times by America's churches. Both are still deeply rooted in the heart of America and the hearts of Americans. Yet even in those past times when the first vision—America as private opportunity and empire—dominated American practice, the second vision—America as public responsibility and compassionate neighbor—maintained its foothold in the deepest recesses of the nation's soul. Glimmering in the founding documents and echoing in inaugural addresses and Fourth of July speeches down the years, it is acknowledged by nearly all Americans as the vision that best expresses who we truly long to be and where we truly wish to go.

Now the new Administration seeks emphatically and forthrightly to reverse the record of half a century and shape the nation decisively to the first vision once again. It claims a mandate from the people to do so; and indeed it would not have the opportunity to try if that vision were not still so strong in so many of us. Nevertheless, as the real intent and scope of the administration's philosophy become clearer and clearer, the American people will themselves decide whether they conferred a mandate for such a vision of the nation.

The Executive Committee of the NCCC, on February 20, 1981 stated its "fundamental disagreement with the proposal to increase our death-dealing capacity while cutting back on life supports for our citizens," noting that "The budget cuts proposed by the Administration demand intolerable sacrifice from the nation's needy and place a disproportionate burden on minority groups, the elderly, and families headed by women." The Governing Board of the NCCC reaffirms that fundamental disagreement with the new Administration's vision of "who we are and where we are going," and expresses deep concern about the probable consequences of its implementation. We do so not in the service of "special interests," as the President refers to those who question his approach, but in the sure conviction that the vision of America the nation is now asked to espouse is not in the common interest of Americans or the world.

When Christians have lived most fully according to the Gospel they have urged the nation toward care and compassion, not away from them. The Scriptures call us to a vision that supersedes all social visions, to a vision of a "good and broad land," a new earth and a new heaven. Jesus of Nazareth launched this new age, as Mary envisioned it in the Magnificat:

"He has shown strength with his arm, He has scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts, He has put down the mighty from thrones, and exalted those of low degree; he has filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he has sent empty away."

—LUKE 1:51-53.

And as he proclaimed it in his own first public message, quoting Isaiah:

"The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor."

"He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

—LUKE 4:18-19.

The Christian Church has not always served this vision-above-all-vision well, often more concerned for its own institutional success or survival than for the plight of the poor. In these days, when economic anxiety lures fundamental fears and selfish-

ness to the surface of human motivation and the nation is tempted to make them the basis of policy, we must never forget that "judgment begins with the household of God." The Governing Board calls upon the units of the National Council of Churches and its constituent communions to give serious study and continuing attention to the development of resources and programs that will assist churches and church members to understand and respond effectively to the issues of justice in the life of the nation and the world as they participate in the public debate over national purpose and goals.

Let us pray for the wisdom, courage, and strength to serve God and nation faithfully in the days that lie ahead.●

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, as a former Peace Corps volunteer in Somalia during the 1960's, I join with many others in marking the 20th anniversary of the Peace Corps.

Much has been said and written about the Peace Corps, and I have seen firsthand that a well conceived and well run Peace Corps program can have a positive impact on the education and development of a country.

The strength of the Peace Corps is that it is people to people, rather than government to government or elite to elite.

Moreover, Peace Corps programs have benefited our country. It gives Americans a greater understanding of how our society compares to other people in the world. The Peace Corps helps others understand our country and values. It helps to counter negative propaganda about the United States.

Operating on a relatively inexpensive budget, the Peace Corps has provided an important way of demonstrating American interest and support of the development of other nations.

On a small Federal investment, the return has been impressive.

I salute the Peace Corps as it celebrates today its 20th anniversary.●

MILITARY MANPOWER

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, this past week, 34 individuals of varied backgrounds and viewpoints met at Mount Kisco, N.Y., under the auspices of the American Assembly of Columbia University and under the direction of Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, former

National Security Adviser to President Ford. Participants included high-ranking people from the White House, Defense Department, leaders from the armed services, manpower experts, Congressman LES ASPIN, and myself.

The subject for discussion was military service in the United States and current policy options relating to the All-Volunteer Force, the draft, and a national youth service.

The findings of the group may be summarized as follows:

1. Current manning of U.S. Armed Forces is inadequate to meet our national needs.

2. The All-Volunteer Force has failed to meet necessary quality standards.

3. The Reserve and National Guard are wholly inadequate to current needs.

4. Universal military service is not an appropriate response; compulsory military service at this time is neither desirable nor necessary.

5. A high quality military force is essential; a new targeted educational incentive program would be most effective in promptly increasing the supply of high-quality recruits.

Excerpts from the conclusions reached at Mount Kisco follow:

FINAL REPORT OF THE 60TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

At the close of their discussions, the participants in the Sixtieth American Assembly on "Military Service in the United States," at Seven Springs Center, Mt. Kisco, New York, September 17-20, 1981, reviewed as a group the following statement. This statement represents general agreement; however, it should not be assumed that every participant subscribes to every recommendation.

Current manning of the military forces in the United States is inadequate to our national needs. The problems involved in manning the armed forces of the United States are complex, have developed over a substantial period of time, and cannot be ascribed solely to the all-volunteer force (AVF). Nonetheless, manpower in adequate numbers and quality is so central to our security needs that this issue demands our priority attention. We face a fundamental national decision to determine whether we will attempt to deal with this problem through purely voluntary measures, through a return to some form of compulsory service, or through some combination of measures involving elements both of inducement and compulsion.

FORCE REQUIREMENTS

The international environment of the decade of the 1980s is likely to be more turbulent and more unstable than was that of the decade just past. Potential demands on U.S. military forces, as a consequence, can be expected to increase. In the past, force structure and size have been based in theory on a political determination of the number, scale, and duration of the contingencies U.S. military forces should be prepared to meet simultaneously. The present military force structure, for example, was based upon the need to be able to fight simultaneously one major and one minor conflict. There are two important factors to consider when analyzing

ing a force posture constructed on the basis of such a concept.

The first is that there is an element of arbitrariness about the determination of the number of simultaneous contingencies; that is, they often do not represent the full range of the actual "threat" against which the U.S. government may in the event perceive that military force should be employed. The other factor is that not for some time if ever have U.S. military forces been adequate to meet the requirement even of the "defined threat."

Therefore, rather than start with an analysis of the forces required to meet an actual threat or one specified for force planning purposes, it is more realistic to use as a point of departure the current force posture. This includes both active duty and reserve component forces. The current active force size is not adequate, nor was it so designed, for conflicts of more than brief duration or for major conflicts such as a war in Europe; for such contingencies a pre-trained combat reserve force and a responsive system of mobilization are also essential.

Since the need for military forces in the coming years is anticipated to be greater than in the past, there should be no thought of reducing the force structure below its current level. On the other hand, while force increases would be desirable in the future, the first priority should be to correct the serious inadequacies in the current force.

The AVF, which in 1973 replaced the draft, has, in general, met the quantitative goals which have been set for the active force over the coming decade, however, it is clear that a decline in cohort size will occur. This will magnify the problems of the AVF, and, especially if it is accompanied by a decision to increase significantly the active force size, the ability of the AVF to meet force goals could be in considerable doubt.

Even more serious are questions such as quality of the force under the AVF and various apparent societal consequences. Indeed, in meeting the quantitative goals of the active AVF, there continues to be a shortage of recruits from the higher mental categories, particularly in the Army.

It was the unanimous view of the participants that the Army reserve and national guard forces are wholly inadequate to current need. In many anticipated deployment scenarios, the reserve components, especially in the Army, could not be expected to perform their assigned missions adequately.

Concern was expressed that, in the event of a conflict, overrepresentation of blacks in the Army would result in a black casualty rate sharply higher than the proportion of blacks in the general population. This could stimulate serious charges of inequity at a critical or sensitive time.

As a final point on this issue, it was agreed that social representativeness, except as it might contribute to the fighting effectiveness of the force, should not be an objective of high priority.

It was the unanimous view of the participants that military effectiveness should be the principal, if not exclusive, goal of military manpower policy. To the extent that manpower policies are designed to assist in the achievement of other societal goals they should not detract from military effectiveness.

The quality of the Army's active military force is not adequate, and the Army reserve forces require improvements in both quantity and quality.

PROPOSALS CONSIDERED

Systems of universal military service (UMS) were dismissed because they require a force structure substantially larger than current needs, and result in costs beyond reason.

Some participants believed that a return to compulsory service could satisfactorily cure the ills of the present AVF. A small minority thought that only such a move could deal adequately with the problem. One possible concept was to register all males, encourage volunteers, and draft by lottery to two years of service, either in the active or reserve forces. Educational benefits would be provided for the career force and volunteers; in addition, the career force would receive increased pay. Pay for recruits would be cut from current levels, and no educational benefits would be provided for draftees. A "skill bank" would be created from the registered cohort to facilitate mobilization in an emergency.

A substantial majority, however, was of the opinion that a return to compulsory service at this time was neither necessary nor desirable in order to correct the deficiencies in the AVF. With requirements for additional manpower being very small relative to the size of the present cohort, this majority felt that the perceived inequities, even of the lottery draft, would make such a system politically infeasible. Of greater significance, improving the quality of the recruit force by more than a marginal amount would require substantial reductions in the volunteer component. In addition, the problems created by those compelled to serve would more than offset the military advantages.

Of this majority, there were several who believed that a return to compulsory service at some point in the future had a probability sufficiently high to make prudent a careful examination now of the circumstances likely to require such a move and the optimum characteristics of such a draft. Among the issues deserving of study are appropriate triggering events, political reactions associated with a return to the draft, adequacy of the current standby draft system and plans for its activation, characteristics of those to be drafted and exempted, terms and types of service, compensation, postservice obligations and benefits, and the relationship between volunteers and draftees.

Most believed that remedies other than compulsion existed that could sustain the AVF in some amended form for the present, at least in the absence of a significant increase in required force size. There was a variety of opinions as to how much of an inducement would be required, the kind of measures which would produce the most desirable results, and the extent to which any solution should focus on or differentiate between the active and reserve forces. There was, however, a general consensus that an improved educational benefit program should be enacted for both the active and reserve forces, directed toward obtaining high quality recruits for areas of demonstrated need, such as the combat arms. The program should include the right to use the benefit while in service and on reenlistment and could include the right to "cash in" the benefit or possibly to transfer it to dependents. Any such benefit would have to be substantially in excess of those presently available to college students. There was as well a discussion of terminating federally sponsored educational benefits for all but those volunteering for service in lieu of adding an increment above current benefits

for those who volunteer for military service. Others felt that future budget cuts were likely to produce those same results and separate prior action in that direction was, therefore, unnecessary and undesirable. No conclusions on this latter issue were reached.

A number of options based on various combinations of voluntarism and compulsion were discussed. They generally addressed four separate components. The first component would provide substantially new educational grants for two-year volunteers in areas of special military need. Their pay would be lower than present enlistment standards, and they would assume a substantial reserve commitment. A second choice would offer lesser educational benefits for those volunteering for a six-month period of active duty training and an extensive reserve commitment. A third component, requiring substantial study, would be the provision of educational benefits along the lines now available through federally sponsored programs for those volunteering for approved national civilian service. An element of compulsion would be added to this conceptual scheme by automatic placement of nonvolunteers in a realistic standby draft pool.

CONCLUSIONS

The participants unanimously stressed the need to assure a high quality, professional career force. There must be continued emphasis upon sufficient compensation and amenities to attract and keep trained people.

A significant majority of the participants agreed that a new, targeted educational incentive program would be most effective in promptly increasing the supply of highly qualified recruits.

There was general agreement among the participants that while some reserve and national guard units are extremely good, some serious overall shortcomings in the reserve components demand special attention. Many believed that substantial restructuring was essential in order to provide the necessary pretrained forces. This may include selected relocation of reserve units. However, even if restructuring proves infeasible, there are actions that can and should be taken to improve the readiness and morale of the reserve components. Increased support must, in fact, be accorded to the reserve components by the active establishment. Increased funding for equipment and training must be provided, but so too must energy and imagination be expended to ensure that service in the reserve components is more relevant to the primary mission and more challenging. If necessary to ensure higher readiness, larger numbers of active duty cadre should be assigned to Army reserve component units, similar to the practice of the Marine Corps. Closer relationships should be established between reserve component forces and the active duty units they support or with which they affiliate.

It is the judgment of the majority of this group, however, that the proper course of action at this time is to dedicate ourselves to the determined application of remedies, such as those here examined, within the overall framework of a volunteer force.

PARTICIPANTS—THE 60TH AMERICAN ASSEMBLY, MT. KISCO, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 17-20, 1981

Les Aspin, Representative from Wisconsin, United States Congress, Washington, D.C.

Doug Bandow, Special Assistant to the President for Policy Development, The White House, Washington, D.C.

Jayne Gilbert Benz, Harriman Scholar, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.

Sue E. Berryman, Social Scientist, The Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.

Antonia Handler Chayes, Csaplar & Bok, Boston, Mass.

Cheryl A. Cook, Director, Manpower, Mobilization & Readiness Program, The Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.

Richard V. L. Cooper, Partner, Coopers & Lybrand, Washington, D.C.

Bernhard Fleckenstein, Planning Staff, Ministry of Defense, Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, West Germany.

Janet C. Fleishhacker, Trustee, The American Assembly, San Francisco, Calif.

Richard A. Gabriel, Professor, Department of Political Science, Saint Anselm College, Manchester, N.H.

Lt. Gen. Robert G. Gard, Jr., USA (ret.), (formerly President National Defense University), Paris, France.

Adm. James R. Hogg, USN, Director, Military Personnel Policy, United States Navy, Washington, D.C.

James R. Hosek, Associate Director, Manpower Mobilization & Readiness Program, The Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.

Michael Howard, Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford University, Oxford, United Kingdom.

Richard W. Hunter, Assistant Director, Compensation Program Development, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Korb, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Reserve Affairs & Logistics, U.S. Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

James L. Lacy, Senator Research Fellow, Research Directorate, National Defense University, Washington, D.C.

William Laughlin, Founder, Saga Corp., Woodside, Calif.

Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Representative from California, United States Congress, Washington, D.C.

Charles C. Moskos, Professor, Department of Sociology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Roger A. Munson, Chairman, National Security Commission, The American Legion, Washington, D.C.

Gary R. Nelson, Associate Director for Compensation, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, Washington, D.C.

Philip A. Odeen, Partner, Coopers & Lybrand, Washington, D.C.

Stanley R. Resor, Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, New York, N.Y.

Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft, USAF (ret.), Washington, D.C.

James L. Tanner, Harriman Scholar, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Ind.

Lt. Gen. Maxwell R. Thurman, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, United States Army, Washington, D.C.

George F. Travers, Manager, Human Resources Analysis & Development, Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.

Gen. Volney F. Warner, USA (ret.), The Vertex Corp., Rockville, Md.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, USA (ret.), Charleston, S.C.

John P. White, Chairman, Interactive Systems Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.

Eddie N. Williams, President, Joint Center for Political Studies, Inc., Washington, D.C.

R. James Woolsey, Shea & Gardner, Washington, D.C.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Kominers, Fort Schlefer & Boyer, Washington, D.C.●

IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE FRANK J. BECKER

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 1981

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of great loss and sorrow that I now pay tribute to the late Honorable Frank J. Becker.

Having served 8 years in the New York State Legislature prior to coming to Washington, Frank was a man who dedicated his life to public service. He was a diligent, hardworking Representative for the people of New York. And in his years of service to this Chamber he was a consistent advocate of a strong national defense.

I would like to make special mention that Frank and I were neighbors on the seventh floor of the Longworth Building. There I had a chance to realize that Frank Becker was not only a helpful but also a genuinely kind individual.

Frank J. Becker, a dedicated public servant, a man of integrity, a dear friend, will long be missed by this Member of Congress.●

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE HANDICAPPED

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, today, September 22, 1981, the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board will meet to consider elimination of the Board's minimum guidelines and requirements for accessible design which were created to insure that federally funded and constructed facilities are usable by physically handicapped citizens. These guidelines have fallen victim to the administration's regulatory review efforts, and are viewed as an example of unnecessary Government regulation and expenditure.

The following is a letter which I recently sent to the Board's General Counsel, expressing my strong concern regarding the lack of adequate public information or opportunity for discussion which preceded this action. It is both irresponsible and counterproductive to deny handicapped citizens the right to participate as working and contributing members of society. I hope that the Members will join me in protesting the elimination of these minimum accessibility guidelines.

The letter follows:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1981.
Mr. CHARLES D. GOLDMAN,
General Counsel, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDMAN: I wish to register my strong opposition to the proposal by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board to rescind its Minimum Guidelines and Requirements. The Compliance Board should not act precipitously in the name of undisclosed cost factors, particularly in this the International Year of Disabled Persons.

The Board in its Notice of Proposed Rule-making has set forth a single question, a referendum on the continuation of its rule. The Board is proposing to eliminate, after a 45-day comment period, a rule which took a year to develop. Such a comment period is simply not adequate public notice, particularly where the Board has noted, but not disclosed major concerns over the cost of its regulations.

I am very disturbed that the Board did not disclose the cost information which has prompted its action. Such information is essential for the public to have a basis on which to comment. I also find distressing the complete lack of mention of the benefit of eliminating or preventing architectural barriers. An accessible environment makes disabled persons taxpayers, not tax users, and benefits all of society, including the very young and the elderly.

It is my view that the Compliance Board should refrain from taking any action until it conducts public hearings on the cost of its regulation. As a former public service commissioner and as Representative to the U.S. Congress from Montgomery County, Maryland where active citizen participation is common practice, I know well the benefits of public hearings. Only by having such hearings and carefully weighing their results can the Board issue a realistic regulation.

The ATBCB meeting on September 22 should be an occasion to undertake plans for opening fully the rulemaking process. It must not rescind its rule.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL D. BARNES.●

LOS ANGELES: STARTING A THIRD CENTURY

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the city of Los Angeles as it celebrates its 200th anniversary. Over the past 200 years, the city of Los Angeles has grown to become the third largest city in the United States. This great city attracts millions of tourists and visitors each year who seek to experience the magnificent features this area has to offer. From Hollywood to Watts, from Westwood to El Monte, the city of Angels has become a melting pot rich in cultural diversity. Recognized around the world as a major international entertainment center, Los Angeles and its

September 22, 1981

founding fathers should be proud of its development since its inception as a tiny Spanish pueblo. The ingenuity of the people of Los Angeles is well known, and has made Los Angeles and the United States a leader in the fields of communications, entertainment, electronics, and energy. The city of Los Angeles has contributed much to the development of our Nation, and I am pleased to share in this celebration as Los Angeles enters its third century.●

RETIREMENT OF MIKE MICHAELSON

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, we will all miss Mike Michaelson who is retiring on October 1 as superintendent of the House Radio and TV Gallery. Mike is a kind and helpful human being, a thoughtful and conscientious public servant and a skillful and pleasant manager of a difficult and pressure-filled assignment. I want to add my best wishes to those of many others to Mike in his new job as executive vice president of the Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network (C-SPAN).●

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FIRE DEPARTMENT'S RACIAL HIRING POLICIES

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enclose in the Record the following editorial by William Raspberry, who accurately describes the District of Columbia Fire Department's racial hiring policies: "Fundamentally unfair and destructive of popular support for affirmative action." The article illustrates what happens when the concept of merit is abandoned, standards are ignored and the rules of the game changed, and race is substituted as the decisive factor in the apportionment of jobs. Although even the District of Columbia's black administrators and Human Rights Department have not suggested that discrimination has occurred in the Fire Department, District of Columbia officials press ahead with their plan to guarantee a racial proportionality in the work force which satisfies their own specifications. The American people are sophisticated enough to know the difference between fairness to minorities in hiring practices and brazen discrimination against nonminorities. I believe

the Fire Department's policies will be identified as the latter, and will lead to the unfortunate consequences of increased racial prejudice, defeatism among workers, and a loss of respect for legitimate affirmative action programs.

RACE, MERIT AND JOBS
(By William Raspberry)

Back in 1972, a federal judge ordered the Alabama Department of Public Safety to hire one black highway patrolman for every new white trooper until the overall force was 25 percent black.

I thought the order made sense.

In 1981, the D.C. Office of Human Rights ordered the District fire department to fill 60 of its 70 vacancies with minority applicants and, after that, to give preference to minorities until the racial makeup of the department approximates the racial makeup of the city.

I don't know whether that one makes sense or not, and neither, so far as I can tell, does human rights director Anita Shelton, who issued the order.

In the Alabama case, the problem was clear-cut racial discrimination. There were some 600 state troopers, and all of them were white. A federal judge found evidence of overt discrimination and was upheld on appeal.

There has been no similar finding of discrimination against minorities by the local fire department. The principal evidence—so far as I can tell, the only evidence—of bias is the fact that in a city whose population is some 70 percent black, 63 percent of the fire-fighters are white.

And on the basis of that evidence, Shelton ordered the department to fill 60 of its 70 vacancies with minority applicants, even though most of those who made the top scores on the entrance exam were white.

She has now been ordered by the city administrator's office to hold public hearings to determine whether the skewed racial makeup of the department is the result of racial discrimination. It's something that might have occurred to Shelton without prodding from Veronica Pace, the aide who issued the order.

While there are superficial similarities between the 1972 situation in Alabama and the 1981 situation in the District, there are also important differences. All the relevant officials involved in the Alabama case were white. White people ran the state and were quite obviously determined to run it for the benefit of white people.

In the District, the key officials—the mayor, the city administrator, the fire chief—are black. It takes a good deal of imagining to suppose that these officials are guilty of discriminating in favor of white firefighter applicants.

Indeed, Shelton has not made such a charge. Her contention is that the discriminatory instrument is the entrance exam, on which white applicants tend to score higher than blacks. But for this fact to translate into discrimination, there ought to be some showing—in public hearings or otherwise—that the test is biased in favor of whites in ways that have nothing to do with competency in firefighting or in training for the job.

It would have made more sense if Shelton had ordered the establishment of a cutoff score for success on the entrance exam, with selections to be made randomly from those who passed the exam, as Mayor Barry did in the case of the police department.

The unspoken issue is whether jobs and other privileges are to be awarded on the basis of merit, however, determined, or on the basis of racial proportion. A case can be made either way.

You can establish criteria and make appointments based on how well applicants meet those criteria, without regard to race or other considerations. Or you can make the appointments reflect the racial makeup of the city, without regard to test scores or other measures of merit. You can even combine the two, ordering in effect, the establishment of two lists, one white, one black, with 30 percent of the appointments to be made from the top of the white list, 70 percent from the highest-scoring blacks. The same choices hold for promotions to supervisory ranks. One of the two assistant chief positions could be reserved for blacks; two of the five deputy chiefs would be white. The chief would automatically be black, since more than half the population is black.

My suspicion is that those who support Anita Shelton's order would want no part of such a two-track personnel system. If the five best-qualified applicants for the deputy jobs were black, they would insist that the five blacks be appointed.

In other words: merit, where merit works to the advantage of blacks; proportional appointment where merit favors whites.

Isn't it about time we opted for simple fairness? It's legitimate to debate the qualities (intelligence, reliability, physical condition and so on) we want in fire-fighters; it's legitimate to argue about how best to measure these qualities.

What strikes me as illegitimate, fundamentally unfair and destructive of popular support for affirmative action is to insist on bending the rules and requirements until they produce some arbitrary racial proportion. ●

**SEPTEMBER 21, BELIZE'S
INDEPENDENCE DAY**

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, September 21, Belize celebrated its independence from Great Britain. It is a pleasure to welcome this new nation to the family of American states. I hope that our Government will actively express our support of the newly gained sovereignty of Belize. But more than that, I trust that our country will help this new nation with the serious problems it faces: constraints on economic development, the creation and preservation of a democratic society, and the safekeeping of its national autonomy.

Unfortunately, there are dark clouds threatening this nation. I am referring to the Guatemalan Government's refusal to recognize the independence of Belize. For many years the Guatemalans have been claiming jurisdiction over this territory, which was previously known as British Honduras. In addition to the Government's declarations, the ultrarightist Movement of

National Liberation, headed by Mario Sandoval Alarcon, declared the month of September to be "black September," symbolizing the loss of the Guatemalan "Province of Belize." A committee, "Belize Now," has also been created to oppose the independence of Belize. An indication of the degree of the perceived threat is the fact that Great Britain is leaving 1,600 troops in Belize at the request of Premier George Price.

Although there is ample disagreement among Members of Congress on what U.S. policy toward Guatemala should be, I am certain that all of us here in Congress strongly believe in the inalienable sovereignty of nations. I trust that the administration will be able to convey this message loudly enough to our friends in Central America. In times when the whole region is confronting economic dislocations, political turmoil, and military conflicts, we should be glad to see a nation gaining its independence, fulfilling its ambitions, achieving its rights to participate fully in the international community of nations, and assuming the responsibilities of a self-governing state. ●

**IN SUPPORT OF THE
PRESIDENT'S VETO**

HON. ALBERT LEE SMITH, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Representative SCHULZE and I presented a letter signed by 154 Republican Representatives to President Reagan, pledging to support any veto the President may choose to exercise to carry out his economic recovery program.

The text of the letter was as follows:

We are very concerned about the economic direction of our Nation. We feel your plan for economic recovery heads us in the right direction and is a necessary departure from business as usual.

Accordingly, we urge you to stand firm by your public resolve and to veto any economic package which damages your program in the aggregate. Further, to assure you of our commitment, we hereby pledge to support any veto you may exercise to achieve your budgetary aggregate.

The delivery of this letter was timed to coincide with the current deliberations on appropriation bills. These funding measures will be the real test of congressional resolve. It is essential Congress stand firm on the budget cut decisions reached with bipartisan support earlier this year in the first budget resolution.

The letter we presented to President Reagan affirms that he can veto with confidence any fiscal year 1982 appropriation which exceeds the maximum

spending targets already set. The letter is not intended to pledge the signers with regard to future budget decisions, but it certainly does demonstrate we are united in our desire to bring Government spending under control and to hold firm with regard to the present appropriation legislation.

At this point I am submitting the names of those Republican Members who joined with me and signed this letter to President Reagan:

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SIGNING LETTER TO SUSTAIN VETO

Bill Archer (R-Tex.), John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio), Robert E. Badham (R-Calif.), L.A. "Skip" Bafalis (R-Fla.), Wendell Bailey (R-Mo.), Robin L. Beard (R-Tenn.), Cleve Benedict (R-W. Va.), Douglas K. Bereuter (R-Nebr.), Ed Bethune (R-Ark.), Tom Bliley (R-Va.), William S. Broomfield (R-Mich.), Hank Brown (R-Colo.), James T. Broyhill (R-N.C.), Clair W. Burgener (R-Calif.), M. Caldwell Butler (R-Va.).

Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. (R-S.C.), Greg Carman (R-N.Y.), William Carney (R-N.Y.), Gene Chappie (R-Calif.), Richard Bruce Cheney (R-Wyo.), Don H. Clausen (R-Calif.), William F. Clinger, Jr. (R-Pa.), Daniel R. Coats (R-Ind.), E. Thomas Coleman (R-Mo.), James M. Collins (R-Tex.), Barber B. Conable, Jr. (R-N.Y.), Tom Corcoran (R-Ill.), Lawrence Coughlin (R-Pa.), James A. Courter (R-N.J.), James K. Coyne (R-Pa.).

Larry Craig (R-Idaho), Daniel B. Crane (R-Ill.), Philip M. Crane (R-Ill.), Robert W. Daniel, Jr. (R-Va.), William E. Dannemeyer (R-Calif.), Hal Daub (R-Nebr.), Robert W. Davis (R-Mich.), H. Joel Deckard (R-Ind.), Larry DeNardis (R-Conn.), Edward J. Derwinski (R-Ill.), William L. Dickinson (R-Ala.), Robert K. Dornan (R-Calif.), David Dreier (R-Calif.), Jack Edwards (R-Ala.), Bill Emerson (R-Mo.).

David F. Emery (R-Maine), Arlen Erdahl (R-Minn.), John N. Erlenborn (R-Ill.), Cooper Evans (R-Iowa), Thomas B. Evans, Jr. (R-Del.), Bobbi Fiedler (R-Calif.), Jack Fields (R-Tex.), Hamilton Fish, Jr. (R-N.Y.), Edwin B. Forsythe (R-N.J.), Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (R-Calif.), William F. Goodling (R-Pa.), Judd Gregg (R-N.H.), Wayne Grisham (R-Calif.), Steve Gunderson (R-Wis.).

Tennyson Guyer (R-Ohio), Tom Hagedorn (R-Minn.), John Paul Hammerschmidt (R-Ark.), George Hansen (R-Idaho), James V. Hansen (R-Utah), Thomas F. Hartnett (R-S.C.), Bill Hendon (R-N.C.), John Hiler (R-Ind.), Elwood Hillis (R-Ind.), Marjorie S. Holt (R-Md.), Larry J. Hopkins (R-Ky.), Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.), Henry J. Hyde (R-Ill.), Jim Jeffries (R-Kans.), Eugene Johnston (R-N.C.).

Jack F. Kemp (R-N.Y.), Thomas N. Kindness (R-Ohio), Ken Kramer (R-Colo.), Robert J. Lagomarsino (R-Calif.), Delbert L. Latta (R-Ohio), Jim Leach (R-Iowa), John LeBoutillier (R-N.Y.), Gary A. Lee (R-N.Y.), Norman F. Lent (R-N.Y.), Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.), Bob Livingston (R-La.), Thomas G. Loeffler (R-Tex.), Trent Lott (R-Miss.), Bill Lowery (R-Calif.).

Manuel Lujan, Jr. (R-N. Mex.), Dan Lungren (R-Calif.), Edward R. Madigan (R-Ill.), Dan Marriott (R-Utah), David O'B. Martin (R-N.Y.), James G. Martin (R-N.C.), Lynn Martin (R-Ill.), Paul N. McCloskey, Jr. (R-Calif.), Bill McCollum (R-Fla.), Bob McEwen (R-Ohio), Stewart B. McKinney

(R-Conn.), Robert H. Michel (R-Ill.), Clarence E. Miller (R-Ohio), Guy V. Molinari (R-N.Y.), W. Henson Moore (R-La.), Carlos J. Moorhead (R-Calif.).

Sid Morrison (R-Wash.), Stan Parris (R-Va.), Charles Pashayan, Jr. (R-Calif.), Ron Paul (R-Texas), Thomas E. Petri (R-Wis.), John Edward Porter (R-Ill.), Joel Pritchard (R-Wash.), James "Jimmy" H. Quillen (R-Tenn.), John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.), Don Ritter (R-Pa.), Clint Roberts (R-S. Dak.), Pat Roberts (R-Kans.), J. Kenneth Robinson (R-Va.), Harold Rogers (R-Ky.), Toby Roth (R-Wis.).

John H. Rousselot (R-Calif.), Eldon Rudd (R-Ariz.), Harold S. Sawyer (R-Mich.), Richard T. Schulze (R-Pa.), F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr. (R-Wis.), E. Clay Shaw, Jr. (R-Fla.), Norman D. Shumway (R-Calif.), Joe Skeen (R-N. Mex.), Albert Lee Smith (R-Ala.), Chris Smith (R-N.J.), Denny Smith (R-Oreg.), Virginia Smith (R-Nebr.), Gene Snyder (R-Ky.), Gerald B. H. Solomon (R-N.Y.), Floyd Spence (R-S.C.).

J. William Stanton (R-Ohio), David Mick Staton (R-W. Va.), Mark D. Siljander (R-Mich.), Gene Taylor (R-Mo.), William M. Thomas (R-Calif.), Paul S. Trible, Jr. (R-Va.), Guy Vander Jagt (R-Mich.), Robert S. Walker (R-Pa.), Ed Weber (R-Ohio), Vin Weber (R-Minn.), G. William Whitehurst (R-Va.), Robert "Bob" Whittaker (R-Kans.), Lyle Williams (R-Ohio), Larry Winn, Jr. (R-Kans.), George Wortley (R-N.Y.), Chalmers P. Wylie (R-Ohio), C. W. "Bill" Young (R-Fla.), Don Young (R-Alaska), Michael G. Oxley (R-Ohio).

TRIBUTE TO MIKE MICHAELSON

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mike Michaelson, superintendent of the Radio and Television Gallery and one of the most valued employees of the House, who will retire on October 1.

For 30 years, Mike has devoted himself to the problems and needs of the Members of this body in a friendly and accommodating manner. He deserves our thanks for the special effort and extra consideration he has never failed to display.

His career paralleled the expansion of television news, and he has grown with the industry.

When he came to work in the Radio and Television Gallery in 1951, its membership was small, and television was just beginning to come of age.

By the time Mike became superintendent in 1974, television news had become a major force in American journalism. Today, his gallery is one of the largest, with 1,300 members.

Always friendly and willing to please, he earned the respect of five Speakers of the House for whom he worked, countless Members of this body, and of the media.

Fortunately, he will not really be leaving the House when he retires. He is just moving across the street.

As executive vice president of the Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network (C-SPAN), he will be involved in the day-to-day televised coverage of House proceedings.

He will enter the cable television industry at a time when it is expanding its horizons in much the same way as television news was 30 years ago.

No one knows the House better than Mike, and few are better equipped to pioneer cable television's expanded coverage of its sessions.

All of us who have worked with him for so many years will miss his warm personality and professional manner in the gallery.

I know his many friends in the House and in the media join in wishing him well in his new career.

GREEN BERETS STEP UP HONDURAS ROLE

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following New York Times article which reveals American military activity in Honduras. I visited the refugee camps in La Virtud, Honduras last January; however, there was no American military activity there at that time. As is explained in the article, La Virtud is in the border area of Honduras and El Salvador. With the help of American advisers, Honduran troops are now patrolling this area because of suspected guerrilla activity in this area. It has also been reported that Salvadoran troops have crossed the border and engaged in operations in the La Virtud area.

Mr. Speaker, I saw no evidence of guerrilla activity when I visited La Virtud. I did listen to the stories of Salvadoran refugees who had been driven from their homes by the Salvadoran authorities. Charles Bazoché, the representative of the U.N. High Commission on Refugees who guided my voyage into the Honduran border country, says there is no proof that any international relief for the refugees is going to the guerrillas.

In light of the tremendous concern and controversy surrounding U.S. involvement in the current Salvadoran conflict, I am greatly disturbed about reports of American military activity in Honduras. I think that the administration has a responsibility to explain the purpose and scope of this activity. Very little has been made known to Congress and the public about what American Green Berets are doing patrolling the Honduras-El Salvador border.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 9, 1981]

GREEN BERETS STEP UP HONDURAS ROLE

(By Raymond Bonner)

LA VIRTUD, HONDURAS.—This village's isolated mountain valley, as oppressively muggy by day as it is bleak by night, is nonetheless attracting its share of visitors. They include peasant refugees fleeing from neighboring El Salvador, Salvadoran Government troops and American military advisers.

"This dump is the center of the world now," a United States Army officer said when he was here for three days at the end of July. The officer, Capt. Michael Sheehan, is a member of the Army's elite Special Forces, known popularly as the Green Berets.

Captain Sheehan was accompanied by two senior enlisted men with extensive experience in Vietnam. All three wore camouflage jungle uniforms and carried M-16 automatic rifles.

They said they were from a Special Forces battalion based in Panama and that they and five other American soldiers from the same unit had been assigned to help the Honduran Army patrol the border. Their primary objective, they said, was to control the Salvadoran refugees streaming in to escape the upheaval in their country.

AID MAY BE REACHING GUERRILLAS

But there is a special dimension to this duty: The American advisers in La Virtud say that many of the refugees are from the families of leftist guerrillas and guerrilla sympathizers and that at night some of them sneak out of the Honduran refugee camps carrying food and other supplies through the rugged mountain gorges to the rebels in El Salvador.

While the United States has long supplied Honduras with a limited number of military advisers, their presence along the Salvadoran border is believed to represent the first time they have been engaged in a mission connected with the conflict in El Salvador.

Captain Sheehan said that the National Security Council had approved the use of Special Forces units in Honduras in support of the military effort against Salvadoran guerrillas. A Special Forces unit would soon be based in La Virtud, he said.

The Reagan Administration has requested an increase in United States military aid from \$5.4 million this year to \$10.7 million next year. In April, four military advisers were on temporary assignment in the country.

SALVADORANS LAND IN AREA

Early in July, an American-trained battalion of the Salvadoran Army landed in this area then crossed back into El Salvador in an operation to squeeze the guerrillas out of the mountains on the Salvadoran side of the border.

The day after the landing, the Mayo of Valladolid, a small village up the deeply rutted mountain road from here told local reporters that she had seen American soldiers in the area a few days before the landing.

According to an official in the San José office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 70,000 Salvadoran refugees have entered Honduras out of about 305,000 who have fled El Salvador in the last year.

REFUGEES LIVE UNDER TARPS

On the bank of a river, in an area slightly larger than a football field, more than 60 incandescent green and orange tarpaulin

sheets, normally used to cover truck cargos, provide shelter for several hundred Salvadoran families. The soil here is cement-like, but astonishingly a few cornstalks, surrounded by crude stick fences, stretch more than 10 feet high.

Several international relief groups, including Caritas Honduras, part of the Roman Catholic relief organization, have set up tin-roofed schools and a medical clinic. All of the work is being coordinated by the Evangelical Committee for Development and National Emergencies, which is known as Ceden, its initials in Spanish. It is affiliated with the World Council of Churches.

The effort has not been without controversy. The United States Embassy in Honduras has been embroiled in a dispute growing out of charges that international aid intended for the refugees has been reaching Salvadoran leftist guerrillas.

REPORTS DIFFER ON GUERRILLA AID

In June, the country's major newspapers reported that Ambassador Jack Binns had said that 50 percent of the international aid intended for the refugees was going to the guerrillas.

In letters to the directors of Ceden and Caritas, Ambassador Binns said he had not been the source of the reports. But he said that there was "circumstantial evidence" that "small quantities" of the aid was reaching the guerrillas.

"There is no proof that any of the international aid for the refugees is going to the guerrillas," Charles-Henry Bazoche, director of the Honduras office of the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, said in a recent interview. "We have established tight controls."

Militarily, it would be easy to control the refugees, the American advisers here said, but there would be an international outcry about human rights if more military control were exercised. Mr. Bazoche has protested to the Honduran Government that the Honduran Army is treating the refugees brutally.

THREE REFUGEES REPORTED KILLED

Mr. Bazoche said that in March three refugees were killed after being taken from a camp by the Honduran Army and turned over to Salvadoran soldiers. He said that army incursions into the camps have "somewhat lessened, but it remains a serious concern of ours."

A major problem now, he said, is that refugees are being turned back at the border by the Honduran Army. Refugees reaching Honduras say that hundreds of others are unable to leave El Salvador because the Salvadoran Air Force bombs the fleeing columns of peasants.

In La Virtud, naked children, older boys playing soccer and grunting black pigs share the weed-infested, garbage-littered central area surrounded on four equal sides by crumbling adobe buildings. Widespread hepatitis and malaria have disabled even the foreign doctors working here.

A DINNER SHARED WITH AMERICANS

One evening, in a ramshackle adobe building where torrential rains easily penetrate the gaps in the red tile roof, four American and Honduran soldiers shared a kerosene lamp-lighted dinner with the French, West German and Honduran doctors that are part of the relief effort in La Virtud.

When the discussion turned to the refugees, Captain Sheehan, a 1977 graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point said, "They have no human rights." He said they have a "right to food and a

roof." And medicine, he added, realizing he was among medical people.

Captain Sheehan told the international doctors that a Special Forces medical team and other military personnel were being sent to La Virtud. International volunteers were solemn and angry, and they verbally sniped at Captain Sheehan, who again came to dinner, this night uninvited.

La Virtud has survived the poverty of underdevelopment for generations, they said. A medical team from the Special Forces is coming more for military than humanitarian reasons, they said.

RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE REDUCTION IN SOCIAL SECURITY COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution I introduce today expresses congressional opposition to proposals to reduce cost-of-living adjustments for social security beneficiaries.

The social security cost-of-living adjustment mechanism became effective in 1975. It protects the purchasing power of older Americans, disabled persons, survivors and their families.

This measure was the result of bipartisan action from Democrats and Republicans alike. The cost-of-living adjustment mechanism still enjoys solid bipartisan support because it has helped to remove politics in determining the amount and timing of social security increases.

However, President Reagan has recommended that the 1982 social security automatic adjustment will be delayed by 3 months.

The administration's proposal strikes at the very heart of cost-of-living protection principle. At a time when the elderly need all the help they can muster to cope with inflation, the President would arbitrarily push back the social security increase due to them by law.

Social security beneficiaries now receive cost-of-living increases each July, provided the inflation rate is at least 3 percent. The adjustment is computed by determining the rise in prices from the first quarter in the previous year—January, February, and March—to the first quarter in the current year. For example, the 11.2-percent increase this past July was based upon the inflation rate from the first quarter in 1980 to the first quarter in 1981.

The cost-of-living adjustment mechanism provides valuable protection for older Americans and other social security beneficiaries, but it still only enables them to play a catch-up game with inflation. The span of time from the first month for measuring the inflation rate for the adjustment and

the actual receipt of the check is 18 months.

President Reagan wants to make elderly and other social security beneficiaries wait an additional 3 months. This multibillion dollar cut strikes at those Americans who are least able to defend themselves in the current economic crisis. Older Americans have been paying higher prices for food, fuel, electricity, and other necessities, and now, they will be asked to shoulder perhaps the greatest burden of any group in our Nation.

It is high time that the administration stop trying to balance the budget on the backs of the sick, the disabled, and the elderly.

Nearly 600,000 persons 65 or older were added to the poverty rolls during the past 2 years, from 3.3 million in 1978 to 3.9 million in 1980. This represents the sharpest increase since poverty statistics were first tabulated more than two decades ago.

Poverty is a bare bones existence: Less than \$3,941 a year for a single aged person and \$4,954 for an older couple.

If the Reagan proposal to postpone the cost-of-living adjustment and other administration cutbacks is adopted, many more older Americans will be added to the poverty rolls.

Congress has already enacted substantial social security reductions—cuts which I strongly opposed—in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act.

Social security's financial integrity can be maintained for the immediate future through the use of interfund borrowing among the social security trust funds under Congressional Budget Office assumptions.

My proposal would also protect others whose benefit increases are pegged to the social security cost-of-living adjustments. These individuals would include supplemental security income recipients, railroad retirement annuitants, and veterans receiving non-service-connected disability pensions.

My resolution would make it clear that Congress will not be a partner in reducing the purchasing power of people who are hardest hit by inflation.

For these reasons, I urge prompt and favorable action on my resolution.

This proposal for the cost-of-living adjustment delay is not needed. It is unfair. And, it deserves to be soundly rejected.

H. CON. RES. 189

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the schedule of cost-of-living increases in benefits under title II of the Social Security Act should be maintained as currently in effect

Whereas the social security system is the major source of financial protection for most of our Nation's elderly and disabled;

Whereas many of the 36,000,000 social security benefit recipients depend on benefits under the social security system to shield

them from the devastating impact of inflation;

Whereas the proposal of the President to delay cost-of-living increases in social security benefits would erode this vital protection and jeopardize the economic security of countless older or disabled Americans; and

Whereas the Congress intends to keep its long-standing promise to the American people who have labored to build the social security system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the schedule of cost-of-living benefit increases under title II of the Social Security Act as in effect on the date of the adoption of this resolution should be maintained.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO
THE HONORABLE RAYMOND V.
ARNOLD, GRAND EXALTED
RULER OF THE BENEVOLENT
AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF
ELKS, UPON THE COMMEMORATIVE
TRIBUTE OF WAYNE
LODGE 2181

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call your attention to a special testimonial and commemorative program that is taking place in my hometown of Wayne in tribute to the grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks (B.P.O.E.), the Honorable Raymond V. Arnold of Michigan, under the sponsorship and leadership of Wayne Lodge 2181 of B.P.O.E. and its esteemed officers:

The Honorable Alfred Greig, exalted ruler; Ronald Del Balso, leading knight; Thomas Wolke, loyal knight; Raymond Favocci, lecturing knight; Harry Avogardo, secretary; Bernard Brozowski, treasurer; Herb Deeths, tiler; Norman Gilman, esq.; James Randazzo, chaplain; Harold Morganfruh, inner guard; William Tylka, organist; Anthony Fiorello, justice of the subordinate forum; Leon Noorigan, trustee; Joseph Buckley, trustee; John Stefanacci, trustee; Charles Werkley, trustee; John Riccardi, trustee; Louis V. Messercola, past exalted ruler and banquet chairman; together with two outstanding dignitaries of the Elks: The Honorable Edward Van Vooren, State president of the New Jersey Elks Association; and William Jay Jernick, past grand exalted ruler.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 29, the residents of Wayne, our Eighth Congressional District, and State of New Jersey will join with these exemplary leaders of the Wayne, State, and national Elks in testimony to the lifetime of good works of a distinguished citizen, outstanding community leader, and good friend, the Honorable Raymond V. Arnold, whose standards of excellence in the principles of charity,

justice, brotherly love, fidelity, and American patriotism under the auspices of the B.P.O.E. have earned him the highest office and most respected national title of grand exalted ruler—the chief officer—of the Elks. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to Raymond Arnold and share the pride of his good wife, Eleanor, and their family in this milestone of achievements in their family endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the charitable and benevolent activities of the Elks which span the needs and concerns of all of our people—young and adults alike—and especially their generous contributions to God's special children who are physically handicapped. The Elks have provided assistance to needy and unfortunate individuals. It has helped victims of the Chicago fire, given to flood relief, contributed to the work of the Red Cross, aided Scout work, supported hospitalized veterans, and provided scholarships for the education of our young people—to name but a few of their vast endeavors of benevolence. They are particularly identified with their devotion to Americanism and have brought an added quality of life and way of life to the people of our Nation.

It is fitting and appropriate that we take this opportunity to commend and express our heartiest congratulations to the grand exalted ruler of elkdome, the Honorable Raymond V. Arnold, who has recently been elected the chief officer to serve the membership of this most prestigious fraternal organization nationwide during the current fiscal year 1981-82.

Mr. Speaker, insert at this point in our historic Journal of Congress a profile of Ray Arnold as prepared by the Jackson, Mich., Lodge No. 113 upon presenting him as their candidate for the office of grand exalted ruler with confidence that his experience, quality of leadership, and devotion to the B.P.O.E. would eminently qualify him as an outstanding candidate for this most esteemed and highest office of the B.P.O.E. His résumé reads, as follows:

Raymond V. Arnold is a member of Jackson, Michigan Lodge No. 113, located in the gently rolling farmland hills of South Central Michigan with an economic base closely tied to the auto industry of Detroit.

Brother Arnold was born in Erie, Michigan, on September 27, 1925, to parents who had immigrated to the United States from Europe. He attended the Trinity Lutheran Grade School in Monroe, Michigan, and moved to Toledo, Ohio, then to Addison, Michigan, where he attended high school, taking some extra courses in his senior year in order to graduate mid-year to enlist in the United States Army Air Force which he did in March of 1944 becoming a pilot cadet in the Air Force program. With the ending of the war he moved to Jackson, building

tires at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, and at the same time being a full time student at Jackson Junior College. He was able to enter the combined curriculum program at the University of Michigan Law School and graduated in 1952 after six years rather than the normal seven years, with a degree of Juris Doctor.

He was associated in the practice of law with C. E. Bigg, and also in the operation of Central Adjusting Bureau specializing in tort law and basically doing defense work for insurance companies. Upon Mr. Bigg's retirement in 1960, he was a sole practitioner until 1965 when he became associated with Felix F. Best, forming a partnership in 1966 and then a professional corporation now operating under the name of Best, Arnold, Gleeson & Best, P.C., and still specializing in negligence defense work, and in which he is now one of six full time attorneys.

Over the years he has held memberships in the American Bar Association, Michigan Bar Association and Jackson County Bar Association, and is admitted to practice in the State of Michigan and before the Federal Court. He is also an arbitrator for the American Arbitration Association.

Brother Arnold has been deeply interested in sports and is a member of several sports organizations including archery, horseshoes, golf and bowling. In bowling he has been associated with the American Bowling Congress since 1965, first as a director, then Vice President since 1972, and in 1980 as President of this sports organization of 5,000,000 members. He was inducted into the Jackson Bowling Association Hall of Fame in June of 1980.

Initiated in the Jackson Elks Lodge No. 113 on June 7, 1954, he immediately became active and several weeks later was appointed Chaplain, and in 1955 to the office of Esquire, and then progressed through the chairs becoming Exalted Ruler in the year 1959-60. He became a member of the Past Exalted Rulers Association of his home lodge, being a past secretary and past president of that organization. He was twice elected as trustee of his home Lodge and served on all of the Lodge committees over the years. In recognition of his distinguished service to Elksdom and to the community of Jackson, the Jackson Lodge voted him an honorary life membership in 1960.

Brother Arnold was appointed to the Michigan State Elks Law Committee in 1963, and he has been on that committee each year since that date being its chairman for 15 years. In 1970 he was District Deputy Grand Exalted Ruler to Honorable Glenn L. Miller. He was on the Grand Lodge Judiciary Committee from 1972 to 1980, being its chairman for the last two years.

At the annual convention of the Michigan Elks Association on May 16, 1980, he was honored by the Past Presidents of that association and the delegates in session who elected him as an Honorary Past State President.

Brother Arnold and the former Eleanor McQuillin were married on June 15, 1946, and were blessed with two fine boys, Thomas, age 33, and Robert, age 27. They now have two granddaughters, Kim and Kris, ages 14 and 12, and one grandson, Joshua, age 1½.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our Wayne Lodge 2181, B.P.O.E., in this testimony to the grand exalted ruler of the B.P.O.E. and seek this national recognition of Raymond Arnold for his outstanding contribution to the

American way of life and the American dream. He has labored in the vineyard with other community leaders and our veterans in many, many social, civic, and charitable endeavors. His standards of excellence and exemplary service have truly enriched our Nation. We do indeed salute a most distinguished citizen, community leader, and great American—the Honorable Raymond V. Arnold, the grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks.●

TRIBUTE TO RILEY "B. B." KING

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, "B. B." King, a great artist and talented entertainer, just passed a significant milestone. He has just completed his 40th benefit concert for prison inmates. The achievement is even more remarkable, given the fact that it was accomplished in a little over 9 years.

In 1972, B. B. King and trial attorney F. Lee Bailey founded the Foundation for the Advancement of Inmate Rehabilitation and Recreation (FAIRR). FAIRR is a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the morale and rehabilitation efforts of prisons through cultural exposure to entertainers, writers, musicians, and public figures, and better quality libraries and available music, films, and literature. B. B. King's efforts toward prisoners and prison rehabilitation through FAIRR have been remarkable and the value of his help, immeasurable.

In a sense, it is puzzling that a man who has never been convicted or imprisoned can be so compassionate about such forlorned and forgotten people, but one only has to listen to B. B. King's music to understand. B. B. King sings the "blues," the expressions of joy and sorrow of the black experience in the rural South. Many prison inmates share roots with B. B. and his blues and he is sensitive to this. In fact, B. B. King's early life is probably indistinguishable from many of the inmates he recently performed for at Parchman Prison in Mississippi. He left school after the 10th grade to earn a living by picking cotton on a plantation in the Mississippi Delta. Fortunately for music lovers the world over, he took up the guitar in late adolescence and began playing the blues, one of the few occupations open to black people in the delta, at that time, that promised deliverance from a lifetime of manual labor. He moved to Memphis and eventually landed a job with WDIA, the first black operated radio station in the country. His real name is Riley, but a local disc jockey

nicknamed him the "Beale Street Blues Boy" and it stuck. Later the nickname was shortened to "B. B." and the rest is history.

Thankfully, B. B. King, in his illustrious career, has never forgotten his heritage, nor the deep compassion such an experience can produce. He constantly reaffirms this compassion through his music and his humanitarian works.●

BRASS BICUSPID AWARD

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should award the Navy a "Brass Bicuspid Award" for running such an inefficient executive dining room that it costs more than \$31 to serve a simple lunch based around a western omelette.

I do not mean to be entirely tongue-in-cheek when I suggest the overall efficiency of the services can be judged by the way they run their exclusive, members' only dining rooms for their top brass.

The cost of lunches ranges from \$12 in the Air Force's private dining nest, to \$15 in the Army's and \$31 in the Navy's. Once again the Navy—home of the \$2 billion aircraft carrier—comes in with the most expensive approach imaginable.

The costs really would not matter if the generals and the admirals were picking up the tab. But no admiral no matter how flush is about to lay out \$31 for his broiled filet of sole. No; he asks the taxpayer to cough up \$26.98 while he pays an average of only \$4.05.

It has been said you can tell a man by what he eats. I think you can also tell the brass by what they spend to eat. The spendthrift attitude that prevails in the closed-door dining rooms carries over after lunch.

I want to make clear that the pricey meals don't mean the admirals are lunching on pheasant under glass every day. The problem is the regal style in which the 125 admirals choose to dine with staff galore to look after their needs. The Navy's executive dining room had a staff of 22 to serve 13,500 meals last year while its Air Force counterpart had a staff of 20 to serve 28,000 meals, more than twice as many. That indicates an egregious case of overstaffing in the Navy and is a key reason the taxpayer is subsidizing the admirals' tuna espiciale served with fruit sections and cottage cheese to the tune of \$26.98.

But it does not mean the Air Force is terribly efficient. The charbroiled Delmonico steak topped with onion rings, which sells for \$1.75, is subsidized by the taxpayer to the tune of \$10.12 in

the Air Force executive dining room—not exactly a bargain meal for the Treasury—although the \$2.22 the generals pay on average is a bargain meal for them.

There are two other executive dining rooms in the Pentagon, one for the officials of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and one for the principal staff working for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. All are heavily overstaffed, with a ratio of only 4.2 meals per employee served each day. All are heavily subsidized with appropriated funds, with the total subsidy for the five dining rooms coming to \$1,438,322 in fiscal year 1980, or an average of \$14.28 per meal.

PENTAGON EXECUTIVE DINING ROOMS—FISCAL 1980 COST DATA

	Income from meals	Appropriated funds	Total
OSD—26,004 meals served; 19 staff:			
Total.....	\$74,739.00	\$313,588.00	\$388,325.00
Per meal.....	2.87	12.06	14.93
CJCS—11,068 meals served; 12 staff:			
Total.....	32,298.00	187,462.00	219,760.00
Per meal.....	2.92	16.94	19.86
Army—21,876 meals served; 18 staff:			
Total.....	42,240.00	286,389.00	328,629.00
Per meal.....	1.93	13.09	15.02
Navy—13,505 meals served; 22 staff:			
Total.....	54,737.00	364,414.00	419,151.00
Per meal.....	4.05	26.98	31.03
USAF—28,297 meals served; 20 staff:			
Total.....	62,768.00	286,469.00	349,237.00
Per meal.....	2.22	10.12	12.34
Total—100,750; 91 staff:			
Total.....	266,782.00	1,438,322.00	1,705,104.00
Per meal.....	2.64	14.28	16.92

I am frequently asked, "What about the dining room for Members of Congress?" So let me note here that according to the auditors' report for

fiscal year 1980, the same time period covered by my data for the Pentagon, the House of Representatives Members' dining room lost a total of \$42,010, just looking at food sales. While I do not have a figure on the number of meals served, that works out at a loss averaging \$95.69 per member for the entire year. That compares with a loss at the Pentagon averaging \$1,832.26 for each of the 785 members of the private dining rooms at the Pentagon.

The entire House restaurant system, incidentally, showed a profit of almost \$11,000 last year, largely due to the highly profitable tobacco sales. This is not a defense of the Members' dining room loss. I believe that as a matter of principle it should not be subsidized even to the tune of a penny a meal. But I think it speaks volumes to see that the House, which has never been criticized for ignoring perks, enjoys a meal subsidy totaling at best 5 percent of that found in the austere Pentagon. ●

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION LEGISLATION

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 1981

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the addition of another two dozen cosponsors of H.R. 4373, the proposed Small Business Innovation Research Act of 1981. This brings to 83 the number of Representatives who are cosponsors of this bill, which was introduced on August 4 by Mr. McDade and myself.

A similar measure in the Senate is cosponsored by 82 Members of that body. I am happy to report that the Senate Small Business Committee today voted unanimously to report that legislation.

Here in the House, Congressman LAFALCE last week held hearings on innovation in his Small Business Subcommittee on Oversight. In addition to the Bedell-McDade bill, the hearing considered other innovation proposals, including those put forward by NEAL SMITH, PARREN MITCHELL, JERRY LEWIS, and JOHN LAFALCE. All of the bills are quite similar in concept and effect, and the small business community strongly supports this sort of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation is obvious to all who have studied the issue. The small business community is by far the most productive and innovative segment of our economy. Yet it receives the smallest portion of the Federal Government's expenditures in support of research and development. This is wasteful and counterproductive.

H.R. 4373 and similar bills simply require that a portion of Government R. & D. outlays go to small businesses. The shame of it is that we even need to consider legislation to force the bureaucracy to do what is so obviously sensible.

Based on the Senate committee's enthusiastic action this morning and the strong support this legislation enjoys here in the House, I am hopeful that small business innovation research legislation can be enacted before the year's end. That would be something we all could be proud of. ●