

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

CAN ONE MAN STOP THE GUN LOBBY?

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, last month's issue of Prime Time carried a cover story about Pete Shields, the chairman of Handgun Control, Inc. It is an important story about one family's personal tragedy and today's effort to bring reasonableness to our Nation's gun control laws. I commend it to our colleagues.

CAN ONE MAN STOP THE GUN LOBBY?

"Another street slaying—the 18th 'zebra' victim." It was a headline chilling in its familiarity. "A Visitor to Bay Area Shot Down."

It went on. "A young man was shot to death on an Ingleside district street last night, the 18th in a series of shocking, unprovoked shootings that have become the terror of San Francisco since January 28.

"Nelson T. Shields IV, 23, who came to the Bay Area only two weeks ago, became the latest victim in the shootings the police list under 'Code Zebra.'

"Shields, a member of a socially prominent Delaware family, was killed at 9:30 p.m. while he and a friend were preparing to pick up a rug at 231 Vernon Street in the Ingleside District. . . .

"Until the witness spoke to police, it was thought that Shields had been shot by a sniper. But the girl told officers what she had seen, and inspectors found two .32 caliber cartridge casings, one of them in the victim's automobile. That was the same kind of weapon used in other 'Code Zebra' shootings. . . ."

It was April 17, 1974, early morning, when the San Francisco Chronicle story appeared, by which time Nelson T. "Pete" Shields III was already packing in Delaware. A late phone call the night before had informed him of the shooting and so, as San Franciscans read of the killing over breakfast, a father prepared to retrieve the corpse an assassin's cheap handgun had made of "Nick," his son.

Here, Pete Shields recalls, is how a young man wound up in the wrong place at the wrong time: "Nick had been working in Denver. He had dropped out of college a year before, a year and a half before. He had reapplied and gotten back into college in the next term, transferring from Hobart to Rochester. He had left his job in Denver and decided to go out to the West Coast and see some friends in San Francisco and then go down to Los Angeles and see his sister before he went back East and started the new term.

"He had only been in San Francisco six or seven days, staying with friends. He was a great lacrosse player, captain of his team in school. This friend of his was a lacrosse player too, and coaching a kind of little-league lacrosse team down in the center of the city. So as soon as Nick got to town he

got involved with that, working with the kids. They were coming back from practice about nine-thirty at night and his friend had made arrangements to pick up a rug from a person he worked with who was selling it second hand. They stopped by the home of the associate. While Nick's friend went into the house to get the rug, Nick was cleaning the back of the station wagon to make room for the rug among the lacrosse equipment. Someone came up behind him and shot three shots right into him from close range. He never saw him. Shot in the back. Died instantaneously."

People may indeed kill people, but handguns are their weapon of choice. One American dies in a handgun murder every fifty minutes, or put another way, twenty-nine more will be dead by this time tomorrow, or another, almost 11,000 lives ended the same time next year, all thanks to handguns. In addition to murders, there are more than 250,000 other handgun crimes committed annually—nonfatal shootings, assaults, robberies, rapes. During the Vietnam War, more than 56,000 U.S. soldiers died; during the same period, some 110,000 Americans were killed with handguns. Handguns are used in 50 percent of all murders, compared to knives in 19 percent and rifles in 5 percent. There are currently 60 million handguns circulating in this country, and 2.5 million more introduced every year. At that rate, 100 million handguns will be floating around come the year 2000, or one deadly pistol in the hands of roughly every third man, woman and child.

How we must perplex the rest of the world. Great Britain, with one-quarter of our population had just fifty-five handgun killings in 1979. Japan, with half as many people, had only 171 handgun crimes, fatal and nonfatal, during the same period. Figures for West Germany, France and Canada are similarly small. In these countries and many others throughout the civilized world, the sale of handguns is restricted to those licensed for their ownership, and then only under strict conditions involving certification by the police.

How we vex ourselves. For almost fifty years public-opinion samplings have shown strong support for handgun controls among a majority of Americans. An August 1979 ABC News-Harris Survey found 78 percent in favor of "a federal law requiring that all handguns people own be registered by federal authorities." A January 1981 Gallup poll showed 62 percent urging stricter handgun control legislation. And a Washington Post-ABC News poll in March, following the attempted assassination of President Reagan, put 65 percent of all Americans behind "stronger legislation controlling the distribution of handguns."

Those who do oppose handgun control frequently base their opinion upon a mistaken belief that the Constitution grants Americans an inalienable right to own a gun. Certainly, we are historically and culturally a pistol-packing lot, what with Wyatt Earp and John Wayne and the six-shooter and all, but in precise legal terms the founding fathers never ordained that this be so. The Second Amendment to the Constitution reads, "A Well-Regulated Militia, Being Necessary To The Security of a

Free State, the Right of the People to Keep and Bear Arms, Shall Not Be Infringed." On five separate occasions, the Supreme Court has ruled that the Second Amendment was intended to prevent members of the state militias—i.e., the National Guard—from being disarmed by the federal government, and not to secure a handgun at the bottom of father's dresser drawer. As long ago as 1875, in *United States v. Cruikshank*, the High Court wrote, "The bearing of arms for a lawful purpose . . . is not a right granted by the Constitution." Furthermore, the American Bar Association states that "every Federal Court decision involving the amendment has given the amendment a collective, militia interpretation and/or held that firearms control laws enacted under state's police power are constitutional."

There is hardly a city or county in this country without its target range where firearm enthusiasts may take their guns to shoot tiny holes in "official" bull's eye grids, courtesy of the NRA, and hob nob with other members of the local gun club, which is usually connected in one way or another with the NRA. For over a century, these ranges and clubs have provided the organization with a grass-roots network ideal for generating national membership, financial support and local political pressure to neutralize attempts at enacting gun control laws. Up against such opposition, a sense of futility is hard to avoid. Presidents, artists, even the Pope, can be struck down, and still nothing seems capable of shaking the NRA's grip on our spineless legislators.

But Pete and Jeanne Shields think they can. At the time of their son's murder, the Shieldses were just another suburban couple like so many other suburban couples. The kids had grown and the house was quiet; that was new, yet they continued to lead the life they had constructed for themselves over more than two decades of marriage: he, a middle-management marketing executive for the Du Pont Chemical Company; she, a homemaker and active member of their community. So much has changed since then. Pete is now chairman of Handgun Control, Inc., a national "citizens lobby" with the goal of keeping pistols out of the hands of maniacs *by law*, and Jeanne is one of the group's principal volunteers, currently setting up a "victims network" to organize people like themselves who have suffered directly or indirectly from the wanton use of a handgun. They have stolen a page from the NRA's own manual, coalescing a concerned citizenry and collaring politicians and demanding results.

In calling itself a citizens lobby, Handgun Control means two things. First, it attempts to represent the general public in contrast to any specific industry or economic group. The issue of handgun control truly affects everyone; its adherents range from wealthy industrialists to the poor, from doctors and educators to daylaborers. Second, the organization terms itself a citizens lobby since it is supported almost exclusively by membership dues (fifteen dollars annually) and small donations (usually in the twenty-five to one-hundred-dollar area). It draws precious few foundation grants and little business support, nor does it receive government

grants, obviously. "Ninety-five percent of our money comes from average everyday folks," says its chairman.

Strangely enough, Handgun Control has no notion of its total membership—so quickly has it grown. Before John Lennon's assassination, it had reached a new highwater mark of 80,000, reflecting a respectable growth of between 10-15,000 a year since its founding in 1974. Outrage over the rock star's brutal, inexplicable death, however, flooded the lobby with 50,000 new members in just twelve weeks. Then President Reagan suffered his assault and, well, all hell broke loose. Handgun Control received mail by the sackful, actually the dozens of sackful. Then came the shooting of Pope John Paul II, and the organization still hasn't had a moment to tally up its gains, much less catch its breath. Pete Shields estimates that, barring another electrifying act of handgun violence, his group will move into 1982 with a membership of between 250,000 and 400,000, plus a network of active, letter-writing nonmembers numbering perhaps 150,000 or more.

By no small design, victims of handgun violence now occupy an expanding role in the lobby and its efforts. Handgun Control publishes a monthly "Handgun Body Count," patterned after those grim Vietnam War listings, and it attempts to identify and contact survivors. Printed right on the membership blank is a box to check if the donor has ever sustained or had a loved one perish in a handgun assault. "We try to identify and motivate them," says Pete Shields, "which is a difficult task. A lot of them—in fact, the majority of them—don't want to go public. Typically, people want to bury their grief with the dead. But if they can and are willing to talk about their experience, then they can be very useful and very powerful. It's tough for a congressman to ignore a mother telling him about the loss of a son, or a son telling about the loss of a father. It's tough for a congressman, for anyone; to ignore that type of commitment."

Tactics such as these inspire controversy and do raise the question of exploitation, but Shields had given it all a bit of thought and he has a strong answer for his critics. "A lot of people say we're too emotional. I say, bull! That's what the name of the game is. If they, the NRA, can get emotional over that piece of steel, I can get emotional over life and death. This is the difference: they act like they're debating an economic issue—maybe the decontrol of an industry. We're not! We're not debating what President Reagan's economic policy is going to do to the gross national product, or if a 5 percent unemployment rate is tolerable. We see this issue as a life-and-death issue, a human-rights issue. In my book there's no 'acceptable' death rate. They talk about the 11,000 people murdered by handguns each year in the same sense as any other statistic. It's disgusting."

The Shieldses may personally wish for the banning of handguns entirely, but it is not something their organization is working toward—merely strict control. For all of their emotion, they are pragmatists, and they don't think—as some of their colleagues do—that handguns will ever be outlawed and driven out of circulation in this country. They appreciate the desires of those who use firearms for sport. Pete Shields is himself a hunter and owns several long guns; he instructed both his sons in marksmanship and bought them shotguns when they reached the age and maturity to handle them. It's the "Saturday night spe-

cial" that raise his fury. A hood can terrorize a neighborhood and a racist nut kill a young boy with these cheap, inaccurate, but deadly, handguns, available for thirty to forty dollars in almost any pawnshop. State laws alone are not enough: the pistol that killed John Lennon was purchased in Hawaii and smuggled all the way to New York, while the one fired at President Reagan was acquired at a Dallas pawnshop. If they cannot be banned, Handgun Control reasons, then at least license their owners and try to keep them out of the hands of the hoods and the nuts. Isn't it simple common sense?

"That's part of my own tragedy," Pete Shields says in one of his flashing segues between professional lobbyist and grieving father. "We tend to be so apathetic. I don't know if it's an American trait or a trait of our time. Until something has literally struck us personally, we tend to leave it to Joe, leave it to the other guy. I was aware of the handgun control debate over the years, read about it after the assassination of the Kennedy brothers, Martin Luther King, Jr., the shooting of George Wallace. But I didn't get involved. I didn't take a position. I didn't write my congressman—until it was too late."

Both he and Jeanne involved themselves in church and civic affairs around Wilmington. Once they helped start up a community drug clinic. They were Republicans like their neighbors. They socialized, played tennis; and it does take a lot of time to raise five kids. They were happy, content. A phone call in the night changed all that.

"Our whole emotion at the time," he remembers, "was built around not the tragedy, not vindictiveness toward the killers, but around the loss of a son. You know, one of our staff members, a woman whose son was also murdered, says, 'When you lose a parent, you lose the past; when you lose a child, you lose the future.'"

"When I went out to California to identify the body and bring it back and the media wanted to interview me, they were amazed that I did not show more outrage, more anger, that I didn't want revenge. All the other victims were groping for—you know, 'Gimme a gun so I can go out and get that bastard.'"

Nothing made much sense after that. Not work. Not civic affairs. Not even friends. Pete Shields just knew he was angry, that his son had died for no earthly reason and that something had to be done about it. Now, too late perhaps, but now he began looking into the issue of handgun control. He read books and articles on the topic. He wrote his congressman. Finally, through a mutual friend, he heard about a year-old group called the National Council to Control Handguns. Shields first volunteered his time on evenings and weekends—it felt right, it was making some kind of sense out of his life. After agonizing over the decision, he asked Du Pont for a leave of absence, an unprecedented request. They granted it and he started going into the Washington, D.C. office part-time, eventually full-time, ultimately becoming chairman of the council. He took his thirty years and cashed them in for early retirement from Du Pont.

Jeanne threw herself into handgun control about a year after her husband. Today, she is virtually a full-time volunteer, working four days a week in the cramped and frenetic office. She writes many of the letters and makes many of the calls that go out to those the organization has identified as handgun violence victims. It is not a

pleasant job, especially for her, but it is important, vital, in fact, and so she does it without complaint—just an occasional breather. Every once in awhile, I do have to take a week off and get away from it. When you keep seeing the letters that come in and hearing the things that keep happening to other people, it get to you. It conjures up all the memories. You have to come up for air."

Each in their own way, all the Shieldses, father, mother and the four remaining children, are involved in the handgun control issue. But perhaps most involved is Nick. Jeanne remembers, "We did talk it over as a family when we decided to do this full time. It meant that in order to do this and make an impact—talking about Nick and making him the focal point, and going public, was necessary. We wanted the children to be part of that decision; we wanted them to really understand why. They understood and agreed, provided it didn't become, as one of them said, 'maudlin and icky.' I don't think we have been." Even so, it's never easy. "Oh yes, it's seven years now, and often it's perfectly simple to talk about, and then there are times when a phrase or something somebody says sort of triggers an emotion—and then tears come."

"What I'm running into now are people who say that their sons or husbands have been shot and are paraplegics. That went through my mind at the time of Nick's death and again later: what if Nicky had lived but had been paralyzed for the rest of his life? In many ways, that would have been a worse burden, not on us, but on a young man who was very athletic and full of life. I don't think I would want that for him—it's really hell on earth. Yet, on the other hand, at least he would have had his mind. Then I think I probably shouldn't dwell on it. So I don't."

In theory, Pete and Jeanne Shields took on their cause as a means of tempering their personal grief. In effect, they have tendered their lives to the issue.

The first, most obvious hardship was financial. During his leave, Pete drew no salary from Du Pont, living instead off some investment income and savings. Later, he had his early retirement pay, plus a modest stipend from the organization. Now, he estimates his income has once again reached the point where it was when he left Du Pont, seven years ago.

And there were logistical strains. At first Pete commuted, a five-hour round trip from Wilmington to Washington. He used up what welcomes he had, spending the nights on sofas and floors of city friends. He then took a shabby furnished room, which was wearing after awhile. Finally, every other option exhausted, the Shieldses bought themselves a livable condominium in the capital for weekdays, saving their old house for the weekends. Says Jeanne, "You get more organized. You make more lists. And then you let certain things slide, and you find it doesn't make that much difference. If you don't get the house cleaned as often as possible, you soon discover that dirt's not going anywhere. It's no big shakes." Still, her husband explains, "Once you've found a 'solution' the question remains: where is what part of your life? It's worked out that this is our working life and that's our social life—Wilmington is where the roots are. It's hard. We're out of town five days a week and in for two; whether we like it or not, those roots tend to get disrupted. It's very hard to keep the old ties."

Nor does the issue they have chosen make things any more comfortable "What are the three emotional issues of our time?" Pete Shields asks. "Abortion, busing and gun control. We have friends who are polite and still friends, but not like it used to be, because they disagree with us. There are others who think I've kind of gone off my rocker. It has nothing to do with the issue. They just think: how could I get up a job and go off and live this crazy life, half in Washington, half in Wilmington! And then there are some wonderful people on the other side, people who have been so supportive and strong in their support that it makes up for all the rest."

"It's a bitter pill to swallow," says Jeanne Shields of their new life, "in that we know we're in it because we had a son who was shot. That's always there. But it's a lousy life; if we can make the world a better place for someone else, I think that's a pretty great thing to have accomplished. I like to think that there's going to be an end to this. Maybe I'm too optimistic, but I have to be."

Pete Shields has his sanguine moments. "I wish I could say that we'd passed a whole bunch of bills. We haven't. And I wish I could say that our increase in membership wasn't a function of tragedy, but it is."

"Yet, we don't find the battle hopeless. We know we have 75 percent of the American people on our side. That prevents the hopelessness. We know that they are with us, that they know it makes commonsense to keep such deadly weapons out of the hands of the felons and the sick people and the drug addicts of this country. They can't prove it will reduce crime by 1 percent or 12 percent. It just makes sense. But, what do they do about it?"

"Our job is getting them to act on that commonsensical belief. We want that belief to affect them at the voting booth, to affect their choice of candidates. That's why we consciously emotionalize the issue: to get people off their intellectual asses. Look, the proliferation of handgun violence affects everyone. If they aren't themselves victims, they live in fear of becoming victims."

No law is going to eliminate all crime. And the wrong people will always have guns. But somehow, and someday soon, something must be done to halt the arming of America. It really is as simple as that.

One person shot every fifty minutes. Twenty-nine people every day. Eleven thousand every year. Who will be next in this insane lottery? Another politician? Another pop star? Another religious leader? Another Nick Shields? Or you? ●

POLAND REMEMBERS ITS INDEPENDENCE OF THE PAST—WITH AN EYE TOWARD THE FUTURE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of Poland celebrated the 63d anniversary of Polish Independence Day. This year's observance was especially significant as Polish Communist officials, apparently with the consent of the Soviet Union, permitted a national day of observance of this important day in Poland's history.

While the duration of Poland's status as an independent nation was brief—the memory of freedom has endured throughout these six decades. Yesterday's activities in Poland focused on events of the past but clearly on the minds of the people of Poland is the future. Fourteen months ago, the Solidarity labor movement entered Poland's political scene—and in this short time period has had an enormous impact on Polish life. Two years ago when a group of Polish citizens marked November 11 with a rally, they were attacked by officials and their banners and signs were ripped up and destroyed. Yesterday the entire nation was permitted to observe Independence Day. In fact, according to an account in this morning's New York Times,

In addition to the official ceremony at noon, there was a nighttime rally that drew some 10,000 to 15,000 people. The procession was led by dozens of Boy Scouts bearing torches and dressed in the camouflage uniforms that youths wore during the Warsaw uprising in 1944 against the German occupation. The wreath laying and hymn singing went on for almost two hours.

One can only hope that the events of yesterday may signal the acknowledgment by the Soviet Government that the Solidarity movement is a potent political force which accurately reflects the sentiments and aspirations of the Polish people. The Soviet Union must abandon its dogmatic philosophy that it can only rule through coercion and oppression. Solidarity has shown the world the extent to which the quest for freedom and justice is a predominant part of the Polish spirit. Polish Solidarity has captured world attention and has made it difficult for the Soviet Union to impose its customary suppression of these aspirations. The saber rattling of the Kremlin, including threats of invasion of Poland, have drawn strong world criticism.

I hope that history records the events of yesterday as a catalyst for the rebirth of independence in Poland. ●

THATCHER-REAGAN COMPARISON IS UNFAIR

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, hardly a day goes by without some new declaration of why and how the economic recovery program will not work. After 40 years of fiscal excess, these critics demand miracles in the first 40 days of this dramatic change in Federal tax and spending policies.

Some of these doomsayers predict that America is following the course of Britain's Thatcher government. I recently read an interesting paper by

Edwin Feulner, Jr., president of the Heritage Foundation, which dispels many of the false claims that have been circulated about the shortcomings of the Reagan economic program.

I am inserting a copy of this paper for my colleagues' information and use. This paper follows:

REAGAN TEAM AVOIDS BRITISH FACTIONALISM

(By Edwin J. Feulner, Jr.)

One by one over the past few months, some of America's leading political pundits have declared the "Thatcher experiment" a failure in Britain, and in appropriately somber tones (somber except for the sounds of joy that occasionally ring through) warn that President Reagan won't have long to wait before he too trips over his conservative baggage.

The equation sounds so appealingly simple that it seems to have gone unchallenged.

But what of the Thatcher-Reagan comparison? Is there substance behind the hot air? Is the Thatcher experiment over, and has the Reagan experiment failed before even getting off the ground?

I think not. First of all, Ronald Reagan isn't Margaret Thatcher, the United States isn't the United Kingdom, and the Thatcher experiment is far from dead. Mrs. Thatcher can still rescue Britain's economy; but even if she fails, it would hardly be a repudiation of Reaganomics.

When Mrs. Thatcher took office the British economy was in a shambles—far worse than the American economy which Ronald Reagan inherited. True, the diseases were very similar. However, in the British case, the symptoms were much more marked. For example:

1. British budget deficits constituted a larger proportion of the gross national product. Consequently, the British government's borrowing "crowded out" much more investment capital.

2. British tax rates had soared as high as 98 percent on "unearned" income.

3. Britain's annual industrial product had slipped back to the level which it had held in 1966.

4. Trade unions are much stronger and more militant in Britain than in the United States.

5. Many key industries (railroads, British Airways, steel, medicine, coal, electricity, gas, telephone, British Leyland, and the BBC) were already under government control, and thus, managed with political rather than economic objectives in mind.

6. More than half of Britain's workers belong to labor unions, compared to less than one-fifth of workers in the United States.

As if all of these problems were not enough, Margaret Thatcher did not assemble a Cabinet which was ideologically united. Until the recent shake-up, her Cabinet included an assortment of members ranging from hard-core Thatcherites—such as Sir Geoffrey Howe, the Chancellor of the Exchequer—to the "Wets"—practitioners of the old brand of Edward Heath Tory paternalism, such as James Prior, the ex-Secretary for Employment. Consequently, Mrs. Thatcher's Cabinet quickly divided into a variety of warring factions which proved incapable of supporting a consistent, coherent, cohesive economic policy. Throughout her tenure in office, the Cabinet has proved to be Mrs. Thatcher's most intractable (and least understood) problem.

Mrs. Thatcher's Cabinet, therefore, presents a sad contrast with that of President Reagan. While the British haggle about where to increase spending, the U.S. Cabinet has thrown itself into the fight to cut federal spending. In Britain, public spending equals 40% of the nation's GNP. Whereas, in the United States, total spending of federal, state and local governments was only 32% in 1980.

Malcolm Baldrige, the Secretary for Commerce, and certainly not one of the strongest of the "Reaganauts," is said to have declared in one of the early Cabinet meetings, "Yes, I can absorb \$300 million in cuts. In fact, I'll see you 300 and raise you 50!" Determination such as this has launched the Reagan Administration upon a path which Mrs. Thatcher's feet have not yet touched.

Because the Thatcher Cabinet has no solid, principled commitment to economic reforms, there have been a number of strange anomalies in British government policy. The education ministry cut a relatively minor amount from its annual budget for higher education, to the detriment of some venerable British universities. However, Sir Keith Joseph, Mrs. Thatcher's supposedly free-market guru, is still subsidizing the British Leyland auto company, British steel, and other inefficient nationalized industries. Indeed, Sir Keith's industrial subsidies have been larger than those of the previous labor government. This hodgepodge of policies has not made for good economic policy, nor has it made for good politics.

Moreover, when Ronald Reagan assumed the Presidency he also had David Stockman on his team. Stockman is a savvy (some would say brilliant) Cabinet member who possesses detailed knowledge of the minutiae of the federal budget. Margaret Thatcher has no such individual at her side. Consequently, when her Cabinet split along ideological lines, she had no knowledge, ideological force to back up her prescription. As a result, the Cabinet lost sight of any overall objectives it had ever had and collapsed into a collection of squabbling ministers, each representing his own particular interest group.

Finally, the Thatcher government encountered a characteristically British problem—the transition period or, to be more accurate, the lack of a transition period. Great Britain does not have a transition period between elections and the beginning of the new government's tenure in office. When Margaret Thatcher defeated James Callaghan she had less than a day to form a government and assume power. The Conservatives had a "Shadow Cabinet" in opposition, but not all its members were called into the government. In view of the radical differences between the Callaghan and Thatcher programs, this was certainly not enough of a base or enough time to form a coherent program.

The Reagan Administration, on the other hand, had ample time to study issues, make political appointments several layers deep, construct a broad policy outline, and hear suggestions from outside groups as well as its own transition task forces. The difference in preparation is, of course, tremendous.

In light of all these differences, it should come as no surprise that the Reagan Administration has been much more successful in putting its plans into action. With an informed, unified Cabinet, and with members of Congress fully briefed in advance, President Reagan was able to take advantage of

the "honeymoon period" to enact sweeping changes in federal policies. (It is worth pointing out, to the benefit of the Reagan team, that Congress is less homogenous than the House of Commons.) Mrs. Thatcher, on the other hand, was pushed and pulled in different directions during her own "honeymoon period," and the results were often directly contradictory to her campaign promises. For instance, the Thatcher Government has not cut taxes overall; it has increased them.

In the wake of her recent Cabinet re-shuffling, Mrs. Thatcher might be presented with a new opportunity to utilize this new "honeymoon period" for a burst of direct action on the economic front. She might ask each new Cabinet minister for firm budget-cutting commitments. She could ask every Cabinet member to pledge support for legislation that would restore her government's ability to enforce the rule of law on trade unions. Such basic social changes would be more in keeping with the spirit of the Thatcher experiment—a restoration of British economic freedoms.

There is one more intriguing idea currently under discussion among British observers Mrs. Thatcher might choose to appoint an outside group—possibly one composed of retired civil servants and academics—to compile a master list of budget cuts. Such a plan could constitute the blueprint for the new Thatcher experiment, and would form the backbone of the new government's efforts toward economic restoration.

As things stand, the confusion of the Thatcher forces has meant that the Prime Minister is blamed for a policy which she is not following. That is, she is condemned for her monetarism although her policies have been anything but strict. Moreover, she is condemned by her friend and foe alike; her friends criticize her for not sticking to her plans, while her foes argue that she is inflexible in her ideology. Unless she constructs a consistent economic stance, with the full support of a reconstructed Cabinet, she cannot possibly muster the political strength to win her legislative battles.

What lessons can the United States learn from the mistakes of the Thatcher government? Should we think, as many of the pundits are telling us, that the Reagan program is doomed to the same fate? On the contrary, the record points in exactly the opposite direction. If the Reagan Administration loses its commitment to bold economic reforms, it will become the same indecisive, vacillating government that Mrs. Thatcher's Cabinet has been. President Reagan won the 1980 election by presenting the voters with a clear slate of economic reforms; a pledge that it would not be "business as usual" in Washington any longer. If he and his team back off from those commitments, they will be inviting the same sort of problems that Mrs. Thatcher must now seek to correct. We hope that Mr. Thatcher will succeed in conquering these problems, but we must not wish them upon ourselves. ●

HUMBUG ON THE HILL

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by James J. Kilpatrick, appearing in the Washington

Post on November 4, 1981, is inserted to be read or reread by Members of the U.S. House of Representatives now, and assure that it is a part of our readily accessible record of public events in this Nation:

HUMBUG ON THE HILL

By James J. Kilpatrick)

There is a little bit of bad in the best of us, so the saying goes, and a little bit of good in the worst of us. In our town there is a little bit of humbug in practically everybody. Consider, if you will, three recent events:

The first has to do with tourists, the second with tobacco, the third with milk.

Back in January the Senate approved the National Tourism Policy Act. In July the House added some amendments. The bill went to conference in September. A few weeks ago it reached the White House, and on Oct. 16 with President Reagan's signature it became Public Law 97-63.

The National Tourism Policy Act, you will observe, is the product of an administration absolutely dedicated to reducing the federal bureaucracy. The law drifts onto the statutory beaches on waves of austerity. It was signed by a president who constantly reminds us of his preference for the private sector as distinguished from the public sector.

Well. The act will abolish the old U.S. Travel Service, whose function was to encourage foreign tourists to come to our shores. In its place the law creates a new U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration to do the same thing. This "administration," God save the mark, will be headed by an undersecretary of commerce. The agency also will benefit from an assistant secretary of commerce. We are to have a nine-member Tourism Policy Council and a 15-member Travel and Tourism Advisory Board. A notable provision of the act will bind the grasping hands of budget director David Stockman: no matter what the budget and staff of the administration cannot be cut below 1979 levels. So much for tourism. So much for austerity.

On Oct. 21, by a vote of 231-184, the House killed what was known as the Shamansky amendment to the farm bill. The amendment, had it passed, would have put an end to the program of tobacco acreage allotments and commodity loans that has operated since 1933.

In the House the debate ran on for hours. The chamber rang with pathos, bathos and bum statistics. As the orators dwelled upon the plight of 171,000 small family farmers—or 300,000 or 550,000 or 700,000 small family farmers, for the number kept escalating—the floor of the chamber was flooded with tears. "Man the boats!" cried Speaker O'Neill. Only a roll call vote forestalled a tragedy of ghastly proportions.

The principal speakers in opposition to the Shamansky amendment, as you will have surmised, were the gentlemen from the tobacco-growing states of Dixie—from Virginia, Kentucky, Georgia and the Carolinas. It is an interesting thing about these gentlemen: almost to a man, they are fierce defenders of free enterprise, free competition and deregulation. Emblazoned upon their conservative coat of arms is a motto for the ages: "Get the Gummint Off Our Backs!" But on the afternoon of Oct. 21, that venerable motto had been turned to the wall.

While all this was going on over on the Senate side the greatest showboat economist of them all, William Proxmire of Wisconsin, was interminably holding the floor. The senator's chief claim to fame lies in his monthly Golden Fleece Award given to especially deplorable examples of governmental extravagance. But on this occasion, what was the senator's purpose? Why, sir, his purpose was to defend that especially deplorable extravagance by which millions of tax dollars are spent to buy surplus milk and cheese from the dairy farmers of Wisconsin.

At this point perhaps I should turn purple, clear the old tonsils and fumigate against the hypocrisy of man, but 9 years in legislative galleries have run down my reservoirs of outrage. This is the way lawmakers have been, are now, and ever will be, roll calls without end, amen. You keep hoping to see principle rise consistently above politics, but after a while you don't hope much. ●

PAYING TRIBUTE TO OUR VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues today in paying special tribute to our veterans of the Vietnam war. There can be no denying the fact that those who were called to serve in this conflict did so under immensely unpopular conditions. There can also be no denying the fact that these individuals made enormous personal sacrifices, which have not always been fully appreciated. Even though the final round of artillery in Vietnam was fired long ago, the horror and anguish of that conflict, unfortunately, continue to haunt many of these brave soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, our words alone certainly will not erase the tragic events of the Vietnam war years and heal the physical and emotional wounds of those involved. It is my hope, however, that those who served in that war will come to realize that the sacrifices they made for their country have not gone unappreciated. The 97th Congress has taken note of this and passed several pieces of legislation in recent months, some of which is designed to help those veterans still having readjustment problems.

Thank you. ●

DO NOT DELAY NEXT ROUND OF TAX CUTS

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the raging debate over how best to stimulate genuine economic recovery is in-

tensifying. Unfortunately, it has become clear that we are still suffering an economic hangover from the fiscal policies implemented by the Carter administration. Incredibly, as an alternative to the program offered by the Reagan administration, there are those who are actually recommended that the next round of tax rate cuts be delayed. Nothing could be worse. We are in a recession; you don't raise taxes in a recession.

For those of us who have faith in the President's prescription, the solution to our problem is clear: We need to cut taxes again, and we need to do it quickly. Today, the Wall Street Journal, in a brilliantly incisive lead editorial, described our current economic problems; the evolution of the Reagan solution to them; and pinpoints precisely our future course of action: We should move the effective dates of the next round of rate cuts forward. I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD, and highly commend its final recommendation to my colleagues.

RECESSION SPECTACLE

With recession breaking around us, we should record for posterity the current conventional wisdom: The recession is caused by high interest rates. High interest rates are caused by the fiscal 1984 deficit. The 1984 deficit is caused by tax cuts. Therefore, you must fight the recession by raising taxes.

This collection of non sequiturs is currently being offered by the same people who throw around epithets about "voodoo economics." In fact, it has not been accepted anywhere since similar thinking caused Herbert Hoover to boost taxes in 1932. And amid the peals of this conventional wisdom we are hearing the first whispers of what, as the recession deepens, will predictably be the next conventional wisdom.

To wit: A recession is no time to control government spending. The government must "offset" the fall in private spending with "countercyclical stimulus." "Stimulus" means a high deficit, for you see, deficits are not a bad thing, they are a good thing. This of course really is "standard" economics, the conventional Keynesianism that got us where we are today. (Unless, of course, you think that the economy was dandy until last Jan. 20.)

It will be fascinating to watch the Hooveresque tax-boosters evolve into Keynesian free spenders. We see that putative Democratic presidential nominee Walter Mondale jumped on the tax-boost ship this week, just as the water started to come over the gunwales. The Republican Senators will be even more amusing; by the third budget resolution Pete Domenici will be repeating Richard Nixon's immortal words that we are all Keynesians now. The deficit is sometimes an argument for higher taxes, and sometimes an argument for higher spending; the one constant is that either way it is an excuse for ducking expenditure restraint and increasing government's role in the economy.

Given the developing spectacle, it's clever of Ronald Reagan to put off his next round of economic proposals until January. We need a little time for countermarching so everyone can find his position before the

battle. And perhaps Mr. Reagan can use the time to restore some order in his own economic councils. He is not going to be able to get anything done if his administration offers Congressmen a Chinese menu of economic theories from which they can pick and choose to suit their political convenience. Even without the new flap over David Stockman quotations in The Atlantic Monthly, the cacophony of voices on economic policy has come to approach that on foreign policy.

Which brings us to supply-side economics. The fundamental premise uniting the various thinkers collected under this umbrella, remember, is this: You fight inflation with a tight monetary policy. And you offset the possible recessionary impact of tight monetary policy with the incentive effects of reductions in marginal tax rates. Since we are now having a recession, you could claim the formula has failed, except for one detail: We've had the tight money all right, but, dear friends, we haven't had any tax cut.

The drama now being played out was predicted in the midst of the tax-cut debate by various supply-side theoreticians. Last June, for example, A. B. Laffer Associates published this commentary by Howard Segermark: "The danger is in the concessions on the timing of the tax cut. One possible compromise—a 5 percent cut effective Oct. 1 of this year followed by 10 percent cuts on July 1 of 1982 and 1983—means a 1.25 percent tax cut for 1981 and only 10 percent for the first two years of the Reagan presidency. That could mean little of the positive effects of the tax cuts would be evident by the November 1982 elections."

Precisely this compromise was enacted, after concern over deficits watered down the Reagan campaign proposal of 10 percent reductions in each calendar year 1981, 1982 and 1983. Restrained money growth succeeded in turning inflation down more rapidly than most economists expected, but there was nothing to offset the effects on the real economy. Recession started in September. The puny October tax rate reductions were more than offset by bracket creep. And the tax-boosters blame "voodoo economics" for causing recession.

As for the outlook: On Jan. 1 taxpayers will have a New Year's gift of a boost in Social Security taxes. Further adjustment of their withholding rates will wait until July. On the brighter side, business tax reductions and the end of the 70 percent top rate on income from savings will take effect in January. This will surely boost the savings pool and lower interest rates. Along with normal cyclical factors like a run-off of inventory, this may be enough to spark a recovery. We have little choice but to wait and see.

There would be far more reason for confidence, though, if that next 10 percent personal tax cut were coming into effect in January rather than July. That is, if taxes were cut not less but more. ●

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CRIME

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, a recent poll conducted by the Baltimore Sun

and verified by my own poll indicated that 33 percent of Marylanders polled named crime as the No. 1 local problem. The perception of crime as the worst community problem was fairly uniform at all income and age levels. It was this concern about crime that led me to form a Citizens Advisory Committee on Crime. The purpose of the committee is to initiate a dialog between our local and State law enforcement of officials, our attorneys, the citizens of the First District of Maryland, and myself, so that we can address this serious problem and come up with some meaningful solutions.

To date, I have held two meetings in Washington, D.C. and a public forum in Salisbury, Md. The testimony of the involved citizens has been informative and enlightening. I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Richard Holloway, president of the Salisbury Chamber of Commerce:

SALISBURY AREA CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE,
Salisbury, Md., October 28, 1981.

Congressman Roy P. DYSON,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DYSON: The Salisbury Area Chamber of Commerce appreciates the opportunity to participate in the public hearing conducted by you on October 29, 1981. As the representative of the business community in the Wicomico County area we are vitally concerned with the impact of crime on the businessman. On the other hand, we have growing concerns for the attitude of society toward these crimes. It is our contention that a criminal act represents a deterioration of the moral code of our society in addition to an infraction of a law. To the extent that society respects its historical precedents, its present leaders, and its laws, it is less likely to commit a crime. Unfortunately, many people have little respect for laws which they judge to be unfair, unjust, and injurious to their best interest. Education is probably the best long-term measure which will be effective to provide these people with an insight to our democratic processes and procedures.

On the other hand, the violent criminal is not concerned with values and precedent and personal morals. For him the penalty is the solution. This solution must be coupled, of course, with a fair and expeditious rendering of the law. An even handed approach coupled by the rule of law will insure that justice will prevail.

It is important that such crimes as shoplifting, burglary, murder and personal injury be treated as serious crime. It is important that, while the burden of proof belongs to the prosecution, that his hands are not tied by judicial conservatism.

Mandatory jail terms for persons using a gun in the commission of a crime would be a positive step. Also, the model law used in Oregon and Washington for the prosecution of shoplifters should be considered.

It is our position that the law shall protect the innocent, punish the guilty, and preserve society for future generations.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
W. RICHARD HOLLOWAY,
President. ●

ABORTION DOES CAUSE PAIN TO ITS VICTIMS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask all of my colleagues to consider an article by George F. Will which appeared in the November 5 Washington Post, "Abortion Does Cause Pain To Its Victims." Mr. Will sheds light on an area which has gained little attention since abortion became an issue of national interest—the cruel and inhuman techniques used in aborting an unborn child.

Mr. Speaker, in all the years we have debated this issue, have we ever taken a hard look at the reality of pain to the unborn? As Prof. John Noonan has suggested,

All of our knowledge of pain is by empathy: we do not feel another's pain directly. That is why the pain of others is so tolerable for us. But if we begin to empathize, we may begin to feel what is intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, I'm certain that once my colleagues take to mind the hard facts contained in this study, some will reconsider their position favoring abortion-on-demand through the 9 months of pregnancy. Thank you for taking the time to consider this article.

ABORTION DOES CAUSE PAIN TO ITS VICTIMS

(By George F. Will)

In the eight years since the Supreme Court nationalized the abortion controversy, one facet of that subject has been neglected: pain. Abortion is painful for the aborted.

The neglect is explainable. To opponents of abortion, death, not pain, is the paramount issue. And proponents of abortion need (emotionally or logically, or both) to deny the possibility of fetal pain.

In its 1973 decision legislating abortion on demand, the Supreme Court announced that fetal life is not alive. At least that is what the court seems to have meant (if it can be said to have meant anything) when it described the fetus as "potential life." Those who support the 1973 decision are committed to the idea that a fetus, being only "potential" life, cannot feel pain, pain being an attribute of actual life.

Thus does a legal absurdity breed a biological falsehood. This intellectual train wreck is the subject of an essay in *The Human Life Review* by Prof. John Noonan of the University of California (Berkeley) Law School. There are, he notes, four principal means of abortion.

Sharp curettage involves a knife killing the fetus (if the amateur embryologists on the court will allow us to speak of "killing" life that is merely "potential"). In suction curettage, a vacuum pump sucks out the fetus in bits (and a knife cleans out any remnants). In second trimester and later abortions a saline solution is injected into the amniotic fluid. The salt seems to act as a poison; the skin of the fetus, when delivered, resembles skin scaked in acid. If by accident the solution leaks into the body of

the mother, she experiences pain that is described as "severe." The fetus can be in this solution for two hours before its heart (a stubborn bit of "potential" life) stops beating. Alternatively, the mother can be given a dosage of a chemical sufficient to impair the circulation and cardiac functioning of the fetus, which will be delivered dead or dying.

A fetus, like an infant or an animal, has no language in which to express pain. But we infer, and empathize with, the pain of creatures such as baby seals, which lack language to express pain.

There are uncertainties about the precise points in fetal development at which particular kinds of sensations are experienced. But observations of development and behavior indicate that by the 56th day, a fetus can move. Discomfort may occasion the movement. Tactile stimulation of the mouth produces reflex action about day 59 or 60. By day 77 the fetus develops sensitivity to touch on hands, feet, genital and anal areas, and begins to swallow. Noonan believes that the physiological literature teaches that "beginning with the presence of sense receptors and spinal responses, there is as much reason to believe that the unborn are capable of pain as that they are capable of sensation."

Americans are proud of their humane feelings and are moved by empathy. Thus, we regulate the ways animals can be killed. Certain kinds of traps are banned. Cattle cannot be slaughtered in ways deemed careless about pain. Stray dogs and cats must be killed in certain humane ways.

But no laws regulate the suffering of the aborted. Indeed, Planned Parenthood, the most extreme pro-abortion lobby, won a Supreme Court ruling that it is unconstitutional to ban the saline abortion technique. That's right: the court discovered that the "privacy" right to abortion, which right the framers of the Constitution neglected to mention, even confers a right to particular abortion techniques.

Most pro-abortion persons have a deeply felt and understandable need to keep the discussion of abortion as abstract as possible. They become bitter when opponents use photographs to document early fetal development. The sight of something that looks so much like a child complicates the task of trying to believe that there is nothing there but "potential" life. And if fetal pain is acknowledged, America has a problem: its easy conscience about 1.6 million abortions a year depends on the supposition that such pain is impossible.

Magda Denes, in her book, "In Necessity and Sorrow: Life and Death in an Abortion Hospital," brought to her subject not anti-abortion convictions but a reporter's eye for concrete detail. Examining the body of an aborted child, she described the face as showing "the agonized tautness of one forced to die too soon." That is a description to bear in mind this day, as many thousands of abortions occur. ●

PARRIS INTRODUCES MARRIAGE PENALTY REFORM BILL

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to correct what I believe to have been an oversight during the consideration of H.R. 4242, the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

In that legislation, the Congress took an important first step toward eliminating the so-called marriage penalty which taxes the combined income of a married couple at a rate higher than the rate which would apply if the couple were not married and filed individual returns.

While I applaud that action by the Congress, I believe the definition of income included in the bill applies unfairly to those couples whose combined income is not derived from wages and salaries but rather results in payments from pensions and annuities.

The unfairness of the marriage penalty affects all dual income married couples and to limit the application of the marriage penalty relief only to those whose income is derived from wages and salaries discriminates against the disabled and retired.

I hope the Ways and Means Committee will correct this oversight when they consider the technical corrections for the Economic Recovery Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this correction of the definition of income for the purposes of the marriage penalty provisions of Public Law 97-34.●

ECONOMIC GOALS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting my Washington report for Wednesday, November 11, 1981, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ECONOMIC GOALS

The United States has passed through a decade of frustration with the performance of the economy. We enter the 1980's with an unsatisfactory rate of growth and high rates of interest, inflation, and unemployment. One often encounters doubt that our current economic system can weather the storm, but free enterprise is resilient and dynamic. Proposals to reinvigorate America's productive capacity and to restore her competitive edge should build on the economy's underlying strengths. Our approach to the economy should be marked by an emphasis on the free market, a reorientation of policy toward long-term solutions, and an acknowledgement that the system is not

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

working as well as we would like, that major changes are needed, and that no one has all the answers. Our long-term strategy must consider the institutions in which economic decisions are made, and it must deal directly with lagging productivity, inflation, and joblessness.

INSTITUTIONS

We must begin to think about better ways of governing, doing business, and working. A reassessment of these institutions may be required. We have lost the consensus which provided the basis for American leadership abroad and rising prosperity at home. The consensus must be forged anew.

We cannot craft a successful economic policy without the broad support of these key institutions and the public. To achieve that support, cuts in spending and taxes must result in a fair sharing of burdens and benefits. Incentives for saving must include the middle class, and government must work to find new patterns of cooperation among business and labor to marshal our resources in a new effort to foster economic growth.

PRODUCTIVITY

For most of the period since World War II, the average worker produced from 2 percent to 3 percent more every year, but in the 1970's the growth of productivity slowed and then stopped.

Various steps can help us work "smarter" and produce more. Liberalized depreciation and recent cuts in taxes on capital gains and corporate profits should be helpful incentives in modernizing our plant and equipment. Tax incentives to spur research and development by business are long overdue. The government should consider direct support for such efforts when the benefits would outweigh the costs. We must speed the arrival and harness the potential of the revolution in telecommunications, biotechnology, computers, and other areas to assure that America stays competitive.

Beyond these steps, there are many others to be taken. Problems of morale in the workplace might be corrected by joint labor-management committees. Inexperienced workers should be helped by on-the-job training. Regulation must be reduced wherever possible. Several of our basic industries will have to undergo retooling before they can return to prosperity, and the deterioration of roads, sewers, and other public investments will have to be reversed.

INFLATION

Throughout the 1970's, high rates of inflation have discouraged investment, pushed up interest rates, eroded savings, and clouded our future with uncertainty.

We should attack inflation across a broad front. The best weapon is an increase in productivity. We cannot rely on tight money alone. We need to correct the imbalance between monetary and fiscal policies by ending regular and massive deficit spending at the federal level. Reduced deficits would ease many of the pressures which keep interest rates and inflation high. Overall, government expenditures should be reduced as a percentage of the gross national product.

Other steps should be taken as well. Indexation of programs itself is inflationary, so it should be avoided as much as possible. The Consumer Price Index should be revised since it overstates housing costs and, because of indexation, contributes to inflation. Competition must be promoted because it forces prices down, and special incentives must be used to boost growth among small businesses. Trade barriers should be lowered, and protectionism

November 12, 1981

should be resisted because it means less competition and more inflation. Exports should be increased because a loss of exports weakens the dollar, and a weak dollar is inflationary.

We must continue to make progress in reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Huge increases in oil prices have sent inflationary shocks through the economy. Programs to diminish the use of oil by conservation and the development of substitute fuels are essential.

The government must handle better the demands of many small but powerful interests. In treating such demands, the government may give long-term price stability too low a priority. The government should not be an inflationary wage or price setter, and it should encourage labor and business to support voluntary wage and price restraint.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Despite considerable expansion in recent years, the economy has not been able to provide enough jobs for an expanding work force. The rate of unemployment still hovers above 7 percent. Rapid increases in the number of workers and the fevered pace of industrial change have contributed to the gloomy picture.

Getting the economy growing again is the single most important thing we can do to bring joblessness under control. A new emphasis must be placed on the creation of jobs. Our aim should be new jobs through the production of more goods and services. Growth, however, will not solve all our problems.

Because millions lack the specialized skills to make their way in a specialized economy, government, business, and labor must cooperate to open up new opportunities for work. The targeted jobs tax credit is one device management and labor may use to train workers. We must continue to remove the barriers which have kept many from productive work. The transition from school to work often leaves the young jobless. Vocational training programs are not always geared to the modern workplace, and the general level of technical education has been a problem. We should make every effort to see that the transition from school to work takes place smoothly.●

BERNICE ROSS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of this body, an outstanding lady from my district who was recently elected president of the Missouri Federation of Democratic Women's Club. Bernice Ross, of Holden, Johnson County, Mo., was elected president of the Federation in a meeting held in Hannibal, Mo.

Through the years, Mrs. Ross has made a significant contribution to our State and to the political process. She has been member of the Johnson County Democratic Central Committee for 30 years and has twice served as chairman and three terms as secretary. Also, Mrs. Ross has been a delegate and alternate to the National

Democratic Convention and in 1976, she was presidential elector. I congratulate Mrs. Ross on her continued dedication to the political system as well as her husband, Marion, for the years of dedication they have shown.●

WASHINGTON COUNTERATTACK

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent alarming headlines about deficits, I believe that the editorial which appeared in the Thursday, November 5, Wall Street Journal deserves consideration, since it serves to put the matter in its proper perspective. I commend it to all of my colleagues.

WASHINGTON COUNTERATTACK

Since August signs of panic over economic policy have been emanating from Washington, and we have been attributing them to the stickiness of high interest rates. Unless rates started to fall with the lowering of inflation, we confessed, we might need an entirely new theory of the economy.

But now interest rates have started to decline, and stock prices are rallying. Yet the panic in Washington continues unabated; Senator Domenici, Senator Dole, OMB Director Stockman and the like are trying to boost taxes on the theory that higher taxes would raise bond prices, fight recession and bolster the administration's credibility. Apparently what we need is not a new theory of the economy but a new theory of the panic.

Perhaps there is a clue in the cast of characters. The tax-boost drive is led in the Senate by the chairman of the Budget Committee. It is led within the administration by the Director of the Budget. It is resisted in the House by the Republicans, who do not control the House Budget Committee. It is cheered in the press by Joseph Kraft, David Broder and George Will, who are distinguished not by their grasp of economics but by their eminence in the Washington establishment.

Everyone who lives more than 50 miles from the Washington monument understands what's going on. The panic has little to do with interest rates. Nor does it have much to do with deficits, which have never previously caused any ripple of panic on the Potomac. What the current tax-boost drive is all about is protecting the power of Washington.

The talisman of this effort is of course the horror of the deficit and the splendor of a balanced budget. While this may seem ironic at first blush, Washington has long understood the use of the balanced budget as a lever for increasing taxes and thus its own sway over the nation. Every administration budget and congressional budget resolution within memory has shown a balanced budget, located safely in the mythical future. Usually balance was achieved by boosting taxes; the last budget of the Carter administration, for example, had a recipe for a balanced budget. Outlays were to drop from 22.6 percent of GNP in 1980 to 22 percent in 1984, while receipts were to rise from 20.3 percent to 22.8 percent. Presto, a 1984

surplus of 0.8 percent of GNP. If you chose to believe.

The Reagan promise was to balance the budget at 19 percent of GNP, meanwhile returning 2 percent or so of GNP to defense, from which it had been taken over the last decade in order to boost social spending even faster than total outlays. Accordingly the first congressional budget resolution showed a balanced budget in 1984 at 18.7 percent of GNP. As time comes for a second resolution, Congress is in full cry to boost this number back toward Mr. Carter's.

Driving this process is, not interest rates, but Congress' unwillingness to meet its own spending targets. Most of the major appropriations bills are coming in substantially above the targets in the first resolution, and this naturally leads to pressure for higher spending targets, which naturally leads to pressure for higher taxes. It happens every year, and is happening again with nonpartisan impartiality. This is, of course, precisely the game Mr. Reagan was elected to stop.

In this game economics scarcely matters, but for the record the current deficit is running about 2% of GNP, compared with 2.3% in fiscal 1980, 3.4% in the 1975-76 period and vastly higher numbers in many foreign economies. The Congressional Budget Office September forecast showed the deficit falling to 1% of GNP by 1984. Recession will push it higher, as will further progress against inflation. The economy would be healthier if it were lower, but it is an exercise in hypocrisy to use this fear not to cut spending but to boost taxes. Those in charge of spending control should be forbidden to ever mention revenues or deficits, and should be judged solely by how well they contain outlays. If Mr. Domenici or Mr. Stockman ever comes forward with the proposals implicit in the current tax-boost drive, the only test ought to be whether they hold 1984 outlays to 19% of GNP.

Mr. Reagan seems to understand this despite living within sight of the Washington monument. It is far from clear that his economic program has failed, and even less clear that tax boosts would be the proper remedy if it does. To throw in the towel in this early round would be a capitulation not merely on the Reagan administration's economic theories but on the view of government it was elected to pursue.●

THE RESOLVE TO PERSEVERE

HON. HAROLD C. HOLLENBECK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. HOLLENBECK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I take this opportunity to rise and commemorate the 63d anniversary of Polish independence. As we all know, November 11, 1918, is recognized by Poles and their descendants worldwide as Polish Independence Day. In terms of the Polish people's love of freedom and basic liberties, I believe that little has changed between 1918 and 1981. Whereas 63 years ago, we know that the Polish people declared their freedom from the Germans, Austro-Hungarians, and the Russians, today we have a situation in which the Polish people are successfully expressing

their will on the mighty Soviet military and political machine.

Since the creation of Solidarity, the 10-million-member independent trade union and the first of its kind in a Soviet bloc country, Poles once again have been showing their resolve to persevere. By establishing the Communist bloc's first independent trade union, they have shown the world that their commitment is based on the strength of a determined grassroots movement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the United States must do all that it can to support the movement toward increased freedom in Poland. For this reason, I have joined some of my colleagues in cosponsoring House Resolution 233, urging the President to extend additional agricultural credits to Poland beyond the \$670 million provided in 1980. I believe that with the agricultural reserves held in this country by the Commodity Credit Corporation and those held by farmers, we have a staggering surplus that can be put to use in alleviating some of the sacrifices being made by the Polish people. Because economic breakdowns may do more to cripple Polish resolve than Soviet tanks, it is essential that we in the United States do all that we can to help relieve Poland of its current shortages.

The people of Poland have found themselves at a crossroads. On one hand they could acquiesce to Soviet demands and, in all likelihood, lose their independent labor union. On the other hand, they can continue their resistance to Soviet policies which restrict their fundamental freedoms and stifle their well-being.

On this 63d anniversary of Polish independence, I think that there can be little doubt as to which of the two alternatives the Polish people will select, and I pledge to do all that I can to support their struggle against Soviet domination as well as their efforts to secure badly needed reforms.

The people of America have always had a close bond with the people of Poland. With our help, Poles can continue to stand up to Soviet abuses and make the next anniversary of their 1918 Independence Day observance even more significant.●

WNVT-TV COMMENDED FOR TELECASTING ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the legislative process enacted here in Washington, D.C. remains to be a greater mystery to millions of people throughout all of America. While a limited

number of people have the opportunity to witness the Congress in action, too little effort has been made to make our activities visible to most of the people in this country.

It is vital for the American people to have greater access to any opportunity that provides them a better understanding of the legislative process.

Sadly enough this is the case right here in Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital, until today. WNVN-TV, an independent television station in northern Virginia, has stepped in to fill a tremendous void by telecasting the activities of the House throughout the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., area.

This is another good example of the expanding role independent television stations play for countless receivers, not only in northern Virginia, but throughout the entire United States.

WNVN-TV has an outstanding record of public service and has performed admirably in providing programming of local, regional, and national interest and scope.

By extending its coverage to include the House proceedings, WNVN extends its commitment and addresses itself to a community with a very close bond to Government.

WNVN is to be commended for realizing the importance and value such programming provides for the viewing public. ●

MIRROR FUSION TEST FACILITY DEDICATION

HON. SID MORRISON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under the capable leadership of my predecessor in the Congress, the Honorable Mike McCormack, legislation was passed establishing a plan for the development of fusion energy for this country. As the various elements of this plan fall into place, Members should be reminded that fusion energy holds great potential to solve many of our energy supply problems, but at a price. The price is a continuing commitment to fund the necessary research on a timely basis, or the goal of energy self-sufficiency will be pushed further into the next century.

In light of the need for continuing understanding and support of the fusion energy program, I am asking that the presentation by W. Kenneth Davis, Deputy Secretary, Department of Energy, at the dedication of the Mirror Fusion Test Facility be made a part of the record.

REMARKS PRESENTED BY W. KENNETH DAVIS, DEPUTY SECRETARY AT THE MFTF DEDICATION

It is a real personal pleasure for me to be able to return to California to participate in this dedication of the Mirror Fusion Test

Facility. In June of this year I had the opportunity to visit the construction site in Building 431. Seeing the large MFTF vacuum vessel there brought back many memories of Ernest Lawrence's visionary but realistic MTA project that I worked on in that building 30 years ago. I am pleased to see that MFTF is carrying on in the tradition set by Lawrence.

During my visit I saw and climbed on the first MFTF magnet, which is the most ambitious superconducting magnet yet attempted by the fusion community. All eyes will be on Livermore as the MFTF magnet undergoes final testing over the next few weeks. Project Manager Victor Karpenko and the MFTF engineering staff are to be congratulated on their achievements thus far in completing the construction of the MFTF magnet, and I wish them the best of luck in the upcoming tests. The MFTF team is also to be congratulated on its proven dedication to the control of cost and schedule. Like technical performance, the cost and schedule performance of MFTF and other fusion construction projects will provide an important measure of the maturity of fusion technology as a viable energy option for the future. You are now midway through the MFTF project that has grown in scope to capitalize on exciting advances in mirror reactor concepts. As you proceed on the second phase to extend MFTF to a tandem mirror configuration, I trust you will continue to exercise the fiscal discipline that has characterized this project thus far.

Besides superconducting magnets, the MFTF project has already led to important technical advances in the areas of neutral beams, cryogenics, vacuum systems and controls. Important as they are, these technologies concern only the special paraphernalia of plasma physics. To become a real energy option, it is now time for the magnetic fusion program to embark on nuclear engineering with all that this implies in developing the materials, blanket designs, power conversion and reactor safety features essential to turn fusion neutrons into a useful and economically competitive power source. The Department of Energy is fully committed to taking this step, in an orderly manner. I look forward to continuing work with Dr. Trivelpiece, Mr. Kintner and members of the fusion community in formulating a realistic plan for the engineering development of magnetic fusion.

There must be no illusions about the difficulty, the cost or the time likely to be required for the engineering development. Some have suggested that the present fusion R&D expenditure rate will have to double. In the long run that may be an underestimate, for experience shows that engineering development is expensive. Moreover, the scientific research program must continue to be strong and innovative. In view of its protracted development and ultimate promise, the fusion program must not narrow its options too soon nor cease to improve its basic concepts. There is still much work for the physicists.

Engineering development will enlarge the fusion community, with a greater role for engineering and for industry. A number of companies are gaining valuable experience through their participation in MFTF and other fusion projects. In that regard, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of Aydin Industries who designed and constructed the MFTF neutral beam power system; RCA who built the beam modules; CVI and PDM who constructed the fusion chamber; CBI who constructed the magnet

case; and General Dynamics for its role in magnet design, to name a few. As engineering development accelerates, companies like these and others not yet involved in fusion research will assume an increasingly important role. Over the past two years, the fusion physics community has widely acknowledged the timeliness of this transition. Still, many challenges lie ahead as fusion evolves from physics research to engineering development in what may be the most extensive experiment in technology development and transfer ever attempted.

The road ahead is long and risky with no certainty of success. Yet, the potential of fusion is so great that these risks must be taken, with the support of the government for years to come. This Administration is committed to Federal support of long-range R&D, such as fusion, to achieve a secure energy future in the next century.

While it is a "fact of life" that because of the extreme pressure on budgets we may not be able to proceed as rapidly as we would like or on as many parallel paths as might otherwise seem desirable, we are committed to, and will pursue, our major potential options for the future including fusion. I must also express my conviction that "restructuring" of energy activities in the Federal Government will not affect that dedication.

We are constructing and implementing an energy policy based on maximum reliance on the initiatives and management expertise of our industry with the free market and industrial decisions playing the key roles. We believe our programs will only be of value if they are ultimately utilized by industry to serve real needs of the public sector and that industry and the private sector should be brought into the program planning to make sure our work is likely to be useful. We are looking for cooperation and mutually desirable programs and are seeking to do away with the adversary relationship which evolved over the last several years. These concepts will be utilized as magnetic fusion moves toward practical industrial use.

It must also be recognized that the industry most likely to utilize magnetic fusion at least in the early stages of its use, the electric utility industry is unique in several ways which relate to development of electric energy sources. Today it uses one-third of all the energy used in the United States. It is the most capital intensive of all major industries. At the same time it is fragmented geographically and heavily regulated as to revenues and rates—and is largely without the financial resources or initiatives available to other industries to support long-range, large-scale developments such as fusion or even the breeder which is nearer commercial realization. Thus, it is necessary that our approach be different than that for some other developments such as that of synthetic fuels.

Even if fusion succeeds technically, to enter the marketplace it must not only be economic but be accepted by the public. Fusion is a nuclear technology. Like the fission reactors of today, fusion reactors will face public scrutiny on the issues of cost, safety and waste disposal. It is important that fusion advocates address these issues squarely and realistically as public awareness of fusion increases.

Finally, I cannot visit Livermore without publicly acknowledging the great debt of the Nation to this Laboratory, its leaders, and its personnel, for its role in maintaining a strong defense. The Department of Energy is proud of its nuclear weapons lab-

oratories and the roles they have played in maintaining the peace. We are fortunate that this great technical strength can now be brought to bear, through projects like the MFTF, to solve the energy problems of tomorrow.

Roger, distinguished guests, it is a pleasure on behalf of the Department of Energy for me to dedicate the Mirror Fusion Test Facility. It will soon be 50 years since the discovery of fusion, and 30 years since it was first put to use militarily. Let us hope that the MFTF and its companion projects around the world will help make fusion power a reality in the next century. ●

RESOLUTION ON TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution stating my support for Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Over the past several decades, substantial gains have been made in insuring fair treatment of women. This has been, in large part, as a result of statutes and guidelines which have been enacted by Congress to correct past discrimination policies which have worked to deny equal opportunities for women.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is one such piece of legislation. It prohibits sex discrimination in education programs receiving Federal financial assistance. Title IX touches upon nearly all facets of education and applies to students from preschool through graduate programs.

A report recently released by the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, "Title IX: The Half Full, Half Empty Glass," illustrates how effective this statute has been in promoting education opportunities for women. This is a law that has made a difference:

The number of women enrolled in professional schools has increased substantially over the past nine years: Dental Schools: 1,011 percent. Veterinary Schools: 120 percent. Law Schools: 337 percent. Medical Schools: 296 percent.

Counseling has often limited the career aspirations of boys and girls. Counselors use the Stong Vocational Interest Blank to evaluate a student's interest. At one point there were two versions, a pink one for the girls and a blue one for the boys. The pink one contained lower paying career possibilities such as nurse or science teacher. The blue one contained such occupations as physician or scientist. Title IX requirements have changed this.

Over the past nine years the enrollment increase for women in vocational education was greater than men. Women increased by 60 percent while men increased by 32 percent.

Great strides have been made, however, economic realities continue to in-

dicating the need for the implementation of such legislation. The average working woman continues to earn only 59 cents for every dollar earned by her male counterpart. Equal education opportunities provide women with the tools to earn a decent wage and to pursue career advancement.

While many sectors of our society do indeed need relief from overly burdensome regulations, corrective action must not be taken at the expense of women who are at long last seeing the barriers fall.

The resolution which I have introduced today, along with a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, simply states our view that title IX should not be repealed or altered in a manner which will deny any person equal access to education. I would like to urge my colleagues to support and cosponsor this resolution to insure continued equal opportunity for women in education. ●

VETERANS DAY

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, November 11, was a day of thanksgiving for all Americans. It is on this day every year that we pay tribute to the veterans of our Nation. Originally celebrated as Armistice Day to mark the end of World War I in 1918, Veterans Day has come to mean much more to us. It is the day that we honor the outstanding contributions of all veterans.

Over 1 million Americans have died in battle, and an estimated 30 million have served in the Armed Forces starting with the Revolution, to preserve our freedom. We survive today as one nation because Americans were willing to fight and lay down their lives for their fellow citizens. We remain the greatest country on Earth because our veterans were, and still are, willing to pay the price.

The courage, sacrifice, and endurance of our veterans cannot be over-emphasized. It is only fitting that we honor them with medals, ceremonies, and parades. However, our country owes them much more than just 1 day a year. Our responsibility to the veterans does not stop on November 12.

This year the Congress passed several bills which seek to address the needs of our veterans. Veterans disability, dependency, and indemnity compensation were increased by an average of 11.2 percent. The Veterans' Administration was ordered to operate an adequate number of hospital beds. Priority medical care will now be given to Vietnam veterans suffering from the effects of agent orange. The psy-

chological readjustment counseling was extended until at least 1984.

America is a free land today because our veterans have always performed above and beyond the call of duty. We can help guarantee our future freedom by caring for those who have done so much for us. ●

WHY CAN'T JOHNNY READ OR WRITE?

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have dedicated their public careers to promoting educational equity and quality in our schools, we have just reason to be alarmed by the recently released report by the National Assessment on Education Progress. Despite the millions of Federal, State, and local dollars which are spent on education, the sad result is that our children cannot explain—in writing—exactly what it is that they read.

The national assessment, funded by the federally supported National Institute of Education, has been testing our schoolchildren since 1969 on their skills and their classroom performance. Never have the results of such a survey, which looked at 106,000 students between 9 and 17, been so onerous for our educational system and the products it is vested to train—our young people.

The report findings show clear deterioration since the last such survey was conducted in 1970-71 to test students on reading and literature and in 1974 on reading alone. In asking students to read and analyze poems, a shaggy-dog story and other works, three-quarters of the 17-year-olds responded to multiple-choice questions correctly but only 5 to 10 percent showed "strong analytic skills and about 10 to 15 percent showed no evidence of being able to do the analytic tasks at all." In 1970-71, 51 percent of those surveyed could write a response as compared to the 41 percent who could for this survey—a decline of 10 percent in 10 years.

This survey has important implications for our educational system. First, it points to the vital work which is being conducted by the National Institute of Education, whose mission is to monitor educational progress in this Nation and underscores the need for adequate funding of such research which has national significance.

Second, this report indicates that we are not teaching our student skills which will assist them in adulthood and will train them to be effective communicators in whatever walk of life they choose. A dialog must begin within the educational community to

refocus attention on our educational priorities and reexamination of those priorities is clearly in order.

Finally, in an era of shrinking resources for local schools we must be diligent in targeting existing resources where they are most needed. We must demand excellence in education, not merely equity at the expense of quality. I was pleased to see that Secretary of Education Bell has appointed a commission on this very topic and I am anxious to see their agenda. Clearly, this report will be an important base upon which to build their priorities for the next 18 months and I plan to monitor this situation closely.

The danger in not immediately and directly addressing the issue of reading and writing by our students has long-term liabilities for our strength as a Nation. If we cannot train young people to articulate their thoughts and ideas, the skills of our work force will deteriorate over time—and our economy and productivity will suffer irreparably because of this. I urge my colleagues attention to this matter and invite them to share these concerns with their own communities.●

MEN'S DAY AT BETHEL A.M.E.

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the country went about its business on Sunday, November 8, 1981, the men of Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Easton, Md., celebrated their annual Men's Day.

I was honored to be able to share in the afternoon worship with the men of Bethel, and to hear our colleague, Hon. PARREN J. MITCHELL, speak. The service was impressive, combining a devotion to Christ with a strong feeling of purpose and hope.

I was struck by the sense of commitment that the men of Bethel exhibited. The church and service told of their tremendous energy and devotion to the Christian cause, a trademark of Bethel A.M.E. throughout its long history.

Bethel was founded in Easton in 1818 by a group of 15 concerned men who saw the need for racial leadership and self-help in the struggle to gain their freedom. Enslaved and impoverished, the founding members were unable to provide lavishly for their church, but they gave an invaluable dedication and undisturbed faith in its place. My visit last Sunday convinced me that their tradition of selfless devotion continues today.

I would like to commend the Reverend Earle M. Brooks and the following men who worked so hard to make Men's Day such a meaningful event:

Mr. Albert Brooks, Jr., Mr. Clyde Jeffries, Mr. Sheldon L. Scott, Mr. Richard Gardner, Mr. Andre Blackwell, Mr. Lawrence Niskey, Mr. Edward Fountain, Mr. Richard Brooks, Mr. Clarence Pritchett, Mr. Albert Brooks, Sr., Mr. Charles Gale, Mr. Otis Rhynes, Mr. J. Walter Blake, Mr. Ronald Turner, Mr. Francis W. Gates, Mr. Albert Brooks, Jr., Mr. Sheldon L. Scott, Mr. Arnold Fields, Mr. William Caldwell, Mr. Bruce Freeman, Mr. Darrin Williams, Mr. Ronald Turner, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, the dedication and hard work of the Bethel A.M.E. congregation is a tribute to the First District and a fine example for Christians everywhere.●

AMENDMENTS TO OUTLAW ABORTION

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed by the constitutional amendments to outlaw abortion that are currently pending before this Congress. I believe that these amendments strike at the very basis of our free society. They would grant Congress and State legislative bodies unprecedented power to deny citizens what are now guaranteed as constitutional rights, regulate the most intimate aspects of their lives, and dictate moral and religious beliefs to the American people. Beyond law and custom, the proposed amendments jeopardize the physical and mental health, and in some cases the lives, of women in this country.

I would like to focus my remarks on the human life federalism amendment, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH, which grants both Congress and the States the power to restrict and prohibit abortion. This amendment has been described and promoted as a fair and reasonable middle ground that can be supported by all, regardless of one's position on abortion. However, I am afraid that this amendment is really no compromise at all. If enacted, Senate Joint Resolution 110 would imperil the right to choose by permitting a statute restricting or outlawing abortion to pass Congress or any State legislature by a simple majority vote. And what should be even greater cause for concern is that these abortion statutes would then be insulated from the Supreme Court's scrutiny. In other words, the Congress or any State, would be enabled to pass a human life statute that would be immune from challenge on constitutional grounds. This amendment overhauls our Government's system of checks and balances that has protected our constitutional rights.

Senator HATCH has stated that his amendment simply reenfranchises elected representatives on this issue. I believe, however, it would do so by enacting the views of a vocal and well-funded minority, while ignoring the majority of Americans who support freedom of choice. It would use, and abuse, governmental authority to impose particular moral beliefs and codes of personal conduct on all citizens, without respect for their divergent convictions.

Furthermore, the amendment would establish a dangerous precedent which would enable Congress to violate or repeal constitutional rights at the whim of an apparent majority. It would open up a Pandora's box of legislating personal morality at the expense of constitutional liberties and civil rights. Who is to say, or guarantee, where this stripping away of individual freedoms will end? With abortion? Freedom of religion? Right to privacy? Freedom of speech? The amendment would bring us one step closer to a climate in which the abridgment of personal rights would be an acceptable practice. We cannot allow this to happen.

As we are all aware, in 1973 the Supreme Court ruled that the right to privacy and the concept of personal liberty embodied in the 14th amendment guaranteed the right of a woman, in the first trimester of her pregnancy, to make her own decision, in accord with her conscience, to bear a child or terminate her pregnancy. This decision rescued women from the horror of backroom illegal abortions. Finally, abortion became a safe and legal choice for both a woman and her doctor.

Opponents of the right to choose claim that the Justices improperly imposed their personal views on the Nation. I must emphatically disagree. In reality, the Court chose a path that least interferes with an intensely private and personal aspect of our lives. No one is forced to have an abortion as a result of Roe against Wade. Similarly, no one is forced to carry an unwanted or unintended pregnancy to term. This freedom of choice is also extended to doctors, who may or may not perform abortions; to medical facilities that may or may not offer abortion services; and even to both Congress and the States, which may or may not use public money to fund abortion.

The significance of this decision, therefore, is more basic than a woman's right to abortion. Roe against Wade showed that the right of individuals to be free from unreasonable and unwarranted governmental interference in their personal lives applies to abortion, as it does to other individual liberties. This decision is consistent with the Court's history of restricting

undue limitations on individual freedoms. In cases dealing with family relationships, marriage, childrearing, contraception, and procreation, the Court has preserved individual and family choices by invoking the right to privacy. To do otherwise, with respect to abortion, would compromise the welfare and integrity not only of women, but of their families as well.

The Supreme Court decision also recognized how deeply divided we are as a people when confronted with the complexities of the abortion issue. The Justices found that a variety of factors color one's thinking on the issue including, and I quote—"one's philosophy, one's experiences, one's exposure to the raw edges of human existence, one's religious training, one's attitudes toward life and family, and the moral standards one establishes and seeks to observe." I think that we would all agree with the Court's finding that there is no consensus and, certainly, no overwhelming public mandate on this deeply personal and moral question.

Given this spectrum of competing values and opinions, the Supreme Court appropriately chose not to impose one doctrine of religious and moral thought on the men and women of this country. In keeping with our first amendment traditions, the Court elected to leave the decision in the private domain, as a matter of individual conscience.

For these reasons, I believe that the Roe against Wade decision should mark the last governmental declaration on this difficult and controversial issue. The decision provides sufficient guidance to lawmakers to insure that constitutional rights are not abridged by unchecked governmental intrusions while maintaining the States' interest in the regulation of late-term abortions. I see absolutely no justification for amending the Constitution with the purpose of overturning this decision.

Certainly, the legal implications of constitutional amendments outlawing abortion must be carefully scrutinized. However, I believe that this scholarly discussion should not be allowed to obscure the very real nightmare of pain, suffering, and death that will result from a ban on legal abortions. A constitutional amendment cannot eradicate the compelling circumstances that lead women to terminate their pregnancies. A constitutional amendment cannot miraculously guarantee infallible contraceptive devices any more than it can perfect human behavior. As experience painfully teaches us, a constitutional amendment does not prevent abortion; it only stops abortions that are legal and safe.

Mr. Speaker, approximately 25 years ago, as a young assistant district attorney in New York, one of my responsibilities was the investigation and pros-

ecution of illegal abortionists. For the most part, they were without medical knowledge or training; the few who were trained had lost their license or capacity to practice medicine. Neither group was comprised of individuals to whom one would want to entrust the life of a loved one. I saw results of their butchery, the maiming and the killing of women who did not have a freedom of choice.

What I witnessed was only a small segment of the atrocities that occurred daily in this country before 1973. It is estimated that between 200,000 and 1.2 million women a year were subjected to life and health endangering abortions, that hundreds of women died annually as a result of botched abortions, and thousands of women suffered permanent disability as a consequence of the procedures used by this underground network. Women who were morally and physically trapped by inhumane laws often had no alternative but self-induced abortions, performed with coat-hangers, turpentine, and other lethal devices. As we consider action on these legislative proposals, I urge that we not close out the reality of those past years, and to avoid condemning women to relive them.

It is time that we as a society recognize that circumstances will always exist in which some women will decide, after consulting their doctors, evaluating their options, and struggling with their consciences, that abortion is their only reasonable, responsible, and healthful choice. To preserve this freedom of choice, the Congress should reject these constitutional attacks.●

**VA HEALTH FACILITIES MUST
BE EXEMPT FROM OMB CIRCULAR A-76**

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in its effort to reduce Federal Government involvement in the affairs of the Nation, the administration, through OMB Circular A-76, is seeking to create a policy where the Government would rely on the private sector to provide needed goods and services for functions it believes could be provided to it at less expense by private enterprise.

Of late, the impact of A-76 on the Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery has been the subject of hearings in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. According to a witness from the VA, the agency has begun studies to determine whether it would be more cost-effective to contract out custodial, food preparation, and service and mainte-

nance functions. However, during both the July 14 Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing, and the full committee's October 20 hearing on this subject, outside of the VA and OMB representatives, every other witness was overwhelmingly opposed to the implementation of A-76 with regard to the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

I share the same concerns of those who do not believe OMB Circular A-76 would be beneficial in the area of health care, a group which includes the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Committee, **SONNY MONTGOMERY**.

Recently, I was contacted by employees of the VA Medical Center in Beckley, W. Va., who are disturbed over the effect A-76 would have on the quality of service they provide to their patients. These employees work daily with the patients and know their needs more than any outside contractor. A patient builds a healthy bond with the VA professional staff and depends on that staff for caring health service. I doubt an outside contractor would have the compassion and understanding of the professional staff. To quote from one of the letters I received from an employee at the Beckley Medical Center: "Contracting out in the VA will, in our opinion, result in reduced health care to the most deserving group of Americans—our Nation's veterans." Another letter stated that A-76 would be "detrimental to the veterans of this country, not only reducing the amount of care that they receive but the quality of care as well. These individuals who have already given more than their fair share toward the care of this Nation, are now being expected * * * to bear the brunt of the administration's budget cuts, and once again give till it hurts."

Mr. Speaker, surely we owe it to the brave men who served this Nation in its darkest hours the finest in health treatment. Surely, we cannot allow this treatment to be jeopardized by inconsiderate measures which could reduce the quality of their health care. Without a doubt, we owe the veterans of this Nation that much.

With this in mind, I applaud the actions taken by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the House for approving a provision in H.R. 3995, the recently passed Veterans' Disability Compensation, Housing and Memorial Benefits Amendments of 1981 (Public Law 97-66), which states that funds appropriated for VA medical care, research, and administration may not be used for the conduct of Circular A-76 cost-comparison studies. I also would like to congratulate employees of the VA Medical Centers in Beckley, Huntington, and Clarksburg, W. Va., for having the courage to stand up for the rights of their patients. These dedicat-

ed employees are doing a great service and are a shining example of what is most needed in public employees: Compassion, justice, and commitment.●

IVAN HILL—PROMOTING ETHICS
IN OUR SOCIETY

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the record the text of an interview with Ivan Hill which recently appeared in the U.S. News and World Report. Mr. Hill has been at the forefront of setting an example for honesty and responsibility in American society. I share his view that honesty increases efficiency and productivity in business and Government and applaud his selfless efforts in instilling openness in Government.

ETHICS IN OUR SOCIETY

(By Marvin Stone)

Almost eight years ago, Ivan Hill gave up a lucrative career in industry for an unpaid job as president of a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization working for honesty and social responsibility in government and business. Out of that grew the Ethics Resource Center in Washington, D.C. When Hill retired recently from the presidency of the Ethics Resource Center, we asked him how he views the present state of American society and what he foresees for the future.

Q. Mr. Hill, what was it that inspired a successful businessman to quit and spend his entire time chasing what many would consider an impossible dream?

A. It was a recognition that the most urgent task in the country was being neglected—that of trying to strengthen our ethical underpinnings.

Q. How would you define ethics?

A. Albert Schweitzer said that in a general sense, ethics is the name we give to our concern for good behavior. We feel an obligation to consider not only our personal well-being but also that of others and of human society as a whole.

If early man had not identified his own welfare with that of others, he could not have survived and mankind wouldn't have developed. In recent books on anthropology, such as Richard Leakey and Roger Lewin's *People of the Lake*, cooperation and sharing were given as basic reasons for man's survival. Honesty and ethics are basic, working social principles, not just moral guidelines.

Incidentally, there was another compelling reason for my new pursuit: I have three children, and I hated to see them, in 5 to 10 years, living in a closed or almost closed society?

Q. Are you saying that lack of ethical conduct in the U.S. will lead to a closed society?

A. When trust in one another diminishes to a point where we can no longer do business without pervasive dishonesty and corruption, an open society cannot function efficiently and will become unmanageable. If business decides it cannot do business honestly and make a profit, that will severely undermine the private-enterprise system itself. A change in the system will then become inevitable.

It is my opinion that an open society cannot function efficiently and remain manageable unless about 80 to 85 percent of the people are honest about 80 to 85 percent of the time.

Q. What happens if 80 percent are not honest 80 percent of the time?

A. The result I see is a great deal of power concentration, centralization of authority, in a kind of messy oligarchic system which is likely to become so inefficient by the crosscutting of various special interests, that we will move into authoritarianism. I think this is the probable outlook for the United States in the foreseeable future.

Historian Arnold Toynbee observed: "Freedom is expendable, stability is indispensable." And order and stability in a society would take precedence over a multiplicity of freedoms.

Q. You've said in the past that you believe it's in the interest of the corporations themselves to pursue ethical conduct. Does business have an especially bad record?

A. Most of the large corporations—if they could ever get the next guy, their peer competitor, to move first—could do all their business honestly and make a good profit and be very happy doing so. Honesty increases efficiency and productivity in business and government.

I don't feel that big business is any more or less honest than little business or individual citizens. We are not going to solve our problems until the country as a whole takes a different attitude, until cultural and social changes are made that will make honesty "all right" and "safe" or even fashionable. This has to be a total cultural movement. That is the method we recently recommended to the Office of Government Ethics, the Justice Department's Task Force on Crime and the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

Q. How do you get a thing like that going?

A. We have recommended making six or eight different TV commercials, six or eight radio commercials and newspaper adaptations of the TV storyboard cartoons. Go into test markets, like Rochester and Columbus. Form local committees with the League of Women Voters, the Rotary, law-enforcement agencies, the churches, schools and business and conduct intensive local campaigns, placing at least 30 to 40 TV and radio spots daily on a public-interest basis through these local committees—you must have a high-volume, massive exposure of the message in order to break the prison of peer-group pressure. We should measure the effectiveness of these efforts every 30 days—the effect on crimes against property, burglaries, arson, shoplifting, all of those things.

Kits would be developed—the films and the tapes and the newspaper ads—and they would be passed to other communities for locally sponsored campaigns. These TV spots would not be preachy or admonitory or didactic.

Q. You say these programs are not preachy. Exactly what do they say to people?

A. A typical illustration would be this: A teen-age girl is seen stealing some cosmetics in a department store. And then we follow the teen-ager home on the bus. And she thinks that everybody is looking at her; she's looking around. Then an unseen announcer asks: "How do you feel when you steal?" The next morning when she walks through the steno pool in the office, she thinks that everyone knows she stole her cosmetics. And all the announcer says is: "How do you feel when you steal?"

No matter what other steps are taken or considered, we must understand that crime is bred in a bed of dishonesty. The progression is easy, from lying to stealing, from robbery to homicide.

Q. Is the government active in promoting ethics—say among its civilian employees?

A. We sponsored a bill, which was passed unanimously by the Congress, to mandate the public display of the United States Code of Ethics for Government Service in federal buildings. We have about 90,000 of these codes posted now in more than 10,000 buildings. If we could display the amount of codes that we have printed, 205,000, a person coming to work would probably see the code three or four times a day. He would thus become assured that it is all right for him to be honest and not to goof off, and become aware that it might not be the "in" thing for him to be absent or irresponsible.

There have been various estimates as to what is being lost to fraud and waste and absenteeism and such. We took a range of 25 to 50 billion dollars. If these codes are only 10 percent effective, we will save 2.5 to 5 billion dollars a year in government operations alone.

Q. Are you optimistic about spreading the word in the future?

A. To some extent. There's a great deal of talk about ethics; there are great numbers of corporate and professional and governmental codes. If we keep increasing awareness throughout the country, we're going to make this breakthrough into acceptance of much higher standards of values.

I have been surprised to find that the leadership of the armed forces is far more concerned about, more knowledgeable about, and doing more about ethics than are our educational institutions and our large corporations.

I see more progress in industry than I do in the educational institutions. In industry, many of the companies have teaching programs and bring in ethics counselors now.

During the last three or four years, there has been a tremendous increase in the number of corporations using codes of ethics and much more interest in ethics. But we find that interest has declined in the last six or eight months. My supposition—and that's all that I can say—is that businessmen believe they don't need ethics codes now; they don't need to be as self-governing as they should be because they have President Reagan taking care of them. It's a wrong concept. They should be taking just the opposite view: Now that Mr. Reagan's in, business should focus on developing more-effective means of self-regulation through stronger codes and do everything possible to make it unnecessary for government to intervene. Let's deserve more economic freedom.●

NO MORE SOCIAL SECURITY
CUTS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, a larger portion of the heavy volume of mail that I receive each day comes from people increasingly concerned about the status of the social security

system. My constituents are asking me if time is running out on the social security system. And will there be enough to pay their benefits when they retire? Frances Williams, a constituent of mine in Madisonville, Ky., has written to express some of her feelings about the social security system. I feel her letter is one which should be shared with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time. The letter follows:

MADISONVILLE, KY.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: This is to express my feelings once again on the Social Security program. I do not think any more cuts should be made in that area. President Reagan says the American people expect too much. Well I don't think so when you have worked all your adult life paying into social security and then to have it taken away from you. If anything, the program should provide higher benefits for the ones who pay the most into it.

If my husband and I could put what is taken from our paycheck and deposit it into savings drawing interest, we would have far more than we will ever draw from the social security. I still think we do far too much for foreign aid and not enough for the true Americans who would and want to work if given a chance. There are always those who would rather get all they can from government and not work at all. When I read and hear about those people in New York who live on the streets and in an abandoned sewer (I just read one was found dead who made his home in one) that is just unbelievable to think we have people in this wealthy country of ours living in those conditions.

President Reagan knows if you work beyond 65 before you retire then you are not going to draw benefits too long because you will not live to do that. Of course being 70 years old and a millionaire makes all the difference.

Sincerely,

FRANCES WILLIAMS.●

THE BUDGET PROCESS—A HIDDEN AGENDA

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly disturbed by mounting evidence that the Reagan administration is using the budget process not just to reduce expenditures but to destroy entire programs. The budget process has become the means to the end of abdicating the responsibility of Government which Abraham Lincoln described as doing for the people that which they cannot do for themselves.

In that spirit, the Members of this House should be aware of the remarks of former Labor Department official, John W. Leslie, who last week received the 1981 Communicator of the Year Award from the National Association of Government Communicators. Members should recognize the implications of Mr. Leslie's remarks in regard to

the direction in which the Reagan administration is leading other Departments and Agencies.

Mr. Leslie worked 32 years at the Department of Labor, serving for 22 years as public information director under 12 Secretaries of Labor, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, in both the brightest days of the Kennedy administration and the depths of Watergate.

Earlier this year, he resigned after serving 6 months under the Reagan administration.

Of his resignation, Leslie said:

I sat for six months and watched a department in which I had worked most of my adult life systematically dismantled. I watched programs to serve and protect working people, which I helped develop and promote, be slowly strangled or gutted.

In his remarks, Leslie compared his reaction to that of the people of Rome upon the arrival of the Barbarians at the city gates.

I submit a report of Mr. Leslie's remarks from the Washington Post of November 9, 1981, to be included in the RECORD. His remarks are important not only to the working people of America interested in the future of the Labor Department, but to all concerned about the course of Government set by this administration to terminate programs established over the past 40 years to improve the quality of life for all Americans. Mr. Leslie's description of life in the Labor Department is characteristic of what is happening throughout the Government as the Reagan administration works to close off access to information the public is entitled to have about the erosion of programs.

I ask my colleagues to consider carefully the implications of the process described by John Leslie.

The article follows:

FORMER LABOR SPOKESMAN SPEAKS HIS OWN
MIND

(By Warren Brown)

In his 22 years as public relations director of the Labor Department, John W. Leslie built a solid reputation as a thoroughgoing, dispassionate professional who did well by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Therefore, it was no surprise when the National Association of Government Communicators named Leslie the recipient of its 1981 Communicator of the Year Award.

The surprise came late last week when the normally reticent Leslie, 57, used his acceptance speech to blast the Reagan administration in general and Labor Secretary Raymond Donovan in particular.

The communicators group "told me I could say anything I wanted," Leslie, who now is employed by The Kamber Group, a Washington-based labor lobby, said later. "So I told them what a lot of my former career government colleagues have been telling me, and what I have been feeling, myself."

After 32 years in the Labor Department, 10 of them before becoming public information director, and working for 12 successive secretaries of Labor in that position, Leslie said he left under the Reagan administra-

tion because "in the six months that I served . . . during this administration, no one asked me what I did, what my office did, who we served, why we existed, or what would happen if we disappeared."

Leslie said, "I sat for six months and watched a department in which I had worked most of my adult life systematically dismantled. I watched programs to serve and protect working people, which I had helped develop and promote, be slowly strangled or gutted." he said he began "to understand . . . how those of sensitivity and understanding must have felt when the barbarians sacked Rome.

"I claim, without qualification, that the efforts today throughout government to cut public information and public affairs activities are based not on a desire to save money, but are a cynical attempt by this administration to cover up efforts to destroy programs and services people want and need."

Leslie's speech has been circulating among some department careerists who agree with his position and who find some solace in the idea that one of their own, so to speak, can criticize the administration publicly without fear of retribution. But Reagan-Donovan loyalists such as Earl Cox, who holds Leslie's old position, understandably are unhappy.

"I regret that Mr. Leslie feels he was mistreated," Cox said last week. "No effort was made to sidestep him. Frankly, I was surprised by his remarks."●

EDUCATIONAL PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITIES PROGRAMS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues information on and recognition of the 10th anniversary of the EPIC Consortium in Los Angeles. The consortium is a regional association of five educational participation in communities EPIC programs operating at five universities in the Los Angeles area. These EPIC programs are student-volunteer and community service operations sponsored by California State University, Los Angeles; California State University, Long Beach; California State University, Dominguez Hills; California State University, Northridge; and Loyola-Marymount University.

During the last 10 years, these programs have recruited over 25,000 university students to work as paraprofessional volunteers in low-income, minority, and disadvantaged communities throughout Los Angeles. EPIC volunteers have contributed over 1½ million hours of valuable work-time in these communities working with youth, senior citizens, the disabled, the mentally handicapped, women, minority persons of all ages, and more. The estimated value of this university-sponsored service to the poor and disadvantaged communities is over \$7 million worth of volunteer time,

energy, and dedication. Hundreds of public and human service agencies depend on EPIC volunteers to assist them each year.

Congress had a direct role in making these worthwhile programs possible. The original EPIC program at California State University, Los Angeles, was established in 1966 and was supported through funds from title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Due to the great success of this original program, in 1971 the EPIC Consortium was founded and expanded the EPIC concept to other universities in the Los Angeles area. Here again, title I provided the impetus and means for this to be accomplished.

EPIC programs have become institutionalized and self-sustaining on each of their respective campuses. They continue to collectively operate as a regional consortium to coordinate and share resources between campuses and are continually striving to improve their collective assistance to communities under stress.

The sponsoring universities also have gained much from these title I-initiated programs. EPIC student volunteers not only provide valuable services to the community, but are themselves provided with real-life learning and work experiences through their participation. They learn more about themselves, about the careers or majors they are pursuing, and about the concrete societal questions which they as responsible citizens must address. Last but not least, many learn or are trained in concrete job skills that will help them when they graduate and enter the increasingly difficult job market. Thus, the EPIC programs have also become important additions to each university's overall academic program. In fact, many EPIC students today receive academic credit for their field work from their sponsoring institutions.

In a period when the problems of the poor and the disadvantaged of our communities grow larger each day in the face of economic turmoil and budget constraints, it is remarkable that community-student programs of the quality of EPIC have survived. I would like to commend the EPIC programs and the universities which support them for their fine and outstanding efforts, and I congratulate them on the 10th anniversary of their regional consortium.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD HENSON

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a man who has done the

First Congressional District of Maryland a great service over the last 20 years. Mr. Richard A. Henson is a pioneer, an innovator, and a man whose life reads like an American success story.

It is little wonder that Mr. Henson was recently honored with the Bill Pate Award for outstanding economic achievement in the State of Maryland. In the early 1960's, he formed his own commuter airline service with one four-seat plane that he flew between Hagerstown and Washington. He had a strong belief that improved air service and the vitality of outlying Maryland communities would go hand in hand. With hard work and perseverance his belief paid off, for today Mr. Henson is the president of one of the largest commuter airlines in the Nation. Last year alone, Henson Aviation, Inc., transported nearly one-half of a million people.

The Pate Award that Richard Henson received is awarded each year for outstanding economic achievement in Maryland. The winners are selected by the Maryland Department of Economic and Community Development Advisory Commission from among 28 firms and individuals nominated locally. The Bendix Field Engineering Corp. and H. G. Parks, Inc., were also honored, although Mr. Henson was the only individual to win this year. Gov. Harry Hughes presented the award before nearly 1,000 government and business leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I have met Richard Henson on numerous occasions, and I am always struck by his dedication to the economic development of Maryland. He has recently opened a main office in Salisbury, which he refers to as "the model commuter city in the United States." His belief in rural Maryland and its economic potential is obvious to all those who have met him.

Mr. Henson has done the Eastern Shore of Maryland a great service over the past 20 years. His airline provides the small communities of rural Maryland with a vital link to the markets and resources of the Nation's major cities. As Henson Airlines has grown, the First District of Maryland has profited.

Mr. Speaker, I join the business leaders, government officials, and citizens of Maryland in applauding Mr. Richard Henson, and in thanking him for his enormous contribution to Maryland.●

JAMES BRADY: NOT JUST A VICTIM BUT A LESSON

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post, there was a column by Richard Cohen regarding James Brady, President Reagan's press secretary, who was gunned down with the President and two others last March.

The column is a moving tribute to the character and courage of this brave man whose recovery from his terrible wound is miraculous. It is also a well-reasoned plea that we in the Congress enact handgun legislation that might keep these weapons out of the possession of persons such as Mr. Brady's assailant.

The lesson drawn from the James Brady tragedy is this: Mr. Brady would not have suffered his ordeal if only we would have made it harder for his assailant to get a gun.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 12, 1981]

Guns

(By Richard Cohen)

Among my colleagues, James Brady is a much-loved man. He was President Reagan's press secretary for just a short time before he was shot, but his humor and his warmth and his honesty quickly made him many friends. His story is a poignant one. One wishes him only the best. And one wishes that only the best will come from what has happened to him.

But that does not seem to be the case. The tragedy of Jim Brady is treated in some sort of vacuum. From time to time stories appear about his medical condition, his occasional trips home and his recent appearance in the White House press room where he bantered with the press, the president and Nancy Reagan. Always, though, his injury is discussed without context. You would be forgiven for thinking that he had been struck by some disease and not a bullet.

But it was a bullet that struck James Brady. It was a bullet that entered his skull and smashed his brain. This is what paralyzed him on one side, that has kept him in the hospital since March, that has required four operations, and that, for a time, left him emotionally infantile—likely to cry if he stumbled. This was not an act of God, it was an act of man.

And man could do something about it. It was a man, after all, who shot Brady. John Hinckley, the man accused of the shooting, bought a gun with incredible ease. No one asked him why he wanted the gun, whether, say, he wanted to kill someone—and when he was caught with a gun trying to get on an airplane, none of these same questions were asked then, either.

It is more difficult to bring fruit into America from a foreign country than to buy a gun. It is also harder to drive a car—certainly harder to buy a car than a gun. It takes some time to get married and a lot more time to get divorced, but it takes no time to buy a gun. This is possible because of an archaic interpretation of the Second

Amendment which deals with the right of the people to bear arms. That refers to the right of the people to raise a militia, not the right of some deranged young man to buy a gun.

The obvious lesson to come out of all this is that the nation needs a gun control law. It needs a national law, because to have a law in one state and not to have one in the next state is pure folly. These laws accomplish nothing except to allow those who are opposed to gun control to say that legislation never works. It could be that even a national gun control law will not work, but we will never know until we try it. It is not too much to imagine that a Hinckley—no hardened killer he—would have quit his task if he found it hard to get a gun.

However obvious these lessons are, they are lost on Ronald Reagan. He can stare down at a Jim Brady in his wheelchair and see no connection between Brady's condition and the gun that caused it. He, like so many Americans, seems to have accepted the event as a natural tragedy—like polio. He can see Brady as the regrettable price you sometimes have to pay for yet another American freedom.

Gun control advocates ought to understand this argument. It is not much different from what others say when it comes to civil liberties. For instance, no murder committed by someone out on bail is going to convince bail advocates that bail is not a good idea. And the occasional case where the guilty walks free because, say, the evidence was tainted, does not deter civil libertarians from believing in strict laws of evidence.

But that is because these laws serve a greater good. They are designed to protect the rights of us all. The gun, though, is a different matter. It protects only those who have it—and then only in theory. In fact, it works best for whoever takes the initiative—usually the criminal. This is what happened with James Brady. He and the president were surrounded by armed men—trained, armed men—yet a single man with a gun and a obsession for an actress shot them both.

The president recovered, but Brady still ails. His recovery has been miraculous. His bravery is undisputed. What is disputed, though, is his status. The president, it seems, would prefer to see him as a victim. It does not do him justice. He is, instead, a lesson. ●

CASEIN IMPORTS

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to impose a 50-percent quota on casein imports into the United States.

The USDA has concluded that these imports interfere significantly with the success of our dairy price support program by displacing our own supplies of nonfat dry milk. At a time when we seek to decrease Federal expenditures in the farm bill and decrease surpluses of dairy products, we simply cannot fail to act to save as much as \$150 million per year by curtailing casein.

In 1980, 152.2 million pounds of imported casein displaced 333 million pounds of nonfat dry milk. The Federal Government purchased this product at a cost to the taxpayer of \$300 million.

Countries in the European Economic Community account for a large portion of our casein imports. The EEC subsidizes its casein production and disposes of its excess products in the United States. What we are experiencing, Mr. Speaker, is a situation in which the American taxpayer is paying twice for the same commodity. We are paying the EEC to subsidize casein production by allowing it to export so generously to the United States its surpluses. Simultaneously, we are buying our own nonfat dry milk which has been displaced by the casein imports. This is an intolerable waste of American tax dollars.

The quota to be imposed would be 50 percent of the average of yearly imports of casein to the United States during the period of January 1, 1977, to December 1, 1981. Under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the President would have authority to review and change the quota as conditions dictate in the future.

Today, the evidence is clear that casein imports interfere directly with the dairy price support program. Milk protein product imports have shifted in use from industrial application to food and feed products. In its report, "U.S. Casein and Lactalbumin Imports: An Economic and Policy Perspective," the Department of Agriculture concluded that 53 percent of the casein used in the United States in 1980 was used in products for which domestic milk solids could be used.

In 1935, the Congress enacted section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which provided for the orderly imposition of quotas on imported products determined to interfere with domestic agricultural policy.

A 50-percent limitation on casein imports would not restrict availability for uses for which there is no available substitute or for which domestic milk or milk products would not be used.

Should casein imports continue unchecked, we will simply see rapid increases in the cost of the dairy price support program to taxpayers, an increase which all of my colleagues, be they from dairy regions or urban areas, are trying to avoid.

Added costs of casein imports account for 15 to 30 percent of the total cost of the dairy price support program. It is imperative that we learn to consider casein as a dairy issue as much as a typical trade issue. I would assert that the effects on domestic food policy of this import even supercede its colorations as a trade matter.

We have at our command legislation that allows us to insure that our dairy price support program can operate to

the best interests of the taxpayer, the farmer, and the consumer. We also have conclusive evidence that we must employ the provisions of that law to protect our domestic policy from unwarranted interference by the rapidly expanding influence of casein imports.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to act to curtail the counterproductive import of casein, and I urge my colleagues to support my legislation to accomplish this goal.

By doing so we will see positive results for America that include decreased Federal expenditures for the dairy price support program, acceleration of domestic milk protein product production, and the triumph of commonsense over laissez-faire trade policies that so often put the interest of America last. ●

ECONOMIC RECOVERY TAX ACT OF 1981

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 creates a variety of tax incentives for the rehabilitation and restoration of historic buildings. In the November-December issue of Historic Preservation published by the National Trust, Editor Thomas Colin writes about the effects of the tax act on preservation projects. At the center of this article is Mr. Robertson E. Collins, a businessman in Medford, Oreg., and a member of the National Trust Board of Trustees. The Trust regards him highly as " * * * a fount of wisdom that reflects both his global interests in preservation as well as his deep concern for people * * * "

I share this article with my colleagues in order that they may better understand tax incentives for historic preservation.

[From the Historic Preservation, November-December Issue]

A GURU LOOKS AT THE NEW TAX ACT (By Thomas Colin)

We are fortunate in the historic preservation movement to have a rather special guru in our ranks. Possessed of boundless energy, he is a fount of wisdom that reflects both his global interests in preservation as well as his deep concern for people—refreshing in a field that, necessarily, talks a lot about inanimate objects.

Robertson E. Collins—Robbie to everyone—is a businessman in Oregon and a member of the National Trust Board of Trustees, among many others. But first and foremost he is a preservationist. Robbie is one of many activists in the preservation community who celebrated the hard-won passage of the new Economic Recovery Tax Act in 1981.

But, as befits a guru, Robbie has tried to envision what the future will be like with

this new legislation, and, while he's still enthusiastic, he sees some potential side effects.

The law, born with the strong leadership of the National Trust, Preservation Action, several statewide groups and the support of Secretary of the Interior James G. Watts, creates a variety of investment tax credits for the substantial rehabilitation of older buildings. The highest credit, moreover, applies only to historic structures.

Under the law, investors get a 15 percent tax credit for rehabilitation of buildings that are at least 30 years old, a 20 percent credit for buildings that are at least 40 years old and an alluring 25 percent tax credit for quality rehabilitation work on structures that are certified as historic. The Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation assure that the work is compatible with the historic character of the building. The law applies only to expenditures incurred after December 31, 1981.

Although subsequent amendments will be needed to iron out a few bugs in the law, clearly it surpasses the Tax Reform Act of 1976 in making the restoration of historic buildings attractive to everyone from developers and investors to Main Street merchants. According to a recent analysis by Cythia R. Field and Charles G. Field, the new law will have the greatest effect on the rehabilitation of historic buildings because, in large measure, the 25 percent investment tax credit extends to income-producing residential property as well as to commercial. On the other hand, the 15 and 20 percent credits (which apply to nonhistoric older buildings) can be used only in commercial rehabilitations.

And, the Fields say, the new law is also more alluring to rehabbers of historic buildings because the "depreciable basis of the nonhistoric older buildings is reduced by the amount of the credit."

The National Trust worked hard for a greater differential between certified historic buildings and other older buildings so that people would have an incentive to go through the designation process and not perform harmful rehabilitations on significant, but as yet undesignated, buildings.

Moreover, the 25 percent credit is against income tax owed, it is not just an accelerated deduction from income before taxes.

For all these reasons, the Fields conclude that "An investor will realize a greater profitability from using the 25 percent investment tax credit on historic properties . . . even with a marginal amount of extra paperwork that is required."

Robbie Collins likes the new tax credits, too, but he sees potential problems. "While we all love the new tax act, we have to remember that the glass-panel people and the aluminum-grill-panel people and all that crowd can also use the tax breaks. There is a good chance that they could wipe out two decades of standing architecture—buildings built in the 1950s that could be the historic buildings of the future."

This is possible because, under the new law, standards for quality rehabilitation are required only for rehab work on historic buildings. What Robbie would like to see, optimally, is the creation of standards of excellence for the rehabilitation of nonhistoric structures. At the least he wants to build awareness now that there are significant buildings that aren't 50 years old.

Understandably, most of us nongurus have enough trouble just dealing with threats to our beloved Federal-style buildings and other classic structures without

worrying about distant dangers. It's the same stick-your-head-in-the-sand phenomenon that permits smokers to disregard the warnings on their cigarette packs.

Nonetheless, Robbie proposes nothing less than vigilance for our future historic buildings—vigilance tempered by careful evaluation. "We must avoid falling in love with too many diners and gas stations. The challenge is to chart our way through the solid professional work of the recent era, to work through our current disenchantment with much of it to find the jewels, the benchmarks that history will recognize."

This will mean a new role for the architectural scholars and critics, and Robbie has no illusions about the difficulty of the task. "Predicting future history is not easy, but we simply must allow for continuous evaluations as 30-year-old buildings mature to 50. "It is not something the preservation field has done before. We have often identified excellence, seldom forecast it."●

CHANGE NEEDED IN TAX LAWS TO PROTECT MUTUAL AID SOCIETIES

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under present law, the Internal Revenue Code exempts numerous insurance organizations under both the general exemption provisions of section 501(c) of the IRS Code as well as certain specific insurance exemption provisions. For example, fraternal benefit societies are entitled to an income tax exemption where they provide life, sick, accident or other benefits to the members of that society, or their dependents where they operate under the lodge system. Voluntary employee beneficiary associations are also exempt when they provide similar benefits. Other exemption statutes include exemptions for certain life insurance companies under section 501(c)(12) and mutual insurance companies under section 501(c)(15). In fact, the exemption language is sufficiently broad that the Nation's largest health insurer, the Blue Cross system, is exempt. There is very little litigation in this area and consequently the construction of terms found in the specific exemption provisions for insurance carriers is rather limited. Unfortunately, that has left some anomalies in the application of the exemption provisions.

A number of religious organizations, including the Amish, the Mennonites, and the Church of the Brethren, are brotherhood types of churches which operate independently of any hierarchy like some of the more familiar religious institutions. Congregations of these particular churches are generally independent of one another yet have a long history of close supporting relationships not only within their own congregation, but with other con-

gregations. One form of this mutual support taken by members of these religions is local participation in assisting or mitigating in the losses or other hardships which occur when a disaster strikes such as a tornado, hailstorm or devastating fire. To meet that need a number of mutual aid associations have been created be the Amish and the Mennonites. Over the years they have been exempt under various provisions of the Internal Revenue laws including section 501(c)(4), dealing with social welfare organizations, section 501(c)(8) dealing with fraternal benefit societies, and section 501(c)(15) dealing with mutual insurance companies, other than life and marine. With the publication of Revenue Ruling 75-199, certain of these section 501(c)(4) organizations, previously treated as social welfare organizations, were denied their tax exempt status because the Internal Revenue Service claimed that they were not promoting the welfare of the community, but merely the welfare of their membership. That revenue ruling revoked Revenue Ruling 55-495 which had held these religious insurance societies to be tax exempt.

Clearly, these mutual aid societies of these nonhierarchical churches have been excluded from an exemption to which they would otherwise be entitled merely because of the organization of their church. It only makes sense that we should act to assure equity in the application of these exemptions.

In order to restore the tax benefits that had been enjoyed by so many of these organizations for so many years until the publication of Revenue Ruling 75-199 and which has been available to many under other provisions of the tax code, I am today introducing legislation to treat them as exempt organizations by creating a new class to be known as section 501(c)(22) of the Internal Revenue Code. My bill would return application of law to that in effect prior to 1975. It will clearly correct an inequity that needs attention.●

THE VERY SURVIVAL OF THE HUMAN RACE IS AT STAKE

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, a sermon delivered by the Reverend John R. Quinn, archbishop of the San Francisco Catholic Diocese on October 4, 1981, was recently brought to my attention by Edward D. Cone of San Leandro, Calif. Given the fact that just last week we considered the Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorization (H.R. 2330), Archbishop

Quinn's epistle which punctuates the unveiled threat of nuclear destruction is fearfully topical.

The archbishop's message trumpets a clarion call to rethink our national and international priorities. As Mr. Edward Cone, retired teacher and current community activist so simply and directly said, "An unchecked arms race promises the end of the human race."

THE VERY SURVIVAL OF THE HUMAN RACE IS AT STAKE

(The Rev. John R. Quinn is archbishop of the San Francisco Catholic Archdiocese. These remarks are excerpts from this sermon delivered from the pulpit of St. Mary's Cathedral on October 4, 1981.)

The continued existence of the human race is seriously endangered today by the threat of nuclear destruction.

The famous German theologian, Romano Guardini, commented at the end of World War II that the pre-eminent human question for the last half of the 20th century would be whether we could develop the moral capacity to control the power we had created. The phrasing here is important: Our dilemma arises from the fact that we have created a vast military technology without thinking through its moral implications.

This same dilemma was raised by Albert Einstein who, at the dawn of the nuclear age, recognized the enormous and terrible impact of nuclear bombs: "The splitting of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe."

In considering a Christian response to the arms race, we must, as Einstein warns, change our very ways of thinking. Nuclear weapons are not simply conventional weapons on a larger scale. They are qualitatively of a whole different order of destructiveness. Their tremendous explosive force, as well as their enormous and terrible side effects, will irrevocably alter our ecological system, genetic structures for generations to come, and the fundamental fabric of our social systems. The neutron bomb, for example, even though it is being promoted as a "clean" bomb for use only as a "theater" or "tactical" weapon, is a deadly instrument of mass destruction, and its use could easily ignite a global nuclear conflagration. It contributes to the dangerous illusion that a "limited" nuclear war can be fought and won.

At the present time, the United States has a stockpile of nuclear weapons equivalent to 615,000 times the explosive force of the bomb dropped at Hiroshima. With that stockpile we can destroy every major Soviet city 40 times over. The Soviet Union, in its turn, can destroy every major American city 17 times over. The Soviet and U.S. stockpiles together contain the equivalent of 12 tons to TNT for every man, woman and child in the entire world.

At the end of the 1950s, both Russia and America had already amassed enough weapons to absorb a first strike and still destroy the other's society completely. Nevertheless, the U.S. continues to build three nuclear warheads every day. The madness has continued year after year, and it accounts for a large portion of the \$1.6 trillion which has been budgeted for the Pentagon over the next five years. The military research and procurement budget for 1986 is set at just under \$1 billion per day.

In human terms, excessive spending on arms production takes lives just as surely as if the weapons produced had actually been put to use. The extreme poverty that is endured by one-third of the human race is in large part a direct by-product of an arms race out of control. The billions of dollars presently being spent on arms each year throughout the world are surely an appalling form of theft in a world where so many persons die each day of starvation and privation.

The obsessive drive for security through nuclear weaponry has not brought security, either for the six nations which now have strategic nuclear capacity or for the 40 other nations who will possess that capacity by 1985. Rather, by straining the world economy and diverting resources from urgent human needs, the arms race has intensified international instability and has itself become the major threat to security among nations.

The physical and social destruction which would result from a nuclear blast borders on the unthinkable. It is now clear to a growing segment of the medical community that no effective medical response can be conceived to deal with the human suffering and damage that would result. All efforts must therefore be directed toward prevention; healing after the fact will be beyond the physicians' art.

My brothers and sisters, not only the peace of the world but the very survival of the human experiment is at stake. If we accept the inescapable conclusion that, as the Catholic Church clearly teaches, nuclear weapons and the arms race are essentially evil, what kind of response are we called upon to make?

First, there is a growing national campaign calling for a "nuclear arms freeze," i.e., a halt right now to any further development or deployment of nuclear weapons by the United States or the Soviet Union. As a first realistic step toward a process of bilateral disarmament, I urge your active cooperation with religious and community groups in this campaign.

Second, since many in the medical community are now convinced that it is dangerously deceptive to pretend there can be any effective medical response in the case of a thermonuclear attack. I urge the administrators and staff of Catholic Health Facilities to join all those who are vigorously opposing the intentions of the Department of Defense to establish a "Civilian-Military Contingency Hospital System" if this system is based on the illusion that there can be an effective medical response in the case of nuclear war.

Third, much greater support is needed for developing creative proposals for converting military weapons technology to civilian production uses. Such a restructuring of national priorities must begin at the local level and in a variety of industries. I urge you to become aware of the alternatives which are being explored in this important area, and to express your active interest and concern to legislative representatives at every level.

I call upon all the Catholic people of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, as well as all people of peace and non-violence, to work for bilateral disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons. Let us replace violence and mistrust and hate with confidence and caring. ●

RENAISSANCE MAN—HENRY SCHACHT

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, in this age of specialization, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to recognize the accomplishments of a renaissance man in the field of California agriculture. The man is Mr. Henry Schacht, and the opportunity is the occasion of his retirement from active service from California Canners and Growers. Mr. Schacht's 45 year career has spanned the growth of California, which has become America's number one agricultural state.

Mr. Schacht was born in Pasadena, Calif., February 28, 1916, and attended Polytechnic High School at Long Beach and Long Beach Junior College. At the University of California, Berkeley, he was editor of the student newspaper, a member of the Order of Golden Bear, Senior Men's Honor Society, and the president of Pi Delta Epsilon, and honorary journalistic fraternity.

Upon graduation from the University of California in 1936, he joined the university's news service as a radio writer scripting the university explorer program, a network feature on NBC.

In 1939 Schacht was appointed director of press and radio for the University of California College of Agriculture, a post he held until 1942.

From 1942 to 1961 he was director of agriculture for KNBC and later KOG, San Francisco. His morning broadcast, sponsored by Standard Oil Co. of California, became one of the nation's outstanding farm programs. He also did TV news on KGO-TV.

From 1956-60 he escorted farm groups to Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, South America and the Orient. In 1962-64 he also traveled in Europe, conducting foreign trade surveys.

He was the San Francisco liaison for the NBC network's National Farm and Home Hour and was head on NBC's news of the World and Monitor. He was a member of the NBC news team at the United Nations conference and the Japanese Peace Conference.

From January 1, 1961, to November 15, 1965, Schacht served as director of information for the division of agricultural sciences of the University of California. In this position he supervised the agricultural information staff on the Berkeley, Davis, and Riverside campuses.

From November 15, 1965, to October 1, 1981, Henry Schacht has served as vice president of corporate relations, and corporate secretary of the California Canners and Growers, a grower-

owned cooperative which processes and markets a full line of fruits and vegetables in this country and abroad. Responsibilities included communications, public and governmental relations, and the functions of corporate secretary. He continues his association with the company as a consultant on governmental affairs.

Among the many accomplishments during his career Mr. Schacht has: Since 1959 written the Twice-weekly Farm Reporter column in the San Francisco Chronicle;

Received the Asta Award, symbolic of the Nation's best agricultural writing in newspapers;

Won the Pfizer Award for effectively communicating agriculture's story to the general public;

Received a special award from the National Agricultural Advertising and Marketing Association for the San Francisco Chronicle column;

In 1963, at the invitation of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, served on the faculty of the World's First International Seminar on Farm Broadcasting in Cairo, U.A.R., and in seminars for Central America and the Caribbean in Mexico, and for the Pacific Basin in Tokyo;

Been a member of the Agricultural Relations Round Table. He organized and was for 8 years chairman of region 8 of the National Association of Farm Broadcasters;

Served as chairman of the advisory council to the University of California Division of Agricultural Sciences. He is an honorary member of the 4-H Clubs and the Future Farmers of America, and a past member of the Alumni Council of the University of California;

Headed the First California Agricultural Trade Mission to the Soviet Union in 1967;

Accompanied the official California Agricultural Trade Mission to the People's Republic of China in 1979;

Served as director of the National Canners Association, 1966-72;

Served for 2 years as president of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council and is presently a member of the Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, he is a director of the California Council for International Trade.

He is a director of Parrott Ranch Co., operating 40,000 acres in California's Scramento Valley.

His writing on scientific and agricultural subjects has been carried in national publications. One of his articles on atomic energy was translated into eight languages.

Mr. Speaker, I think at this time it is fitting that we take the opportunity to recognize the many accomplishments of Mr. Schacht in the areas of public

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

education, agricultural broadcasting, Government service and private industry. His presence has most certainly enriched California agriculture.●

CONSEQUENCES OF CHANGES IN STATISTICAL INDICATORS

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday the Subcommittee on Census and Population, which I chair, examined the real-life consequences of the changes the administration proposed for the Government's statistical indicators for inflation and unemployment. Specifically, the administration is attempting to redefine inflation. They are doing this by revising the Consumer Price Index, or CPI. Although the changes in the CPI will not appear officially until at least 1983, I am nonetheless concerned that the net effect of this revision will reflect an apparent slowing of inflation. The CPI may even move downward, when the revision first occurs. This, of course, would fit in nicely with the administration's prescription for economic recovery. The truth is, however, that the proposed revision will create the illusion that inflation has been reduced, but it will not treat the underlying economic problems of our country. The CPI revision will not make it easier for Americans to buy a home or a loaf of bread. In fact, wage earners, social security recipients, and Federal retirees whose pay and benefits are linked to the CPI could face sharp cutbacks as a result of this revision.

Why make changes now? Although the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which produces the CPI, assured us at the hearing that politics was not a consideration in the revision, I, nonetheless, believe that the appropriate steps must be taken to safeguard against an artificial and political drop in the CPI.

Similarly, I believe, this House should be concerned with the impact of the administration's budget reductions on the collection of adequate employment data. The administration's demand for better labor force data is simply not matched by a commitment to fund data collection initiatives such as the current population survey, which is the basic source of labor force data. The administration is also not willing to collect data on the contributions volunteers make to our labor force picture. Volunteers are a highly integrated part of our economic structure; the increased role of volunteers also represents a major initiative of the administration to lessen certain economic difficulties. Further, I fear the administration's myopic vision of Federal expenditures may undermine

November 12, 1981

State's ability to identify and serve the needy under their proposed block grant scheme because of a lack of sufficient information which will be certified if the budget cuts are upheld.●

A TRIBUTE TO OUR DEDICATED AMERICAN NURSES

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, there are over 1.4 million registered nurses in the United States who comprise the largest segment of professional health care workers in the United States.

The contributions that professional nurses make to our Nation's health care is of great importance. I would like to share with my colleagues an article which was published in the New Jersey Star-Ledger. This article provides a unique view of the role of registered nurses and of the conditions under which they work:

[From the New Jersey Star-Ledger, Sept. 27, 1981]

DOCTOR TURNS NURSE, GETS THE TREATMENT (By Joan Whitlow)

For one week, Dr. Aloysius Cuyjet, cardiologist and director of intensive care at United Hospitals Medical Center of Newark, stopped being a doctor and became a nurse.

For one week, he took care of incontinent patients, and made beds with patients in them who were too sick to be moved. He carried out doctors' orders for tests, therapy and medications, and then assessed the patients' response.

He monitored pulses, blood pressures, respiration and heart function. He took care of patients on intravenous therapy and those on respirators, inserting tubes and suctioning patients to keep them breathing.

It was his job to measure how much fluid a patient was taking in, how much the patient was putting out and whether the combination meant the kidneys were still working. It was his job to see that everything that was supposed to be done was done and on time, his job to decide if there was something wrong and if the patient's doctor should be contacted.

As a doctor he would have been involved in this process of care, by writing an order that someone else carried out. As a nurse, Cuyjet said he hustled more than he ever had in his life—including his internship.

At about 2 a.m. on a Monday morning, with five more hours to go in his career as a nurse, Cuyjet was asked what he thought of nursing.

"It's complex, hard, physical labor. And they don't get paid enough. Doctors have no idea what this job is like. I thought I did. After the first day I was physically beat.

"When the doctor comes in and sees the patient he writes an order on the chart or says what tests are to be done, and that's it. He leaves. He might see the patient 15 minutes," said Cuyjet.

As director of the unit his involvement with the patients is much more extensive than the average doctor. "But the nurse is with the patient all day—actually knows

that patient better than anyone else," Cuyjet said.

"Doctors make a lot of assumptions without understanding what the mechanics are," he continued.

Cuyjet decided to "become a nurse" to better understand the rapid turnover rate among critical care nurses.

On Cuyjet's service there is a new cardiac care unit that was completed a year ago, but never opened. The hospital says it cannot find enough trained critical care nurses to staff it.

On the night Cuyjet was interviewed every bed in the intensive care unit was filled, some of them with heart patients who could have been treated in the cardiac care unit, had it been opened. At 2:10 a.m. the emergency room called with a patient who needed intensive care. That patient had to be transferred to College Hospital. There was no room for him.

Most parts of a hospital are quiet at night and early in the morning, but until about 2 a.m., the intensive care unit was bustling.

Three patients had been brought in a few hours before, all needing respirators, and each patient on a respirator gets one nurse assigned exclusively to that case.

Nurses who work that unit say they like it because of the excitement, and because the work is never the same from day to day.

Never the same, they say, except for the stress and responsibility. And several also cited the attitude of the doctors they work with as major reasons for their negative feelings about the job.

The doctors do not see them as coprofessionals, they claimed, and frequently show no respect for the amount of work the nurses perform, or for their professional judgment.

One nurse said that sometimes a nurse will question a doctor's order, asking if a medication dose should be adjusted, given the patient's previous reaction, or if a test can be rescheduled, so it won't conflict with the patient's therapy.

"You can make it a suggestion, a question, you can say it as nicely as you please, but the doctor usually takes your head off for questioning his judgment," she said.

"Some of these doctors think they are God," said another. "They can be standing in the room with the patient, and if the patient asks for a bedpan, instead of handing it to the patient, the doctor will ring for the nurse," she said.

"I was trying to get one patient out of bed and into a chair, and a doctor was there. He wouldn't help me. He said it was not part of his professionalism," she added.

The nurses said they were apprehensive when they first learned Cuyjet would be rotating through the unit as a nurse.

"But I think it's a very good idea. The only way to learn what it's like to be a nurse is to be one. I think it will set a good example for the other doctors, even if they don't do it themselves," was one opinion.

Cuyjet said one reason for working as a nurse was to get a better idea as to how all the people who must work together—doctors, nurses and technicians—do, in fact, work together, and whether changes can be made on the unit to improve things.

As medical director of the unit, he has responsibilities for education of the medical students, interns and residents who are assigned there. Cuyjet said he is considering having some of them spend time as nurses.

"And I guess the next logical step would be for me to become a patient," he added.●

BROOKS HAYS—AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 4, 1981

● Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to join in paying tribute to our former colleague and good friend, the late Brooks Hays. I had the good fortune to serve with Brooks during my first three terms in the House, and I enjoyed his warm fellowship for many years thereafter at meetings of the House prayer breakfast group.

Although his involuntary retirement from this body in 1958 was a great loss to the House and to the Nation, this energetic and dedicated man continued his distinguished public life by serving three Presidents in a variety of Government posts. He also engaged in university teaching—including a professorship at Wake Forest in my home State—and devoted a lifetime to religion. A deeply religious man, Brooks Hays had the honor of being the first layman elected to the presidency of the 8-million member Southern Baptist Convention.

Brooks Hays was widely known for his humor and keen wit. The primary purpose of his stories, however, was not simply entertainment. Rather, he would use his great gift to attract the attention of his listeners in order to dramatize an important point in the discussion.

This wise, gentle, and unassuming man was consistently motivated by high principles, and he worked diligently throughout his life to promote better human relations. He was truly a rare and extraordinary person who will be greatly missed.

Christine and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wonderful wife, Marian, and to their children.●

TRIBUTE TO VETERANS

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my own gratitude and appreciation to all Americans who have set aside their lives for the cause of freedom and justice. For those who have died in this service and for their families, too, there must be a source of deep consolation in knowing that their lives were offered up in the pursuit and perpetuation of freedom and justice. All across this land we acknowledge this contribution. In Maryland's First Congressional District alone there are nearly 70,000 veterans—

thousands more have died—who have this Nation's deepest gratitude and appreciation.

On November 11, the Nation paid tribute to over 1 million Americans who have died in defense of their country in all American wars since 1776.

Clearly, the gratitude this Nation feels and acknowledges on this day of national observance must never be diminished. We owe a debt to recent veterans which we are just beginning to pay. At the same time, I believe, our obligation to veterans of other eras remains as compelling as ever.

This year, I am pleased to report, the Congress has approved rights, benefits, and medical services for veterans in recognition of their special contribution to the national interest through their military services. Within the budget limitations, this Congress has enacted three major bills that will greatly benefit veterans.

On July 30 the House passed the Former Prisoner of the War Benefits Act of 1981. This measure provides priority hospital care and outpatient treatment to former POW's and service-connected benefits for psychosis and any anxiety states.

It also reduces from 6 months to 30 days the requisite prisoner-of-war incarceration period for presumptions relating to certain disabilities and diseases. Further, it requires the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to maintain a centralized record of claims of former POW's and of disposition of such claims.

On October 2, the House passed the Veterans Disability Compensation, Housing, and Memorial Benefits Amendments of 1981.

This important measure was signed into law on October 17 and provides an 11.2 percent cost-of-living increase in disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation effective October 1, 1981, for over 2½ million veterans and dependents.

It also requires the Administrator to include in the annual budget any plans to make major reductions in personnel or to close VA offices.

It provides that such plans cannot be implemented until the beginning of the next fiscal year, thereby giving the Congress an opportunity to take legislative action to prevent such closings or reductions.

It prevents the VA from using medical care funds to conduct cost comparison studies related to contracting-out of functions now being performed in-house at local VA hospitals.

It increases Serviceman's Group Life Insurance coverage from \$20,000 to \$35,000 effective December 1, 1981.

On the same day the House passed the final version of the Veterans Health Care, Training, and Small Business Loan Act of 1981.

This legislation is particularly significant in light of the fact that the number of citizens served by the Veterans' Administration has risen to an all-time high. By 1985 it is estimated there will be 10 million veterans 65 and over.

A major provision of this bill requires that the VA operate not less than 90,000 hospital and nursing home care beds and maintain the availability of such additional beds and facilities to fulfill VA's contingency responsibilities for assistance to the Department of Defense.

Equally important, this measure will greatly enhance the benefits of Vietnam-era veterans.

It provides priority hospital and outpatient care for Vietnam veterans who believe their current medical conditions may be the result of exposure to agent orange or other defoliants used in Vietnam, as well as for other veterans who may have been exposed to ionizing radiation from nuclear tests following World War II.

Notwithstanding these improvements in veterans' programs and benefits, still much remains to be done to meet the changing needs of veterans and the changing demands of society.

"A nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers," said John F. Kennedy. We owe a continuing debt to those men and women who have put aside their lives to serve in the country's armed services. ●

NATIONAL SHUT-IN DAY WOULD PROVE COMPASSION LIVES ON IN THE HEART OF CONGRESS

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in every congressional district lives an often neglected segment of our society commonly called "shut-ins." These are people who live within the confines of their homes due to physical impairment and old age. In general, they have been left by the wayside, done with only their thoughts and memories for company.

However, shut-ins have contributed to society by being good parents, concerned citizens, and hard workers. They are valuable for the qualities they possess as individuals with a rich past which can be shared with those who have not enjoyed their experiences.

It is for this reason I introduced House Joint Resolution 145, which requests the President to proclaim the first Sunday in June as "National Shut-In Day." In light of the drastic budget cuts made this year in many social programs, passage of this resolu-

tion would prove that compassion does indeed live on in the heart of Congress.

I might also add that there is a Shut-In Day Association with representatives in Alabama, Kansas, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Utah, Washington, and Hawaii. If any of my colleagues would like the name of the Shut-In Day Association contact in their State, or would like to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 145, please contact my office.

Finally, following is a humorous, but informational, article which recently appeared in the Huntington, W. Va., Herald Dispatch on the designation of special days by Congress.

SHUT-INS' DAY

(By James E. Casto)

There's a Bosses' Day, a Secretary's Day, a Grandparents' Day and even a Mothers'-in-law Day.

So why shouldn't there be a Shut-ins' Day?

Why not, indeed, asks Judy Boone of Logan, W. Va.

For something like 20 years now, Mrs. Boone, 74, has been conducting a one-woman crusade aimed at convincing Congress and the White House to designate the first Sunday in June as Shut-ins' Day.

At her urging, legislation to the effect has been introduced in the Senate by Robert C. Byrd, D-W. Va., and in the House by Nick Rahall, D-W. Va.

Byrd's bill has been referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Rahall reports that, with 218 co-sponsors needed for his measure, he has thus far arm-twisted 59 of his colleagues into adding their names to it.

All this may prompt most of us to smile a bit and shake our heads, but Mrs. Boone is dead serious, and as you listen to her, what she says makes a great deal of sense.

"Our shut-ins," she explains, "are an often-neglected part of our society."

Congressman Rahall agrees, saying in remarks delivered last year on the House floor:

"These persons have contributed in the past to the happiness and well-being of others by being parents, children, hard workers, and concerned citizens. Although in most instances they are older or physically impaired, they are valuable for the qualities they possess as individuals with a rich past that can be shared with those who have not enjoyed their experiences.

"The shut-in people of our country have a great deal of warmth and friendship to offer, and those who observe National Shut-in Day will gain richly by the experience."

Mrs. Boone learned about shut-ins at an early age when, as a young girl in Logan, she would deliver pies and cakes made by her mother to those shut-ins in her community.

She continued to do so all through her life as an adult and in 1962, beginning with the shut-in members of her church, organized a Shut-ins Association. Later she spearheaded the establishment of chapters all over West Virginia.

Then, in 1971, Mrs. Boone was installed as president of the National Shut-ins' Day Association.

Says Rahall, "'Dedicated' is too little a word to describe Mrs. Boone. She lets noth-

ing deter her in her efforts for others, wherever, whenever she can."

This year she was able to convert Gov. Jay Rockefeller to her cause, persuading him to issue an official gubernatorial proclamation designating June 7 as Shut-in Day in West Virginia.

For whatever it might be worth, this newspaperman is happy to enlist in Mrs. Boone's crusade.

After all, if there's room on America's calendar for a Billy the Kid Day (July 15), a National Aviation Day (Aug. 19), a Lief Ericsson Day (Oct. 9), a Huey Long Day (Aug. 30) in Louisiana and some other Southern states), a National Inventors Day (Feb. 11) and a World Poetry Day (Oct. 15), then surely there ought to be room, too, for a National Shut-ins' Day. ●

VETERANS DAY—1981

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Nation observed Veterans Day. I am especially pleased that the observance has been returned to the traditional November 11 date after several years of having Veterans Day scheduled in order to give Americans a 3-day weekend. The contributions which veterans have made to our Nation's history deserve its own individual day which is November 11 which was chosen because it was on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month of 1918 that World War I was ended and America's freedom preserved.

Yesterday there were ceremonies and parades held in all corners of this great Nation to pay tribute to those men and women who have served our Nation in the Armed Forces. On Veterans Day we honor those who gave up their lives so that we might live in freedom. In addition we honor those veterans who survived wars.

This year's observance was marked by a long overdue recognition of the contributions made by Vietnam war veterans. Our Nation has failed to accord proper respect to the hundreds of thousands of Americans who fought in Vietnam. The unpopularity of the war combined with the unfavorable outcome served as an incentive for many in this Nation—including the Federal Government—to practically shun these Americans including those in urgent need of help.

Perhaps the most poignant and meaningful scenes from yesterday's observances were those pictures of veterans from World Wars I and II standing side by side with veterans from the Vietnam era hearing their collective contributions praised and honored.

Yet as we all should know, it is not enough merely to acknowledge and pay tribute to the contributions made by our veterans. We must also rededi-

cate ourselves to insuring that those who fought to keep our Nation free are not asked to fight another battle of survival in their own nation. For the medically needy veterans of World War I and II let us insure that proper medical care is available including the all important long-term care. For the Vietnam era veteran we must insure proper and specialized medical attention is available including counseling services. Further unemployment rates among Vietnam era veterans has always been too high and we must make a conscious effort to find more employment opportunities for these Americans.

On November 11, 1981, we do not find any American servicemen engaged in combat anywhere in the world. We hope this will continue for years to come. However, we must not become complacent about the fact that there is peace in the world. The Soviet Union remains poised and ready in many areas of the world ranging from Poland to Central America to the Third World. To remain free we must remain strong. American veterans have kept us strong and free in the past and for that they are owed a great deal of gratitude which should be shown daily not just 1 day a year.●

NICHOLAS JOHN STEBLAY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the universal magic and beauty of St. Francis of Assisi lie in his selflessness. The other day I received a letter which reminded me of St. Francis and indicated there are people in our Nation who have his selfless qualities. Mr. Nicholas John Steblay of Minneapolis, Minn., in his letter asked for nothing but God's blessing for all those who travel. Because of its simplicity, beauty, and altruism, I wish to include it in the RECORD so that all travelers may be touched by the concern of this gentleman from Minnesota.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to give my support and blessings for the systems of mass transportation and private transportation. May God bless and keep safe all who use these systems to travel. May all reach their destination in health and joy. Amen.

In truth,

NICHOLAS JOHN STEBLAY.●

WIDESPREAD CONCERN ABOUT BUDGET CUTS IN THE CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the rumors and facts of budget cuts in the civilian space program, while not as well known as many budget cuts nor of as much immediate concern, are nevertheless quite serious.

Perhaps the most serious aspect of these cuts is the lack of coherent thought or planning behind them. Supply-side economics and a belief in the majesty of the marketplace seem to dictate these cuts, regardless of how absurd the thought that "free enterprise" will pick up the slack.

Mr. Speaker, I need not dwell on this subject now. I have introduced legislation to establish a long-range civilian space policy and have made these points over and over again. At this time I simply wish to place in the RECORD a few editorials which underline the point I am making.

The editorials follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 28, 1981]

SPACE: INVESTING IN THE FUTURE

(By Robert Sherman Wolff)

While the American people's support for basic space exploration is by and large very strong, it is often asked: What benefits does planetary exploration yield? Is space exploration good for the United States? Is it worth the money put into it?

On the utilitarian side, "spinoffs" have often been cited as the main reason why the U.S. should continue to explore. However, spinoffs are not the reason we explore space, and the tremendous economic and technological benefits we have derived from spinoff technologies should not be confused with why we explore—namely, our desire and curiosity as human beings to probe the unknown.

From a strictly economic point of view, basic exploration has always been important to an evolving, expanding society. Exploration, in this sense, includes basic research and development (R&D) and, over the last 30 years or so, a number of studies have been done to estimate the economic impact of R&D spending on the U.S. economy.

The most comprehensive of these, with regard to NASA funding, was the 1976 work performed by Chase Econometrics Associates of Bala Cynwyd, Pa. Although the analysis was performed specifically with the 1975 economy in mind, the results are most likely applicable to the present economy.

The principal conclusions reached by the Chase study are twofold. First, a \$1 billion increase in NASA spending, coupled with a \$1 billion reduction of other federal expenditures in any single year would likely: (a) reduce the inflation pressures on the economy, (b) increase employment, (c) increase productivity.

Second, a sustained increase in NASA spending of \$1 billion per year over 10 years would significantly: (a) increase the GNP,

(b) reduce the consumer price index, (c) reduce unemployment, (d) increase the productivity of the nonfarm sector of the economy.

Overall, the Chase study claims a 43 percent return on investment for every dollar invested in NASA R&D, with the net effects on various aspects of the economy roughly linearly proportional to the amount invested.

However, it is a well-known fact that economic modeling is an inexact science. Consequently, even the best of models is open to substantial criticism, even if that criticism amounts to simply a divergence of economic philosophy. In that sense, it is not the absolute magnitude of the results of the Chase study, but rather the direction and approximate range of the estimated returns on investment.

Historically, exploration has always tied the natural human desire to explore with the drive to acquire more and better material goods. In the past, a number of societies have chosen to get away from exploration, to turn their attention towards more immediately pressing needs at home. For those peoples, the Vikings, Chinese, Romans, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, and English, to name a few, such a drawing away from expansion and exploration has always marked a turning point in that society's power and influence. Once the decision was made to cease exploring, the society began to contract, and its empire subsequently weakened.

Perhaps the US is at such a point. If we are, then let us use history to guide us in our decisions.

Today, our leaders are telling us that they have made the decision for us. We will not fly to Halley's Comet, although the Soviets, Europeans, and Japanese will be there. We have canceled our half of the International Solar Polar Mission, leaving the Europeans with only one-half of a two-spacecraft mission to study the sun. We have delayed our next mission to Venus, the Venus Orbiting Imaging Radar, until at least 1988; and even then it will likely be equipped to do far less science than originally planned. And Project Galileo, NASA's next mission to Jupiter, and the only funded planetary mission for the 1980s, has an increasingly difficult battle with Congress for funding each year.

We are rapidly losing the desire, and along with it, the capability to explore the solar system. And the sad thing is, the cost in dollars is tiny. A mission like Voyager or Galileo costs each American the equivalent of a pack of chewing gum a year for the entire lifetime of the mission. Moreover, the total annual cost necessary to maintain a vigorous planetary exploration and general space science R&D program is less than one tenth of one percent of the federal budget—less than the cost of one B-1 bomber, or less than one day's worth of the Health and Human Services budget.

All we have done in space exploration to date is only a beginning. If we stop now, if we turn our eyes inward and refuse to look further than our hands can reach, then we will lower our sights on all things and, as a society, we will likely meet the same fate as the Vikings, Romans, and Europeans of old.

(Robert Sherman Wolff is senior scientist, space physics section, at Jet Propulsion Laboratory.)

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 28, 1981]

DON'T CRIPPLE U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

(By Robert C. Cowen)

As the two letters reproduced on this page indicate, the highly successful U.S. space program is deeply threatened.

President Reagan's additional 12 percent across-the-board cut in discretionary spending by federal agencies, which is considered for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), among others, would emasculate the U.S. capacity to carry out space research and apply its fruits usefully. It would also restrict, although not destroy, the country's capacity for manned spaceflight by slowing development of practical uses of the space shuttle.

In fact, the industry journal *Aviation Week & Space Technology* reports that the extent of the cutbacks being discussed has raised concern within NASA that they "would end 23 years of federal support for broad civil space research areas, possibly violating the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 that founded NASA in the first place."

At this writing, it was not known how much of the cutback talk was just a trial balloon and how much was a deadly serious proposal. A definitive statement from the administration is expected sometime in November. There is no doubt at all, however, that the cutbacks under discussion would forfeit U.S. preeminence in space.

In fiscal terms, NASA would be asked to absorb cuts of \$1 billion each for fiscal years 1983 and '84, plus \$367 million in 1982, the current fiscal year. These cuts are over and above what was already included in the administration's earlier financial planning, which had put NASA on a tight budget that space scientists felt dangerously restricted prospects for US space exploration.

What now is proposed goes far beyond that kind of limitation. Virtually all solar-system research would be terminated. The *Voyager* spacecraft now heading for Uranus and Neptune would be shut down and the deep-space tracking network scrapped. Future planetary missions would probably be unlikely for an indefinite period. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory—the preeminent space research facility in the world—might well be closed, its capacities and personnel lost as a useful national resource. Most space applications would be canceled, with the exception of the latest resources surveillance satellite, *Landsat D*. Much aeronautical research would be stopped.

In short, the United States would weaken itself substantially in both space and aeronautical capacity. It is hard to square this prospect with the recent statement of presidential science adviser George Keyworth that "in setting our priorities in the support of science and technology . . . the principal criterion for the fundamental pursuit of knowledge must be excellence—excellence in the investigators and in the subject. An additional criterion for the support of areas of research directed toward technological advances is pertinence—and this means pertinence to the recognizable economic and societal needs of the nation."

What has achieved a higher standard of excellence than the space research that has opened a new era of exploration and revolutionized earth and planetary science? What could be more pertinent than those satellite

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

photos that augment so powerfully the daily weather forecast?

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 28, 1981]

TWO PERSPECTIVES ON CONTINUATION OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

(Following is an open letter originally sent to the White House.)

Mr. EDWIN MEESE,
Special Counselor to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MEESE: We are writing out of deep concern for the future of this nation's commitment to the exploration of the solar system—and extraordinary technological triumph in which American spacecraft have visited, for the first time in human history, 40 new worlds. Our two organizations represent a part of the professional and public constituency of planetary exploration: approximately 1,000 scientists engaged in planetary research, and 100,000 other citizens who have joined The Planetary Society during the past year because of their commitment to planetary exploration. The Planetary Society is in fact the fastest growing membership organization of any sort in America over the past decade.

We recognize the efforts being made to reduce unnecessary federal spending, but we also recognize that there are some activities that can only be supported by the Federal government, and that are critical to our national and global future. Much of basic scientific research represents just such a critical area. Planetary exploration is on the leading edge of our efforts to advance high technology and to increase our understanding of the Earth and its place in the universe. In two decades, we have developed a unique capability to send sophisticated robot vehicles to the farthest reaches of the solar system. The pioneering accomplishments of the *Vikings* and *Voyagers* and their predecessors have captured the interest and imagination, not only of millions of Americans, but of multitudes around the world. Even those dubious about the policies of the United States have acknowledged the benign influence and technical leadership represented by this endeavor. It is hard to think of another federal program that has been so successful in accomplishing its goals, or so generally recognized as positive in its effects. It is an example of what we do best.

If we back off from the enterprise of the planets, we will be losing on many levels simultaneously. By examining other worlds—their weather, their climate, their geology, their organic chemistry, the possibility of life—we calibrate our own world. We learn better how to understand and improve the Earth. Planetary exploration is an activity involving high technology which has many important applications to the national and global economy—robotics and computer systems being two of many examples. It uses aerospace technology in an enterprise which is a credit to our nation, our species and our epoch. And planetary exploration is an adventure of historic proportions. A thousand years from now our age will be remembered because this was the moment when we first set sail for the planets.

In the decades of the 1960s and 1970s, dozens of American missions were launched to the Moon and the Planets. For the decade of the 1980s at most one such launch has been approved, and even it is in jeopardy. We write to ask your support to ensure the survival of planetary exploration

in the United States. Survival truly is at stake, because once the engineering teams are dispersed, the scientists demoralized, and the facilities closed or redirected to other functions, it would take many years and a great deal of money to return us to our present capabilities. The minimum level of effort essential for such survival is to complete the Galileo orbiter and probe for launch to Jupiter in 1985, to approve at least one other new planetary mission for launch in this decade and to maintain the base support for science and engineering necessary to revitalize the program when a stronger economy can support it.

We and millions of Americans will appreciate any help you give to the enterprise of the planets.

CARL SAGAN,
President.

DAVID MORRISON,
Chairman, American Astronomical Society,
Division for Planetary Sciences.

(And a scientist's plea from the heart.)

To the Editor:

It is true that out of every \$100 the US spends, the planetary program costs three cents. The result of this 0.03 percent investment, however, is supporting a great deal more than its share of our present US economy with such offshoots as communication satellites, image processing of satellite data (weather photos, lake pollution, crop growth, mineral and coal deposits, for example), a vast computer, calculator, and microelectronics industry, and the whole solar voltaics industry, to name but a few. Some of the top industries in the US today are direct space science spinoffs.

Most of today's great technological breakthroughs have come from the space program, and the present satellite surveillance, jet propulsion, computer missile monitoring and so on that give our country its present military edge are results of military applications of basic space science developed technology. And these are but some of the offshoots of trying to learn how worlds work—ours included.

We must watch our level of man-made CO₂ pollution, the Venusian atmosphere has taught us. And the ozone layer must be kept intact or the ultraviolet rays from the sun will kill off our plant life, as arid Mars attests. What amazing insights into our own hurricanes and tornadoes, and what causes them, have been gained by studying them in the atmospheres of Jupiter and Saturn. One need only mention the earthquake-like faults on Jupiter's moon *Ganymede* and Saturn's *Enceladus*, and the volcanoes on Jupiter's moon *Io* to indicate how much our knowledge of such things has grown toward understanding, predicting, and some day perhaps preventing such uncontrolled forces on Earth.

And how vital is our understanding of the Sun, the source of all energy on Earth, if we are to solve an "energy crisis." Finally, the prestige of the US is never more enhanced, (not with military might nor with economic clout), than when we demonstrate what freedom means by overcoming the confines of Earth for the peaceful purpose of discovering knowledge of our place in the universe for all mankind.

Thus you see I feel a great injustice is being done, to the vital scientific community in the immediate place, but to the entire US population in the very near run, by the present annihilation of what amounts to the space exploration part of NASA. The plane-

tary program has sacrificed many years worth of funding and development time to get the space shuttle built—the promised source for much cheaper planetary probe launches among other things. Now that it is built, such planetary projects are being cancelled outright, virtually reducing NASA, (if this trend continues), to a mostly military orbital trucking service.

To put things in perspective, it may be helpful, for example, to point out that the cancelled US Halley's comet mission would have cost the US a little less than nine hours worth of its yearly military or welfare budget. And yet we are far better protected, far better fed, and I dare say, far more inspired as a people for such explorations.

The history of mankind's civilization and enlightenment is directly linked to [its] searching and growing awareness of [its] environment. I believe this pioneering spirit, a prime essential in the history of our country is still undying in the hearts of our people. It is of essential importance now for them to let their government know.

LAURANCE REEVE DOYLE,
Space Image Processing Group,
NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory. ●

A REACTION TO STOCKMAN

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there will be a lot written about Budget Director Stockman during the next few weeks, but today's Detroit Free Press lead editorial has done an excellent job of assessing the situation. I want to take this opportunity to call this editorial to your attention.

**BAD MEDICINE: CYNICISM AND GUESSWORK
MARK THE REAGAN ECONOMIC CURE**

Budget Director David Stockman's revelations on how the Reagan economic plan was shaped show how much of that plan was based on guesswork, cynicism and outright deception. "Supply-side economics" turns out to be a slogan to mask the old trickle-down policies, in which the chief object is slashing the income tax rates of the rich. In Mr. Stockman's words, the Kemp-Roth tax plan "was always a Trojan horse to bring down the top rate" paid by wealthy taxpayers from 70 percent to 50 percent.

Some of the problematic results of the Reagan program, Mr. Stockman indicates, became visible as early as April, though the administration still keeps up the pretense that a combination of budget cuts that hurt the poor, tax cuts that benefit the rich and increased defense spending will somehow lead to a burst of renewed prosperity. Meanwhile, the "swamp" of waste Mr. Stockman saw in the Defense Department is still ignored by the president. The budget director believed as much as \$30 billion could be cut; Mr. Reagan is resisting even a token cut of \$2 billion.

Coincidentally with the publication of Mr. Stockman's remarks in the Atlantic Monthly, President Reagan admitted Wednesday that the recession may last for months and the balanced budget is but a distant dream. This is no surprise to anyone who has watched the economic forecasts. The news is not that the Reagan plan isn't working, only that at last the numbers have made an impression upon Mr. Reagan himself.

The question is, what is he going to do about it? The answer, apparently, is that he will continue to tiptoe around the swelling military budget and hack some more from social programs that have already been mutilated. The safety net, like the balanced budget, now exists only in the imagination.

It should be more evident than ever that what Mr. Reagan offers us is a budget more concerned with ideology than with either economics or reality. Its goal is to buoy the rich, to dismantle the social services and income maintenance programs that so offend rockbound conservatives and to cut back the role of the federal government for the sake of cutting; without regard to the merits of what is being done. How else to explain why a president who talked so tough about cracking down on crime a few weeks ago by seeking budget cuts that will leave federal law enforcement agencies too poor to gas up the investigators' cars, to protect informants or to illustrate the runaway drug trade?

Mr. Reagan has never had a program for eliminating deficit spending, merely for transferring it from social services and entitlement programs to the military budget—although spending on superfluous weapons systems is inflationary, creates no jobs for those who need them most and is skewed geographically against the regions is greatest need of help.

And Mr. Stockman's comments confirm the fraudulent nature of supply-side theory. The budget director, nonetheless, has engaged in a remarkable exercise in cynicism, using supply-side mumbo-jumbo to get the Reagan program through Congress. The Democrats now hastening to hang him share the guilt for swallowing the scheme and for competing with Mr. Reagan in the rush to cut taxes helter-skelter.

There is, at last, growing alarm and skepticism about the president's course even among influential Republican Senators. The Senate leaders who met with Mr. Reagan last week pressed him to moderate the budget-cutting and consider ways to raise taxes. They were unsuccessful, but the latest proposals for cutting the budget are almost certain to face bipartisan resistance. And while Mr. Reagan is backing off even from the tax increases he himself proposed in September, "revenue enhancement" is gaining adherents in Congress.

Even the president now concedes his economic medicine isn't working. His budget director admits much of it is quackery. On the heels of those remarkable admissions, what is needed is not the stiffening of the administration's stance that Mr. Reagan has called for, but for Congress to force a change in the prescription. ●

TRIBUTE TO LIVINGSTON L.
BIDDLE, JR.

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts must be an especially gifted individual, able to support artists and artistic institutions, yet without creating or sanctioning an "official" art. One who has performed this task with skill, dedication, and compassion is Livingston L. Biddle, Jr.,

whose tenure as Chairman of the NEA ended this week.

Liv Biddle encouraged private support of the arts and created programs to assist artists and institutions in management and fund raising. He made the peer panel review system, the heart of the Endowment's grant making process, more representative and made the presidentially appointed National Council on the Arts a far more active advisory body. He assembled one of the most dedicated and talented staffs that I have seen in my years in the Congress.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, which oversees the Endowments, I have had an opportunity to work closely with Liv over the years as he implemented the policies he helped draft into law in 1965. He was always candid and knew when to rely on his own considerable knowledge and when to defer to the views of others. He was rare among administrators not only in his ability to delegate responsibility to his staff, but in his willingness to give them credit for a job well done.

I am sorry to see Livingston Biddle leave public service after so many years. I am not sure what his and his dear wife Catherina's future plans include—perhaps writing another novel or running another ballet. I hope he will not engage in singing as a profession. He deserves the thanks of the Congress for his service on behalf of the people and our wishes for a happy and healthy future. ●

NATIONAL OPERATING ROOM
NURSES' DAY

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Operating Room Nurses of America. November 14, 1981, has been proclaimed Operating Room Nurses' Day, in recognition of the Nation's registered nurses who practice in the operating room. Surgery today is highly technical, sophisticated, and exacting, and operating room nurses are trained both to provide nursing care and to manage the operating room environment. They are to be highly commended for these skills, which they exhibit daily in caring for patients in medical centers across the country. Their job is indeed a multifaceted one, in which they must be prepared to meet the patient's physical and emotional needs before, during and after surgery. The operating room nurse must possess not only medical knowledge and technical expertise, but also great resources of human compassion and understanding. They are

highly depended on by both doctor and patient, often acting as a go-between for these two parties. In these ways, and by recognizing that the surgical patient is going through a major crisis in his life, they greatly humanize the hospital or clinical atmosphere. The personal attentions and reassuring, capable manner of the operating room nurse do much to allay a patient's fears and make his hospital stay a less trying experience. I am sure that you will all join me in recognizing the outstanding contributions of this fine group of skilled professionals on National Operating Room Nurses' Day. ●

SPECIAL INTERESTS OR ENERGY INDEPENDENCE?

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see in the November 4 issue of the Washington Post an editorial in support of expanding daylight saving time. As you know, the bipartisan bill that I and my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. MOORHEAD) introduced, passed the House on October 28. Our bill will expand daylight saving time by 2 months. The simple task of turning back our clocks 1 hour for the additional months of March and April will save our country 6 million barrels of oil every year.

It is my hope that the Senate will move the companion bill (S. 49 introduced by Senators CRANSTON and TSONGAS). With Americans favoring an extension of daylight saving time by a 2-to-1 margin, how can the Senate do anything else?

CLOCK-WATCHING ON CAPITOL HILL

Do cows really care what time the clock says when they're being milked, or is it a case of the milker caring more than the milkee? Every other year or so, Congress considers legislation to allow more than the current six months of daylight saving time—and every time the farmers and their cows are cited as reasons not to give up another minute of standard time. But this year, the House has passed a bill—a perfectly reasonable modification of the current arrangement—that would extend daylight saving time for an additional two months every year by starting it on the first Sunday in March instead of the last Sunday in April.

Supporters of this change note that having another hour of daylight in the afternoons of March and April would not only allow more time for outdoor work and recreation, but would also result in some energy savings because less electricity would be used. In urban areas, the light at the end of the day is also popular with people who don't particularly enjoy going home from work in the twilight or dark.

The change would make sunrise an hour later, but by March this wouldn't put schoolchildren out the door in the dark,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

except possibly in the westernmost section of each time zone, and only then for a matter of days. Backers of the bill also say the change in March would not result in any increase in traffic fatalities for schoolchildren. And any state could exempt itself from daylight-saving time for the whole summer.

Whether more daylight in the afternoon would actually save approximately 100,000 barrels of oil a day, as claimed, is difficult to know without a trial, but 243 members of the House voted to give the change a try. They may have seen opinion polls, cited by backers of the bill, that show the public favoring the change by a 2-to-1 margin. Or they may have recognized this year's bill as the most sensible one on a subject that by now is wasting more congressional time than it should. With Senate approval, a harmless, popular change could take effect next year. ●

A TRIBUTE TO MING QUONG CHILDREN'S CENTER

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise today to pay tribute to Ming Quong Children's Center on their 100th anniversary for the contributions the center has made to San Francisco Bay Area children and their families.

The center, located in Los Gatos, Calif., has dedicated 100 years of service to providing a comprehensive treatment program for emotionally disturbed young people. Organized in 1881 by a group of San Francisco churchwomen, the center was originally established as a rescue mission for young Chinese slave girls. The center has changed with time from a rescue shelter to an orphanage, and currently to a treatment program for young people with special needs. Many of their clients have been referred from local law enforcement agencies.

Today, the Ming Quong Center distinguishes itself as a private, charitable children's center which offers both day and residential treatment for youngsters. An impressive and dedicated staff of administrators and educators are essential components of this high quality program. The staff focuses on academic, social, and emotional goals to be achieved in a family-oriented therapeutic program. A family atmosphere which places great emphasis on an individual's special needs is a top priority of the center.

A combination of qualified staff, effective program development, expanded facilities, and the pressing need for the center's efforts make Ming Quong an easily supportable organization for governmental agencies as well as private groups and individuals. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you and all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me in ex-

November 12, 1981

pressing our appreciation to Ming Quong for all their fine work and outstanding programs and to wish them continued success in treating emotionally disturbed children. ●

CONGRESSMAN BOLAND SPEAKS OUT ON THE SPACE PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I came across an insightful and important essay written by our colleague, EDDIE BOLAND, on the dangerous drift in U.S. space policy. Given the two hats Congressman BOLAND wears on the Appropriations Committee and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, he is perhaps in the best position in the Congress to critique U.S. space policy.

The essay, which I will insert in the RECORD at the end of these remarks, deals with more than the steadily decreasing civilian space program due to budget cuts. The implications of those cuts are clearly laid out, specifically the "militarization" of the NASA, the civilian space agency. Not only does Congressman BOLAND warn (or should I say predict?) of the conversion of NASA into a trucking company for the Department of Defense, but he describes the almost inevitable shift of civilian space technologies to Europe and Japan, who are seeking markets in this field of U.S. leadership.

It is clear that the United States needs a long-term civilian space policy that will demonstrate our commitment to this area of human development. It is also clear that we are considering random budget cuts without such a policy, and with little thought to the implications of those budget cuts.

As one who has introduced a modest civilian space policy bill, I welcome the calls by leaders like EDDIE BOLAND for the United States to set out a coherent space policy.

I commend the following essay to my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 2, 1981]

SQUEEZING THE BRIGHT PROMISE OUT OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

(By Edward P. Boland)

When the space shuttle Columbia returned to the California desert last spring, we were all filled with pride and renewed hope. After years of discouragement and setbacks, the shuttle flew a perfect mission, meeting every objective. We celebrated the accomplishment of that day. If the truth were known, never was this nation's space program beset by more uncertainty, greater disarray and a cloudier future in all its 30-year history.

What has gone wrong? There is no simple answer to that question. But it is clear that too few dollars are chasing too many

projects with too many technological problems.

In a talk given 3½ years ago, before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, I made the observation that, "after all the uncontrollables are funded, the remaining 25 percent (of the budget) comes under increasing pressure to make cuts. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is one of those agencies that are within that 25 percent—and any President who is struggling to balance a budget, whether it is 1980 or 1981 or 1982 or 1983, will continue to squeeze all 'controllable' programs."

That is what has been happening. And from all indications it will continue to happen. The President's latest budget reductions only serve to emphasize this, and successive efforts to cut hundreds of millions of dollars from an already shrinking NASA budget have resulted in a space program with little or no direction.

In the past 18 months, NASA has faced three separate budget retrenchments.

The first occurred in March, 1980, when President Jimmy Carter proposed a reduction of \$220 million below the original 1981 budget request. NASA's response was predictable. The agency attempted to absorb the budget reduction by stretching out all programs and canceling none of them.

While at first glance this appears attractive—and certainly can be expected as a natural reaction of NASA to placate all its constituencies—the "stretch-everything-out" policy inevitably leads to unacceptably high costs, which in turn can only serve to complicate the allocation of already scarce dollars. When a President does not support the entire NASA program on the schedule that was originally planned, some programs must be pared or canceled and new priorities must be struck. Stretching it all out is not the answer.

The second major budget retrenchment occurred in March, 1981, when the President proposed slicing \$600 million from the original 1982 NASA request.

That was followed by a third budget tremor sent to Congress in the past month. It proposes cutting an additional \$367 million below the March reductions. These 1982 budget crunches have had the effect of throwing a hand grenade into the middle of programs that are already beset by both funding constraints and technological problems.

Perhaps the most tragic victim of the dollar crunch has been the space shuttle. Tragic because, although its funding has been partially "held harmless," the promise of the shuttle appears dimmer with each new NASA announcement.

At the beginning of 1981, 48 shuttle flights had been scheduled by NASA through 1985. After the Reagan reductions were sent to Congress, that target was trimmed by 14 missions. We now hear that there is a \$700 million problem with development and production of shuttle orbiters in fiscal 1983. Unless that money is found within the total federal budget—or unless some cost-saving measures can be implemented—the number of shuttle flights through 1985 could be reduced to only 24. This would, for all practical purposes, force almost every commercial satellite back into more expensive expandable launchers or— even worse—onto the European Ariane launcher.

On the eve of the shuttle's second launch, that is not a happy picture. But the shuttle has not had a model development history. It

has been plagued by expensive main-engine and thermal-tile problems. It is overweight and overcost and, as if that weren't enough, the Air Force has always been a reluctant bride in this joint venture. Even after a successful first flight, there are those in the Air Force who would still like to see the shuttle die an early death. Regrettably, in the halls of the Pentagon, the shuttle suffers from the "Not Invented Here" syndrome.

Still, when you discard bureaucratic rivalries and technological mishaps, it all comes back to a problem of dollars. It is not possible to squeeze a major shuttle development program and new planetary missions and new application missions and aeronautical research out of a continually contracting budget. It is like trying to put 10 pounds of potatoes into a 5-pound bag. Understandably, NASA has attempted to do just that. But it defies the laws of physics, and simply will not work.

And so NASA is at the crossroads. Decisions must be made, and made soon, on the future role of the U.S. civilian space agency. What will happen to the space shuttle? Will it become a \$15 billion white elephant? Clearly, it can never be a reliable and profitable civilian space transportation system unless the turnaround time between flights can be drastically reduced. That cannot be done without sufficient money to fund enough flights to demonstrate its workability.

So the shuttle is caught in a vicious circle, and, painful as it is to admit, perhaps its promise as a cheap reusable civilian launch system may never be realized. Ironically, the shuttle may gradually evolve primarily into a military vehicle. That would be a particularly difficult pill to swallow because, in trying to hold the shuttle's funding harmless, nearly all NASA's science and applications programs are being sacrificed. That tragic and frustrating scenario appears to be the trend.

NASA faces other problems—potentially even more difficult. The fiscal 1983 budget process is now under way at the Office of Management and Budget. If the 1982 cuts are repeated in 1983, we may be seeing the beginning of the end of NASA as a civilian space agency.

In effect, we may be witnessing the gradual "militarization" of NASA. Sadly, we may see NASA become nothing more than an arm of the Department of Defense tasked with running a trucking company. That would abrogate to the Japanese and the Europeans many science, applications and communications programs in the next decade. Perhaps the picture is not that bleak. But, again, when one looks at the trends, it is hard to escape these conclusions.

Whatever ultimately comes from these and other questions, it is clear that in the past three years NASA's budgets have not been sufficient to support the space program justified before Congress. But the important point is that the shrinkage of those budgets and the stretchout of programs has not saved money. It has cost more money. And, until a space policy is set out that succeeding Administrations and Congresses will stick with, we are going to continue to pay more for less. ●

H.R. 2456—THE U.S. FLAGSHIP FAIR COMPETITION ACT

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during this period of austere budgeting, the Congress must recognize and assign priority to those tax expenditures from which our Nation realizes multiple benefits. Because H.R. 2456, the U.S. Flagship Fair Competition Act, ultimately in more than a single benefit for America, I want to speak in its support, and urge prompt consideration by the full House.

We easily recognize that a strong U.S.-flag fleet of merchant vessels working the oceans of the world both encourages and serves domestic/foreign commerce. Thus, this fleet contributes to our economic well-being, both through the merchandising of commodities and manufactured goods as well as the gainful employment of American workers across the entire spectrum of the job market. However, we may tend not to recognize that this same strong U.S.-flag fleet is—as General Eisenhower called it—our fourth line of defense.

Alfred Thayer Mahan, who was and remains one of America's most respected authorities on the influence of seapower on history, reduced the problems of operating freely on the seas to a simple formula: Navy plus bases plus merchant marine equals seapower.

Even today, in this age of the airplane and rocket, the efficient movement of men and materials by sea is still vital to our national defense. The essence of this vital role was recently stated in current terms we all can recognize:

In a Persian Gulf conflict, the Soviets drive to work, while we have an 8,000-mile nautical fire hose to string.

Mr. Speaker, it behooves the Congress to see that the United States is not found "on the short end of the string."

Recent figures indicate a fourfold increase in the Soviet Union's merchant fleet within only 17 years. Such an achievement was not happenstance, but the targeted result of purposeful Soviet national policies that increased shipbuilding capabilities, supported healthy maritime markets, and created a supply of ships and trained seamen.

Navy Secretary Lehman pinpoints one of the shocking side effects of such Russian policies: "There are more Soviet . . . than American ships operating in (our own) country's foreign trade."

During these same years, the U.S. sea merchant policy seems to have been no policy at all.

At long last, we are hearing from many corners the call for a reversal of such nonpolicy. I feel that H.R. 2456 is such a call. Obviously, no one piece of congressional legislation of itself will achieve the reversal necessary to achieve the strong merchant marine we all desire to see. An important step was the transfer of the Maritime Administration from the Commerce Department to the Transportation Department—authorized this past July by the Congress and signed into law by the President the following month. Soon thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation was designated as official spokesman for the Maritime Administration.

The proposal of H.R. 2456 to reduce the depreciation period for American-built vessels from 14.5 to 5 years, together with other capital cost recovery provisions included in this measure, should be another vital step toward encouraging increased American shipbuilding on a basis that will be competitive in the world market.

We must get our ships built and out to sea quickly. Then we need to develop those further policies which will strengthen our maritime industry's commercial services, while at the same time enlarging its potential for serving as the U.S. fourth line of defense. ●

EDUCATION AT THE CROSSROADS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11/12/81, November 12, 1981

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a matter of great concern to me and the residents of my home town of Taylor, Mich. During recent weeks, the national media has focused attention on the fiscal dilemma of the Taylor Public School District, our State educational system as a whole, and the plight of the school children in Taylor, who may soon be left out in the educational cold.

While the potential closing of schools is a situation my constituents and I are very distressed about, it could very well arise in each and every Member's congressional district. The schools of the Nation are in desperate financial trouble. Some local school districts are facing more difficult situations than others. But unfortunately my home State of Michigan and its schools are suffering under the absolute worst economic conditions in the country, and there is no more vivid example of this anguish than the Taylor School District.

The citizens of Taylor have gone to the polls three times to vote on millage to support their schools. And, each time, out of absolute desperation, they have rejected the millage. I be-

lieve that, to a great extent, my constituents have rejected these millages because the school tax is the only tax which is put before them, for an up or down vote. With it, they can express their current attitude on their economic situation.

Mr. Speaker, I make these comments as a warning to my colleagues to make them aware of the challenges before our system of public school financing.

I would like to point out that there are a number of false assumptions being made about the crisis which has beset the Taylor School District. The first—and the most widely held—is that in some fashion, the State can take over the schools and the funding for them. I would like to set the record straight. There is absolutely no provision under State law which permits a financial takeover of a local school district by the State. And, even if there were, the State is not in any position financially to do so. While President Reagan has now declared that the Nation is in a recession, Michigan is suffering from a depression. Not meaning to bring humor into what I see as a very serious situation, the old, worn story about when the Nation's economy has a cold, Michigan suffers from pneumonia, certainly applies in 1981.

Under the State's constitution, Michigan is required to balance its budget annually. Because the economic predictions of the Governor, the legislature, the department of management and budget and even the prestigious research seminar in quantitative economics at the University of Michigan predicted a considerable shortfall in State revenue, the Governor has already been forced to impose a \$270 million executive order cutting back on State spending. And this move was taken in only the very first month of the fiscal year.

It is anticipated that more such orders will come in the months ahead.

Our nationally respected State superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Phillip E. Runkel, made it clear on October 29, 1981:

There will be no state bailout for financially-troubled school districts. I have met with the Governor, the Speaker of the House, the Senate Majority Leader and the minority leaders of both houses in the State legislature, and they are unanimous in this decision—no bailout for the districts.

I have every reason to believe, given my long and close friendship with Dr. Runkel, that he is giving us straight talk.

Attorney General Frank J. Kelley also has confirmed that the State cannot take over the district financially. On October 18, he said:

The Governor, the legislature, State school officials and others have already said there is no pot of gold available in Lansing. They have repeatedly said the financial fate of the local school district is in the hands of local voters.

The Michigan Constitution does not impose a duty on the Michigan Legislature to appropriate additional State funds to those school districts where the electors have refused to approve property tax limitation increases for school operating purposes. It is a mistake for anyone to believe that the State has funds available for aid to school districts which run out of funds, Attorney General Kelley said.

Wayne County Circuit Judge Joseph B. Sullivan ruled on November 3 that the State must advance the Taylor School District \$2.1 million on its State school aid payment account to enable the schools to stay open until the millage election on December 3. Some believe that since the judge was able to rule in this way, that it proves that the State could step in financially. But this payment is strictly an advance on future State aid, and the district has already been reimbursed for 65 days of instruction, even though it has only been open for 35 days. So, even without this new payment, the district has been operating in the hole. Without a new infusion of funding, which the millage would provide, the school district cannot afford to stay open.

Another false assumption of the residents of Taylor is that they are "overtaxed" compared to neighboring school districts. It should be pointed out that even though Taylor has a high total tax rate, at 16th out of the 36 school districts in Wayne County, it is clearly not at the top. The Taylor School District at the same time ranks 27th out of the 36 districts in local wealth—State equalized value—and is, in fact, just below the average in the county in per pupil operating expenditures.

That the fate of the school district and its 16,000 students lies with the will of the local voters is a trusted—and for the most part—respected tradition in Michigan. Local control of the schools is a policy I fought for as a young attorney for the then-Taylor Township schools, as a delegate to the State constitutional convention, and as a State senator. I continue to work diligently to maintain this posture in writing Federal education statutes on the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.

Our schools in Michigan rank as some of the best in the United States. From its very beginning under the provisions of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 and the State's first constitution in 1835, Michigan has pledged to its citizens that "the means of education shall forever be encouraged," and that a "system of free public elementary and secondary schools" shall be maintained.

The December 3 millage vote gives the Taylor voters the opportunity to maintain and enrich that commitment. It gives them the prerogative of

insuring that their children and my grandchildren receive the same chance for a successful future that we had. For the 1,246 seniors expecting to graduate in June, it means that they can fulfill their long held plans—and dreams—first, of course, to receive the diplomas they've worked toward for 13 years of their lives, and then to go on to school, or hold a responsible job. But, without a renewed commitment on the part of the voters, these children have less of a future than most of their parents had. The voters cannot afford to shut the school doors, and rob their children of just 1 year of education, because they could well be robbing them of their entire futures or setting back their educational progress irreparably.

There is no question that the Taylor schools have faced some very difficult times in the last few years. But I firmly believe that it now is the time to put that all behind us. There are many achievements that the schools are responsible for that Taylor residents can point to with pride and enthusiasm:

Accreditation by the North Central Association and the University of Michigan.

A State leadership role in developing a comprehensive reading and math program which combines State and Federal programs and funding.

Selection as a national sample for compensatory education distribution formulas.

A model preschool program.

Outstanding success in "mainstreaming" handicapped children into regular classrooms.

A successful public works grant application for a new vocational-technical education center.

A highly acclaimed teacher in-service training program, conducted in conjunction with Eastern Michigan University and Wayne State University, which has been adopted statewide as the "Taylor Model."

Not only does the passage of the millage make good sense for the future of our children, it makes good economic sense. If the millage is not approved, Taylor could well be the only municipality in the entire State without public schools. What impact would this have on home values, and on the ability of our mayor and city council to attract new business which we so desperately need? I can assure you that not only would home values plummet, but any hope of bringing in new businesses would be quashed.

I cannot stress enough how strongly I believe in the value of education and the importance of providing it for our young people. My ballot will be cast in the affirmative on December 3. I truly hope that position is in the majority when the votes are counted.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMERICAN LEGION CALLS FOR THE RECOGNITION OF NAMIBIA

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely find it increasingly difficult to understand why more leaders in our Nation are not aware of the serious threat that the Soviet Union poses to the Government of South West Africa/Namibia, and therefore to U.S. national security.

Namibia has the largest uranium mine in the world, exceeding one-sixth of all the known uranium in the Western World. Namibia also holds vast quantities of copper, zinc, and gem diamonds. Namibia's importance as a trading partner will be even more significant and vital should the United States become a signatory to the Law of the Sea Treaty in its present inferior form.

In addition, the deepwater port at Walvis Bay on Namibia's southwest coast is ideally suited for harboring Soviet nuclear submarines in a position to bisect the oil lifeline from the Persian Gulf to the United States and our European allies in NATO. Over 26,000 ships a year pass from the Persian Gulf around the Cape of Good Hope, and as much as 70 percent of the critical minerals needed by the West. It is obvious that Soviet control of those sea lanes and the South Atlantic would nearly give the Soviets a complete victory in its resource war with the United States and its Western allies.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that more of us speak out boldly against the Soviet Union's active participation in SWAPO's terrorist war against Namibia's nonracial, representative government. SWAPO terrorists engage in hit-and-run raids of the type that has become all too familiar in many parts of the world where Soviet financed, trained, and equipped terrorist movements are at work. SWAPO terrorists plant Russian landmines in front of schools, stores, and other civilian localities in the black communities, using murder as a tool with which to wrench the government from the hands of Namibia's free people.

I am proud of the American Legion for raising its voice in defense of the peoples of South West Africa/Namibia. At the Legion's 63d national convention held this past September 1 through September 3, a resolution was adopted concerning Namibia. The text of resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 20—NAMIBIA/SOUTH WEST AFRICA

(63d National Convention of the American Legion, Honolulu, Hawaii, September 1 to 3, 1981)

Whereas, The Nation of South West Africa have been friends and allies of the United States during our national crisis, continues to be so, and

Whereas, free elections have been held with a multiracially balanced government being formed named the DTA in the majority, and

Whereas, the United Nations have failed to recognize it as a legitimate government because of Walvis Bay naval base controlled by South Africa, was not included in the transfer of properties along the Atlantic seaboard, the Communist and Third World countries refuse to recognize the legitimate elected Government of South West Africa, namely Namibia, and

Whereas, with the Communists in control of South West Africa would give the red belt across the entire Continent of Africa, controlling the sea lanes of the Indian, Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, and

Whereas, the industrialized nations of the western world are dependent upon the minerals and defense of the sea lanes, dependent upon for our survival;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Honolulu, Hawaii, September 1 to 3, 1981, that we go on record as requesting that the United States Government recognize the present legitimately elected Government of Namibia as the legal government.●

LET'S LABEL CIGARETTES FOR WHAT THEY ARE: A MAJOR CAUSE OF DEATH AND ILLNESS

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the introduction of H.R. 4957, the Comprehensive Smoking Prevention Education Act of 1981. This legislation will result in a dramatic increase in public knowledge about the significant adverse health effects of smoking.

The need for this legislation is clear. An estimated 54 million Americans smoke and the number of young smokers—particularly young women—is disturbingly high. There can be no question that the health of smokers suffers as a result of the smoking habit. The increased risk of serious illness is well documented.

Today we know much more about the adverse health effects of smoking than we did when the first report of the Surgeon General was issued in 1964. Today we know that smoking is our Nation's most preventable cause of illness.

Smoking is the No. 1 cause of lung cancer and is a significant cause of

larynx, oral cavity, esophagus, and bladder cancer.

Smoking accounts for one-third of all heart disease deaths and nearly doubles a persons risk of heart attack.

Smoking is a major cause of emphysema and chronic bronchitis.

Smoking significantly increases the risk of birth defects or spontaneous abortion during pregnancy.

Simply put, smoking is a major health risk factor and is directly responsible for the death of over 300,000 Americans each year. The costs in terms of unnecessary health care expenditures and lost productivity to the U.S. economy are a multibillion-dollar national embarrassment.

Tragically, a significant portion of the public—particularly smokers—are unaware of this information.

The Federal Trade Commission recently reviewed a large number of studies concerning the extent of consumer knowledge about the health effects of smoking. Its conclusions were published in a May 1981 Staff Report. The report notes:

... the evidence indicates that many consumers do not have enough information about the health risks of smoking in order to know how dangerous smoking is, i.e. what is the nature and extent of the health risk of smoking. Many consumers also do not know whether the general health risks of smoking have any personal relevance to themselves or whether they are among those groups of people who may be uniquely vulnerable to these health hazards. Finally, without more specific, concrete information, consumers have a more difficult time remembering and are less likely to consider health information at all in making their smoking decision.

The level of public ignorance and misunderstanding about the health effects of smoking and the trend of smokers to start at younger and younger ages highlights the need for legislative action. Steps must be taken to make smokers and potential smokers more aware that smoking is a certain and most potent killer.

For years now the cigarette industry has sponsored advertising campaigns which attribute positive lifestyle values to smoking. These efforts have been all too effective and have served to blunt and undercut both Federal and private sector smoking education activities. Its time to take a new look at developing more effective antismoking activities. Enactment of H.R. 4957 will be a positive step toward developing more successful smoking prevention campaigns.

H.R. 4957, provides statutory standing to the Office on Smoking and Health within the Department of Health and Human Resources. It charges the Office with establishment and administration of a national smoking education program. It requires the Office to become more actively involved in the preparation and dissemination of educational and scientific in-

formation on smoking and to actively involve a wide range of Federal agencies and private sector organizations in these activities.

In addition, the bill replaces the current cigarette warning label with six new health warnings. Unlike the current label, the new warnings are specific and reflect the most current scientific knowledge about the relationship between smoking and disease. The warnings will rotate among cigarette packages and advertising on an annual basis in order to enhance their visibility and assure the widest dissemination of their health message.

I am pleased to say that H.R. 4957 has broad support among private voluntary health associations. I would like to express my personal appreciation to the American Heart Association for their technical assistance in the preparation of this legislation. Through their leadership, H.R. 4957 can now claim the endorsement of virtually every major private health organization concerned about public health and disease prevention.

Mr. Speaker, the body of scientific knowledge documenting the adverse health effects of smoking is overwhelming. The linkage between smoking and serious illness or death is unequivocal. I believe our national smoking habit can be reduced if the public is better informed of the risks they take when they light up.

Increasing the level of public knowledge about these health risks will require the commitment of the Federal Government as well as voluntary health organizations to work together in initiating a vigorous nationwide campaign of smoking education. Passage of H.R. 4957 is an integral step in initiating this campaign and forging such a partnership.

I urge all Members to join with me as cosponsors of this important health promotion initiative. ●

STATESMANSHIP NEEDED TO RESCUE SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor illustrates well, in my view, the crisis of social security's future. Change will be difficult but letting luck take care of the very bread and butter of many of our citizens is inexcusable. We have a duty and responsibility to our constituency to make every effort in their behalf.

I ask permission to have the editorial from the Monitor issue of October 19 printed in full following these remarks and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

SOCIAL SECURITY'S FUTURE

A great sigh of relief seemed to go up from Congress and the White House when the thin ice of social security reform was once more skated over with no one actually falling through. But the future lies ahead, as the comedian said, whether Washington acknowledges it or not. An increasing elderly population will have to be taken care of one way or another. While Congress gets off the hook with short-term remedies, and the President gets off the hook with a bipartisan study commission, the American public ought to be demanding that the momentum for saving a humane and valuable system not be lost entirely. It is good to see that at least House Speaker O'Neill and Senate Majority Leader Baker have agreed that the commission ought to report back by April 15 rather than in a year or two as mentioned by Mr. Reagan.

The place to start is with the facts which the commission will have to consider—and which the President will have to act upon to regain the bold image achieved by his original social security initiatives. These facts begin with the well-publicized postwar "baby boom" generation reaching retirement age in the first half of the next century—with an added social security drain on the working generation then. But they add up to a picture of the U.S. population that has encouraging as well as sobering aspects.

For one thing, the people who would now be called elderly are projected to have "younger" characteristics than the word suggests: more years ahead of them, better health, more education than their present counterparts—and a greater place for them in the working world. The latter would be due to slowed growth in the labor force, to an increase in the economy's service sector with physical demands suitable to older people, and to improved educational backgrounds enabling them to adapt to technological change.

One dramatic way of putting the trend is to note the actuarial calculations that retiring in 1980 at 69 years of age was equivalent to retiring in 1940 at 65—and in the year 2000 the figure rises to 71 years. Such factors have to be taken into account when the social security commission considers increasing the age of retirement for full social security benefits. It appears that many people would be well prepared to benefit both themselves and society by staying longer in the work force.

Yet the picture is complicated. And we are indebted to such a social security expert as Alicia Munnell, vice-president and economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, for interpreting the statistics as she has for the Senate's Special Committee on Aging. Considering such matters as disability and technological displacement, she finds that proposals for a gradual increase of the retirement age from 65 to 68 would yield a long-term reduction in costs of only about 1 percent of taxable payroll, with somewhat more in later years. A question for the commission is whether such cost reductions are really worth the restructuring of the system and the risk of leaving some unemployed elderly without a sound means of support.

For Mrs. Munnell notes that past experience indicates lower-paid workers are not able to save for their own retirement and even middle-income workers are not likely to plan enough retirement savings. As for private pension plans, less than half of the private nonfarm workforce is covered by them. Pension benefits go mainly to highly

paid people; low-wage workers receive almost none.

So, for all the lengthened years of activity open to tomorrow's older people there would remain many dependent on children or other sources if not social security. In other words, the costs of their keep will be borne somehow. Though the idea of raising taxes instead of reducing benefits has not been popular of late, Mrs. Munnell puts it in perspective. The upshot is that the system would have sufficient revenue to run well through the first decade of the 21st century if the present proposals for borrowing within the social security trust funds were combined with payroll tax increases costing \$45 a year for a worker earning \$15,000 a year. This would mean .3 percent for an employee for three years compared with scheduled taxes.

On into the next century the combined employee and employer tax rate would become 17 percent of taxable payroll. This seems high in relation to the present 11 percent for the pension portion of social security. But it is less than what a number of European countries already pay—more than 20 percent of payroll in Italy, Sweden, and the Netherlands, for example, with West Germany at 18 percent. And the rate would have to be seen in conjunction with a reduced outlay on dependents at the younger end of the spectrum. The proportion of the combined younger and older generations to the working generation is called the dependency ratio. It reached a peak of .95 in 1965 and fell to .75 by last year. Under birth rate projections rising to 2,100 births for every 1,000 women, the ratio continues to fall until 2005 and then rises to a plateau of .69 in 2035-2055—still not as high as in 1965.

Should Americans, then, invest more in social security rather than receive less out of it? This is the kind of question the commission will be having to go into, getting across that thin ice, this time onto solid ground. ●

TO LOWER INTEREST RATES, GO FORWARD TO GOLD

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the administration has made great progress in reforming tax, spending and regulatory policy. But the final pillar of economic recovery—monetary reform—has not yet been established. The thinking of the Federal Reserve, as explained recently in the Wall Street Journal, is that it is necessary to slow down the economy and raise unemployment, in order to lower interest rates. While the most significant of President Reagan's tax incentives will not begin until next year, the economy is now suffering from recession, with the highest unemployment rates since 1975. The problem—the tragedy—is that, despite the human suffering caused by current Federal Reserve policy, it will not cure the underlying problem of inflation and high interest rates. Once the "going out of business" sale is over, interest rates will

remain high, because people have no long-term confidence in money.

The answer, I am convinced, is to go forward with a monetary reform which will make the dollar once again as good as gold. Jude Wanniski, president of Polyconomics Inc., recently explained this fact in an excellent column in the Washington Post. I commend the article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

TO LOWER INTEREST RATES, GO BACK TO GOLD

(By Jude Wanniski)

There are only two ways to bring down interest rates: decrease the demand for credit or increase the supply of credit.

President Reagan has been struggling with record-shattering interest rates because his administration has been almost wholly occupied with the first of these two options. The Keynesian and monetarist "demand-side" economists have dominated thinking about the interest-rate dilemma. They focus on trying to reduce the demand for credit.

Budget director David Stockman, once a supply-sider, has been drawn into this demand-side exercise, hacking away at school-lunch programs, Medicaid and national defense in a desperate attempt to reduce the federal government's demand for credit.

The monetarists sprinkled through the administration likewise have no interest in the supply of credit. Indeed, they specifically argue that the Federal Reserve should pay no attention whatever to the price of credit, i.e., interest rates. They aim at control of the "money supply," as they define money. If there is less "money," people will be able to demand less in the way of wage and price increases.

For the monetarist solution to work, we are told, there must be a period of recession and unemployment in which "people" realize they can't ask for more, because there isn't enough "money" in the system.

Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker is not a monetarist per se, but he is a big believer in recessions as a way of bringing down interest rates. He believes that inflation is caused by workers asking for more money and businessmen granting those demands. He thus will support any idea to induce a recession, a goal he has now achieved.

The supply-side economists put their focus on the supply of credit. If we could increase the supply of credit we could avoid using a recession as a way of lowering interest rates. If we could increase the supply of credit rapidly enough, we could even experience a rising demand for credit with falling interest rates.

The chief instrument to bring down interest rates, though, could not be fiscal policy. Supply-side economists (excepting a few supply-side fiscalists such as Treasury Undersecretary Norman Ture) have always asserted that monetary policy is the key to interest rates. Of course, they believe any assault on credit demand is doomed to failure. The recession only shrinks the economy and its tax base, setting the stage for lower interest rates next year.

The only way to break this spiral is by increasing the supply of credit, basically by making it so much more attractive to be a creditor that people will once again be happy to lend long at low interest rates.

How can this be done? The supply-siders say it can only be done with a gold standard.

Only by announcing that we are going to move toward the opening of the gold window that President Nixon closed in 1971 will people be encouraged to lend long again. Only by guaranteeing the dollar's value as a unit of account, in a specified weight of gold, can the current global liquidity crisis end without inflation. And it surely is a global crisis. It was Robert Mundell, the Canadian economist, who observed 10 years ago when the gold window was closed that it was the first time in 1,500 years that the world was without a single currency convertible into gold or silver. We are in a Greenback era, in which all governments can change the value of their currencies annually, monthly, weekly, daily, hourly.

In the past decade, the U.S. government has repeatedly defaulted on its debt to bondholders—by devaluing the dollar relative to real goods. Prospective lenders to either government or the private sector demand enormous premiums in the form of interest rates. Why should anyone lend to anyone else when the banking is done in dollars or other non-convertible currencies that constantly melt in real value?

It is, after all, not only government that defaults on debt when the monetary standard shrinks, all creditors lose. The more they lose, the less they lend. For this reason, there is almost nothing better that the government can do for its people than maintain a constant value of its unit of account, its currency. People make most of the important decisions of their lives around the value of the government official unit of account. When the government alters its value, or "floats" it, as Nixon did, everyone loses. The debtors may momentarily gain, but inflation poisons the community at large in which debtors live too.

When the dollar is convertible into gold, this is impossible. There are no windfall losses or windfall gains. Debtors pay what they promised; creditors receive what was pledged. As a result, there are no inflation premiums in the interest rate. Once again, people lend long at low interest rates.

If Reagan tomorrow announced a return to convertibility, the rest of the world would rush to join the system. No nation could afford to stay on the paper standard if it wished to continue conducting international banking services. Who would bank in floating Deutschmarks, yen, sterling, francs or lira if the dollar were as good as gold?

We abandoned convertibility, remember, not because we were in a credit crunch, but because Nixon was sold the Keynesian idea that a devalued U.S. dollar would make us more competitive with the Japanese. The monetarists persuaded Nixon to float the dollar altogether in 1973 so they could try another of history's periodic experiments with a paper standard.

Stockman believes convertibility would mean an initial period of illiquidity, a wave of bankruptcies. But, that is what we are now experiencing. Gold ends the liquidity crisis that is endemic on a global scale because there is no international monetary standard of value. When the supply of credit expands, interest rates tumble and relieved debtors and creditors can happily re-finance.

Before we get to that point, though, there must be a general awareness in Washington—in the White House and on Capitol Hill—that there is more than one way to bring down interest rates. Cutting the demand for credit, the method attempted thus far, is the wrong way. The "cure" is

worse than the affliction in that it embraces poverty and unemployment as necessary side effects to lowering interest rates.

Expanding the supply of credit is the only positive solution. It can only be done by reestablishing the dollar's link with gold, reestablishing the value of the accounting unit in real terms. Until the President moves decisively toward this positive solution, he and his administration and the world economy will continue to suffer, and it will get worse.●

VETERANS NOT RECEIVING NEEDED BENEFITS

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, November 11, 1981, ceremonies were held all around this country celebrating Veterans Day, the anniversary of the armistice signed at the end of the First World War. Unfortunately, that war did not mark the end to the armed conflicts the young men and women of the United States have been asked to fight in. The battle to preserve the rights of a free society was continued in another world war and in the Korean and Vietnamese conflicts. It is only fitting that Americans take the time to commemorate friends and relatives who have sacrificed so much of their own personal well-being for their country. Veterans of each of these wars need to know that we appreciate their sacrifices and we are willing to do all we can to pay back our debts. Recently, however, our veterans have been alarmed by signals they are receiving from Washington, and rightly so.

I am concerned about the recent proposals being circulated through Congress calling for additional spending cuts in the range of \$450 million in VA health care programs. We have sent our men and women to war and they have come home suffering from physical and psychological ailments. We have an obligation to these veterans to insure the availability of proper medical care to tend to their lingering wounds.

Our veterans, recognizing the budget problems facing this Nation, have taken the first round of budget cuts they were dealt this year in stride; \$110 million was cut from the veterans' budget during reconciliation, affecting their burial benefits, dental care, and education programs. Now, veterans are being asked to accept drastic spending cuts in their medical care programs. Direct medical care would be affected as well as medical research and veterans' hospital construction. This would be a ruinous blow to the veterans' health care system.

I appreciate the pressures facing our economy and the need to cut spending

by the Federal Government. Projections for our budget deficits over the next several years are devastating. However, we have to insure the viability of the veterans' health care system. We can correct the problems facing our Nation's economy without turning our backs on our veterans.

At existing levels, there is clear evidence that our veterans are not receiving the benefits the Congress had intended for them to receive. My Oklahoma colleague, GLENN ENGLISH, recently held a hearing in his Government Information Subcommittee, which brought out the fact that \$16.2 million had been appropriated for services at the Vietnam Vet Outreach Centers in the last 2 years which they never received. In addition, between \$1 and \$4 million in operating funds for these Centers never reached them because it was lost at the VA due to confused accounting procedures.

When services are not reaching our veterans that Congress has approved funding for already, how can we honestly contemplate cutting the veterans' budget even further?●

STATE DEPARTMENT BILL H.R. 3518

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the State Department authorization bill, H.R. 3518, was finally passed on October 29, title II of the bill was designed to provide a means to remedy a serious and growing imbalance between treatment accorded by many countries to official missions of the United States abroad, and that accorded to foreign missions in the United States.

This matter was overlooked in the other controversies, primarily budget matters, that plagued this measure.

Basically, the United States is getting the short end of the deal in its diplomatic arrangements with many other countries. Our State Department does not now have the authority to enforce reciprocity with these countries. The bill would give it the authority.

For a firsthand point of view on the subject of reciprocity, I recommend the following article on problems we have with so-called diplomatic service bureaus with which we have to deal in foreign countries. It was written by the State Department's branch public affairs officer in our embassy in Beijing and appeared in the State Department professional publication, *Open Forum*, in September 1981:

TAKE YOUR DAMN THUMB OFF THE SCALE

(By David W. Hess)¹

For years, Foreign Service personnel serving in Communist countries have been harassed by the activities of the so-called Diplomatic Service Bureaus, such as the DSB in Beijing and the UPDK in Moscow. All commercial transactions (hiring local staff; arranging housing; internal travel; hotel, dinner, and ticket reservations; etc.) made between Foreign Service personnel and local organizations must be handled through these Bureaus. Their uncooperative manner often results in unequal and debilitating conditions for our colleagues.

As the Service Bureaus control our housing, they tell us where to live (often in ghettos under constant surveillance) and determine our personnel ceilings by the slow rate with which they provide working and living space. At one point, detente with the Soviet Union may have been growing, but the UPDK, in refusing to give us more working and living space, put an effective brake on our ability to respond to new policy directions in Moscow. Meanwhile, Soviet diplomats in Washington are relatively unrestricted as to the location and size of their living accommodations. Now, even as our relationship with the PRC rapidly expands, Embassy Beijing is under duress. The average person reporting for duty will live at least 6 months in a hotel before receiving a small apartment. Because we lack the necessary working space, we cannot make the increases in our American staff we need to fulfill the responsibilities to which our two governments have been committed.

In Moscow and Beijing, we cannot hire anyone directly. The local staff works for the UPDK and the DSB. Often, our requests for local personnel, translators, typists, administrators, or "golfers" languish in the Bureaus for months. When we insist, we are told that out of the 250 million people in the Soviet Union or the 1 billion in China, there is no one qualified to fill the position. We suspect there is no one with those qualifications ideologically suited to survive long-term, close contact with Americans. The Bureaus evidently feel that in refusing to provide these workers, they can reduce Foreign Service personnel to baggage handlers and warehouse workers. "Since they are all spies anyway, we will at least reduce their effectiveness." Whatever the reason, the result is a serious labor shortage and inefficiency in responding to diplomatic responsibilities.

In many Communist countries, the Foreign Ministry rigidly controls the internal travel of Foreign Service personnel. Such travel must be requested in advance—often it is not approved. If granted, all travel arrangements must be made through the Service Bureaus. Thus, the lucky traveller is faced with one of the most aggravating elements of serving in the Communist world.

We all know that traveling on second-class airlines and living in third-class hotels are the conditions of service, but the Service Bureaus charge top dollar, as though we were flying United and staying at the Hilton. This overcharging is even more galling because ordinary citizens pay a much lower price. For example, while an American diplomat would pay \$45 for a hotel room, the cost to a Russian citizen would be \$7.50—its real worth. A flight from Beijing to Shanghai costs our diplomat \$100, but

¹ David W. Hess is currently Branch Public Affairs Officer at our Embassy in Beijing.

the Chinese passenger only pays \$40. The excuse is: "We are so much poorer than you; you can afford it." We should answer that "We will choose our own charities." Admittedly, we live under a different economic system with dissimilar inflationary effects, but the Communist state officials withhold the information that would allow comparisons leading to reasonable adjustments. Instead, they give their assumptions the force of law and sock it to us.

Why have we failed to press for a quid pro quo for our diplomats? Our senior diplomats resist taking a strong position on these issues, fearing that: (a) they will appear small, haggling for pennies and handling administrative rather than substantive work; and (b) pressing for equal living conditions will somehow reduce the possible successful results from such substantive issues as SALT, detente, MBFR, etc.

The leaders of these Communist states—in believing their way to be the wave of the future and ours destined for the trash heap of history—strive to hasten our demise. They may see achievement of their goal as near or far and disagree as to how far away it may be. Nevertheless, as long as this goal remains undiminished as a principal rationale for their regimes, we will be viewed as enemies. They will test us often, in various ways, and point to their successes as proof of their version of historical development.

Officially, we seek detente, equality, and peace, but this must be changed to include reciprocity. Because this testing will continue, we must respond in a manner that is consistent and understandable to the Communists. If our senior diplomats have to involve themselves in administrative issues, then so be it. When equality and reciprocity are uniformly established as the sine qua non of our relationship, we will be acting in the interests of substantive issues, not in spite of them.

How can we get fair treatment from the Diplomatic Service Bureaus? Simple. The Department of State, in cooperation with the F.B.I., should establish the United States Diplomatic Service Bureau, which would give the same type of service to those diplomats who force us to use their DSB's. These diplomats would have to arrange their travel and hotel accommodations through the USDSB, and would be charged the same exorbitant rate our diplomats are made to pay in their country. The Bureau would approve every lease, thus exercising effective control over the whereabouts of these diplomats. In restricting local staff, we would also closely adhere to the Communist state example.

Present U.S. law would not block this plan since diplomats do not have rights under our law—they have immunity supervised by the State Department. The Department could thus expand its mandate.

If present international diplomatic conventions block this plan, these conventions could also be used to reduce the control Service Bureaus have over our diplomats.

Many Foreign Service personnel who have served in Communist countries with Diplomatic Service Bureaus would like to "get even." That is not the thrust of this proposal. In fact, it would be best if such an organization were not necessary. The purpose of this proposal is to establish some of the leverage necessary to negotiate more normal working and living conditions in the Communist countries for our diplomats and to emphasize that the United States insists on equality and reciprocity in all of its relationships.●

REAR ADMIRAL KIDD'S NAVAL ORDER MEDAL FOUND IN U.S.S. "ARIZONA"

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently, I had the distinct honor of speaking before the Naval Order of the United States at its biennial congress held in San Diego. Present at the congress were many of the distinguished members of the Naval Order who have so nobly served America in the U.S. naval service.

Of interest to all of us, particularly Arizonans and those families and friends of the brave men aboard at the time of its sinking, is the relationship of the Naval Order to the U.S.S. *Arizona* which is now a national monument.

Following the attack and destruction of the fleet at Pearl Harbor, attempts were made to raise the sunken U.S.S. *Arizona* and to bring up the bodies of the men entombed, including the remains of Rear Adm. Isaac Kidd, Sr. These attempts were abandoned because of the loss of life. However, the ship continued to be used as a training school for divers. In one of these dives, the jewelry box of Rear Admiral Kidd was retrieved and is now in the possession of his son, Adm. Isaac Kidd, Jr. The box contained mementos of the cruise of the Great White Fleet, including medals and decorations received from foreign nations. Among them was a medal that Isaac Kidd, Jr. could not at first identify. Recently, the admiral identified the questioned decoration as the medal of the Naval Order of the United States.

Rear Adm. Isaac Kidd's Naval Order Medal, signifying his membership in the order, had been brought up from the historic U.S.S. *Arizona* lying as a national monument on the bottom at Pearl Harbor. It is even more significant to know that his son, Admiral Kidd, Jr., dedicated the beautiful Arizona Memorial near the Cincpacflit landing at Pearl Harbor, which is visited by thousands each year.

While the story of Rear Admiral Kidd's Naval Order association is special to all of its members, there are many other famous, some illustrious, companions in the Naval Order. Among them: Adm. George Dewey, Loyall Farragut (son of David Farragut), Rear Adm. John Grimes Walker, Capt. Jon Codman Soley, all founders; and, Admirals King, Nimitz, Leahy, Halsey, Spruance, Blandy, Clark, and many others.

Some of my Arizona friends who are privileged to wear the Naval Order Medal and have brought honor to our Nation are Lt. Cmdr. Guy Stillman, Lt. H. T. Aardweg, Capt. E. B. Waldman and Capt. Merrill Hammond. I,

too, am proud and humble to wear this same medal.●

MEDIA WATCHDOG

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress deals on a regular basis with members of the news media.

From frequent contact with members of America's press corps, one can develop a deep respect for the talents and powers of the fourth estate. As a profession, they share our concerns for the Nation and the ever-present demands of timeliness and accuracy. However, sometimes those demands, especially the latter, are not met. What then?

Sixty-five years ago, the first national press council was established in Sweden. In the nation known as the birthplace of the modern-day ombudsman, an organization was created to serve as watchdog on the activities of the news media. Today more than 30 press councils, taking a variety of forms, exist throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, what recourse does a private citizen or public official have when a news story is reported inaccurately? What recourse does a religious, social or government organization have when the news-gathering activities of the news media breach commonly accepted standards of privacy?

Beyond a tart letter to the editor or perhaps an expensive, time-consuming and risky libel suit, there are few avenues available for addressing these complex and serious occurrences.

A recent article by David Shaw outlines one method of dealing with this problem. In the article printed below, Mr. Shaw reports on the history, the successes and the failures of the news council system of monitoring the news media.

While it is certainly not a perfect means of resolving the serious dangers posed by reckless reporting, it does provide a system by which the public can watch the watchdog.

Given the importance of the news media and accurate reporting to the proper functioning of our form of democracy, I commend this article and its insights to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Buffalo News, Oct. 4, 1981]

IS WATCHDOG NEEDED OVER THE NEWS MEDIA?

(By David Shaw)

In London, a newspaper investigating a government official's relationship with a prostitute bugs bedroom and takes photographs through a hole in the wall.

In New York, a newspaper identifies many supporters of anti-abortion legislation as Roman Catholics—and does not identify

any other individuals by religion in these same stories.

In Minneapolis, a newspaper reporter in an automobile follows FBI agents so closely that they are forced to abandon a ransom drop in a kidnap case.

What can anyone who is offended, endangered or damaged by such journalistic behavior do about it, other than write an angry letter to the editor?

Well, he can file a formal complaint with, respectively, the British Press Council, the National News Council or the Minnesota News Council—three independent bodies created to evaluate reader complaints of inaccuracy, unfairness and irresponsibility in the media.

In those three cases, the various councils involved decided the complaints were warranted—and they censured the newspapers involved. The complaining parties were vindicated, and the newspapers were publicly embarrassed.

In the case involving the gratuitous identification of Catholics, for example, the National News Council not only ruled that The New York Times had been unfair but said further, that because the paper had ignored "repeated complaints on this specific issue, the council can only conclude that the Times is either insensitive to justifiable criticism or is condoning careless editing."

It has been 65 years since the first national press council was established in Sweden. Now there are more than 30 press councils throughout the world.

Some councils—like those in Indonesia and Sri Lanka—were created by the government, primarily to muzzle the press.

Others—like those in Austria, Denmark and Switzerland—were established and are run exclusively by the media, with neither government intrusion nor lay public representation.

But the most effective press councils are generally modeled after the British Press Council—*independent of the government but with members of the lay public joining journalists in investigating and ruling upon complaints against the media.*

The British Press Council was initially created as a purely journalistic body in 1953, upon the recommendation of a government-appointed Royal Commission on the Press. After a second Royal Commission report in 1963, the council voted to include lay members.

Despite the government's role in the establishment of the British Press Council, the government has taken no role in its financing, membership or decision-making. Thus, many in the British media who greeted the formation of the council about as warmly as one would welcome an outbreak of typhus are now enthusiastic supporters of the council. They think its very existence has enabled the press to avoid restrictive government regulation.

That is precisely why some American journalists supported the creation of the National News Council in the United States in 1972.

Spiro Agnew, then vice president, had been traveling around the country, accusing the press of a liberal bias. Many in the media feared that the Nixon administration might try to enact restrictive—coercive—legislation unless the media made a serious effort to monitor its own performance. Hence, the National News Council.

The idea of a National News Council was not new. The Hutchins Commission on the Freedom of the Press recommended creation of such a council in 1947, but press re-

sistance—indeed hostility—delayed its establishment until a task force of the Twentieth Century Fund made a similar proposal in the wake of Agnew's attacks 25 years later.

In the interim, perhaps two dozen community press councils were formed in various parts of the country. Most gradually died; the Honolulu Community Media Council is probably the largest of those now functioning.

But a statewide news council was established in Minnesota in 1971, and both it and the New York-based National News Council continue to be enormously controversial within the media, despite their attempts to design complaint procedures to offset media resistance.

Before either the National News Council or the Minnesota News Council will agree to investigate a citizen complaint, for example, the complaining party must sign a waiver, agreeing not to pursue any legal claim against anyone "based on the subject matter of my complaint."

Complainants must first try to resolve their complaints directly with the news organization involved. Then, if they are not satisfied, the complaint is subject to a screening procedure by the council or its staff before it is finally accepted for investigation and a public hearing.

The vast majority of complaints are settled, withdrawn, dismissed or rejected as outside the council's purview before the formal investigative process begins. The National News Council has formally investigated only 198 of the 853 complaints it has received in nine years. The Minnesota News Council has investigated only 43 of the 349 complaints it has received in 10 years.

Of those complaints investigated, the Minnesota council has ruled that about half were warranted. The national council has found only 30 percent warranted (although that figure has jumped to 60 percent in the last three years, largely because the initial screening process is now more rigorous).

Although many editors who have worked with news councils on complaints against their papers tend to praise the councils' work, most American editors continue to oppose the entire news council concept.

Journalists in the United States are fiercely protective of their First Amendment rights. They know there are countries that issue (and revoke) journalists' licenses, and they know there are press councils in other countries empowered to impose jail sentences on reporters and to levy heavy fines against newspapers.

No thanks, most American editors say. We don't want a press council here. It would just be a first step toward government regulation.

"Peer pressure can lead to regulatory pressure," says A. M. Rosenthal, executive editor of The New York Times.

Frequently ignored (or criticized) by what is generally regarded as the best paper in America—the paper of record—the council has had great difficulty gaining nationwide acceptance, credibility and impact.

But news councils in the United States were not created by the government, they receive no government financing, have no government membership and can take no punitive or coercive action.

Council defenders insist that the specter of council-deliberation-cum-government regulation is counter-productive, self-justifying paranoia. "Nonsense and in some cases . . . sophistry" George Chaplin, editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, said.

"These councils have no authority at all beyond their persuasive power and their

ability to make public reports," Chaplin pointed out. "If we're putting out the kind of paper we should, we have nothing to worry about (from them). And if we're not putting out the kind of paper we should, we ought to get kicked in the tail on those areas of dereliction."

Most council supporters say that the councils help prevent government regulation and save newspapers from some expensive libel suits by providing critics with an alternative means of vindication.

The basic argument in favor of a news council is relatively simple:

The press is more powerful than ever before thanks to the pervasiveness of network television, the growth of media conglomerates and monopoly newspapers, the celebrity status of some journalists and the loosening of libel restraints by the courts, dating back to 1964.

Therefore, since the people who report and edit the news, being only human, occasionally make mistakes—of both omission and commission involving questions of both accuracy and fairness—some independent body should monitor and pass judgment on their performance when specific complaints arise.

After all, the press criticizes every other institution in society; why shouldn't the press, too, be criticized and be held accountable—in public? Doctors and lawyers have internal watchdog groups that monitor ethical standards. Why shouldn't the press do the same thing?

Most editors reject that line of reasoning, though. Their attitude was best summed up by Claude Jean Bertrand who studied press councils worldwide while a research fellow at the American Council of Learned Societies:

"Newspeople, accustomed as they are to criticizing others and not being criticized, resent having their work publicly evaluated by arrogant colleagues and incompetent strangers."

Thus, few newspapers report National News Council rulings, and only a few major media companies contribute money to the council.

Only 26 percent of the council's funding comes from the media. The rest comes from foundations, corporations and private individuals.

There are small signs that media resistance may be lessening, though.

When the council was founded for example the Los Angeles Times editorialized against it, arguing that the press was already subject to pressure from government and from the courts and that the added intimidation of a news council might improperly influence individual newspaper decisions on what to publish or not to publish.

But Times Editor William F. Thomas says he is no longer quite as worried about the council's powers of intimidation as he once was, and he says he would cooperate with the council any time it wanted to investigate a specific complaint against the paper. Nor would he object to a corporate contribution to the council.

Thomas says the council "has behaved in every case I've noticed, very responsibly . . . It does a pretty good job."

The Washington Post has always cooperated fully with council investigations, too—most recently in the Janet Cooke-Pulitzer Prize case—but only in the last two years has the Post supported the council financially.

In fact, Post Executive Editor Benjamin C. Bradlee still thinks "the council's target

is wrong. Why do you (the council) target the best of American journalism, rather than the worst of American journalism?"

The council has heard more complaints against CBS and The New York Times, for example, than against any other news organizations. But that's because CBS and The New York Times are not only the best in their fields, they are also the most visible and the most influential.

"The way you keep the press in line is to pick on the best," Newsweek Editor Lester Bernstein said.

The National News Council has issued more findings critical of CBS than of any other single news organization in the United States, council officials say. But CBS continues to support the council financially. CBS News President William Leonard says the council performs "a useful service."

There are, however, some valid criticisms of the council—most recently over its ruling against the Village Voice in New York for a story on Dennis Sweeney, the accused killer of former Congressman Allard Lowenstein.

In some ways, the council almost seemed less upset by the Voice's journalistic transgressions than by suggestions in the Voice story that Lowenstein had engaged in homosexual activity.

"I don't think the council applied the same standard of ethics and accuracy in those proceedings as it demands of the press," said Osborn Elliott, dean of the Graduate School of Journalism at Columbia University.

The news council can also be faulted on other grounds—beginning with the very composition of its membership.

The council is supposed to be composed of eight people from the media and 10 from the general public, according to its bylaws. But four of the present "public" members are former journalists, and all four are clearly media-oriented in their experience and outlook.

It raises an important question: Is the media-oriented imbalance on the council—in truth, 12 of its 18 members are media figures—a major reason why the council finds only 30 percent of the complaints it investigates against the media to be warranted?

Most Council members—and most council decisions—do not seem biased. "I was very favorably impressed and to some degree surprised by the amount of objectivity," said William Rusher, publisher of the National Review and a member of the council from 1972 to 1980.

As a conservative magazine publisher and outspoken press critic, surrounded by what he perceived as a group of liberal newspaper editors, Rusher says he fully expected to "see myself in a den of inequity." But that didn't happen.

Nevertheless, the council selects its own members, and the stacking of the council with media representatives creates at least the appearance of impropriety and raises legitimate questions of credibility—the very kinds of issues the council is supposed to be investigating.

Chairman Norman Isaacs himself concedes that is a problem and he says a council committee is studying the matter. He says that what the council really needs is a new "outside re-evaluation" to more clearly define its purposes.

Isaacs is particularly sympathetic to the charge that the council largely ignores the truly significant issues facing the media today.

The council rarely, if ever, looks into such issues as newspaper monopolies, concentra-

tion of media ownership, the small percentage of total revenue that many very successful publishers spend on their editorial product—and the potential conflict of interest arising from increasing media ownership of nonmedia companies.●

FIRE SAFETY

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the media attention given recent major hotel fires in Nevada and New York highlighted a serious national tragedy. Each year thousands of lives are lost and millions of dollars of damage occur because of disastrous fires. It is time for the Federal Government to intensify its efforts to promote fire prevention.

A good place to begin, Mr. Speaker, is with our Nation's lodging institutions. Residential fire safety ultimately must depend upon the vigilance of individual homeowners. However, when each of us checks into a hotel, or place those we love in a medical care institution, we must rely entirely upon the institution's owners and the adequacy of local safety codes to provide fire protection.

Fires start for many reasons—because of a faulty appliance or poor electrical wiring, or someone smoking in bed. Such fires ought to be contained, but—more often than not—there are too few smoke detectors and inadequate sprinkler systems, or fires originate in bedrooms containing flammable furniture or bedding, usually the largest concentration of flammable material in lodging guest rooms.

The U.S. Fire Administration has found that upholstered furniture and mattresses, as the first items ignited, account for 40 percent of all U.S. residential fire deaths. Several recent large fires—notably the 1980 MGM Grand Hotel fire in Las Vegas—were also made more severe by this factor.

When a fire spreads through a large institution, many innocent victims are trapped. Thus, containment of fires, as much as prevention of ignition, is a critical factor in fire safety. Increased use of flame-resistant material in furniture and mattresses used in hotel rooms can do much to contain the spread of fire. Recent research resulting in new fiber development has made improved flame-resistant products possible.

I am pleased to note that an Illinois sleep product manufacturer has become a leader in the development of such products. This company has developed a mattress with a ticking—covering—which significantly exceeds the current Federal flammability standards.

Demonstrations have shown that when a fire is ignited in a wastebasket

next to a Sandel-treated mattress, the mattress does not become involved with the fire. The new sleepsets also help confine fire to the room in which it started allowing guests more time to escape and firefighters important extra minutes to contain a blaze. According to industry sources, the bedding represents a major breakthrough in fire safety for the lodging industry.

Clearly, use of this and other fire-resistant products in large institutions should be encouraged. The problem is that fire safety often costs more money, and hotel and other institution owners have insufficient financial incentives to provide this additional protection.

For these reasons, I am today introducing legislation to encourage the owners of hotels, hospitals, high rise office buildings, nursing homes, restaurants, and other institutional facilities, to go beyond their local fire codes and provide more fire safety for all of us. To provide the needed financial incentive, this bill would offer a tax credit for investments in fire prevention property. These include automatic sprinkler systems, early fire detection systems, fire extinguishers, fire rated doors or walls, nonflammable sleep products, and other items which the Secretary of Treasury could specify by regulation as increasing the fire safety of a building.

Last year, fire claimed 7,780 lives and caused estimated property damage exceeding \$5,740,000,000. In addition to the tragedy for the individual victims, these fires also represent a substantial loss of revenue for State and local governments, and our Federal treasury. Fires destroy tax producing property and reduce income tax liability.

This legislation will encourage businesses to take measures which can save lives and at the same time reduce the economic cost to our Nation resulting from the terrible tragedy of fire.●

CONSUMER FINANCING OF ALASKA PIPELINE IS UNWISE

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have decided to oppose the waivers that have been proposed in connection with the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976. The waivers were proposed by the President on October 15. My decision was made after participating in several days of hearings on the proposed waivers by the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels. The full House and Senate will have until mid-December to act on

this proposal, which will not be subject to amendment.

For the benefit of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the text of a press release I issued at the conclusion of the extensive hearings on the subject. The release describes my concerns about this waiver proposal.

PRESS RELEASE

WASHINGTON.—Over half the nation's natural gas consumers could be saddled with "an enormous white elephant" if Congress approves a scheme for financing the Alaska gas pipeline, U.S. Rep. Tom Corcoran (R-15th, IL-Ottawa) said today after a hearing on the plan.

Under a proposal set for expedited congressional review, gas ratepayers could be billed for pipeline construction costs before they receive Alaskan gas and even if it is delayed or never completed. According to a congressional study, consumers could pay \$37 billion over 20 years for a 4,800-mile pipeline they may never use.

"On energy grounds, this unusual financing method is clearly unjustified," said Corcoran. "Gas supplies are now adequate. Paying four times the current average price for gas we probably won't need is folly," he said. As the afternoon hearing neared its conclusion, Corcoran announced that he intends to vote against the plan and work for its defeat.

At the joint hearing by the Energy and Commerce Committee's Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee, on which he serves, and the Interior Committee's Energy and Environment Subcommittee, Corcoran said it is most unlikely that Alaskan gas costing an estimated \$18 per thousand cubic feet "could ever be sold." "It is a strange irony that the consumer would be asked to finance this thing and yet they wouldn't really be consumers in the sense of getting anything to consume," he said.

"It's just a bad deal for consumers," Corcoran said. "Investors see this as too risky for their funds, yet ratepayers would take on those risks through the plan. If it is completed under this arrangement, private concerns—including major oil companies—would get very handsome profits." Originally forecast to cost \$3 billion, the massive pipeline project may now run bills totalling \$50 billion, Corcoran said, citing a Commerce Committee economist's analysis.

Authorized by the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976, the pipeline would transport gas from Alaska's Prudhoe Bay to the Midwest and West Coast. Terminal points are 60 miles southwest of Chicago at Dwight, Illinois, and San Francisco, California.

After a target pipeline completion date determined by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] is reached, the FERC could permit gas bills to be increased for the over 60 percent of American gas consumers whose utilities are involved in the project to cover their costs. Companies building the Canadian segment could be allowed by the FERC to recover their investment and their operating, debt service and tax costs after that time and when the segment is operational. All costs of a gas conditioning plant in Alaska and the Alaskan segment, except the investment, could be passed on to consumers after reaching the target date and having been completed. Non-investment costs represent 80 percent of the total, according to the committee economist's report. Should the elements not be finished

simultaneously or at all, participating companies could nonetheless be allowed to charged consumers for those costs.

Submitted to Congress on October 15, the plan fulfills a commitment made by former President Carter. Under the 1976 law, committees have until mid-November to consider the plan and Congress must act on it by mid-December. ●

ANGOLA—FACING REALITY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Angola is prominent in the news lately, the views of a skilled observer of the Angolan scene are appropriate. "Facing Reality," a book by the noted journalist Cord Meyer, presented new facts about Soviet intervention in Angola and how the United States was outmaneuvered. Mr. Meyer is a now nationally syndicated columnist. The following column was part of a series from the book and appeared in the Washington Star on November 20, 1980. The facts and historical perspective presented in the column are still valid and appropriate.

The joint Soviet-Cuban decision to introduce large numbers of Cuban troops into Angola in 1975 to turn the tide of the civil war there was, in my opinion, the first clear-cut and dramatic demonstration of how the Soviets are likely to react to their improving strategic strength.

By that time, American officials were willing to concede that the Soviets had achieved a position of rough parity with the United States in nuclear armament, and the overwhelming American superiority that had played so decisive a role in the resolution of the Cuban missile crisis had disappeared.

Sensing that the strategic balance was shifting in their favor and correctly estimating that the trauma of Watergate and the withdrawal from Vietnam had at least temporarily impaired the American ability to react, the Soviets gambled successfully in a bold, aggressive move on the world's chessboard.

In an operation spanning three continents and requiring the well-timed orchestration of political assets and conventional military resources that had been built up over many years, the Soviets with their Cuban allies imposed their chosen instrument on the people of Angola as the new government when the Portuguese colonial masters finally withdrew on Nov. 11, 1975.

The Marxist government, based on one of the three black nationalist guerilla organizations that had been fighting the Portuguese, the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, remains in power to this day with the indispensable support of 20,000 Cuban troops. In one strategic stroke, the Soviets with Castro's help, succeeded in fundamentally changing the balance of power in southern Africa to their advantage. In so doing, they gained effective political influence in a huge slice of the Dark Continent, obtained access to new strategic ports and airfields, and secured a political base from which to operate against the remaining non-Communist countries in Africa.

Here, then, as clearly as I could reconstruct it in London where I was CIA station chief at the time, is the story of how the Soviets brought their queen, Castro's Cuban troops, into play on the Angolan chessboard to win a decisive victory and to prepare the way for future successful adventures in Africa.

First, it should be remembered that by 1975 the relationship between the Castro regime in Havana and the Soviets had changed drastically from what it had been a decade earlier when Che Guevara first made his romantic debut as a guerrilla hero in the Congo. After Guevara's career as a modern Robin Hood was ended by his arrest and execution in Bolivia, Castro began his retreat from the guerrilla adventures that had caused so much friction between his guerrilla leaders and the more cautious and pragmatic Latin-American Communist parties who took their guidance from Moscow.

Dependent on the Soviets for economic assistance and military hardware, Castro was compelled to become a much more disciplined member of the international community of Soviet-controlled Communist parties. Symbol and proof of this transformation was the fact that by 1971 the Cuban intelligence service, the DGI, was under close tutelage of the KGB. Cuban intelligence officers regularly sent in large numbers to the Soviet Union to complete their training, and KGB specialists in Cuba exercised a supervisory role over the planning and execution of Cuban intelligence operations. This change in the Soviet-Cuban relationship was an essential precondition for the role Castro was now to play in Africa.

In July 1975, even before the first trickle of covert American military support began to reach the fighting fronts in Angola, there was evidence that the Popular Front leaders had approached the Soviets with the complaint that their cadres were unable to use effectively or to maintain the ever more sophisticated weaponry that the Soviets were giving them. Fearful of the potentially superior numerical strength of their opponents, they pleaded not only for Soviet military training experts but for a Soviet troop presence to operate the new equipment on the battlefield.

The Soviets reportedly explained to the Front that the introduction of Soviet troops into the Angolan civil war was too dangerous an escalatory move and might well provoke the United States into committing its own forces to the struggle. Instead, they advised the Front leadership to seek assistance from the Cubans.

A Front mission flew to Havana and met with Castro in early August to argue their urgent need for trained troops. Perhaps fearful of American reaction, Castro was reported to have appeared initially reluctant; but the Front leaders pleaded that it was his revolutionary duty to help them as he had previously done in sending Cuban troops to South Yemen and Syria.

By mid-August, Castro, for whatever reason, made up his mind to take the risks involved; and the decision was made to proceed with the extensive logistical planning necessary to mount a massive sea and air lift of large numbers of Cuban troops, equipment and supplies across the Atlantic to Angola.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no clear evidence available on the respective roles the Soviet and Cuban leaders played behind the scenes in reaching this decision. Certainly, there had to be very close and continuing coordination between them once

the decision was made, because the bulk of the heavy weapons and ammunition that the Cuban troops were to use in Angola had to be flown or shipped from the Soviet Union.

Whatever history may eventually reveal about the respective roles of Moscow and Havana, it was a brilliant and daring conception that added a whole new and dangerous dimension to the Soviet ability to project Communist power into the Third World. By supporting the proxy army of Cuba, the Soviets avoided the direct commitment of their own forces which could so easily alarm the United States and provoke American counteraction.

Because of Castro's prominent role in the nonaligned movement his army enjoyed the reputation of being part of the Third World and was not as much feared and resented as would have been the troops of one of the superpowers. Moreover, among the Cuban troops sent to Angola, care was taken to ensure that almost half were black, so that a racial identity appeared to exist that would not have been the case if Soviet troops had been sent.

For Castro, too, there were obvious advantages in the new strategy. The guerrilla adventures of Che Guevara had had romantic appeal, but in each case they had failed in conception and execution. They had lacked the careful calculation of the odds and of the strength of the opposition that the Soviets could offer their Cuban partner through their worldwide intelligence apparatus. Guevara had relied upon a spontaneous mass uprising of the peasantry, which never occurred, whereas joint operations with the Soviets depended on a heavy military preponderance ensured by the provision of large amounts of modern weaponry transported by Soviet planes and ships.

By becoming a junior partner in the Soviet geopolitical offensive, Castro lost the freedom of action he had once enjoyed, but he gained indispensable Soviet political and logistical support and a role on the world stage for a vaulting ambition that had never been content to be confined to improving the lot of the Cuban people on one small island.

Once decided upon, the commitment of Cuban troops to the Angolan civil war proceeded with dispatch and utmost secrecy. The arrival of Soviet and Cuban ships and planes in Pointe-Noire and Brazzaville could not be masked from American surveillance, but by unloading troops at night and by strict security discipline during the sea voyage a successful effort was made for some time to conceal the fact that troops as well as weapons and supplies were being transported.

In spite of sporadic agent reporting that Cuban troops were arriving, the CIA and the American policy makers were slow in facing up to the size of this large-scale intervention. On Sept. 24, Cuban troops were identified disembarking at Pointe-Noire and being transported by trucks into Angola, but it was only later that it was realized that, by November, 4,000 Cuban combat troops had been deployed. By January 1976, the figure had reached 15,000. By February, the CIA estimated that the combined Soviet-Cuban sea and air lift had transported 38,000 tons of weapons and supplies to Angola at a total cost for the operations of approximately \$300 million, 10 times the size of the American covert intervention. The armaments included armored cars, T-54 tanks, mass fire rockets, helicopters and MIG fighter planes.

The Soviet intervention dwarfed the scale of American efforts in every respect—and proved once again that when the Soviets determine to commit their military resources, they do so decisively and with overwhelming superiority, leaving little to chance. ●

REAGANOMICS: JEOPARDIZING THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, after Sputnik was launched in 1957, our entire Nation sought to upgrade the quality and quantity of math and science in our schools. It is now a generation later and we seem to have forgotten our need to train scientists, engineers, and mathematicians.

Our need is, I believe, far greater now than it was then. In the 1950's we were a long way ahead of our allies, and certainly the Soviet Union, in almost all scientific disciplines and engineering, with perhaps the exception of space technology. Now, we face very strong competition from Western Europe and Japan in many areas of high technology and machinery sales. They have caught up with us in many areas; they are ahead of us in others. There are numerous reasons for their competitive gain and our present position.

In education we are now making decisions which will determine our place in the economic world for the next generation. Unfortunately, at the national level we seem to place little concern on the need to produce well-trained scientists and engineers for our future. Some say that it is for the local schools, not the National Government, to be concerned about education. However, the administration and Congress are making many decisions which are directly and indirectly having a negative effect on science and math education and on education in general.

The administration recommended completely doing away with the science and engineering education program of the National Science Foundation. This \$77 million program helps to train students at the college level. More importantly, it improves the skills of teachers at all levels. President Carter suggested that the program receive \$112 million in fiscal year 1982. President Reagan recommended \$10 million, an 87-percent cut. The Congress has tentatively approved \$27 million.

Elementary and secondary education funds, commonly called title I, are mainly used for remedial reading and math. While cuts in this program are not as large proportionally, they will be very damaging. Outlays were supposed to be \$3.9 billion under the

Carter budget. Under administration pressure the House of Representatives reduced the program to \$3.2 billion. The President's 12-percent across-the-board cut that he announced on September 24 will actually mean an additional 23-percent cut in this program. It will be reduced to \$2.47 billion if the Congress follows his advice.

A far greater impact on education is the indirect effect of Reaganomics. By sharply cutting back on grants of all kinds and with almost no notice, we are causing a great strain on local government financing. While many of these cuts may not directly affect school funding, it will have its impact. Schools will find it much harder to receive support from local and State governments. Local and State taxes will rise to make up for Federal cutbacks, and this will create pressure against school levies. Salaries will not keep up with inflation and teachers will suffer. Many will leave the profession. Needless to say, the quality of equipment and the availability of new textbooks will also decline. All areas of education will suffer.

Our increase in military spending will also have a real effect. Unlike the increases we experienced during the Vietnam war, a far larger portion of our current escalation of military spending will be in high technology research. The military will spend whatever it must in order to acquire the personnel it needs. Increased demand will increase salaries. This will drain personnel from civilian research projects and from our universities.

The business sector will also pull people away from teaching. Educational institutions will be under the tightest restraints and will certainly lose in the bidding war. The pull will be greatest for those involved in math and the sciences.

As I said earlier, the teaching of science and math is already declining in many schools. However, our present funding policies will hasten that decline. If we cannot change our general priorities, I do believe that we must develop protective programs to support the quality of our schools which will be changed.

Joseph Whitaker wrote an excellent article in the Washington Post which describes the present situation concerning math teachers. I would like to have that article printed in the RECORD at this time:

SUBTRACTING MATH TEACHERS—FRUSTRATIONS, LURE OF HIGHER PAY TAKE TOLL
(By Joseph D. Whitaker)

When Sandra Lavene began teaching in the Montgomery County public schools 10 years ago, she had visions of unlocking the intricacies of mathematics for bright youngsters in a classroom brimming with enthusiasm.

But not long after she began teaching at Walt Whitman High School in Bethesda, Lavene's vision started to fade. As she ex-

pected, the work was hard, the students were sometimes unruly, and the pay was inadequate. What surprised her was the student apathy, the lack of respect for her profession, and the thanklessness.

"I would knock myself out," said Lavene, 34. "I'd stay up long hours marking papers. I worked after school helping the kids. But in nine years, the parents, the principal, the kids—nobody said 'thanks.'"

She quit her \$19,000-a-year teaching job 18 months ago and exchanged the noisy classrooms for quiet computer keyboards, higher pay, merit raises and profit sharing at the Rockville office of Hewlett-Packard.

Decisions like Lavene's are causing increasing concern among educators and scientists who fear that the difficulty of attracting and keeping math teachers poses a threat not only to schools' ability to offer a full range of math courses but also to the nation's long-term dominance in math-related fields.

The same lures of higher pay and fewer hassles that have prompted an exodus by many math teachers also have reduced sharply the number of students opting for math education degrees in college, with the result that there are serious shortages of math teachers in various areas around the country.

Other areas, including Washington, have managed to maintain an adequate supply of certified math teachers so far. But they are aware of the problem and are scrambling to develop strategies to steer them around possible future shortages.

Many experts, pointing to the growing gap between teachers' salaries and those in private industry, expect the shortages to worsen, primarily in grades 7 through 12.

"A lot of math teachers are going into the computer field simply because it pays more and there are fewer hassles," said Max Sobel, president of the 80,000-member National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. "Math teachers coming out of college already realize that the \$12,000 paid to a beginning teacher is a lot less than the \$20,000 they could earn in the first year with some computer firms."

"In addition, the public's indifference to the plight of teachers, the low pay, crowded classrooms and poor facilities are a signal to many students to stay from the teaching field," added Sobel, who teaches math at Montclair (N.J.) State College.

Evidence of the problem abounds:

In North Carolina, 45 percent of all persons teaching math are not certified in the subject. Cleo Meek, assistant director of the mathematics division in the State department of education, said the State's math teachers—who earn \$12,000 to start—have been hired in large numbers by nearby computer firms that sometimes pay starting salaries of more than \$20,000.

The city of Houston, in a desperate effort to hire more math teachers, has added an \$800 bonus to the starting salary of teachers certified to teach math. Still, this year the city issued 44 "emergency permits" to teachers not certified in mathematics in order to cover its math classes, according to Oscar Sarabia, director for secondary school assignments.

Philadelphia, which has just come off a crippling 50-day teachers' strike, began the last school year with 90 vacancies for math teachers and ended the year with 24 of those positions unfilled. With a starting salary of only \$10,900 for new teachers, school officials said they cannot compete with thriving, talent-hungry computer firms.

The National Center for Education Statistics last month released its most recent survey on the issue, showing that in 1979 there were 900 math teacher vacancies in elementary and secondary schools nationwide, although there were major surpluses in most other fields.

A 1979-80 survey in Maryland found that 50,000 secondary school students were being taught mathematics by more than 400 teachers who were not certified to teach math. While that survey has not been updated, state education officials say the situation has not improved since it was taken.

In the Washington area, which has had fewer problems because of generally higher salaries and the lure of the nation's capital, public school systems routinely use persons uncertified in math to teach for a few days or a few weeks while they arrange to fill math vacancies.

Montgomery County, apparently alone among area systems, is allowing half a dozen former elementary school teachers uncertified in math to teach the subject at upper levels—after they took an aptitude test and promised to take the college courses necessary for certification.

Fairfax County reports no uncertified math teachers, but had been concerned about filling 25 vacancies when the year began. The county is developing a series of college courses that would be taught to teachers in the county schools over two summers and would culminate in a mathematics certification.

D.C. public schools, which have laid off hundreds of teachers in recent years because of declining enrollment and budget cuts, have been able to keep an adequate supply of math teachers by drawing from that pool.

The difficulty of recruiting and retaining math teachers nationwide over the past five years has been paralleled by a similar but somewhat lesser problem with science teachers, but more attention and concern are being focused on math because it is critical to so many disciplines.

"If school systems can't find enough qualified teachers, they will use teachers who do not have a good math background," said Alphonse Buccino, the National Science Foundation's acting deputy assistant director of science and engineering. "Advanced-level mathematics classes which usually have the lowest student enrollment are the first ones to be dropped when there are not enough teachers."

"Then students who might otherwise have studied math in college enter higher education poorly prepared and cannot compete in science and engineering programs. Ultimately, we could find that the pool from which we select our future scientists and engineers is shrinking."

Buccino said that current trends in the United States in which high school students over the last decade have been required to take fewer and fewer math and science courses are directly opposite the approach in Japan, Russia and Germany, where increasingly more math and science studies are required.

At the University of Maryland at College Park, the number of graduating students with math education majors has dropped from 39 eight years ago to only 10 last year, according to Robert Risinger, director of math education at the university. During the same period, the school's business administration, business management and engineering programs became overcrowded, Risinger said.

The same trend has emerged at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville where the number of math education graduates has gone from seven in 1973 to only three this year, according to William Lowery, the university's only remaining math education professor.

"I didn't go into teaching for the money," Lavene said recently. "I wanted to teach kids who had a love for learning math and would be willing to work hard. But after I taught for a few years, I found that the kids wanted good grades, but didn't want to do the work."

Her search for alternative employment led to Hewlett-Packard, where she said she was hired at a salary "significantly higher" than the \$19,000 she was earning as a teacher after nine years. Her employment package includes stock purchase options, profit sharing and merit pay increases that brought her pay raises amounting to 25 percent in her first year, she said.

"Mathematics is always a good background for working with computers," said Jerry Hendrick, a spokesman for Hewlett-Packard. "And math teachers make attractive prospective employees because they can usually assimilate computer information rapidly."

"But we don't want to give the impression that we're out to raid the high schools," Hendrick said. "In every instance that we've hired a teacher, they've come to us. If we have an opening and a math teacher applies, we can't say, 'You're needed in the school system, go back there.'"

Lavene's reasons for leaving teaching are echoed by Paris Rasnic. At age 22, he graduated from Virginia Polytechnic Institute with a bachelor's degree in mathematics and immediately took a job teaching math at Marshall High School in Fairfax County.

For the first few years, said Rasnic, he enjoyed teaching. Then the novelty of the classroom wore off and the daily routine of teaching began to wear on his nerves.

"The kids wouldn't cooperate in the classroom," said Rasnic, 32, who is currently employed by a Fairfax County computer firm. "It was a discipline problem that I couldn't control. I frequently came home from school frustrated and mad. That was no way to live."

Rasnic found the contentment he was seeking in a neaby computer firm, which hired him to keep an array of computer programs running smoothly. With few regrets, Rasnic replaced his chalk board, text books and complaining students with a cozy suburban office equipped with computer terminals and silent green screens.

When he went to work for the computer firm in Vienna, Rasnic said, the firm increased the \$16,500 a year he was earning after seven years as a teacher by \$5,000 in cash and other benefits. He currently earns \$27,000 annually, after three years with the company, Rasnic said.

But the money is only one of the benefits of his new job, he said. "I like it here because your supervisors notice what you do and they show appreciation if you've done good work." His job is to keep an array of computer programs running smoothly, and "I can go home relaxed. I don't have to carry my work home with me."

At the end of a typical day, Andre Samson, a math teacher at Woodson High School in Fairfax, leaves work with a briefcase filled with student papers. At home, after dinner, he will typically spend two to three hours marking and evaluating the

papers so he can return them to his students the next day.

"When I go home, I don't play with my daughter or talk to my wife or watch television," said Samson, who said he values job satisfaction over wealth. "I grade my papers. I feel I owe it to the kids to get their papers back to them as quick as possible."

As Samson, voted Virginia's "Teacher of the Year" three years ago, has continued his devotion to teaching, he has seen several of his colleagues move into higher paying, less demanding jobs in the computer field.

"I must admit I'm beginning to envy them more and more," he said. "The people who have left teaching come back with a new personality. They say they have fewer pressures and don't have to take their work home."

"Teaching is not a rosy profession," said Samson, 39. "But I'm a professional and the zest for teaching is still in me. But I don't know how long I can continue because the economic pressure has hit me like it has everyone else."

"I work hard and every now and then I get a pat on the back. But a pat on the back won't feed my family."●

ASSISTANCE LEAGUE OF PHOENIX VOLUNTEERISM DE-SERVES ADMIRATION OF ENTIRE COMMUNITY

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, there exists a group of dedicated, hardworking and civic-minded citizens in my fourth district in Phoenix, Ariz., whose contributions to the well-being of the elderly and frail citizens in my home State cannot go without mention.

The Assistance League of Phoenix, chartered in March 1966, is a women's philanthropic service group which has been dedicated in its worthwhile efforts to providing needed services and assistance to the needy in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Their projects include: Homemaker Service, a family aid program in which the league employs aides to provide home health care and personal assistance to the elderly, infirm, and chronically ill individual; and TONIC (Take on Needs of Immobile Clients), which involves league members who volunteer their time on a one-to-one basis with clients. Such TONIC services include grocery shopping, providing needed clothing and bedding, driving clients to medical appointments, or even transporting and accompanying clients on social outings.

On the TONIC project alone, Assistance League members have given a combined total of about 22,000 hours to their service project.

Unlike many similar community programs, the Assistance League of Phoenix does not receive funding from any government agency, or any larger entity. The Phoenix Chapter of the

National Assistance League raises and distributes all of its operating funds in the Phoenix community through sources like a thrift shop, located at 7044 North Seventh Street, where the homemaker office is also located; an annual champagne brunch; and contributions from individuals and businesses in the community.

In a recent national address to our Nation, President Reagan spoke about the spirit of volunteerism among our citizens which will always be a primary source of relief for our Nation's needy. The Assistance League of Phoenix exemplifies in a most eloquent way the type of voluntary community involvement and spirit our citizens have to offer.●

CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TOWE PROMOTES UNITED STATES-CANADA RELATIONS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Ambassador from Canada, Peter Towe, will terminate his assignment as Canadian Ambassador to the United States in the near future. During Ambassador Towe's service in Washington, I have come to know and respect him as a personal friend and as a friend of our Nation. First and foremost, Peter Towe has been an able representative of the Canadian Government in our Capital City.

In recent conversations with Ambassador Towe I have expressed my concern about some aspects of the relationships between our country and Canada and have pointed out the need for restraint and candor in statements which are uttered on both sides of our common border. It would be unrealistic for us to ignore some of the circumstances which give rise to the Canadian policies. For instance: Canada's efforts to strengthen its own economy encounters right off the dilemma of about 70 percent of its oil and gas industry owned by foreign interests—principally American; our failure to ratify the fisheries treaty; the continuing problem of "acid rain," and the general concern that foreign industry fails to take adequate account of the need of internal industrial development—in Canada.

In my view, President Reagan has set a good example for effective diplomatic contacts by his visit to Canada in March and by his appointment of my friend and constituent, Paul Robinson, Jr., as our Ambassador to Ottawa. However, members of the American business community and representatives of the media should continue to seek ways of cooperation

for the benefit of our two nations, and both Canadians and Americans should avoid suggestions or threats of "retaliation."

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Towe recently addressed the Carnegie Endowment and American Foreign Service Association on the subject of "Canada/United States Relations: The Canadian Perspective."

In my view, Ambassador Towe's remarks set forth a reasoned and straight-forward approach to the problems and solutions inherent in the relations of our respective countries. I am pleased to attach to these remarks for the edification of my colleagues and all those who glean these pages, a copy of the Ambassador's address presented in Washington on Wednesday October 28:

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS: THE CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE

The first words I have for you today are not my own. However, in tone and in content, they are very familiar.

"The relations of few countries are as intimate and important as those between Canada and the United States. They loom far larger in the eyes of a Canadian than of an American. This is natural . . .

. . . It may be expected that the relations between the two states will become increasingly important and that the problems arising therefrom will grow in magnitude."

Those must be the sage observations of a Canadian political figure, you might conclude. Or of an Ambassador to the United States.

They are.

Lester Pearson—Who, of course, was both.

And what might be illuminating to you is that they are from a letter he wrote in January 1932.

You know, Canadian Ambassadors here have been saying that sort of thing for as long as there have been Canadian Ambassadors here. Because it's true. We are two nations sharing a continent. We share prosperity; fears; and many values. We also share a great deal of history. Some of this history is not at all about sharing.

I enjoyed the festivities celebrating the 200th anniversary of the battle of Yorktown earlier this month. I was the one at the ceremony thinking that the American victory at Yorktown made superfluous General Washington's plan for another expedition in 1782 or 83, this one of enormous strength, to take Canada.

I was also thinking, as your President exchanged toasts with President Mitterrand, of how Canada fitted 200 years ago into that triangle. The French did, of course, support the American Revolution against their English enemies. The Congressional leaders in fact expected their French allies to invade Lower Canada. But the French did not attack Canada. The official explanation was that the first priority was to assist the Americans to liberate the colonies in the Southern part of the continent. The actual policy of Versailles was to leave Canada in the hands of the British so as to drive the newly independent state into friendship and expanded trade with France.

To a large extent, French policy was foiled. General Washington, in peace negotiations with the British asked that Canada be ceded to the U.S. which, if the request

had been taken seriously, would have enabled you to spend this lunch hour listening to someone else. It wasn't, but the British concessions to the new Republic were meant to counter French influence—and they were made to a large extent from what eventually became Canada. Such was—and remains—the rather seamy stuff from which history is shaped.

Canada. Not yet a country. Still a colony. But with a growing number of inhabitants of many different kinds. Whose own views were mixed—Canadians in fact fought on both sides at Yorktown—and naturally, were not considered by these big powers.

Who were they? They were the original French-speaking habitants. Still resentful of the British conquest but determined to survive culturally. Then, the Loyalists to the British Crown, many in fact refugees from the Revolutionary War to the South. And there were others—in Montreal, particularly—who had been impressed by the philosophical values of the American Revolution. In a Canadian way, these values worked their way into our own nation-building process, and became the basis of the political values we share in common, even if our political systems are in so many ways quite different.

Indeed, that nation-building process goes on today. Its effects, stemming from the very fact that we are different nations, seem to be what the present fuss in Canada-U.S. relations is all about. But its description is not so different from what Lester Pearson sensed 50 years ago.

My first posting to the Canadian Embassy here came at a time of unprecedented cooperation between us. We worked together even when the issues were difficult, through such huge undertakings as the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Also, at that time, having years before dropped our defences against each other, we joined in defence against others, through the creation of the Permanent Joint Board of Defence in 1940 which led after the war to the Pinetree Line and the Dew Line, and eventually to joint defence of the continent through NORAD.

During my next posting to this city, a decade and more ago, the mood was dramatically different. The U.S. was briefly and aberrationally in trade deficit with Canada. The measures taken in 1971 to protect the American dollar, measures which had a grievous, and disproportionate effect on Canada, were not the object of any prior consultations. Canadian pleas that account be taken of our historically special relationship with the USA went unheeded.

This is, I suppose, a contradiction, but it is one Canadians are used to. You were much bigger and stronger and could speak of retaliation much more credibly than we could. As my historical reflections today indicate, we in Canada are aware that it was ever thus. Successive Administrations here have had, perhaps, a shorter-term view of what's been going on. There is after all a tendency here to think that history re-begins every four years.

I don't mean to suggest that as Ambassador here, or earlier, as an officer in our Embassy—where, incidentally, I've spent almost half my working career—I've been stewing in the acid of 200 years of accumulated grievance.

Far from it. Most of my time has, in fact, been spent on the things we've worked out together, in the development since the war of the most complex, and concentrated relationship which exists between any two nations.

I recall those very creative post-war years when international institutions emerged from a common sense of hope or of peril! The resolution among the three countries which had cooperated in developing the atomic bomb to see atoms used henceforth only for peace; the founding of the United Nations; and when the Cold War shocked us all into insecurity again, the creation of the Atlantic Alliance.

In these experiences, our common and enduring view of the world's perils became shaped. It became natural for Canada to think of itself as an ally of the U.S.; in responding to Secretary Acheson's special plea to send ground troops to Korea; in Canada making a special effort to respond to the Suez crisis, where Canadians could play a peacekeeping role from which the larger powers were disqualified, in a sort of complementarity to U.S. big power leadership—and one which at that time kept the good relations between the U.S. and the U.K., as well as France, on the rails.

So I preface my remarks by taking a long view. Not of antagonism. But of history, the history of two nations, each, in its way, pursuing its own aspirations.

And now I turn to today.

We are told that relations between Canada and the United States have entered a difficult and dangerous phase. Americans in both the public and private sectors bewail the so-called new nationalism of Canadian government policies. In Canada many complain loudly about recent American statements, describing them as alternately patronizing or imperialistic. Looming over all the rhetoric is the perception on both sides of the border that we are locked into an inescapable spiral of retaliation and counter-retaliation, to the eventual disadvantage of both countries.

A dramatic picture—but is it accurate? I think not. It exaggerates current tensions in a few areas at the expense of an overwhelmingly positive relationship and it implies that until recently the bilateral relationship was devoid of substantive issues and difficulties.

Quite frankly, relations between Canada and the United States are always delicate.

It is not hard to see why. Interdependence is the watchword of the present age. Academics describe it, politicians espouse it, and the common man confronts it in his daily life. Imports and exports, balance of payments, the value of the dollar, the shock of escalating energy prices. We have all become part-time international economists. The lesson is clear to us all—no nation's economy is a secure fortress. We must struggle to find accommodations with our economic partners or we will all suffer.

For Americans this is a relatively recent experience. To Canadians this "modern reality" has been a feature of our national life for generations. We have had historically to be more sensitive than most to the economic policies of foreign governments. At the present time fixed U.S. capital investment in Canada is greater than in any other country, as is Canadian investment in the U.S., where we are the third largest source of foreign investment. Trade between our two countries totals almost (Can) \$100 billion annually.

It is important, I believe, not to over stress the negative. It is not surprising to me that many commentators express real anguish over what they perceive to be a deterioration in our bilateral relations. After all, for many years relations between Canada and the U.S.A. as countries and, more impor-

tantly, between Canadians and Americans as individuals, have been warm and genuine. There is an easy familiarity between our two countries which is, perhaps, unequalled in the world. In fact, the similarities between us are so great that we often overlook the differences which make us distinct. And we do so at our peril. Our strength as nations depends not only on our shared qualities but also on those qualities which are unique and lend variety and richness to our national lives.

It is not an easy task to specify these differences: some are very obvious while others are rather abstract and difficult to define with precision. I do not want to provide an exhaustive list for you, but I would like to suggest a few items which contribute to a deeper understanding of Canada.

Our geography and population. Although Canada is larger in area than the U.S., we have a population only one-tenth as large, and almost all of it located within 100 miles of the frontier with the U.S. These facts create special problems such as the vast transportation and communications systems which must be maintained in support of a relatively small economic market.

Our bicultural and bilingual identity. The fact that Canada has two founding cultures and official languages—French and English—creates special national riches but also special and unavoidable costs.

Our federal political system. Canadian provinces exercise jurisdiction over social and economic sectors to a much greater extent than the individual states in the U.S.A. The Canadian federal government's powers are correspondingly more limited than those of its American counterpart.

These, and other, factors taken together have created a distinctively Canadian political culture, a blend of our respect for and dedication to free enterprise and individual initiative with our recognition that government involvement in the economic, social and cultural life of Canada is demanded by the imperatives of our national heritage.

Canadians expect their governments to develop and execute policies which are responsive to their needs and interests. This expectation, by itself, is not unique. Americans also expect their governments to pursue policies which maintain national security, encourage social and political stability and promote economic prosperity. Bluntly put, Canadians and Americans look to their governments to articulate and defend their respective national interests.

And this is as it ought to be. To demand otherwise would be foolish and unrealistic. But it is not the end of the matter for the term "national interest" is infinitely elastic and can be stretched to justify almost any action. Therefore, Canadians and Americans make an additional demand on their governments which reflects their shared belief in democratic political principles—we demand that our governments pursue our national interests in a responsible manner.

When we look at foreign policy we see that responsible governments adjust their policies to suit changing circumstances. This is not opportunism or cynicism; rather we must continually make judgments about how best to pursue our national interests in a manner consistent with our international obligations and responsibilities. At times we must summon up the national will to act boldly while at other times prudence and patience provide the sternest tests of our national resolve.

It is balance we seek and, when I reflect on over three decades of personal involve-

ment in the Canada-U.S.A. relationship. I am struck by the balance we have achieved in the management of this relationship. I cannot think of two other countries which have so effectively pursued their national interests in such a harmonious and mutually beneficial way.

I am deeply troubled, therefore, by the recent charges in the United States that Canada has embarked on a new—and dangerous—course of economic nationalism. Nationalism, I hasten to add, is not used by those making the charge as a neutral description of the reasonable pursuit of national interest. No, we are speaking here of a nationalism which conjures up images of folly, irresponsibility and anti-Americanism. It is our emotions which are being appealed to—not our reason. Against the backdrop of such a long and fruitful bilateral relationship, I find the invocation of the term “nationalism” entirely inappropriate.

When the United States government argues (as does Canada) in favour of fair international trading practices, it does so because it believes such practices benefit the U.S. economy. Similarly, when the Administration and Congress state they will pursue fair trading practices, even if it means “getting tough” with trading partners, they do so because they believe this is necessary to achieve vital national objectives. There is nothing wrong with this; indeed, it would be exceedingly odd if the U.S. government pursued policies which it believed were inimical to American national interests. But we should not delude ourselves into thinking that pursuit of these interests, however reasonable they may be, is cost-free; voluntary restrictions on automobile exports may be a necessary element in the revitalization of the domestic automobile industry, but they do impose a cost on Japanese producers. There have been, and continue to be, debates within the United States on the best ways to pursue trade objectives and yet, throughout these debates, I cannot recall a single reference by any of the participants to the new “nationalism” of the United States Government, not even when such blatant acts as buy-American legislation are enacted by the Congress or, increasingly, by State governments. Perhaps it is the case that one nation’s “nationalism” is another nation’s “patriotism”.

The point is that labels, by themselves, are not really helpful and may even prove damaging. We should be prepared to look behind the labels if we wish to gain a richer understanding of each other. All nations—even Canada and the United States—make mistakes. When we do we expect you to point them out; I know we do not hesitate to point out your mistakes to you. If we cannot resolve our problems through bilateral discussions we have recourse to multilateral instruments such as the GATT, instruments we both helped to create and continue to sustain.

Historically, we have acted responsibly towards each other and we can continue to do so if we do not lose our nerve. It takes political courage to exercise patience, to calmly assess the costs and benefits of foreign policies. In the United States, President Reagan has embarked on a dramatic economic program. Its success will be vital to the recovery of the global economy. We know the measures will take some time to work through the economy and so we have refrained from excessive criticism of the program for its short-term consequences, such as high interest rates, which have a dramatic impact on Canada. Similarly, Canada’s

National Energy Program has as its primary objectives the achievement of energy security and, by 1990, providing for ownership by Canadians of 50 percent of our own oil and gas industry. Surely few Americans will find these goals objectionable. The program’s measures are designed not to punish foreign investors but to encourage Canadians to invest in the energy sector and to bear the costs necessary to achieve national energy objectives. Some have taken issue with the means. But it is by now I hope clear, that Canada has and will continue to implement this policy in a manner consistent with our obligations to you and our other economic partners.

If the Program works—and we believe it will—Canada will be off the world oil market by the early 1990’s. This clearly serves not only Canadian interests but also global interests. Your economic recovery program and our National Energy Program are bold policies designed to meet extraordinary circumstances. Both governments agree and support the long-term objectives of both programs; we must avoid allowing our short-term anxieties to thwart the achievement of those objectives.

I also want to touch on another Canadian policy which has been frequently criticized. I want to demonstrate that this policy, once it is understood, is a most reasonable response to a difficult and precarious situation. I refer to Canada’s policy on foreign investment.

Canada is a major importer of capital. Throughout our history we have actively sought foreign investment and created the domestic conditions which make Canada so attractive to investors from abroad. We would not have achieved, nor could we maintain, our high standard of living without major infusions of foreign investment capital. We have not pursued this policy for selfless reasons; we do it because it serves our interests. Similarly, foreign investors find Canada an attractive country to invest in because they make a profit. Foreign capital investment, like domestic investment, demonstrates the free enterprise maxim that pursuit of private benefit contributes to the public good.

But this is not holy scripture. All modern nations recognize that the marketplace is not perfect and some government role is necessary if market imperfections are to be prevented from becoming gross economic distortions. Antitrust laws, for example, are not predicated on the simplistic notion that big is bad but rather on the hard economic evidence that monopolies can stifle competition, encourage inefficiencies and lower general economic performance. Where natural monopolies are necessary, as in the utilities sector, we regulate them to ensure they operate in the public interest.

Foreign investment is not exempt from this type of scrutiny; if anything, there is greater public demand in this country for your government to become involved in foreign investment issues. And the demand increases in direct proportion to increases in the level of foreign investment. To be sure, some of the complaints reflect little more than xenophobia, a belief that foreign investment is, by virtue of its origin alone, undesirable. But there are grounds for some serious worries as well. For example, are head offices in foreign countries sufficiently sensitive to domestic realities? Do they offer domestic companies a fair opportunity to bid on branch plant procurement? Or do they purchase goods and services from traditional sources located near the head office?

Do decisions about corporate marketing and investment made on a global scale ignore domestic concerns such as the desire to raise the level of research and development activities of branch plants? Are subsidiaries subject to the extraterritorial application of foreign laws?

Successive Canadian governments had to face these issues at a time when foreign investment had risen to extraordinarily high levels and there were real fears in Canada that control of the economy was in foreign hands. We could have chosen to ignore this, but that would have allowed the legitimate concerns of Canadians to fester and, perhaps, explode in an unpredictable manner at some future time. It could have chosen to drive out foreign investment, even though this would have damaged severely the Canadian economy. Instead, in 1974, the government chose to steer a middle course between the two extremes of inaction and over-reaction—it established a mechanism to screen new foreign investment in Canada.

Canada requires foreign investors to demonstrate that their investment proposals confer “significant benefits” on Canada. Is this an irresponsible demand? I think not. Of course, our screening mechanism is not perfect—not everyone, even in Canada, believes it is necessary. No mechanism created by government and implemented by bureaucrats can or should claim omniscience. But minor difficulties should not be used to destroy the reasonable objectives of the policy. Canada will continue to need vast amounts of capital beyond our own ability to save; by reassuring Canadians about the economic benefits of foreign investment, the government ensures that Canada remains an open and hospitable environment for foreign investors.

I’ve spent a lot of time lately explaining Canadian positions but in doing so I don’t want to imply that the U.S. has a monopoly on grievances—far from it. I have already referred to the proliferation of “Buy America” legislation, but there are other trade issues such as the DISC legislation where Canada has serious disagreements with American policy. On investment issues, the Jones Act and the Communications Act among others prohibit or strictly limit foreign investment in certain sectors. You too have notable exceptions to the principle of national treatment. Perhaps I don’t need to recall that there was deep disappointment in Canada at the failure by the Senate to ratify a treaty which would have created an equitable joint management scheme for our East Coast fisheries. As for the environment there are a number of areas where we must develop cooperative programs if we are to avoid the destruction of irreplaceable resources in both countries. These problems—ours and yours—will not be solved by mere finger-pointing, much less exaggerated claims and counter-claims. We must strengthen our commitment at the highest level to finding appropriate solutions.●

MISINFORMATION ON EL SALVADOR

HON. JACK FIELDS
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the perpetual use of misinformation and

"planted" news stories by leftists of every shade has become more generally known and understood by the public in recent years. Therefore, it is hoped that the possibility of lies and distortions appearing in the commercial media would be kept in mind when considering reports from any nation besieged by guerrilla and terrorist movements.

Mr. Speaker, the now familiar patterns of deception used by the left and their sympathizers appear regularly in concert with the activities of Soviet and Cuban-backed insurgents operating throughout Central America.

Mr. Speaker, the Council for Inter-American Security has published in its newsletter, *West Watch*, reports and analyses demonstrating the continued and intentional use of misinformation relative to El Salvador for leftist propaganda purposes. I urge my colleagues to read these reports and cast a critical and cautious eye upon any antigovernment reports about El Salvador or any other nation besieged by terrorist movements. Only the most strained ideologue can remain blind to the truth about what has happened to Nicaragua, and what will ultimately happen to El Salvador and its people without U.S. aid and support.

Two reports follow.

[From *West Watch*, October 1981]

SALVADORAN LEFT "PENETRATES" WORLD MEDIA

The Salvadoran left is executing a plan to influence news coverage of events in El Salvador, according to papers discovered last May in the home of a propaganda director of the Salvadoran revolutionary opposition.

The media manipulation project is set forth in a 31-page document written in Spanish. *WEST WATCH* has obtained a copy of the document, which outlines in detail what it calls "a global plan in the area of propaganda."

The plan calls for the leftists to "penetrate" international news agencies and plant recruits in the most important foreign newspapers.

The revolutionaries have already recruited agents within AP, UPI and ACAN-EFE, the document reveals. Three individuals are mentioned as "comrades" within these agencies. They are identified only as Rina, Ana Leonor and Alex.

This project is called Operation "Aguila," which is Spanish for "Eagle." It includes a step-by-step program showing how to develop "sympathizers" in the media and how to induce journalists to use material such as communiqués provided by the revolutionaries.

Operation "Aguila" is spelled out in a document captured by the Salvadoran National Guard on May 2 in the home of Ana Margarita Gasteazoro Escolan, the General Secretary of the National Revolutionary Movement (MNR), a faction of the Democratic Revolutionary Front (DRF).

The document is not a proposal. It is a practical guide for the propaganda specialists within the revolutionary opposition.

It is important to note that many of the projects mentioned in the document are already being executed. The papers include an assessment of propaganda activities that were initiated in 1970.

The document notes that "we have not penetrated solidly the agencies that have the greatest worldwide repercussion" like AP, UPI, ACAN-EFE and LATIN-REUTERS. Still, the document claims that this is "where we have most been able to advance."

"It is necessary to consolidate the work of political attention with the comrades that have been recruited within the agencies, especially with the comrades of ACAN-EFE, AP and UPI (Rina, Ana Leonor and Alex)," the document states.

Operation "Aguila" itself was begun in October 1980, the document says. The papers also reveal that, since January 10, Operation "Aguila" has been under the responsibility of CONAPROP, which is the Comision Nacional de Propaganda, or National Propaganda Commission, of the DRF.

The project includes establishing relations with TV crews and working with newspaper reporters to convince them to write articles from the opposition's point of view.

"This job must be developed by winning sympathetic journalists of the different media, mostly by providing them with material they can publish . . ." the document says.

Again, this is not something that could be done or will be done. It is already being done.

"We have our people who are already filming for the television networks, using, besides, that cover," the document states.

"In the interior, journalists of diverse world media have been contacted in order to carry them to camps," the papers say. "They have been given a vision of the war, of the organization."

The left in El Salvador is said in the paper to have begun arranging interviews for foreign correspondents with guerrilla leaders and penetrating news agencies during a "preparatory period" before January 1980.

"Journalists in the written media as well as from television news and films for television have been oriented," the document notes. "This is a job that has been able to be developed equally with that of the agencies."

The document also suggests that the opposition continue using institutions "controlled by us" such as the Salvadoran Human Rights Commission.

The revelation that the revolutionary opposition controls the Salvadoran Human Rights Commission is extremely significant. Many news items based on information provided by the Salvadoran Human Rights Commission have been published by major newspapers like the *Washington Post*. This indicates that the revolutionaries' plan to influence the media has already been quite successful.

The Salvadoran Human Rights Commission was the principal source for a front page article in the August 18 *Washington Post* entitled "Salvadoran Troops Said to Murder Up to 41 After Roadside Quarrel." The author of the story, Christopher Dickey, says: "The most comprehensive version of what happened appears in testimony given to the Salvadoran Human Rights Commission, a private organization that collects evidence of alleged rights violations by security forces."

Another news item in the August 26 *Washington Post* begins like this: "Salvadoran political prisoners began a hunger strike to protest death threats against relatives and other alleged rights violations, the Salvadoran Human Rights Commission said."

The Salvadoran Human Rights Commission was also quoted in an Associated Press story in the September 17 *New York Times*. The Commission claimed in this story that more than 32,000 Salvadorans had been killed in political violence since October 1979.

The revolutionaries apparently recognize that propaganda can be disguised as objective news reporting if it emanates through a purported human rights organization that appears to be imminently respectable.

The document sets up a distinction between partisan propaganda, which obviously comes from the organized left, and what is called "objective" or "neutral" propaganda, which is designed to look like the impartial rendering of factual information.

"In 'neutral' propaganda, it is fundamental to use the technique as much as possible of supposed 'neutrality,' 'objectivity,' and 'impartiality,' which is achieved by using another media, and not the party, to affirm or deny something. This is what gives impact to the transmitted message," the document explains.

In other words, leftist propaganda that would be disregarded by the public if it were to come openly from the guerrilla front becomes credible if it is communicated by a "bourgeois" newspaper or magazine in the guise of news reporting.

The document also notes that the revolutionaries have under their control the Film Institute. It so happens that this institute has been playing a film entitled "El Salvador: The People Will Win" in the theaters and on college campuses in the U.S.

This film was reviewed in the August 15 *New York Times*, which mentioned in small print that the "documentary" was presented by "the Film Institute of Revolutionary El Salvador, F.M.L.N." The review also noted that a member of the central command of the Farabundo Marti Liberation Front was the film's political director.

In sum, the document outlining Operation "Aguila" sets forth a systematization of the revolutionary opposition's propaganda network in El Salvador and abroad. "What we need to do, within a general program and within the strategic lines of the organization, is penetrate all the media of the enemy, at the same time, as an organization we need to create our own media," the document says.

Another document found in the opposition leader's home is entitled "Work plan of sub-team with attention to foreign journalists." *WEST WATCH* has obtained a copy of this document, which is dated April 15, 1981.

It sets forth as the general objective "to reach foreign newspapers with our vision of the popular war and have the newspapers transmit the truth about the events."

A specific objective is "to form a network of collaborators among sympathetic journalists." The means of achieving this include "interviews with members of the FMLN and FDR" and "visits to camps and interviews with combatants."

The paper also details how the revolutionaries plan to carefully select certain "recommended" journalists and influence their reporting by granting them access to special information.

"Established mechanisms in the exterior have been left for sending us journalists and media," the document says.

These documents provide an invaluable inside look at the revolutionary propaganda machine in El Salvador.

The most compelling evidence that the plan is working lies in the fact that the discovery of the plan was not reported by the major media in this country.

[From West Watch, October 1981]

MASS MURDER EXPOSED AS RUMOR

Those who have played the children's game of "gossip" know how a story whispered quickly in a child's ear can become another story altogether by the time it has been repeated several times.

This is what is happening in El Salvador. Stories which are nothing more than rumors manage to get repeated by the right people and end up reported as fact in major U.S. newspapers.

For example, there were page one stories in March about the massacre of 1,500 Salvadoran refugees who were supposed to have been sealed in a cave called Cueva Pintada near the towns of Yarutela and Santa Helena.

The "massacre" had been reported by Honduran church and human rights groups. The alleged atrocity triggered demonstrations in this country against aid to El Salvador.

However, it turned out that Cuerva Pintada does not exist. Neither does the town of Yarutela. This was revealed in the April 29 Washington Post on page 16 in an article entitled "Massacre Report Proves Hard to Verify."

The guerrillas broadcast a second version of the "massacre" on their clandestine radio, alleging this time that the incident had taken place near Yarula, a town in Morazan province.

But there is no town of Yarula in Morazan province. Still, Radio Havana and Amnesty International insisted that the "massacre" had occurred in Morazan.

The National Catholic News Service later said that the incident took place, not in March, but in April, and not at Cueva Pintada, but at Cueva Sentada.

The source of this report turned out to be an unnamed priest who is supposed to have said, not that 1,500 people were killed, but rather that "a large number" of Salvadorans were killed. Another source was quoted as saying that 150 people died.

The April 29 Washington Post article notes that Amnesty International now says it simply received word of a "possible" massacre and did not vouch for its veracity.

In other words, what had been reported in the major media as a moral certainty was nothing more than a rumor. The story had been embellished and exaggerated, passing through several inaccurate versions. Maybe there is some truth to it. Maybe not.

Nevertheless, syndicated columnist Ralph de Tolenado observes that the original story continues to be broadcast by Radio Havana and repeated by the media, with the support of "international aid organizations" which, the Post notes, "provide no firm indication of where or how many were killed."

Is this an isolated case? Or could we expect other rumors in El Salvador to be believed and reported as hard news?

"In such a climate of horror, it has become possible to believe almost anything," writes Loren Jenkins, the correspondent who authored the April 29 Washington Post article. "Any street rumor or report heard on foreign or clandestine radio gains a life of its own that no amount of official denials can shake."

Another example of a sensationalist story that on closer inspection turns out to be based on a single, unnamed source appeared in the August 18 Washington Post.

The page one headline was "Salvadoran Troops Said to Murder Up to 41 After Roadside Quarrel."

Sounds ghastly. The problem is that, aside from all the hearsay and gossip, the only allegation in the entire story of the involvement of government troops in the alleged murders was in an affidavit by "an unnamed Armenia resident" filed with the Salvadoran Human Rights Commission.

This "unnamed resident" said that government troops took several persons from their homes at night and that 23 bodies were found in the river the next morning.

The rest of the article consists of second-hand reports or conclusions drawn from anonymous persons and bits of information that could mean almost anything.

One unnamed person, "who makes it his business to know where bodies are buried," tells that someone told him that 42 persons were killed one night and that 22 bodies were dumped in the river. Unnamed peasants who live near the river are said to have heard "a heavy truck" stop for several minutes the following morning. "They did not look outside," the article states.

As evidence of mass murder by Salvadoran troops, this is pretty flimsy stuff.

Yet it was splashed across the front page of the Washington Post in an article cleverly constructed to disguise its lack of substance.

But even the author of the article, Christopher Dickey, did not seem to find this assemblage of "evidence" convincing. About 15 inches into the story, buried on page 14, he writes that the alleged massacre "fits a pattern of similar events in which many people profess to be certain of what happened, and the only certainty is that people were taken from their homes, and people were found dead."●

THE TRI-COUNTY OBSERVER CENTENNIAL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a neighbor in Madisonville that just turned 100 years old. Despite the age, there is no sign of senility or weakness. I still welcome my neighbor's advice and insights. It is always good to know there is someone you can rely on in good times and bad.

My neighbor is the Tri-County Observer, and there are many of us who are happy to see it alive and kicking in its 100th year. The Observer traces its roots back to the Madisonville Clarion, which was first published September 5, 1881. The fortunes of the newspaper have been tied to the Hicks family of Madisonville for about 70 of the 100 years.

Since September of 1967, Dan Hicks, Jr., has been owner and editor of the Observer. He has maintained his family's commitment to journalism and preservation of the first amendment. During his tenure as editor, the Observer has won the Elijah Parish Lovejoy Award for Courage, from Southern Illinois University; the John Peter

Zenger Award, from the University of Arizona; and the Golden Quill Awards for Editorials, from the International Society of Weekly Newspaper Editors, as well as numerous State journalism honors.

It is good to have such a well respected neighbor. That is what the Observer has been as it makes its weekly visits into the homes in Monroe, McMinn, and Loudon Counties. These sentiments can be found in the congratulatory advertisements which fill the centennial edition of the newspaper. This is perhaps the highest honor a newspaper can receive; the support of its community, and its recognition as a neighbor.

I use the word neighbor, because it best expresses the role the Observer fills in the tricounty region. It is a neighbor that communicates through its news stories, advises through editorials, and lifts one's spirits in its features. It listens carefully to the opinions of its readers expressed in the letters to the editor.

One has to appreciate the perseverance shown by the Hicks family in maintaining this paper through the years. As Dan Hicks, Jr. states:

Because it has been the life blood of three generations of the Hicks family, its history will necessarily revolve around the Hicks name. But this is fitting because the motto on the Hicks Family coat of arms reads: "Not we for the kings, but the kings for us."

It was in this spirit that the first amendment became a cornerstone of our democracy. The Tri-County Observer is a legacy of that amendment and the Hicks family motto is good neighborly advice.●

DIVORCED MILITARY SPOUSES

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the activities in this Congress aimed at correcting the inequity in the current system which unfairly penalizes the divorced long-term military spouse, and I commend both the House Armed Services Committee Personnel and Compensation Subcommittee and Senate Armed Services Committee Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee for holding hearings on this issue. I would like to address this important matter by including my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' review, and I urge favorable consideration of legislation of this nature when it comes to the House floor for a vote.

BENEFITS FOR LONG-TERM MILITARY SPOUSE

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, November 4, 1981, I introduced H.R. 4902, which has also been introduced in the Senate by Senator Jepsen, Chairman of the Senate Armed

Services Committee Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee. Our bills address the main areas of concern with regard to the issue of benefits for the long-term military spouse.

As I testified before the House Armed Services Committee Personnel and Compensation Subcommittee last week, I have long been an advocate of official recognition of the contributions of the long-term military spouse. As more and more evidence points to the major role played by the military spouse in determining whether or not an individual decides to pursue a military career, it is imperative that action be taken to establish some security for the military spouse, just as has been for Foreign Service Wives. Military spouses should have the security of knowing that they can, at the least, count on their government after long years of commitment in the partnership dedicated to the defense of this country.

H.R. 4902, will be helpful in establishing that personal security for the long-term military spouse. As we all know, military life is unique and military families are required to share that uniqueness, its benefits and the sacrifices in the name of defense.

The long-term military spouse often sacrifices her own career in order to support her husband's military career. Frequent moves, on the average of one every 2½ years during a 20-year military career, are normally not conducive to a spouse's career. She is often required to begin new jobs at the entry level, and she has scant opportunity to become vested in her own retirement plan. All too often, it is not possible for a military spouse to complete her own education because of the high cost of out-of-state tuitions and frequent moves, especially when the move is the result of an overseas assignment. There are, of course, many other sacrifices and contributions that can be contributed to the military wife, and it is time that they receive the recognition and credit they deserve. Current statistics regarding the plight of older women in our society and the ability of women to collect on court-ordered payments for alimony, child support or property settlements are alarming, and it is important to officially recognize the long-term military wife's contributions by treating her more fairly when her marriage ends in divorce, which is often the direct result of the strains of a military career.

I believe the legislation Senator Jepsen and I have introduced offers a fair and equitable solution for all concerned.

With respect to court-ordered payments, it provides that the Service Secretaries can make direct payments from an individual's retired or retainer pay to a former spouse for court-ordered payments for child support, alimony, or property settlements. This legislation allows military spouses to obtain the benefits awarded them by State Divorce Courts, the recognized authority with regard to the dissolution of a marriage. Our bills also contain a provision which protects the retiree by stipulating that any such payment cannot exceed 50 percent of the retired or retainer pay.

With regard to SBP, this legislation simply amends the current law by including certain former spouses in the category of those eligible to be designated as a recipient of benefits under the SBP program. This does not dictate who would be awarded benefits under the program, it simply would allow a former spouse to be named as a beneficiary if that was the decision of the retiree.

The health care portion of this legislation provides that the unmarried military

spouse, who was married for a minimum of 20 years could be designated by a Service Secretary to receive continued health care for a medical condition which existed prior to the divorce. This provision protects the former spouse, who because of a pre-existing medical condition finds that she is uninsurable in the private sector. I strongly believe that these women should not be forced to turn to our welfare agencies for health care. They should be given the dignity of receiving continued health care from the military at DOD medical facilities or through CHAMPUS.

This legislation was prepared after the Senate hearings on this issue, and after consultation with the Department of Defense. I believe that it offers former spouses an effective collection mechanism for payments under lawful court orders, and it recognizes their contributions and sacrifices.

Certificates of appreciation, grocery bag logos and laurels on a husband's efficiency report are no longer satisfactory compensation in today's society. Passage of legislation of the nature discussed here would be a tangible example of our support for the proverbial, "Mom, apple pie and the American Flag," for those who will benefit by it have been, for the most part, dedicated to the ideals of motherhood, and have been willing to stay home and bake the apple pies as part of their role in the partnership dedicated to the defense of the American Flag. ●

NEGATIVE VOTE FOR ADOPTION OF CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. DICK CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than a century, Republicans have been in the forefront of the environmental movement. From its earliest days, the goals and programs of the U.S. Department of the Interior have been shaped by the framework laid by Republican leadership in the formative years of the agency.

Conservation and preservation of our natural heritage, sound management of our resources, protection of the environment and stable administration of the programs protecting the rights of the first Americans have long been basic Republican principles. So, too have many of the emergency programs created during the past decade to meet the mounting crisis of growing energy demand and dangerous dependence on foreign sources of energy to meet the needs of American society.

There is no greater threat to the environment in which we live and work, however, than the disastrous economic climate in which America finds itself after nearly a half century of the free-spending philosophy of Democratic Congresses. There is no more crucial job facing Congress than the rebuilding of a devastated economy and the restoration of economic vigor to the American working man and woman, the taxpayer, and ultimately, to American business as well. The long-term

economic health of those American workers and taxpayers who finance all of Government, including environmental and energy programs, can be guaranteed only through quick action by Congress to reverse the downturn caused by those spending programs, especially in the 4 years after President Ford left office.

President Reagan's strong economic program of budget and tax cuts has gone far in wiping away the stain of those 4 years of economic mismanagement. The rate of inflation, which nearly tripled under Carter administration programs enacted by the Democratic Congress, will fall more than 25 percent in President Reagan's first year in office. Real growth in the gross national product, which unbelievably fell into negative figures under those programs, has reversed that trend and is rising once again toward a healthy level. Soaring interest rates on Federal T bills, which rose uncontrolled from a 5-percent figure under President Ford to 14.7 percent under those Democratic programs, have been halted. Again, the trend has been reversed. The productivity of American workers and businesses, shackled by those Democratic programs, has been freed and is speeding upward once again after 4 years of stagnation.

This is not the time to scuttle an economic recovery program that is working. Yet by adopting this conference report, the House would be voting to do exactly that.

The report is a major threat to President Reagan's budget proposals already enacted into law by Congress. It would result in an increase in outlays of \$1.5 billion in 1982.

This one appropriations bill would force the projected fiscal 1982 Federal debt up by \$1.5 billion. If this conference report is adopted and the precedent set were to be accepted by Congress in dealing with other pending appropriations measures, the fiscal 1982 budget deficit would increase uncontrollably by between \$10 and \$12 billion.

This conference report alone is \$600 million in budget authority and \$400 million in spending above the March budget of President Reagan. In addition, in drafting this report, there was no meaningful consideration made of means to achieve the additional savings of \$1.4 billion in budget authority and \$1.1 billion in outlays called for by President Reagan in September.

This report keeps alive the solvent refined coal demonstration facility, wasting an additional \$135 million on a project that will not be built because of an anticipated 400-percent increase in its expected cost of construction. If that project is carried through to completion, it alone will add another \$3 to

\$4 billion to Federal spending during the next 5 years.

In a time of retrenchment, this conference report proposes to add \$600 million to Interior programs over the President's budget. It increases funds for Department of Energy programs—other than the strategic and naval petroleum reserve programs—by \$400 million, or 95 percent more than President Reagan's budget. Funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities similarly is some 87 percent over President Reagan's figures.

The conference estimates do not reflect earlier action of the Appropriations Committee on the 1981 supplemental and rescission bill and will add \$400 million in fiscal 1982 outlays to programs funded under the conference report. In addition, the Appropriations Committee estimates of the relationship of the conference report to President Reagan's budget seriously understate the true spending impact of the bill because they fail to account for earlier action on fiscal 1981 funds and for off-budget funds.

This conference report would increase spending in 1983 and subsequent years by \$830 million, making it a total of \$2.3 billion in outlays over President Reagan's budget, which is a centerpiece of the economic recovery America so badly needs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to recommit this conference report. If that motion fails, I urge our Members to vote against adoption of this budget-busting proposal. And if the conference report prevails despite that opposition and if this measure is sent to the White House, I strongly urge an immediate veto from President Reagan.●

VETERANS DAY, 1981

HON. GREGORY W. CARMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. CARMAN. Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy once said, "A nation reveals itself not only by the men it produces but also by the men it honors, the men it remembers."

Yesterday, Congress was not in session in order to commemorate Veterans Day. On that day, the citizens of our Nation joined to pay tribute to the 38 million Americans who have bravely and honorably served our country. Over 1 million of these men and women have died in active service to preserve the freedoms we now enjoy.

Congress has not forgotten these patriots, and this year has passed much legislation increasing and expanding benefits for our veterans. Although we will never be able to fully reward our vets for their devoted service to our country, I am hopeful that our actions

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in Congress will further exemplify our gratitude to them.

I join with all Americans in honoring and thanking our veterans who have risked their lives so that we may live in freedom and democracy.●

NATION'S AIR QUALITY PROGRAMS HAVE SERIOUS PROBLEMS

HON. CLEVE BENEDICT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Speaker, in my previous remarks on the Clean Air Act, I tried to make clear that required pollution control processes and technologies are responsible for impeding progress toward cleaner air. Problems with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) provisions of the act are also hindering movement toward our clean air goals. The SIP requirements have led to serious problems in Federal-State relations and in the overall conduct of the Nation's air quality programs. This assessment is shared by industry, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Commission on Air Quality.

Congress, through the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, required the development of individual State implementation plans that embody the strategies and control measures employed to achieve the national ambient air quality standards. Further requirements for nonattainment areas were added in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977. All plans are required to provide for the implementation of all reasonably available control measures as expeditiously as practicable and to demonstrate reasonable further progress toward attainment of the standards. States not meeting these requirements are subject to federally imposed sanctions.

This process has never afforded the States adequate flexibility to address air quality questions arising from local needs and concerns. The development of State implementation plans has been done under a completion deadline which did not allow States the ability to address specific problems in the most cost effective manner for that region. Under the current act, any area exceeding an ambient standard, regardless of the degree or the circumstances involved, is subject to the same regulations, restrictions, and sanctions, including a ban on new construction.

Such a policy hinders the development of sound air pollution control policies which might benefit our clean air efforts and allow for regionally identified industrial growth. In addition to not addressing the problems preventing the attainment of air qual-

ity standards, construction bans prevent air quality improvements that might be achieved from taking place. Companies and facilities with construction and expansion plans that will significantly reduce emissions of air pollutants are prevented from putting those plans into effect. Current law should be changed to allow States to develop State implementation plans in accordance with the different solutions and schedules appropriate to different areas.

Delays in the initial approval of State implementation plans can also be eliminated safely. Even routine SIP reviews require the approval of both the State and EPA. The approval process requires notice and public comment at the State level and a similar process at the Federal level. Although the act specifies that reviews are to be done by EPA in 4 months, none have been done in less than 9 months and some have taken years. These delays create confusion over the status of State implementation plans and their legal significance, further frustrating efforts at construction planning and realization and the resulting attainment of cleaner air. Changes to the Clean Air Act should specify that any State implementation plan not acted upon by EPA within the designated period of time will be deemed approved. They should also eliminate the need to duplicate the notice and public comment process at the Federal level already completed by the States.

Yet another problem involves the required Federal processing of SIP changes. The act requires the States to include in their plans emission limitations applicable to all stationary sources. Any changes to these limits must be individually reviewed at the Federal level before they can take effect. This process has taken a minimum of 10 months and in some cases years and adds to the difficulties in realizing beneficial new construction and modernization. States need the authority to make these revisions on their own based on local needs and circumstances. The Federal role will be limited to reviewing actions by the States to insure they do not prevent reasonable further progress toward attainment of ambient standards. Only if such progress is not being made should EPA have the authority to intervene and regulate activities within the States.●

INTERNATIONAL BALLET COMPETITION

HON. WAYNE DOWDY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution to

grant official recognition to the International Ballet Competition held in Jackson, Miss.

The International Ballet Competitions began in 1964 in Varna, Bulgaria. Because of the artistic success and prestige of this event, competitions were established in Moscow and Tokyo. The United States entered the "Olympics of Dance" with greater dancer participation when Jackson hosted an International Ballet Competition in 1979. The success of the event spurred a Second International Ballet Competition in Jackson to be held June 20 through July 4, 1982.

This competition promotes international friendship and through recognition of the artistic talents of the young competitors transmits an understanding of excellence to a new generation. I am proud to have such a prestigious and important event held in my congressional district, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution in support of this very worthy artistic endeavor. ●

TELECOMMUNICATIONS REWRITE

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance, on which I serve, is now in the process of drafting one of the most critical and far-reaching pieces of legislation that will come before the 97th Congress—an update of the Communications Act of 1934. As telecommunications assumes an increasingly important role in our domestic economy and international trade policy, the legislation that we enact will have a dramatic impact on our Nation's economic health in the years to come.

An article in today's New York Times clearly defines the critical role the House will play in the enactment of this legislation, and outlines the direction that the able chairman of our subcommittee Representative TIM WIRTH, feels the legislation should take. The issues involved are complex, and require thoughtful and careful analysis. If we are to pass a progressive and forward-looking bill, I believe we must begin now to understand what the issues are, and how best they can be resolved. I commend this article to you.

WIDER HOUSE ROLE IN A.T. & T. DEBATE (By Ernest Holsendolph)

WASHINGTON.—Every branch of government seems to be getting in on the act of reshaping the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and, in the process, national policy in telecommunications.

The Justice Department is pursuing a longstanding antitrust suit. The Federal

Communications Commission has outlined its own program for splitting the company into a regulated telephone company and an unregulated equipment and data-processing company. The Senate has passed its own bill laying down a new structure. And the Reagan Administration is pressing its own views.

ATTENTION SHIFTS TO HOUSE

Now attention is shifting to the House of Representatives, where Timothy E. Wirth, a Colorado Democrat who specializes in communications policy, expects approval by next June of legislation lifting restrictions on A.T. & T. and promoting competition in the communications industry.

The Senate and House approaches to the issue are based on the F.C.C.'s proposal for a split company; the differences have to do with the degree of separation between the parent and its subsidiary and the manner of transition and capitalization.

LESS EMPHASIS ON DEREGULATION

For instance, Mr. Wirth said in an interview this week, his bill was likely to put less emphasis on deregulation than the one passed by the Senate. The Representative is emerging as the key player in a complex Federal effort to reshape phone industry regulations.

"We're looking for a level competitive playing field," Mr. Wirth said, indicating that any measure that allowed Bell to drive competition from the field would be unsatisfactory.

Meanwhile, as Congressional action proceeds, the F.C.C. program is facing a challenge in the United States Court of Appeals here from more than 40 Bell competitors as well as from the Justice Department. All briefs in the case are due next month, and oral arguments are expected to be conducted in February, according to the commission's litigation staff.

Left in limbo, pending the outcome of the court appeal and final congressional action, is an Administration plan to drop its antitrust suit against Bell if "acceptable" legislation is passed. The historic antitrust suit, now being tried here in the United States District Court before Judge Harold Greene, may well conclude as legislation is completed. Judge Greene expects to rule on the case in July.

For its part, Bell is proceeding as if the F.C.C. program will go into effect by January 1983 at the latest. Pickward Wagner, a Bell spokesman here, said that while developments unfold, the company would proceed with reorganization for open competition on the basis of the challenged F.C.C. plans. "We have no other choice," he said.

The commission's proposal to split the company in two is contingent on the company's putting together an acceptable capitalization program for "Baby Bell" at least 180 days before it goes into business. Baby Bell is the nickname given to the divisions that would not be regulated.

A Federal court in Newark has endorsed the commission's view that Bell can enter computer-related businesses and stay in step with the newest communications technology. It rejected arguments by the Justice Department and others that to do so would violate the terms of a 1956 consent decree meant to keep A.T.&T. out of the data processing.

WORK BEGINS IN THE HOUSE

Against this complex and shifting backdrop, the measure that Mr. Wirth and his subcommittee on telecommunications will put together in the next few months will at-

tempt to remove the uncertainty for Bell and provide the F.C.C. with a mandate for opening up the telecommunications business.

The subcommittee, Mr. Wirth said, is basing its draft on a 700-page report on the communications business that shows that although there are competitors throughout the industry, there is less than full competition in certain areas.

For instance, Bell and its affiliates account for 96.3 percent of the long-distance business despite the success of companies like MCI Communications and Southern Pacific, which together account for less than 1 percent. Further, the report said, while there is competition in new terminal phone equipment such as telephones and small switchboards, there is little in the supply of major network equipment.

Mr. Wirth said: "We as a Congress would not have deregulated the airline industry if we found that one airline controlled 95 percent of the air traffic, owned 90 percent of the airports and controlled 98 percent of the rental-car agencies. We just would not have deregulated under those circumstances."

As for the telephone business, he said, "You maintain regulation so that the rate payer can be protected."

A key way in which the House bill could differ from the Senate measure, Mr. Wirth said, is that it would require Baby Bell to obtain its own capital rather than get it from the parent A.T.&T. If Baby Bell does not raise its financing on its own like the competitors do, Mr. Wirth asked, "isn't that a form of subsidy by the regulated company?"

GIVING THE F.C.C. A MANDATE

The most helpful role of legislation, Mr. Wirth said, is to give the F.C.C. a mandate, thus relieving it of having to choose which among many rules and policies to emphasize. "No matter how many people you give the F.C.C.," he said, "no matter how well you pay the accountants and lawyers, no matter what they do in this exploding fast-changing telecommunications market, you can't expect the commission to do all things. They need priorities."

As for the Administration's wish to free Bell to capture more of the export market, Mr. Wirth said this had more to do with Bell's corporate goals than the regulatory structures. "A.T.&T. has much to offer us and our trade base abroad," he said, "but they have little incentive to do that with a captive domestic market in terminal equipment. The network equipment market is over 80 percent A.T.&T., totally captive."

CONCERNS OF THE WHITE HOUSE

Bernard Wunder, an Assistant Secretary of Commerce who is the Administration's top communications policy maker, said he had told Mr. Wirth that the White House had four basic concerns—that the nation's communications system meet the security needs of the Defense Department, that it promise increased international trade, that it promote competition and that it offer protection for the rate payers. "We see those principles embodied in the Senate bill," he said, "and I see no reason why we cannot expect them from the House bill."

Mr. Wirth's schedule calls for a draft bill to be issued by the end of the month, scrutiny of the draft by the industry and the public in December and January, hearings on the bill in February, formal committee approval of the bill in March, floor action in the spring and a conference with the Senate

in June. The House bill will contain nothing about broadcasting or cable television policy, Mr. Wirth said.

For Mr. Wirth, there is a lot at stake. Although Congress has tried for five years to pass a bill and failed, the House has come closer than the Senate. This term, however, Senator Bob Packwood, the Oregon Republican who is chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, stole a march on the House and passed a bill.

Now, the last word will evidently be spoken by the House, making it probably that Congress will have a new common carrier bill for the first time in 48 years.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE ARMENIAN GENERAL BENEVOLENT UNION

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise today on behalf of Congressman DON EDWARDS and myself to pay tribute to the Armenian General Benevolent Union as they celebrate their 75th Diamond Jubilee Anniversary. The week of November 15 through November 21, 1981, has been set aside as the Armenian General Benevolent Union Week. This celebration will culminate on November 20, 1981, with an anniversary banquet and musical program.

The organization was established in Cairo in 1906 by esteemed national leaders, headed by Boghos Nubar Pasha, who saw a need to aid the destitute people of their homeland. This

philanthropic union has grown and flourished throughout the years. It has inspired the trust and appreciation of the Armenian people. Due to the patriotic and unselfish activities of the leaders and members, the organization has been successful in its humanitarian mission.

The Armenian community of Santa Clara County has continued the valiant efforts of their forefathers, resulting in numerous social, cultural, and spiritual events and benefits for our community. Presently, the Santa Clara Valley chapter is hosting a banquet in this year of celebration. Mr. Alex Manoogian, life president of the Union will be their guest of honor and primary speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to ask you and all our colleagues in the House of Representatives to join Congressman DON EDWARDS and myself in honoring the dedicated members of the Armenian General Benevolent Union of America and wishing them continued success in the future on the occasion of their 75th Diamond Jubilee Anniversary.●

STICK TO ANNOUNCED SCHEDULES

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 12, 1981

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, early in this session, Mem-

bers of the House were told that they could expect votes not to be scheduled for Mondays. This was announced so that, with some certainty, Members could schedule events for the benefit of constituents in the district, in my case in Chicago, on Mondays.

With full faith in this announcement, I asked HENRY WAXMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment, to schedule a field hearing on the proposed clean air act amendments in Chicago on Monday, November 16. This is an issue of great importance to my constituents.

Chairman WAXMAN graciously consented to my request.

This afternoon, November 12, we were informed that the House expects to vote on Monday, November 16. The vote is to be on the joint resolutions providing for continuing appropriations. This, too, is an important issue to my constituents.

If I cancel my hearing, it will make my constituents unhappy. If I miss the vote, it will make my constituents unhappy. Darned if I do and darned if I do not, so to speak.

I implore the leadership to please stick to the announced schedule so that Members may plan sensibly and, therefore, maybe break even in trying to fulfill their congressional and constituent obligations.●