EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MONTHLY LIST OF GAO REPORTS

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the monthly list of GAO reports includes summaries of reports which were prepared by the staff of the General Accounting Office. The December 1980 list includes:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

More Effective Internal Controls Needed to Prevent Fraud and Waste in Military Exchanges. FPCD-81-19, December 31.

Department of Defense Still Paying Some Foreign Taxes. C-ID-81-2, December 15.

Legislation on Sizing Military Medical Facilities Needed to Correct Improper Practices, Save Money, and Resolve Policy Conflicts. Acc. No. 114009, HRD-81-24, December 17.

LETTER REPORTS

Details concerning Naval Air Systems Command Contracts with Patty Precision Products Company. Acc. No. 113930, PSAD-81-1, November 24.

Defense's overall master plan for air defense should consider certain issues in its development. Acc. No. 113924, PSAD-81-15, December 5.

The Congress should be provided with more information on the distribution of minorities and females in the military services. Acc. No. 114005, FPCD-81-6, December 18.

The financial inventory accounting system of the Standard Army Intermediate Supply System. Acc. No. 114007, AFMD-81-19, December 19.

Evaluation of Selective Service's summer 1980 draft registration drive for 19- and 20-year old males. FPCD-81-30, December 19.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

American Employment Generally Favorable at International Financial Institutions. Acc. No. 113938, ID-81-3, December 10.

The Value-Added Tax in the European Economic Community. Acc. No. 113921, ID-81-2, December 5.

SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY

NASA Lewis Research Center Attempts to Procure Suitable Wind Turbine Rotor Blades. Acc. No. 113891, PSAD-81-12, November 21.

LETTER REPORTS

NASA needs to provide Congress more complete cost information on its projects. PSAD-81-7, November 26.

ENERGY

Implications of the U.S.-Algerian Liquefied Natural Gas Price Dispute and LNG Imports. Acc. No. 513623, EMD-81-34, December 15.

Long-Term Economic Planning Needed in Oil- and Gas-Producing States. Acc. No. 113959, PAD-81-10, December 10.

Management Problems Impede Success of DOE's Solar Energy Projects. Acc. No. 114013, EMD-81-10, December 22.

Improved Data and Procedures Needed for Development and Implementation of Building Energy Performance Standards. Acc. No. 114012, EMD-81-2, December 23.

Financial and Regulatory Aspects of Converting Oil-Fired Utility Boilers to Coal. Acc. No. 113858, EMD-81-31, November 21.

Electric Powerplant Cancellations and Delays. Acc. No. 113933, EMD-81-25, December 8.

Financing Rural Electric Generating Facilities: A Large and Growing Activity. Acc. No. 113925, CED-81-14, November 28.

Economic Impact of Closing Indian Point Nuclear Facility. Acc. No. 113928, EMD-81-3, November 7.

LETTER REPORTS

Status of Strategic Petroleum Reserve activities for October 1980. Acc. No. 113912, EMD-81-24, November 3.

The Department of Energy did not validate or determine the Argonne National Laboratory's early retirement program to be appropriate. Acc. No. 113857, EMD-81-33, November 26.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Mapping Problems May Undermine Plans for New Federal Coal Leasing. Acc. No. 113967, EMD-81-30, December 12.

Costly Wastewater Treatment Plants Fail to Perform As Expected. Acc. No. 113976, CED-81-9, November 14.

States' Experience with Beverage Container Deposit Laws Shows Positive Benefits. Acc. No. 113944, PAD-81-08, December 11.

Managing Foreign Mineral Information Programs to Support Policy Analyses. Acc. No. 113945, EMD-81-32, December 10.

Environmental Protection Issues in the 1980s. Acc. No. 114227, CED-81-38, December 30.

AGRICULTURE

Promoting Agricultural Exports to Latin America. Acc. No. 113946, ID-81-95, December 11.

COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

Most Borrowers of Economic Opportunity Loans Have Not Succeeded in Business. Acc. No. 113926, CED-81-3, December 8.

Increasing Use of Data Telecommunications Calls for Stronger Protection and Improved Economies. Acc. No. 113962, LCD-81-1, November 12.

More Can Be Done to Ensure That Industrial Parks Create New Jobs. Acc. No. 113909, CED-81-7, December 2.

Administrative Procedures and Controls Need Strengthening to Reduce Losses to HUD's Mortgage Insurance Fund. Acc. No. 114003, CED-81-29, December 18.

Better Planning Needed by Postal Service in Relocating Mail Processing Operations. Acc. No. 113990, GGD-81-11, December 18.

LETTER REPORTS

Delays in implementing HUD's accounting system for its mortgage insurance program. Acc. No. 113941, FGMSD-80-37, March 4, 1980.

TRANSPORTATION

Impact of Work Cutbacks on Northeast Corridor Improvement Project. Acc. No. 113890, CED-8-23, October 31.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Guyana Tragedy Points to a Need for Better Care and Protection of Guardianship Children. HRD-81-7, December 30.

CETA Demonstration Provides Lessons on Implementing Youth Programs. Acc. No. 113934, HRD-81-1, December 8.

LETTER REPORTS

Allegations about administration of the Emergency Energy Assistance Program by the Economic Opportunity Commission of Nassau County, New York. HRD-81-23, December 22.

HEALTH

Further Federal Action Needed to Detect and Control Environmental Contamination of Food. CED-81-19, December 31.

LETTER REPORTS

Federal diabetes activities. Acc. No. 113927, HRD-81-21, October 23.

Validation of health care related convictions attributed to the Department of Health and Human Services. Acc. No. 113930, HRD-81-34, December 5.

INCOME SECURITY

Public Assistance Benefits Vary Widely From State to State, But Generally Exceed the Poverty Line. Acc. No. 113975, HRD-81-6, November 14.

Implementing GAO's Recommendations on the Social Security Administration's Programs Could Save Billions. HRD-81-37, December 31.

LETTER REPORTS

Improvements for the Civil Service Disability Retirement Program. FPCD-81-1, December 15.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

VA Needs Better Visibility and Control over Medical Center Purchases. Acc. No. 113960, PSAD-81-16, December 12.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Women in Prison: Inequitable Treatment requires Action. Acc. No. 113947, GGD-81-6, December 10.

Congressional Sourcebook Series—1980 Edition. (The Sourcebook Series is a part of GAO's efforts to provide the Congress with the information it needs to carry out its budget control and oversight responsibilities.)

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

An assessment of 1980 Census Results in 10 Urban Areas. GGD-81-29, December 24.

Voluntary Early Retirements in the Civil Service too often Misused. FPCD-81-8, December 31.

Federal Work Force Planning: Time for Renewed Emphasis. FPCD-81-4, December 30.

Problems in Developing and Implementing a Total Compensation Plan for Federal Employees. FPCD-81-12, December 5.

Achieving Representation of Minorities and Women in the Federal Work Force. Acc. No. 113910, FPCD-81-5, December 3.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Proposals for Improving the Management of Federal Travel. FPCD-81-13, December 24.

The Office of the Special Counsel Can Improve its Management of Whistleblower Cases. FPCD-81-10, December 30.

Continued Use of Costly, Outmoded Computers in Federal Agencies Can Be Avoided. Acc. No. 113974, AFMD-81-9, December 15.

Most Federal Agencies Have Done Little Planning For ADP Disasters. Acc. No. 113993, AFMD-81-16, December 18.

Oversight of the Government's Security Classification Program—Some Improvement Still Needed. Acc. No. 113985, LCD-81-13, December 16.

Voluntary Pay and Price Standards have had no Discernible Effect on Inflation. Acc. No. 113943, PAD-81-02, December 10.

Department of Labor Has Failed to Take the Lead in Promoting Private Sector Productivity. Acc. No. 113920, AFMD-81-10, December 4.

Audit of Financial Transactions of the Sergeant at Arms for the 12 Months Ended June 30, 1980 House of Representatives. Acc. No. 113885, GGD-81-16, December 2.

Audit of the United States Capitol Historical Society for the Year Ended January 31, 1980. Acc. No. 113919, GGD-81-15, December 4.

LETTER REPORTS

TVA could have avoided substantial expenditures in supplementing the processing capacity of its central computing system. Acc. No. 113929, EMD-81-20, November 7.

Delays in providing office space for the Merit Systems Protection Board. Acc. No. 113931, LCD-81-14, December 5.

Most Government agencies have done little to ensure that federally assisted programs and activities comply with section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. Acc. No. 113923, HRD-81-35, December 5.

Data on exclusionary rule procedures in 36 States. Acc. No. 114008, GGD-81-33, December 22.

GENERAL PURPOSE FISCAL ASSISTANCE

Revenue Sharing Act's 1976 Amendments: Little Effect on Improving Administration and Enforcement of Nondiscrimination Provisions. Acc. No. 113940, GGD-81-9, December 10.

Federal Assistance System Should Be Changed to Permit Greater Involvement by State Legislatures. Acc. No. 114004, GGD-81-3, December 15.

Proposed Changes in Federal Matching and Maintenance of Effort Requirements for State and Local Governments. Acc. No. 114014, GGD-81-7, December 23.

The Monthly List of GAO Reports and/or copies of the full texts are available from the U.S. General Accounting Office, Distribution Section, Room 1518, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548. Phone (202) 275-6241.●

CHANGES IN THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation making important changes in the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. These changes recognize the long-term effects on health experienced by workers who have been exposed to asbestos while building ships.

Those workers who have inhaled or ingested asbestos have suffered various respiratory diseases, including asbestosis and mesothelioma. These diseases often lead to lung cancer. This legislation recognizes that such illnesses in shipyard workers are employment related, and it extends to the victims the protection of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The current law requires that claims for compensation, including those claims arising from asbestos-related disease, must be filed within 1 year of first diagnosis. It often takes up to 7 years for asbestos-related illnesses to become debilitating. It is at this point that many workers apply for compensation, only to be turned down for failing to file the claim earlier. This legislation would permit the afflicted worker to receive appropriate compensation.

This legislation also establishes an appeals procedure to protect workers whose benefits are now subject to termination unilaterally by the employer.●

WOMEN OF ACHIEVEMENT—SYRACUSE, N.Y.

HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest of pleasure that I ask my colleagues to direct their attention for the next couple of minutes to the contributions of the women of achievement from Syracuse, N.Y. There are 10 of them—each very different from the other; but each has in common the desire to reach out to the community with helping hands.

Gladys McElroy, a lay minister of the Tucker Missionary Baptist Church, works full time at the cooperative extension as a supervising staff aide. In addition, she is president of the Visiting Nurses Association, secretary of the Transitional Living Services, and a board member of Home-Aides of Central New York. But perhaps most interesting is that Gladys McElroy does all this on top of caring for her seven children.

Thank heavens for Ann Biesemeyer or what else would Girl Scout cookie lovers do? For 23 years, Ann has been a leader of the Girl Scouts. As district chairwoman, a member of the Girl Scout Council Board and trainer of leaders, she has left her mark in the community. She has also put in 17 years of work with the student exchange program, the American Field Service.

Mrs. Deeds at Carrier Foundation—Patricia Gonzales, vice president of the Carrier Foundation, has the job of giving away $1.2 million annually to nonprofit organizations. Patricia Gonzales also was elected mayor of the village of Phoenix—the first woman to hold that post.

"A one-woman welcome wagon" is an apt description of Eunice Aikman, who is usually accompanied by her homemade peach marmalade or a casserole. Besides spreading central New York good cooking around the neighborhood, Eunice Aikman has been involved with the New York State and Onondaga County Medical Society auxiliaries and the Girl Scouts.

Dr. Marie Blackman knows everything you would ever want to know about children since she is chief of pediatrics at Crouse Irving Memorial Hospital and chief of pediatric cardiology at the Upstate Medical Center. She has also developed an extensive pediatric cardiology research program at Upstate and established a fellowship for doctors.

Patricia Howard is the kind of teacher all parents wish their children could learn from. During her 4 years as principal at Edward Smith Elementary School, Patricia Howard has been instrumental in developing a program for gifted children, a resource center for students and a learning disabilities team that has become a model for Syracuse City schools.

One of the six women in the United States to head a university press, Arpena Mesrobian is director and editor of the Syracuse University Press. Involved in both scholastic affairs and the community, she is acting as president of the Syracuse chapter of the Armenian Relief Society, and serves on the board of the Armenian Review.

The Florence Nightingale of Cazenovia, Orletta Vadeboncoeur, worked in the Victory Center during World War II. Her philanthropic career includes being chairman of the women's division of the Community Chest, now the United Way; fundraiser for Van Duyn for almost 32 years; last year's chairman of Corinthian Club dinner which raised $10,000; chairman of the tribute to Margot Northrup which raised $100,000 for the Crouse-Irving Memorial Foundation; life member of the Community General Hospital Auxiliary; and life member of the Syracuse Boys' Club. She is indeed an alltime woman of achievement.

Ida Benderson's first career was spent at the Syracuse University Library; her second career began in 1964 when she became director of adult and senior activities at the Jewish Home for the Aged—a part of the program of the Jewish Community Center. Ida

Benderson's activities have also included involvement with community development, the nurses' association, libraries, and religious classes at the temple. For her lifetime of contribution, the Ida Benderson Senior Center was given her name in 1975. Ida Benderson is an alltime woman of achievement.

I trust my colleagues will join me in saluting the myriad contributions these 10 women have made to the 32d Congressional District of New York. They have been recognized at home, but I wanted to share the personal histories of these women, a national treasure in their own right, with you today.

Thank you.●

CALL-TO-CONSCIENCE VIGIL

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in the call-to-conscience vigil sponsored by my colleague Representative MICHAEL BARNES and the Union of Councils for Soviet Jewry. As the sponsor of the vigil for freedom for Soviet Jewry in 1978, I believe it is essential for the Congress to bring the attention of the world to bear on the restrictive, discriminatory, and repressive emigration policies of the Soviet Union.

In no case are these harsh policies more evident than in that of Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Maryasin and their daughter, Faina. The Maryasins have repeatedly sought permission from the Soviet Government to join their oldest daughter in Israel. Again and again, they have been refused. No reason for these refusals was ever given.

Shortly after he applied for exit permission, Alexander Maryasin was fired from his executive position at a Riga, Latvia, manufacturing plant. Faina Maryasin was expelled from the university she was attending. The family has been jobless since then and has struggled to survive from day to day. Last year, in desperation, the Maryasins conducted a hunger strike in an attempt to bring their plight to the attention of Soviet authorities. In spite of their repeated and determined efforts to emigrate to Israel, they have so far failed.

The Maryasins first applied for exit permission in 1973, and I became involved in the case in 1977. Since that time, I have written dozens of letters on their behalf to Soviet authorities. None was ever answered.

The case of the Maryasin family is not unique in the Soviet Union. It is duplicated thousands of times over and shows signs of worsening. We must continue our efforts on behalf of these people and all peoples of the world who seek to live in peace and freedom. A national policy which officially turns its back on the Maryasins and those struggling for basic human rights is a national disgrace.●

A TRIBUTE TO TROOP 967

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of presenting an American flag to Troop 967 in Havre de Grace, Md., on the occasion of Scout Sunday. It was an honor to be able to participate in that celebration of American youth and brotherhood. I include in the RECORD the message presented by Rev. Eddie L. Henry of Havre de Grace Methodist Church:

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD

The fog was so thick that the city lighted the street lamps at noon to aid residents and travelers alike. Mr. Boyce, an American publisher, was helplessly lost on the foggiest day of the year in London, England. The year was 1909. A young lad approached Mr. Boyce and inquired if he could be of any assistance. Mr. Boyce told the youngster where he wanted to go and was told the boy would take him there. Several blocks later, after arriving at his destination, Mr. Boyce reached into his pocket to offer a reward. The boy refused, stating that boy scouts did not accept rewards for "good turns." Mr. Boyce was very impressed. After further inquiry, and further discussion, the boy took Mr. Boyce to see Lord Robert Baden-Powell, the founder of Boy Scouts. When the two arrived at scout headquarters, the youngster disappeared.

Several months later, after returning to America, Mr. Boyce and several interested colleagues incorporated the Boy Scouts of America on February 8, 1910—on this day seventy-one years ago. The scouting program in America mushroomed and in 1920 the first World Jamboree was held in England with 321 scouts and thirty-two countries represented. The scouting program has continued to grow into a World-Wide program of International Brotherhood. The fourth scout law, "a scout is friendly," exemplifies the brotherhood and certainly lifts up the "good turn" done for Mr. Boyce in 1909.

One can only imagine the complications of that first World Jamboree. With thirty-two nations represented, consider the language barrier. However, scout ingenuity overcome the barriers and friendliness overcome language. From that first World Jamboree to the ones held today, scouters have always promoted the brotherhood of man.

With all the warm feelings expressed for our scouting program, the idea of World brotherhood is not original. The idea transcends time—to one of the greatest proponents of brotherhood of all time—the Apostle Paul.

Paul was a nation hopper. Never satisfied with staying in one place for more than three or four years at a time, Paul moved throughout the world carrying the Gospel of Jesus Christ from one city to the next. A dynamic organizer and preacher, Paul easily broke down the barriers of religion, language, and politics. Paul was never one to build on his own foundation however and soon became restless. He would rather leave local church building to local disciples. Paul built the fires and left the job of tending the fire to others.

Paul did spend some time in Rome. He had a marvelous ministry there and received many converts. However, sometime after leaving, he wrote a letter to the Romans reminding them of the Christian virtues that he left them. Recall the words of Paul as recorded in Romans 12: 9-16

"Let love be genuine; hate what is evil, hold fast to what is good; love one another with brotherly affection; outdo one another in showing honor. Never flag in zeal, be aglow with the Spirit, serve the Lord. Rejoice in your hope, be patient in tribulation, be constant in prayer. Contribute to the needs of the saints, practice hospitality. Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse them. Rejoice with those who rejoice, weep with those who weep. Live in harmony with one another; do not be haughty, but associate with the lowly; never be conceited."

Today, I would like to lift up just two passages from this text. Each phrase alone deserves special attention but I would call your attention to verses ten and sixteen. "Love one another with brotherly affection" and "live in harmony with one another." Both passages, so closely related and so close together in the passage lead us to believe that Paul placed a great emphasis on International Brotherhood. Paul made no secret wherever he went that all the missionary money he collected would go to the church in Jerusalem to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and shelter the poor. Wherever Paul went in the name of Jesus Christ, he overcame great obstacles to preach. However even Paul's concept of International Brotherhood was not original.

The idea of International Brotherhood originated with Jesus Christ. While stuffy sadducees were oppressing the poor; Jesus was giving them hope. While top ranking pharisees were ignoring the sick and maimed; Jesus was healing them and giving aid and comfort. While the officials were turning their backs on children, women, and the old; Jesus was busy building their self-worth. Jesus saw brotherhood as transcending sex, color, race, age, and religion. He faithfully loved each person as they were regardless of their station in life. Even though Jesus never traveled world-wide, His concept of brotherly love has been reaped by the world. Jesus told His disciples to love one another as much as He loved them. From the ministry of Jesus, brotherhood has spread throughout the world and touches us here today.

Last Friday night, our confirmation class worshiped at the Harford Jewish Center. During the course of the service, a twelve year old girl gave the evening sermon. She said, in essence, that all Jewry could never again allow the extermination of six million people in another Holocaust. I felt like standing up and saying, not only must Jews never let it happen again, but so must Christianity never again let it happen.

The past couple of weeks our country has seen the raising of the ugly head of racism through cross burnings. While we don't want to do anything too quickly to give needless publicity to a few wrong thinking individuals, we also have to do whatever is necessary to suppress this vein of evil that goes specifically against the brotherly affection that both Jesus and Paul taught.

The French have a word—sabot—it means wooden shoes. During the early days, French workers would throw their shoes into the machinery to protest unfair working conditions. This is where we get the word sabotage.

Satan tries his very best to sabotage brotherly affection. He makes every effort to thwart our attempts to live in harmony. As Christians, we must overcome Satan's efforts. We can get along if we just live and let live. Jesus' message of brotherhood must spoil the attempts of Satan. Christianity teaches us to love one another. We must see that Jesus' word is still represented in today's world. Boy Scout Troop 967, sponsored by our church, represents the concept of Jesus' idea of brotherly love. Our troop represents the concept of Paul's idea of living together in harmony. Nowhere is this message more prominent than the testimony of Scout Sunday here today.

Our scout troop for the past six years has been traveling to the Canadian border for a World Brotherhood Camporee. One year the more than twenty-five hundred campers camp on the American side and the next year the Canadian side. Last year, the Canadians presented to the camporee, a flag that had been flown over their parliament. This would be a permanent gift to be flown each year. At the closing ceremony, the Canadians issued a challenge for the Americans to respond with an American flag flown over Congress. Our troop, one of the charter troops of this camporee, accepted the challenge.

Today, our new Congressman, Roy Dyson, presented to our troop, an American flag that will be presented to the World Brotherhood Camporee in Canada during the first weekend of October 1981. This spirit of giving and sharing exemplifies the spirit of Paul and Jesus of brotherly affection. It's certainly a challenge to us all as we learn to live in harmony with each other—whether it's next door or the next country.

The words of Jesus; the message of Paul; the fourth law of scouting; the World Brotherhood Camporee in Canada; all seem to converge and lift up the purpose of Christianity. Breaking down barriers; living in harmony; campers coming from all over Canada and Northeast America expanding International Brotherhood and international understanding.●

BENJAMIN BANE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced legislation that will provide that Benjamin Bane shall be considered not to have lost his status as a citizen of the United States. I am pleased to sponsor this measure on behalf of Benjamin Bane.

The story of Benjamin Bane is an unfortunate one. He has been the victim of a series of catastrophic and administrative situations beyond his individual control.

Born in Durham, N.C., in 1905, Dr. Bane left 6 years later to travel with his parents to South Africa. He remained in that country until his 23d birthday. Dr. Bane wished to return to the United States to complete his education and pursue a career in dentistry. He did discover, however, that his premedical education was not acceptable for U.S. medical schools. Consequently, he completed his studies in England where he obtained his doctorate of dentistry.

During these years, the Hall of Records in North Carolina, where the birth certificate for Dr. Bane was filed, was destroyed by fire. When Benjamin Bane tried to obtain a passport to return to the United States, he was informed by the U.S. Embassy in England that a passport could not be issued in the absence of a birth certificate. Failing to obtain proper evidence of his birth, he was later informed by officials that it would be expeditious for him to apply for and travel on a British passport. Dr. Bane did not understand that an application for a British passport would affect his American citizenship.

Dr. Benjamin Bane is now 76 years of age and is terminally ill. Throughout the years his efforts to prove his citizenship have been unsuccessful, despite the fact that he was able to secure another record of his American birth.

Dr. Benjamin Bane is American-born, and I believe that this Congress should recognize Dr. Bane's citizenship without delay.●

NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO REMOVE PRICE CONTROLS FROM NATURAL GAS

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution on behalf of a large number of my colleagues expressing the sense of the Congress that now is not the time to remove price controls from natural gas.

President Reagan has indicated he may ask us to lift the remaining controls. Abrupt decontrol would have a staggering impact on the rate of inflation and would impose a crushing burden on millions of Americans.

Congress has already laid out an orderly timetable for the removal of the remaining controls on newly discovered natural gas. This cautious approach will still provide the capital and incentives necessary for increased gas production. It has the added advantage of cushioning the inflationary effects of decontrol, and of allowing homeowners a reasonable period in which to adjust their household budgets to reflect anticipated doubling or tripling of prices.

For the poor, the elderly, the people dependent on fixed incomes, the cost of abrupt decontrol of natural gas prices would be literally unbearable.

There's too much important work on the economy and on energy for Congress and the President to do in the next few months without a bitter and divisive fight over decontrol. This resolution is a message to the President: "Don't waste your time or ours on an issue that Congress has already studied, debated, and decided."●

IN THE COUNTRY IN OTHER THAN LEGAL STATUS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, last year in this Chamber we debated the merits of the Census Bureau's widely publicized effort to seek out and count illegal aliens in the decennial census, for the purpose of reapportionment.

Some of us criticized the Carter administration's strenuous efforts to augment the count of those who are in this country in violation of our immigration laws. My colleagues no doubt recall that some in that administration even recorded special television and radio messages, while then-Attorney General Civiletti ordered a suspension of enforcement of the law, while pledging that census data on illegal aliens would "not be sought by, accepted by, or divulged to the Immigration and Naturalization Service or any other arm of the Department of Justice."

There was considerable debate at the time as to whether or not the Census Bureau could determine who was an illegal alien, or to use the former administration's term, "undocumented alien." The Census Bureau maintanined such a determination was not possible, hence illegal aliens were sought out, counted, and we now have the results before us.

The Census Bureau, in its February 23, 1981, press release, announced that—

> The larger 1980 count of Hispanics is a result of improvements in census taking and *improved public relations*, which, in turn, resulted in the inclusion of a sizable but unknown number of persons *in the country in other than legal status.* (Italics are mine.)

The improved public relations efforts were already known about. They apparently served their purpose; illegal aliens were not arrested for violating the law. We do not know how many were counted, but the Census Bureau tells us that a "sizable but unknown number of persons" were included. If they know there was a sizable number, why do they not know how many?

Finally, why beat around the bush with the terminology "in the country

in other than legal status"? Why not just say "illegal aliens"?

The term "undocumented aliens" fascinated me. Shall we call a bank robber a "holder not in due course"? A drug pusher an "unlicensed pharmacist"? Of course, I am not comparing illegal aliens with bank robbers or drug pushers, but the fact is these people are here in violation of the law. Being undocumented, or to use the newest phrase, "in the country in other than legal status," is a consequence of their illegal presence.

I can remember when the prohibition laws were a mockery and led to massive disrespect for law enforcement and the law itself. Are we to treat our laws on immigration the same way? And what do we say to someone who must wait years to emigrate legally to our country? We equate stupidity with abiding by the law.

Now they have been counted. We do not know how many, but the Census Bureau tells us their numbers are sizable.

Their numbers will be included in the numerical base for reapportionment, and our cherished one-man, one-vote principle no longer holds true for American citizens. Distortions in drafting new legislative and congressional districts are inevitable. Being an American citizen has lost its one remaining distinction, and our political base has been eroded by those who are in this country illegally, or to use the Census Bureau's phrase, "in the country in other than legal status."

MY COMMITMENT TO MY COUNTRY

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to first congratulate John Alan Stevens of Dubuque for winning the State competition on the voice of democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I believe that his speech is a real tribute to our Nation's veterans and to our country as a whole. It is for this reason that I would like to share Mr. Stevens' speech with my colleagues:

MY COMMITMENT TO MY COUNTRY

We live in a time that doesn't know hardship or want. My generation has grown up under the infinitely warm wing of protection democracy gives unsacrificingly. Our proud heritage ascended out of the fountain of blood that our brave American veterans sacrificed willingly for us all. I know that not only can I not coast through life without focus, but I know without a hint of a second thought that I have an undeniable commitment to my country to carry on the ever burning torch of righteousness that only America's true believers dare carry.

Our nation was founded in a tumult of shouting where the whisper of wisdom rang out like Gabriel's last stand surely shall. We faced our first test in 1812, only a quarter century after our founding, and we faced it not like a stumbling group of colonies, but as a nation forged in God's cold wrath.

If now we could only know the awe Francis Scott Key felt as the Stars and Stripes emerged out of a dense cannonade smoke, if we only shared the terror Patrick Henry knew in his soul as he put his life on the line between liberty and the crown of England, perhaps then a confused generation would turn from drugs, put down their protest signs and rally behind the Zephyr of Justice.

This confusion stems from the transition we're going through in the United States. At the turn of the century, we were a nation of European refugees escaping tyranny, and as such were ethnically sectored. But now we have lived, shared and fought together for over three generations.

We went through the great depression, as more oppressed people yearning to breathe free, landed in the New York harbors. We put our faith behind Franklin Roosevelt and we even put our freedom on the line as his rebuilding of America meant sacrifice. But wasn't it worth risking on a gamble confronted with losing everything we held dear?

His Socialist-like programs put a kink in our democracy for awhile but it taught us what America was really all about—taking food and clothes to a neighbor in need when you didn't have it to give, and working harder than you ever thought you could for the right cause.

We're overcoming the prejudice of the 1960's and now are all full fledged Americans, far more pre-occupied with pursuing our dreams and aspirations than sloshing through the rut of racial prejudice.

We are all united in this spirit, following justice, equality, opportunity and hard work to their ends. We use all America has for ourselves, and I have a commitment to my country to preserve that spirit, the spirit of an impossible dream envisioned by Thomas Jefferson.

America is still changing, we face a critical re-examination of world dominance as it transforms into world cooperation. The energy crisis among other chronic problems such as pollution, waste disposal and nuclear energy will tax our unity, devotion and ingenuity as Americans to scale the wall of foreshadowed problems affronting us.

To all of this we owe a commitment to be better than our best, to scoff at the median and strive for nothing less than the greatest nation on earth need be represented by.

We are bound to remember what we have—our tremendous prosperity was given to us just as it may be taken away, but it is our freedom that is most dear—its winged spirit is our guiding hope.

The opportunity to make of ourselves what we are able to is the sole salvation of our individuality amidst the people of the world and our own daily grind. The spirit of freedom and justice has kept us great, strong and given us the courage to venture into darkness in search of light. That spirit lies within us all, and it's my commitment to look beyond what I see, and recognize that, once found, that hope leads to the stuff dreams are made of and the will to overcome anything.

We must commit ourselves, as the new generation Americans to preserve that spirit, to work just as our forefathers did—for America in the name of Democracy whenever she calls.

I know what lies ahead, and my duty speaks from within me in my commitment to my country and to the rights of all men.●

MRS. JOHN F. CONROW

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and extreme pride that I take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding and devoted citizen from Roslyn, N.Y.

Mrs. John F. Conrow has been a great asset to the community, serving as a crossing guard at the busy corner of Locust Lane and Round Hill Road for the past 25 years. Her dedication, hard work, and service has provided a safe means by which schoolchildren may be protected from the busy intersection, thus relieving parents' concern.

Anita Conrow began her career after being informed of the need for crossing guards in Nassau County. Before she was assigned a position, she underwent 1 week of intensive training in traffic control at police headquarters in Mineola, N.Y.

Through the year, Mrs. Conrow has developed a code of conduct which incorporates two rules:

First, A smile and a pat on the head will bring more obedience from the youngsters than a scowl and harsh commands.

Second, Nobody rides a bicycle across the street when she is in charge.

Her code has proven to be quite effective, for she claims she has never had any trouble with children, and motorists have always been cooperative.

Through her unselfish dedication to the welfare of the children and the betterment of the community, Anita Conrow had truly enhanced the quality of life in the Roslyn community, and at the same time, earned the respect and admiration of those she so ably serves.●

TRIBUTE TO HARRY WALD, A 1981 HORATIO ALGER

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute a truly great American—one who knows the full meaning of U.S. citizenship. He is Brig. Gen. Harry Wald, ARNG (retired), of Las Vegas, Nev., whose chari-

table and civic activities have enriched the lives of countless thousands, not just in his own State but throughout the Nation.

Harry Wald's life story reads like that of a modern day Horatio Alger. Born in Rheine, Germany, he fled at the age of 13 from the tyranny of Hitler's regime. He obtained his U.S. citizenship in 1943, entered active military duty in World War II, and had a distinguished military career for 33 years.

Serving in military intelligence with the 30th Infantry Division in Comsat in Europe, Harry Wald received numerous decorations for his heroism, including the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, five battle stars, the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and the French and Belgian Fourageres.

Following World War II, he remained active in the Army National Guard, attaining the rank of brigadier general and for 4 years served as assistant adjutant general for the State of Nevada. On June 6, 1980, he was reappointed for a second term as civilian aide to the Secretary of the Army.

Seventeen years ago General Wald was retained as project coordinator and was actively involved in the construction of Caesar's Palace in Las Vegas. By the time the business opened 2 years later, Harry Wald's hard work had earned him a vice-presidency. Later he was promoted to executive vice president and chief operating officer and now he has just been elected president.

While pursuing his business career, Harry Wald has remained active in industry as well as charitable and civic affairs, serving two terms as president of the Nevada Resort Association and also as that industry's representative on the Greater Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce Executive Committee. He also was named by the Nevada Governor to the White House Conference on Balanced National Growth and Economic Development.

Despite the countless hours he spends looking after his business interests, General Wald has always found time to serve others. He has served as general campaign chairman for United Way and is presently its senior vice president; ambassador at large for the Knights of Malta; member of the executive board of the Boy Scouts of America; member of the advisory council of the Clark County Community College; a two-term member of the board of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority; a member of the board of the Las Vegas Symphonic Society; a member of the Association of the U.S. Army, American Legion, Reserve Officers Association, and National Guard Association. He also has been actively involved as a member of the Southern Nevada Drug Abuse Council.

Harry Wald's beautiful wife, Pamela, comes from Abilene, Tex. They have two lovely children, Allyson, 13, and Kerry Lee, 9.

On March 13-14 of this year, hundreds of Harry Wald's friends will be in Nevada for a 2-day celebration honoring him on his promotion to the presidency of Caesar's Palace. This will be a milestone in the distinguished career of an American who has never been too busy to offer a helping hand to a fellow human being.

Therefore, let me offer this special salute to an adopted son of the United States, a distinguished business leader, and a champion of many altruistic causes—Gen. Harry Wald.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 63d anniversary of the independence of the Estonian Republic. It is a bittersweet day for many, as Estonians in the Western Hemisphere are able to celebrate with songs and dances, yet their brothers and sisters living in Estonia proper are barred from participating. It is unfortunate indeed that a people is forbidden to proclaim to the world their anniversary of independence, but this is exactly what is happening now in Estonia, as the Soviet Union continues to crush all vestiges of nationalism.

We are all aware of the fierce fight which the Estonian nation gave the Soviet Union in order to wrest its independence. History has forced the Estonian people to fight for their nation's freedom time and again; the struggle 63 years ago was a successful one, but these noble people were sacrificed to the Russians in 1939, after they had achieved many inroads and successes in forging a free and self-governing nation. Since Soviet occupation during World War II, the people of Estonia have not forsaken their dream that their country will once again be their own. History has shown that, and so the fight continues.

The United States has never recognized the illegal incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union. This fact was recently affirmed at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe being held in Madrid, and it will continue to be a central part of American foreign policy toward the Soviet Union until the day that Estonia and her people are allowed to govern themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the desire of the Estonian people to regain their freedom will never abate. And while the celebrations here will be full of dancing and joyful songs, the knowledge that their countrymen are unable to join them makes this celebration rather hollow. I am certain that one day, this national day of joy will be celebrated by all Estonians, wherever they reside, since their determination to retain their national identity is so strong as to be felt by all of us, including the leaders of the Soviet Union.●

THE SUCCESS OF REAGAN'S ECONOMICS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, George Gilder, the program director of the International Center for Economic Policy Studies, had a superb article in a recent Washington Post.

Mr. Gilder presents the argument that President Reagan's supply side economic policies can—and will—succeed.

I'd like to share Mr. Gilder's remarks with my colleagues, and hope it will help convince them that President Reagan's economic plan will work if given a chance.

WHY REAGAN'S ECONOMICS WILL SUCCEED

(By George Gilder)

Following a splendid series of appointments at the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget, President Reagan's Thursday evening address signified a resounding triumph for supply-side theorists in his administration. As the cautionary tale of Margaret Thatcher's British regime will suggest, however, supply-side theory and monetary restraint can be easier to pronounce than apply.

Thatcher failed to combine her reduction in basic monetary growth rates with a reduction in government taxing and spending. But without spending cuts, tight money merely chokes the private sector. In 1980 and 1981, British manufacturing output is expected to drop by a total of 20 percent, while the obsolescent, inefficient and overmanned British public sector industries absorbed billions of pounds of scarce capital beyond their previously budgeted borrowing levels. Dramatically increasing the need for these bail-outs is the very recession that is at least partly attributable to Thatcher's failure to cut taxes and government spending when she restricted monetary growth.

Now President Reagan has made a seemingly similar commitment to cut tax rates and government spending and to fight inflation by monetary restraint. The possibility naturally arises—indeed, Caroline Atkinson has already predicted it in this newspaper—that Reagan will suffer the same vicious circles of recession and failure.

But Reagan's deeper supply-side convictions—and more committed Cabinet—make this result unlikely. If Congress accepts the three-year schedule for Kemp-Roth, reducing the top tax rate on income to under 38 percent, the benefits will be even more dramatic than Reagan's advisers predict.

The current tax structure, in combination with transfer payments that must be given up as earnings rise, imposes marginal tax

rates of over 50 percent on over half of the earners in America. This means that most Americans can do better by hiding a dollar of existing income than by earning another dollar: a sure formula for a tax system that on the margin loses more revenue than it gains. Moreover, these rates doubly penalize savings, both by deterring the effort to earn the additional dollars that are most likely to be saved and then by taxing the returns at the highest rate.

As has been shown repeatedly in both the United States and Japan, cutting marginal income tax rates will therefore impart twice the stimulus to savings as to consumption. In the lower brackets, people pay off debt and in the upper brackers they leave newly unprofitable tax shelters. Since the U.S. economy is swimming in consumer debt and honeycombed with tax shelters—and since personal savings are near all-time lows—there is vast room for response to substantial cuts in tax rates. The combined benefits of the Reagan programs on revenue, outlays and private savings mean that Kemp-Roth can be enacted without creating unmanageable federal borrowing requirements.

Overseas experience, however, strongly shows that these benefits cannot be achieved through the approach of focusing on corporate tax cuts or through the kind of compromise tax bill reported out of the Senate Finance Committee and now widely supported in Congress. Both Britain and Sweden maintained precisely this combination of high rates on personal income and low rates on corporations during the very years that their productivity plunged and their economies failed. Britain, in fact, has 100 percent one-year depreciation of investments, while Sweden raises just 4 percent of its tax revenue from corporations, less than any other European country and approximately one third of the U.S. proportion.

The result is to concentrate most capital spending within the existing corporate structure and slowly to transform corporations from instruments of production into vessels of disguised consumption. Employees who cannot take money out of the firm without facing confiscatory taxation instead are compensated with company cars, vacation resorts, housing and other perks. These devices tie down workers to particular firms, obstruct entrepreneurship, foster totally spurious "capital formation" and retard productivity and growth.

The world's fast-growing Asian economies, on the other hand, have combined monetary restraint with lower rates of taxation on personal incomes and higher rates on corporations. Japan, for example, has depreciation allowances similar in effect to ours but has far lower marginal rates on comparable levels of personal income, with a top bracket of 70 percent that applies only to earnings over $396,000.

Under current political circumstances, so-called "surgically targeted" tax cuts are particularly perilous in the United States, as in England, because the likely beneficiaries are heavy industries in decline like steel and autos, and housing, already massively subsidized (though the United States has for decades spent an eight-times greater portion of its capital on housing than European countries and a three-times greater share than Japan). The decline of the housing, auto and steel industries portends a desirable shift in the U.S. economy toward vitally needed investments in energy, high technology, sophisticated services and other entrepreneurial ventures. Any effort to retard this change will greatly damage the nation's future.

The one bad portent in Reagan's speech, therefore, is his apparent nostalgia for the days when the United States dominated the world's horizons with industrial smokestacks. Those days are happily gone forever. But as is shown by the British experience—as well as by the effects of the Chrysler bail-out on Ford and General Motors and by the continuing romance of subsidized synfuels—smokestack fetishism can lead rapidly from small doses of "targeted aid," on into the deadly addictions of lemon socialism.

The 1980s can be a period of global economic boom, as the energy prices recede as a result of new efficiencies and natural gas and oil discoveries, and as the full potential of the microcomputer revolution unfolds. But the future can prevail only if governments do not allow themselves to be paralyzed by the claims of the obsolescent past—the stagnant industries, socialist ideologies and government bureaucracies that stand between us and an exciting new decade of discovery and affluence.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DAN LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating the Lithuanian people's valiant fight for freedom during this month which marks the 63d anniversary of the original establishment of a democratic Lithuanian state. Although Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors remain under Soviet domination, the Lithuanian people continue to look resolutely toward the reinstitution of their rights to a free and independent existence.

Following the First World War with the defeat of the Germans and the revolution in Russia, conditions were favorable for Lithuanian independence. In 1917, the German council proclaimed Lithuania an autonomous state and in 1920 Russia signed a peace treaty renouncing all sovereign rights to the nation. For 23 years Lithuania progressed as an independent entity, gaining admittance to the League of Nations and exercising its constitutionally accorded freedoms of speech, assembly, and communication. In 1940, the Germans invaded, the Soviets annexed the Baltic territory, and Lithuania lost its right to self-determination.

The United States recognized the independent Government of Lithuania in 1922 and has since refused to acknowledge the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Today, the United States still actively opposes Soviet suppression of these peoples and aspires to see the blessings of freedom and human liberty restored.

I am proud to join my colleagues and all other free peoples throughout the world in paying tribute to the Lithuanian people's courageous fight for sovereignty. We must never forget their bold struggle against oppression and let it stand as a reminder to all men of the privilege of freedom.●

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment which would require a balanced budget and a limit on Federal spending except in times of war and subject to suspension by the Congress. On February 5, the House approved a bill to increase the limit on the national debt from $935.1 billion to $985 billion. I voted against this public debt limit increase for the reason that to increase the debt ceiling is to ratify fiscally irresponsible behavior. By passing the bill in a business-as-usual manner, this Congress once again signaled its unwillingness to respond to growing public demands to fight inflation by ending budgeting irresponsibility.

My proposal is not a new one. There have been other such proposals. I am not concerned whether my proposal is adopted or some other proposal is adopted. I am merely attempting to provide the impetus for an external force that is needed to compel the Congress in controlling spending. It is time for Congress to break the patterns of the past and bring the Federal budget under control.

The resolution I am introducing provides two methods of controlling Government spending. It contains a balanced budget requirement which restores the link between spending and revenue and reestablishes the historically proven norm in which public officials first determine what resources are available to Government and, against that restraint, choose among, the many competing claims on Government spending. Thus, if the Congress voted new spending programs, it would have to eliminate old programs, or raise additional taxes. There is little doubt that the resistance to the elimination of existing programs or to tax increases would discourage many new spending proposals, thereby eliminating the current bias toward overspending. It would end future deficits and eliminate the inflationary effect of new money creation which has in past years financed these deficits and hit hardest those on fixed income, particularly individuals in the lower and middle economic groups.

Second, the resolution I am introducing restricts Federal expenditures to 20 percent of the gross national product for the previous calendar year. Thus the amount of permitted expenditures is not dependent on any projection of future gross national product. A balanced budget need not prevent future increases in Federal spending, but my spending limitation would successfully place a cap on Federal outlays. Although my spending limitation is a stiff requirement, I believe it should be stiff in order that Congress can demonstrate conclusively that it can discipline itself.

By merging a limit on Government spending into a balanced budget requirement, the size of Government would be limited and the inflationary pressures of Federal deficits would dissolve. Political life would be different from what we know it to be today, but, I believe, much healthier.

Some say that the objectives I seek to accomplish could be achieved by the passage of a simple statute rather than by passing a bill amending the Constitution. However, a provision was enacted in October 1978 which banned deficits in fiscal year 1981 and thereafter. This provision was passed by an overwhelming majority in both the Senate and the House and was signed into law by President Carter. That law has subsequently been ignored, which dramatizes the need for a constitutional amendment.

The constitutional amendment I propose simply reduces the rate of increase of tax revenues and of Government spending to the rate of growth of some broad measure of economic activity. As any such sensible amendment should, my proposal contains an emergency escape hatch. The balanced budget requirement and the spending limit could be set aside for any year by the approval of a concurrent resolution by a majority of the Members in the Senate and in the House for that year. Further, the balanced budget requirement and the spending limit would also be set aside when we are at war.

I believe Government performs best when it provides rules or principles that are as clear and definite as men can make them. This is the purpose of a constitutional amendment that limits the size of Government and the growth of taxes and spending, and this is the purpose that I have attempted to serve with my proposal.●

TRIBUTE TO TOM FLORES

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute and honor a quiet, determined leader in the sports world, a man of talent in human relations and with uncanny ability to mold a group of independent people into a disciplined, well-organized team of champions. That man is Tom Flores, coach of the Oakland Raiders, Super Bowl champions for 1981, and a native of Sanger, a city in central California.

Tom Flores is a man who lets his actions and accomplishments speak for him. Humility is his characteristic, but let no one be mistaken—this quiet man is a strong, tenacious leader of considerable dimension.

Little did Tom, Sr., and Nelly Flores realize that their "quiet boy who no one knew was around" should make such a mark in the world of sports.

From humble beginnings Tom Flores emerged an all-around athlete in high school and an honor student. He was senior class president and captain of the football team. Although he was offered many athletic scholarships, Tom chose to pursue his higher education on a scholastic scholarship.

An all-American football player in junior college and college; selected to play in the East-West Shrine game; most valuable player for Oakland in 1966; Super Bowl rings in 1970 and 1977, the honors go on and on. True to himself, Tom Flores succeeded in his own quiet way.

He is an inspiration to us all, a person who gets things done by doing them. As the World Champion Oakland Raiders point out unanimously: "Tom Flores is the quiet guy who made us champions."●

MISREADING MIDDLE EAST ISSUES

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

●Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in today's RECORD a perceptive New York Times letter to the editor by Mr. Ivan J. Novick, president of the Zionist Organization of America, concerning the false perception among many nations that oil prices are linked to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Mr. Novick's analysis shows that relations between Arab States and the world's oil importers are merely commercial and have nothing to do with the Arab-Israeli conflict. He also notes that the most destabilizing factor in the Middle East is not the Arab-Israeli conflict, but the continued divisiveness of the Arab nations as well as the relationship between the terrorist PLO and Moscow.

The entire world has much to lose by misreading the issues of the Middle East. I praise Mr. Novick for bringing to our attention some popular myths, and I commend his letter to the attention of my colleagues:

JAPAN'S MISREADING OF THE PALESTINIAN PROBLEM

To the EDITOR:

In his review of Japanese policy toward the Persian Gulf area [Op-Ed Feb. 2], Prof. Michael M. Yoshitsu succeeds in reaffirming the axiom that a myth, if repeated often enough, is accepted as reality.

Japan, evidently unable to distinguish between myth and reality, is recklessly following the stratagem of the European Common Market countries. Convinced that they must ingratiate themselves with Arab producers of petroleum and Arab consumers of industries, they now proceed to undermine the Camp David Agreements and to adopt policies harmful to Israel, America's ally in the Middle East.

Without factual justification, Japan and other nations have concluded that peace and stability in the Middle East depend on solving the so-called Palestinian issue. The reality is that the relationships of the Arab states with Japan or other nations are purely commercial; they consist of economic transactions that have no connection whatsoever with the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Why then should Japan and the European countries, which have so much to lose by misreading the Palestinian problem, victimize Israel and in the process appease the Soviet-dominated P.L.O.? Gen. Alexander M. Haig, Jr., in an address made in Miami Beach on Oct. 27, 1979, spelled out the issues in concise terms:

"Will the price of oil be stabilized by a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict? A resounding 'No.' The link between an Arab-Israeli settlement and oil prices is at best tenuous.

"First, not all members of OPEC are Arab. Second, oil prices are determined by supply, demand and the value of the dollar, not by the issue of who rules Jerusalem. Third, to speak of such a link is dangerous not only to us but also to the leading Arab oil producers themselves. Fourth, how can one be considered to be a superpower if foreign policies are distorted solely by domestic needs?

"Linking oil needs and prices to foreign policy only invites more dictation by radical or anti-American states. This is not in our interest, nor is it in the interest of such states as Saudi Arabia."

Mr. Yoshitsu referred to the Iranian-Iraqi war to vindicate Japan's policy favoring the Arabs and the P.L.O. Astonishingly, he sees this as a great unifying force in the area, when in fact this conflict has demonstrated that pan-Arabism is a fictional concept. The Arab states are hopelessly divided; some support Iraq, and others, like Syria, Libya, South Yemen and the P.L.O., side with Iran.

The lesson Mr. Yoshitsu should learn is that the instability of the Middle East continues to be caused by the internal restiveness of the masses, submerged in poverty and not afforded the opportunity to determine their own destiny. In such a climate, radical and anarchistic movements are skillfully orchestrated by the Soviet Union in its efforts to further expand its ambitions and its influences.

The P.L.O. is the most sophisticated element in this Soviet design. Armed and trained by the Soviet Union, the P.L.O. holds a "Sword of Damocles" over the heads of all Arabia. Although primary attention has been focused on the "Palestinian issue," it is the Soviet-P.L.O. partnership that constitutes the real danger in the area.

Professor Yoshitsu would do an important service if he advised Foreign Minister Ito that capitulation to the terrorist P.L.O. is not the answer to the aspirations of the Japanese people or the democratic world.

IVAN J. NOVICK,
President, Zionist Organization of America.●

ON THE 63D ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTONIAN PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 63d anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the Republic of Estonia, a country whose all-too-short life of freedom was snuffed out by Soviet occupation in 1940.

Since then, the people of Estonia and their compatriots abroad have kept alive the dream of a free and independent homeland. Through their courage, sacrifice, and dedication, they have not let the world forget that Estonia is still a slave nation, deprived of its separate voice by the Soviet aggression of the past 41 years.

The struggle of the Estonians is not a decades-old footnote of history, but rather a tragic fact of life even to this day. In Estonia, human rights violations are a daily occurrence, as the Soviet invaders suppress even the most basic of freedoms and imprison those who dare to protest. The Helsinki accords which gave the world hope for improved conditions for captive nations such as Estonia are only a cruel joke for Estonians who every day live the Soviet nightmare.

But the world has not forgotten them, and we refuse steadfastly to recognize the legitimacy of the Soviet presence in Estonia. Meanwhile, in the United States and all over the globe, Estonians and their descendants keep alive the traditions, heritage, and aspirations of their beloved homeland. They know, as do we who today honor their country, that one day Estonia will again be free.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a part of this tribute to a gallant nation which serves as an inspiring reminder to us all. Freedom is a very precious treasure, easily lost if not jealously guarded. The people of Estonia lost theirs under the force of overwhelming arms, yet that event alone cannot stamp out their love of liberty. They have kept the spirit of Estonian independence alive for over four decades. The people of the United States and the entire world marvel at this courage and steadfastness, and I am proud to join the ranks of those wishing Estonia and its people well.●

HONORS 63D ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1981

● Mr. DeNARDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my colleagues in honoring the 63d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Estonia on February 24.

In 1918, Estonians fought a successful war of independence against the invading Bolshevik Russians. Freedom brought economic, cultural, and social advancements to Estonia.

Unfortunately, this freedom was short-lived, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania lost their sovereignty during World War II. These three Baltic countries were forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R. after the Russian forces invaded them in 1940 as a result of the Hitler-Stalin pact.

This illegal annexation not only terminated Estonia's independence, but led to massive slaughter and deportations. Human rights violations by the Soviet regime in Estonia continue to this day. The United States must vehemently oppose such treatment.

I strongly urge that all Americans join with the Estonian people in celebrating their independence day and in working toward the day when Estonians can enjoy the freedoms that Americans too often take for granted.●

EDUCATION AND LABOR

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the RECORD my legislative summary of education and labor issues during the 96th Congress.

The Education and Labor Committee on which I serve dealt with a wide range of education and work-related issues in the 96th Congress. As a member of three subcommittees—Employment Opportunities, Labor-Management Relations, and Postsecondary Education—I was able to play an important role in developing legislation to address many such issues, including higher education, elimination of asbestos from our Nation's schools, educational testing, prohibiting discrimination against homosexuals in employment and housing, employment for artists, and discrimination against the aged.

Perhaps the most important legislation that emerged from this committee to become law this session was the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Comprised of programs which make up the principal Federal effort to assist colleges, universities, and students, this legislation authorizes $48 billion for Federal higher education programs through 1985. Enacted in October, the bill expands existing, successful student loan and grant programs, and provides new assurances against possible fraud and defaults.

For the first time, the act makes federally guaranteed loans available to parents of undergraduate students. Through an amendment I sponsored, some financial aid will be available for students who attend less than half time. This will help to insure access to schooling for an estimated 11 million students above the traditional student age of 22 who previously may have been unable to enroll, or chosen not to do so. Other amendments, I offered, which the committee adopted will provide grants to schools of education to train teachers to be placed in new fields such as education for the handicapped, gifted, and with Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs, and others.

The CETA program received a great deal of attention during the 96th Congress. By working closely with officials of the Labor Department and the White House, I helped some 10,000 New York City CETA employees extend their jobs beyond their original date of termination. I was also able to be of assistance to the city in obtaining an additional $45 million in CETA moneys targeted for public service jobs which had not been spent by other localities. More than 1,200 older workers were able to continue in their public service jobs in 1980 as a result of an amendment I offered to CETA, and by extensive negotiation with the Labor Department for funding.

The employment of our Nation's youth, and especially minority youths, is one of the most crucial legislative areas that Congress must address. In the 95th Congress I helped rewrite the current youth employment legislation. This session, the Education and Labor Committee considered a number of proposals, including two of my own—the Full Youth Employment Act and an expansion of the targeted jobs tax credit—in addition to the Carter administration's youth employment and education initiative. However, the legislation, which included aspects of my proposals, was not enacted. With the unemployment rate for youth over 17 percent nationwide, and 30 percent in New York City, this is a critical issue for the 97th Congress.

The committee also considered a welfare reform package which would have provided almost 1 million new job opportunities. Unfortunately, this also lacked a broad base of support and the legislation was not enacted.

The problem of employer pressure and intimidation of an employee in the workplace has been a prime concern of the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations. Issues raised during hearings in these areas included management's use of lie detector tests, psychological examinations, sexual harassment, and consultants for union busting. A focal point of these hearings was a bill I introduced after a subcommittee visit to the J. P. Stevens textile plant in North Carolina. On that tour we found that an "employee educational association" was engaged in opposing alleged unionization on behalf of the company. My bill would simply require disclosure of the financial sources of these so-called employee organizations.

This same subcommittee drafted a bill which deals with the termination insurance provisions of multiemployer pension plans. An amendment I offered which would enhance the economic well-being of the entertainment industry was adopted by the committee. The amendment permits employers in this industry to make payments into a pension plan only during the run of their productions or engagements. This bill was enacted into law in September 1980.

Also enacted was legislation I cosponsored with Congressman GEORGE MILLER, Democrat of California, providing grants and loans totaling $130 million for inspection and elimination of hazardous asbestos in public and private elementary and secondary schools. In New York City alone, over 150 schools needed some type of repair due to this problem.

In November, the Congress adopted a 3-year extension of child nutrition programs which include summer food service and the women's infant and children's feeding program (WIC). Under the summer feeding program, for example, over 4 million lunches were served to school age children in New York City alone.

The Education and Labor Committee also has jurisdiction over the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This act funds State, local government, and agency programs which aid in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, and improve the juvenile justice system.

With Congressman HENRY WAXMAN, and 50 other cosponsors, I reintroduced legislation to end discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The Subcommittee on Employment opportunities held hearings on the bill in October 1980 in California. These amendments to the Civil Rights Act, if adopted, would prohibit discrimination against homosexual individuals in housing, employment, education, and public accommodations.

The massive influx of immigrants from Cuba and Haiti in 1980 also came to the attention of the committee. It was feared that this large, unanticipated flow of refugee children into local schools could place a severe financial burden on local school districts. In response, the Congress adopted a committee bill which provides an estimated $21 million per year in financial assistance to schools which enroll a large number of these refugee children.

The White House Conference on Library and Information Services held in Washington in November 1979 focused national attention on the continuing importance of libraries within our communities. One of the most significant achievements of the Conference was a proposal for new and comprehensive legislation for libraries. The National Library and Information Services Act would provide for coordination of interlibrary resource sharing and to expand the Federal Government's support of public library services for all segments of the population. The legislation is designed to replace the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) which will expire at the end of fiscal year 1982. As a member of the committee which has jurisdiction over this legislation, I hope to be actively involved in its development.

Funding for public libraries under title I of LSCA for fiscal year 1981 remained at $62,500,000, the same amount as that appropriated during the past 2 years. The failure to increase Federal funds for public libraries has had harsh effects on the New York Public Library, forcing curtailed hours and staff reductions in many of the branch libraries.

The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education held extensive hearings on my legislation—H.R. 4949—to establish a national truth-in-testing law similar to that passed in New York State in 1979. The bill is a disclosure measure requiring the testing companies which administer standardized tests for college and graduate school admissions to open their studies of testing to public review, and to guarantee students access to their answer sheets along with the test questions and correct answers. It is not an attempt to create a Government testing system, nor would it appreciably increase the industry's costs. It would be, however, a major step toward reform of an industry with powerful influence over millions of lives. I plan to reintroduce this legislation and actively pursue its passage in the new Congress.●

THE HONORABLE ELLA T. GRASSO

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Gov. Ella T. Grasso.

While Mrs. Grasso served in a State across the continent from my own, I know that she always had the admiration and love of my constituents. Therefore, I know the whole country must have felt the same way. But the people of Connecticut must feel a very special loss, and I pay tribute to them, as well, not only for the burden they must now bear but also for having had the wisdom in the first place to have elected Mrs. Grasso twice as their Governor, in addition to other offices, including membership in this body.

Ella Grasso was an extremely effective Governor. But she was a national symbol as well. As the first woman elected Governor of a State in her own right, and as a woman with her own family, she proved the enormous capacity of women all over our Nation to live rich and rewarding lives both in and outside of the home. In part because of her pioneering role, the election of women to high political office will, some day, no longer be unusual or even remarked upon in our country.

Mr. Speaker, Ella Grasso was a wise Governor whose constituents truly loved her. At a time when politicians in general were held in low esteem, she stood as an example to the people that the art of governing is not only vital to our society but also a worthy professional goal. Even in her last days, she showed the courage and good humor that had always been her trademarks. The Nation owes her a debt of gratitude.

At this time, I would also like to express my sympathy to Ella Grasso's family. We all know that family life for elected officials creates unique pressures. But her husband and children have maintained the kind of dignity that is increasingly difficult to hold onto in today's society, and they do tribute to Mrs. Grasso's memory.●

THOUGHTS FOR OUR NEW PRESIDENT

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, although these thoughts were given before the inauguration, I still think they are important today.

I would like to share with you the sermon of Dr. Frank Harrington, the pastor of the Peachtree Presbyterian Church in Atlanta. I hope you will find his thoughts to be as inspiring as I did.

JANUARY 18, 1981.

DEAR MR. REAGAN—OR SOME THOUGHTS FOR OUR NEW PRESIDENT

"* * * How long will these people despise me? Will they never believe me, even after all the miracles I have done among them?" Numbers 14:11 (The Living Bible)

On Tuesday, January 20, at about high noon, Ronald Reagan will lift his right hand and take the oath of office. It takes about a minute for the torch to pass! The Chief Justice of the United States, The Honorable Warren Burger, will then say to the nation and to the world:

"* * * Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States * * *"

Immediately in front of the inaugural stand a military band will play, "Hail to the Chief" and the National Anthem and the twenty-one gun salute will sound. As the new president steps to the podium, he will begin his inaugural address * * * his first public statement as the President of the United States.

At precisely that same moment * * * when the mantle of leadership has been passed, James Earl Carter, the thirty-ninth President of the United States, will step back into history and will reverse his steps * * * moving from the Potomac to Plains. From the moment that he takes office until he is defeated in an election, or voluntarily declines to run for office again, or in the ways of Providence is prevented from serving * * * Ronald Reagan will assume the privileges, the powers, and the burdens of the most powerful position on the face of this earth!

I have attended two inaugurals, and there is much about the simplicity and straightforwardness of that event for which we can be grateful.

* * * It is, for example, a peaceful transition! In many places on the face of this earth, government is changed with a palace coup and a hail of bullets. The naked seizure of power and control is the order of the day * * * usually accompanied by much bloodshed, for men do not relinquish power easily!

* * * It is a transition prescribed by constitutional means! All the people know that the power has passed and how the power is transferred! In Russia, for example, leadership is determined by the infighting and control of the levers of power behind the Kremlin wall. It is leadership determined by "intrigue and deceit" and the emerging leader has demonstrated the law of the jungle * * * the survival of the fittest! In this nation a change in government reflects the will of the people.

* * * We can be grateful that in taking the oath of office Mr. Reagan, from that moment, becomes "our president" not the Republican President. He is the leader of all the people * * * and it is our duty and our responsibility to remember him in our prayers and to support him in his best efforts to lead our nation. It has disturbed me immensely that in recent years we seem to have lost our respect for the office of the presidency. Granted, we have had men occupy that office who were not worthy of it, but that does not alter your responsibility and mine as good citizens of this country to look up to it and to uphold the leaders of this nation in our prayers and in our efforts.

Now let's turn for a moment from the banks of the Potomac to a remote place in the wilderness called Kadesh! Moses had led the children of Israel out of Egypt and here two years later, after wandering around, they were on the verge of achieving their destiny! From slavery to freedom is a long march! Moses had listened to their complaints and their murmuring and the desire always to go back * * * to go back to Egypt * * * but now they stood on the border of the promised land!

All the promises that God had made to them about becoming a "nation" were about to come true. Moses, as any wise leader would do, sent spies to determine both potential and the peril of going forward before moving into the land. The spies were gone for forty days and when they returned their report was mixed * * *

* * * They agreed that the land was rich and bountiful. They described it as a place flowing with milk and honey and brought back fruit and produce to prove their point! It was a land of promise and great potential.

* * * It was also a land of peril and danger! The people who inhabited the land were powerful and warlike, and were described as giants.

The record states that they were panic-stricken when they saw them, and said * * *

"* * * We seemed as grasshoppers in our own eyes * * * they were so big!"

It is at this point that a serious problem develops! The twelve spies agreed unanimously on both the promise and the peril of the land before them, but there was disagreement on what they should do next! Ten of the twelve said * * *

"* * * We cannot take the land. The inhabitants are too strong! They live in fortified cities! They are too entrenched in their positions!"

Only Joshua and Caleb felt differently, and so they filed a minority report which in essence said * * *

"* * * Let's get moving, for we are well able to possess the land!"

It was Joshua who pled with the people to get moving! He said * * *

"* * * Do not rebel against the Lord and do not fear the people of the land * * * the Lord is with us and he has removed his protection from them! Don't be afraid of them!" (Numbers 14:9)

The people were in panic; they wanted to go back; they wanted to stone Joshua for making such a ridiculous proposal! It was one of those classic moments in history when the majority ruled, but the majority was wrong! On the brink of achieving their destiny, the people faltered and their faith gave way to fear!

I believe on Tuesday * * * with the inauguration of our fortieth president * * * that we shall either make a new beginning as a nation or we shall accelerate our downward slide. Our new President will immediately be faced with the enormous and oftentimes exaggerated expectations of the people! Given the landslide proportion of his election, I believe the enormity of the expectations that are facing Mr. Reagan, is his greatest danger in the early days of his leadership. We need to remember that he comes to office at a time when there are many problems facing this nation that are not of his own making.

Judge Bell, who became Attorney General in the last administration, tells a story that illustrates the point. Someone asked him what it was like to be Attorney General. This is the story he told:

A man appeared before a judge for drunk and disorderly conduct and for setting his bed on fire. The judge said, "How do you plead?"

The man said, "There ain't no question about it, I was drunk and disorderly. But your Honor, the bed was on fire when I got in it."

So, Mr. President * * * As you assume office I would like for you to remember three words. The first word is * * *

I. PROMISE

You were elected by an enormous mandate of the people. Your election was overwhelming. You have behind you the expressed will of the people to initiate changes, sweeping changes, and so your assumption of office is fraught with great promise! You will shortly realize, though, that it is easier to promise than to perform! Campaign rhetoric often fades with pragmatic reality hammering at you day after day! It would be well for you to remember, Mr. President, the often quoted words of Robert Frost * * *

"We have promises to keep and miles to go before we sleep!"

There are many who believe that this nation is in decline, that the western world has had its ascendancy, that we have lost our will to claim the promise that is ours! Some words of Sir William Watson have come back to haunt me in recent days as I have thought about this sermon and about our nation. Watson wrote:

"* * * Outwardly splendid as of old;
Inwardly sparkless, void and cold;
Her force and fire are all spent and gone,
Like the dead moon, she still shines on * *"

We have our problems, but we must remember our promise! The resources of our people * * the bounty of our land * * the creative genius inherent in many of our people * * our educational system * * the inventive capacity of our technology * * and the great talents of our people, collectively! All these resources must be summoned again and directed by a new sense of national will! Like the children of Israel, we stand on the verge of the promised land if we will move forward. It is only when our hearts grow cold with fear that our way becomes confused!

An English mother once said to her friends who came to offer their condolences when her son was killed in the Battle of Britain * * *

"Why do you commiserate with me? He lived for twenty happy years and then died for England. What better could he had done with his life than that?" (Footnote No. 1)

It is that kind of determined spirit * * that kind of faith * * that needs rekindling for us to claim the promise that is ours as a nation! The president of our nation is the nation's chief cheerleader. He can, by example, lift us above the pettiness of partisan politics and articulate for us again the vision that our fathers had for us and enable us to keep our promises before we sleep!

In 1776 John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson were on a committee to design the great seal of the United States. They decided to have the Latin words "E Pluribus Unum" stamped across the face of the seal.

"Out of many, one!"

The thirteen colonies that were then coming together to form a nation were diverse * * * competitive * * * and different in their aims and objectives. But there was one overriding thing that bound them together * * * they all wanted to be free!

"Out of many, one." * * * That has never been fully achieved, in my judgment. It has always been more of a dream than a reality, but it is a mighty dream that can lift us. As we join hands together, let's not blame everything on our "President." When he fails, we all have failed and lost * * * When he succeeds, we all have won! Remember, Mr. President, the word "promise" but, secondly, the word * * *

II. PERIL

This is a time of great danger! The perception in the world of power is that we are weak * * * that we no longer have the will to be a great nation in the world of power! Many believe like Adolph Hitler who said "* * * I don't see much future for the Americans."

Some of our people * * * and our politicians * * * are as naive as H. L. Mencken who wrote in the twenties * * *

"* * * The American Republic, as nations go, has led a safe and easy life, with no serious enemies, either within or without, and no grim struggle with want." (Footnote No. 2)

I am not sure that that statement has ever been true * * * I am positive that it is not true today. We have enemies within and without! We have serious problems that need to be addressed at home and abroad, and in my lifetime and in the lifetime of many of you who are here today, we are going to experience as a people a struggle with want! It is, Mr. President, a time of peril!

* * * Our cities are decaying!

* * * There is a rising rage among the poor!

* * * Inflation is running rampant. Newsweek, in a cover article this week said:

"Federal spending is running wildly out of control. Like some crazed creature from a science fiction fantasy, the already bloated budget continues to balloon, feeding on the very mechanisms that are supposed to govern it and smothering growth in other sectors of the economy. The figures are staggering. Since 1966 federal expenditures have exploded from 134 million to more than 660 billion * * * More than 75 percent of federal spending falls into the uncontrollable category * * *" (Footnote No. 3)

* * * The auto industry, one of the basic industries of this nation, is on the ropes.

* * * Unemployment is growing more and more severe!

* * * The pressure of the tightening screws from OPEC and the oil cartel is pinching us more and more.

* * * Renewed Soviet power and adventurous mischief-making has us under a full court press around the world!

* * * A game of brinkmanship is still being played in the Middle East as war rages between Iraq and Iran * * * and as 52 Americans are still held hostage in a criminal outrage without precedent in diplomatic history!

It's a time of peril for us as a nation * * * and we would be naive not to face the facts! You will be called upon in the future to be patient and to exercise restraint * * * to sacrifice and to serve! As the children of Israel found out as they stood on the border of the promised land, one does not waltz his way into his destiny! There are problems to be dealt with here at home every day. On the average day in America * * *

* * * There are 2,986 divorces granted.

* * * Drunk Drivers do 18 million dollars worth of damage.

* * * Prime time television is watched by 88 million persons and a lot of it is pure garbage.

* * * 2,740 kids run away from home.

* * * Over 2,700 teen-age girls get pregnant.

* * * 63,288 automobiles are involved in accidents and 120 persons are killed.

* * * 1,070 people die of cancer.

* * * 63,493 teen-agers come down with venereal disease! (Footnote No. 4)

Oh, friends, we have our problems * * * and all of them cannot be blamed on the president! We tend to do that * * * we find a surrogate villain and we say, with the help of the media, "If you had done better we would not be in this predicament." Like the children of Israel, as they saw the giants in the land of promise * * * they immediately wanted to go back to Egypt. They thought of stoning their leader who had brought them to such a God-forsaken place!

In the novel, "The King Must Die," by Mary Renault, the story is told of the mythical kingdom of Naxos and their bloody political system. Every year the ruling king fought a stranger and died. The stranger became king for a year and then lost his crown and his life, and the people celebrated. It sometimes seems that we are following that same form of government in this country. We pile exaggerated hopes on our president and when he inevitably fails and does not measure up, we destroy him! (From a column by Anthony Lewis in the Atlanta Constitution, Friday, January 16, 1981)

A Seattle lawyer once interrupted his lengthy cross examination of a witness, turned with indignation to the judge and said:

"Your Honor, one of the jurors is asleep!"

The judge replied:

"You put him to sleep, you wake him up!"

Every single one of us has played some part in the moral bankruptcy of the modern world, most frequently by what we are not doing for the common good of all. There is not one of us who has not contributed to the deterioration which we see on all sides—directly or through our sins of omission! It is only fair that we should now join hands and do our best to reverse the trend of things * * * to renew our march toward our destiny! (Page 21, "Three Minutes a Day.")

We collectively share the burden of our perils! We are collectively responsible for the moral muddle of our time! The perils of our time will call forth our best efforts and we will have to be supportive and patient!

Remember, Mr. President, the words "promise" and "peril" * * * but, thirdly, the word,

III. PURPOSE

This is what the children of Israel forgot in their fear! They forgot the great purpose of faith that had brought them out of the land of Egypt, from a life of bondage, and had set their bare feet on the road to freedom. They let their fears drown out the resources of faith, and because it happened they were doomed to wander for forty more years in the wilderness until that generation died. And they deserved it! God cannot build a worthy nation on fear! He cannot build a great church with a timid people! The people must have faith in him and go forward!

"Ain't this a terrible world, O Lord!
Ain't this a terrible world, O Lord!
Where's there quiet, where's there peace, O Lord?
There's moaning and sighing and hating and lying,
There's shouting and crying and shooting and dying
Where's there pity, where's there love, O Lord?
You say there's a place called journey's end,
A place called heaven, too,
Where we are all each other's friend,
And there ain't no work to do!
Why, thank you, Lord, thank you! That's very encouraging.
O Lord, show me that place
That you're telling me of,
Where there ain't no creed or race,
And all is brotherly love.
What's that you say, Lord?
I've got to spread the brotherly love down here,
To poor sinners, before I gets the call?
Yes, Lord!" (Footnote No. 5)

You see, there is work to be done here * * * where you live * * * where I live! We have to remember the purposes of God that have led us thus far and get moving! It is a plaintive, frustrating word from God that serves as our text for today. When the people refused to move forward because of fear, having forgotten the resources of faith, the Lord God Almighty said * * *

"How long will these people despise me? Will they never believe me, even after all the miracles I have done among them?" (Numbers 14:11—The Living Bible)

We all need to remember how God has led us in the past and how his promises have been sure and brought us security! It is as we have looked to him that we have been at our best!

Theodore Roosevelt and a friend frequently walked together in the evening. As was their custom, they would look up into the heavens and one of them would say * * *

"That is the spiral galaxy in Andromeda.
It is as large as our Milky Way.
It is one of a hundred million galaxies.
It is 750,000 light years away.
It consists of one hundred billion suns, each larger than our sun."

Then after a quiet interval, Theodore Roosevelt would say * * *

"Now, I think we are small enough! Let's go to bed!"

We need to realize how small we are and how great God is, and look full into his face and walk with him as a people! Harry Emerson Fosdick put it this way * * *

"Not so much what life brings to us in her hands as what we bring to life in our spirits makes the difference between people."

Mr. President, citizens one and all * * * our promise and our peril * * * is related to our adherence to and belief in the purposes of God! If we look to him and have faith we will fulfill our promise and all will yet be well! If we turn our backs on him and seek in our own strength and resources to deal with our peril, then we are doomed!

"What makes a nation great?
Not serried ranks with flags unfurled
Not armored ships that gird the world,
Not hoarded wealth, nor busy mills,
Not cattle on a thousand hills,
Not sages wise, nor schools, nor laws,
Not boasted deed in freedom's cause * * *
All these may be, and yet the state
In the eye of God be far from great.
That land is great which knows the Lord,
Whose songs are guided by his word;
Where justice rules, twixt man and man,
Where love controls in art and plan;
Where breathing in his native air,
Each soul finds joy in praise and prayer,
Thus may our country, good and great,
Be God's delight * * * man's best estate." (Footnote No. 6)

May it be so! May it be so!

Footnotes at end of article.

PRAYER

"We give thanks, our Father, for these moments together. And we ask that you would bless us and move us toward a better exercise of citizenship so that we might make our Nation a nation under God. Bless our new president and help us to walk with him for the good of all * * * For the glory of God." Amen.

W. FRANK HARRINGTON, TH. M., D.D.

FOOTNOTES

1. From "Questions People Ask," by Robert J. McCracken. Published by Harper and Brothers.
2. From "The Royal Bank of Canada Monthly Letter," volume 60, Number 8, August, 1979.
3. From "Newsweek," January 19, 1981, pp. 34 and 37.
4. From "Presbyterian Outlook," p. 9, November 17, 1980.
5. From "The Secret of Abundant Living," by Charles L. Allen, p. 99. Published by Fleming H. Revell Company, Old Tappan, N.J. 1980.
6. From "Dynamic Living for Difficult Days," by Fred M. Wood. Published by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn., 1973—p. 71.●

HOUSING AND ECOMOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the RECORD my legislative summary of housing and ecomomic development issues during the 96th Congress.

HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ISSUES IN THE 96TH CONGRESS

The 96th Congress completed action last year on major legislation reauthorizing the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980. The bill authorizes funding for the community development block grant (CDBG) and urban development action grant (UDAG) programs for 3 years, and provides approval necessary to continue HUD's assisted housing programs and rehabilitation loan programs.

Community development block grants have significantly improved the ability of cities to deal with the continued problems of housing, neighborhood conservation, and community revitalization. The Congress authorized $3.8 billion for this program in 1981 which will increase to $4.1 billion in 1983. Of this amount, New York City was expected to receive $270 million in 1981 for in rem housing programs, rehabilitation aid for low- and moderate-income people, and other service programs such as arson prevention and sanitation.

Funds were also approved under this legislation for urban development action grants through 1983. In the last several years the program has enabled many distressed communities to make progress in stimulating the private economic investment necessary to create jobs and strengthen local economies. Up to 20 percent of these funds may also be used in otherwise ineligible communities containing pockets of poverty, a provision which extends the benefits of the program to additional needy neighborhoods. New York City has received $59 million under 26 such grants in the last 3 years.

I am pleased to report that an extremely damaging provision in the Housing and Community Development Act affecting predominantly urban areas was eliminated during joint House/Senate consideration of the bill. The amendment would have excluded any city with rent control laws from participating in a new multifamily housing initiative, originally included in the act. Members of Congress representing New York City joined with me in voicing our strongest opposition to this discriminatory measure which was subsequently dropped from the bill.

Housing loan and rent subsidy programs geared to low and moderate income dwellers were also authorized under the act. Section 312 rehabilitation loans were authorized for 2 years at a level of $144 million in fiscal years 1981 and 1982. The program subsidizes interest rates for loans used to rehabilitate residential and nonresidential properties. An increase in the maximum loan amounts allowable under section 312 was approved from $27,000 to $33,000. The section 8 subsidy program was authorized in the bill making funds available to low-income renters. This program requires tenants to pay 25 percent of their income for rent, with Federal subsidies compensating landlords for the remainder of the rental payments. New York City is expected to receive $170 million in 1981 under the section 8 program.

Another significant legislative achievement was passage of the National Historic Preservation Act which assures the continuation of the historic preservation fund through 1987. The bill reaffirms the important Federal commitment to historic preservation and provides better definitions of and guidance to State and local governments. The bill also establishes a National Buildings Museum in the beautiful old Pension Building in Washington, D.C.

The failure of the Senate to act on the Fair Housing Act amendments forces the postponement of what has been called the most significant civil rights legislation of the last decade. Passed by the House in June 1980, this bill would have established administrative procedures through which the Fair Housing Act could have been inexpensively and expeditiously enforced. Pressure by special interest groups affected by the legislation stalled the bill in the Senate, where it died during the last days of the 96th Congress. Although the Senate Republican leadership has promised to make it a priority when the new Congress convenes, civil rights advocates were keenly disappointed that these amendments are still not law.

During the 96th Congress I joined with other members of the New York State delegation to urge the Internal Revenue Service to support a State decision regarding the tax treatment of rental property. A bill passed in the New York State Legislature allowed landlords to itemize their costs including property taxes in their rent bills to tenants who could then deduct this amount from their taxes. Residential tenants in New York, and in other parts of the country as well, are subject to economic discrimination because they are denied the tax advantage of real property deductions enjoyed by homeowners. The IRS argued that a Federal law was necessary to accomplish this change. I will continue to support this rightful deduction for renters and work for legislation with the goal in the 97th Congress.

Escalating fuel costs in recent years have hit especially hard at lower income families and those living on fixed incomes. Low income energy assistance to aid these citizens was included in the windfall profits tax legislation passed in March 1980. The provision authorizes $3.1 billion for fiscal year 1981 for a program of block grants to the States to provide assistance to needy families for heating and cooling costs. In addition, States may give aid, regardless of income, to households which receive food stamps, AFDC, veterans pensions, or SSI.

As a member of the congressional travel and tourism caucus I have been particularly involved with issues affecting the tourism industry. More than 6.5 million Americans are employed in travel and tourism related jobs making it the third largest retail industry in the United States. Of all the industries in New York, tourism is now the most important. As the gateway to America for more than 30 percent of all visitors from abroad, New York City hosts more than 17.5 million visitors each year. The 96th Congress officially recognized the social and economic importance of tourism and efforts will continue in the 97th Congress to promote and support this vital segment of our economy.

In recent years the rate of inflation has often exceeded the interest rates on savings accounts and taxes on the interest accrued further erodes the value of savings. As a result lower income taxpayers are penalized for being thrifty. Thus, savings accounts not only fail to produce real income for the savers after adjustments for inflation, but the value of the principal

is diminished as well. This is a cruel burden especially for people whose low income makes it difficult to save in the first place. One provision of the 1980 windfall profits tax legislation began to address this inequity by exempting from taxes up to $400 of interest on savings. However, this bill is only effective through 1983. I introduced a bill in the 96th Congress which would broaden and make permanent the exemption for lower income persons up to $1,000 in the case of a single individual earning less than $10,000 and up to $1,500 in the case of married persons filing jointly whose income does not exceed $15,000. I will continue to push for this legislation and any others that would protect small savers from raging inflation and unreasonable taxes.

During the 96th Congress I also introduced legislation which sought to improve living conditions of former mental patients and provide assistance to the communities where they live. Former mental patients, thousands of whom have been deinstitutionalized under changing Federal and State policies, are frequently forgotten once they leave institutions and are left to their own inadequate resources, often becoming prey for violent crime. My legislation would continue supplemental security income (SSI) payments for 3 months after a person is institutionalized, so that the individual's home or apartment can be maintained while he or she is residing in a public facility. The bill would also eliminate the benefit reduction that now occurs when a former patient is receiving some financial support from other persons with whom he or she is living.

Legislation to authorize funds for public works and economic development was passed in 1979, the first year of the 96th Congress. The Economic Development Administration (EDA), created in 1965 to provide grants to poor communities to help lure new business investment to the area or revive failing industries, was authorized by this bill. In addition, the EDA's authority was expanded to offer $2.5 billion in loan guarantees in 1981 and interest subsidies, as well as grants totaling $750 million in 1981 to companies that agreed to locate in needy areas. The bill also extended the Appalachian Regional Development Commission and a network of other regional commissions for 2 more years and established a $2 billion standby local works program if national unemployment rose above 6.5 percent. This program would provide direct grants to help communities build or improve facilities such as water and sewer systems, courthouses, fire stations, and schools. Though passed by the House, a joint House/Senate conference was unable to reconcile differences between the two Houses before the session ended. EDA programs were then continued under a stopgap funding resolution.

Legislation approving Small Business Administration (SBA) programs through 1984 also cleared the 96th Congress. The bill also revised disaster assistance programs administered by the SBA and FmHA, and continued loans for residential and commercial properties. These loan funds are made available to small businesses which do not have a bad credit rating, but which need short-term loans to handle cash flow problems, thus avoiding the high-cost temporary financing. In addition, the legislation authorizes the SBA to make grants through a small business development center pilot program funded at a level of $20 million in 1981.●

PRODUCT LIABILITY RISK RETENTION ACT OF 1981

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Product Liability Risk Retention Act of 1981. This legislation was approved overwhelmingly by both the House and Senate last year, only to fail in the closing moments of the Congress.

It addresses a critical need of many manufacturers, retailers, distributors, and wholesalers in our economy. Product liability insurance rates have risen dramatically, and have caused severe economic distress to many small businesses.

The Interagency Task Force on Product Liability, chaired by the Department of Commerce, recognized product liability insurance ratemaking practices as a severe problem, and proposed legislation to address the problem. Product liability rates have not generally been set by actuarial techniques, but rather through underwriting judgments. Judicial decisions have increased the potential liability of manufacturers and product sellers throughout the 1970's. Premiums collected today must cover all claims resulting from defective products during the policy period, including claims resulting from old products and claims incurred but not reported for several years. Not surprisingly, underwriters have generally exercised their judgment in a conservative fashion because of the extraordinary variables.

The bill would address the problem in two ways. First, it would allow the formation of risk retention groups, which are essentially self-insurance groups. Second, it would allow group purchase of product liability insurance, giving small purchasers some of the advantages of large purchasers. State laws which prohibit either of these practices would be preempted only to allow these two practices.

This legislation is important, and it will be a priority for the Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism in the months ahead. I would urge other Members, as they look at the problems of small businesses in their States, to give this bill their consideration. The problem of product liability insurance must be addressed, and with the interest and suggestions of other Members I am sure a solution such as the one I am proposing today, or another one, can be found.●

RECOGNIZE JERUSALEM AS ISRAEL'S CAPITAL

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced legislation which expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and move its Embassy there. This resolution would simply recognize a fact that has existed since the creation of the State of Israel.

I believe it is vital for the United States to take the lead in supporting the policies of our best ally in the Middle East. We must help Israel resist the pressure that the Arab nations have applied to our allies by using the oil weapon. By relocating our Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, we will send a signal to the world that the United States stands behind the sovereign rights of its democratic allies.

Jerusalem is unique in the search for peace in the Middle East. Its historical, emotional, and international complexities distinguish it from other issues in the conflicts of that region. The future of Jerusalem cannot be decided by drawing a line; Jerusalem must remain a united city in Israel forever. As Mayor Donald Fraser, of Minneapolis, said when he visited Jerusalem:

> You come to Jerusalem and leave it with a clear smell of freedom and a sense of a people who demonstrate compassion and a dedication to human dignity.

The United States must demonstrate its support for Israel's policies on Jerusalem by relocating its Embassy there. I urge my colleagues to join me in this important endeavor by cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 71, which I am including in today's RECORD:

H. CON. RES. 71

A bill expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and that the United States Embassy in Israel should be relocated to Jerusalem

Whereas the city of Jerusalem has been the capital of the State of Israel since Israel's independence was declared in 1948; and

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is the seat of Israel's President, Parliament, and Supreme Court, and the site of numerous government ministries and social and cultural institutions; and

Whereas the city of Jerusalem is predominantly Jewish, and is the spiritual center for Judaism, and of no other religion; and

Whereas it is the sovereign right of the people of Israel to designate the city of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President and Secretary of State should take all necessary steps to bring about—

(1) recognition by the United States of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel; and

(2) relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem.●

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

● Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues in the observation and commemoration of the 63d anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. February 16 is a day to remember the tragedy of Lithuania's lost independence, and to reaffirm our recognition of Lithuania's right to exist as a free and independent nation.

The Lithuanian people should be commended for their nationalistic spirit that cannot be extinguished, despite Soviet annexation of their borders in 1940. Instead they continue to maintain their own culture, language, history, and desire for liberty.

As a nation who struggled for freedom, and the right to become a self-governing nation 204 years ago, the United States has an obligation to encourage these viable, independent, and free-thinking people who wish to live in their nation, with their government, following their customs.

We are truly blessed to live in a country that values and protects the basic human rights of its citizens. I wish to express my support for Lithuanians trying to achieve that same protection for themselves.●

OPERATION OUTREACH

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today that will extend for 3 years a program known as Operation Outreach, a Veterans' Administration program that provides Vietnam-era veterans' readjustment counseling and related mental health services.

The program began in 1979 after it was recognized that Vietnam-era veterans continued to face problems related to their tour in Southeast Asia. Most common of these readjustment problems is "delayed stress syndrome" or "post traumatic stress disorder."

These types of delayed stress problems have recently received a great deal of media coverage since the return of the hostages from Iran, but these conditions were first diagnosed among the POW's and veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

There is an Operation Outreach center in my district in San Antonio that has been a great success in dealing with the problems confronting the Vietnam veteran population, and there is a definite need, as well as an obligation on the part of the U.S. Government to have this type of service continued.

The return of the hostages brought to our attention the contrast in the way they were welcomed home as compared to that of the Vietnam veteran. The Vietnam-era veteran was left out in the cold by our Nation and Operation Outreach is a small attempt at this late date to bring them in.

Because Operation Outreach will expire this year I am afraid that the Reagan administration will target it for extinction, but I hope that many Members will join me in the fight to continue the program until 1984.

Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, our Nation has attempted to block out the Vietnam war, but we cannot block out those veterans who fought there. They were patriotic and they obeyed the law, two principles that our Nation holds in high regard. The least that we can do for these dedicated veterans is to provide them with the help that they need to become productive citizens, and Operation Outreach seems to be the answer.●

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the RECORD my legislative summary of arts and humanities issues during the 96th Congress.

The latest Harris poll on Americans and the arts vividly demonstrates that the American public is participating in and attending cultural events in unprecedented numbers. Just as importantly, the poll reports that a clear majority of citizens, between 65 to 75 percent, are willing to pay increased taxes for Federal funding of the arts. Congressional interest in the arts and humanities has also burgeoned, with more members introducing legislation to assist the arts and humanities in a variety of ways.

The most significant legislation affecting the arts and humanities passed by the 96th Congress was the reauthorization of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities (NEA and NEH) and the Institute of Museum Services (IMS). This bill extends the life of these cultural agencies for 5 more years and establishes spending ceilings for each year. As a member of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, which has jurisdiction over the Endowments and IMS, I was actively involved in the entire reauthorization process.

The reauthorization legislation reflects a continued Federal commitment to the arts and humanities, while enabling the Endowments and IMS to be more flexible and responsive to their constituencies. None of its new provisions substantively change their basic operations.

I am pleased to report that the reauthorization incorporates, in part, the purposes of the Federal Artists Program Act (H.R. 5518), which I introduced in October 1979. The Federal artists program was designed to provide increased employment opportunities for professional artists in community-based residencies. The bill was endorsed by artists and arts organizations across the Nation, but fiscal restraints within the Congress precluded the passage of any substantial new authorization for the arts. Nevertheless, with the impetus provided by my bill, the reauthorization takes two major steps toward addressing the problems of artists' unemployment.

An extension of the existing challenge grant program will enable State and community arts agencies to apply jointly for grants to support local arts activities, including support of professional artists in community-based residencies. The committee report specifies that the design of these residencies should parallel the Federal artists program. In addition, the reauthorization mandates a study of employment opportunities for professional artists. The study, to be conducted by the Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities and the Department of Labor, will examine the effectiveness of existing programs and the need for

new programs to help reduce the high rate of unemployment and under-employment among artists. I am gratified that the Congress has taken some steps forward in assisting individual artists. I will continue to work during the next Congress for greater recognition and understanding of the contributions artists make to our society.

Other significant new provisions in the reauthorization include loan authority for the Arts Endowment (the Humanities Endowment already has such authority, although it has never been used); specific authority for NEA to support programs for the arts at the local level; a requirement that State Governors and legislators choose between bringing humanities councils within the framework of State government or maintaining them as private bodies; modification of the present formula for allocating NEH funds for State humanities councils; a second study to be conducted by the Federal council on the effectiveness of the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act; a study by both Endowments on the effectiveness of Treasury funds (a separate authorization of money which must be matched on a 2-to-1 basis, rather than the usual 1 to 1); and greater independence for the Institute of Museum Services within the Department of Education.

SPENDING LEVELS AUTHORIZED FOR THE NEXT 5 YEARS FOR EACH AGENCY

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
NEA	175	190.5	207	227	250.5
NEH	170	187.5	205	225	247.5
IMS	25	30.0	35	40	45.0

The appropriations for fiscal year 1981 passed during the 96th Congress illustrate the usual difference between the amount which Congress is permitted to spend for a given fiscal year and the amount that is actually appropriated. These figures are: NEA—$158,560,000; NEH—$151,299,000; and IMS—$12,857,000.

The fiscal year 1981 appropriations provide little growth for the two Endowments; 2.7 percent increase for NEA and a mere 0.8-percent increase for NEH over last year's appropriations. These figures are not encouraging and reflect the fiscally conservative mood of the Congress. However, I and other supporters of the arts will be fighting during the upcoming Congress to insure that these vital programs have the necessary funding to continue to meet the American public's increasing demand for quality cultural experiences.

The economic well-being of the entertainment industry will be enhanced as a result of an amendment I offered to the Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendments Act. This legislation, signed into law in September 1980, modifies the 1974 pension reform law (ERISA) by redesigning the termination insurance provision for multiemployer plans. My amendment allows employers in the entertainment industry, such as theatrical producers, to make payments into a pension plan only during the run of their productions or engagements. These employers will not be subject to the plan withdrawal liability that the act imposes on most other industries. While I strongly endorse the concept of withdrawal liability in order to discourage employer withdrawals, I believe it makes little sense in a highly mobile field such as the entertainment industry. Requiring withdrawal liability could, for example, inhibit the startup of productions by introducing an additional and unnecessary element of financial risk on employers in a field where job instability and unemployment are already high.

The final days of the 96th Congress witnessed failure of congressional efforts to overturn an Internal Revenue Service decision to apply a Supreme Court tax ruling to publishing companies. The Supreme Court's 1979 decision in Thor Power Tool Company against Commissioner of Internal Revenue, held that the valuation of warehouse stock could not be reduced for tax purposes unless it was disposed of or sold at reduced prices. The IRS subsequently applied this decision to the publishing industry in February 1980, bringing strong protests from both publishers and writers.

As a result of the IRS action, many publishers feared that they would have to destroy or sell at a discount millions of books held in their inventories. Other effects of the IRS ruling could be fewer contracts for slower selling, noncommercial, and scholarly books; books going out of print sooner; and smaller first printings as well as fewer second printings, resulting in increased prices of individual books. I plan to sponsor legislation to provide a permanent exemption for publishing companies in the new Congress.

Other bills affecting arts and humanities wound their way through various stages of the legislative process, although no other significant cultural legislation was enacted during the 96th Congress. The Public Buildings Act of 1979, which mandates a small percentage of the public buildings construction budget to be spent on art for new and renovated Federal buildings and which establishes Federal design standards, was passed by both the House and Senate but died in conference. It will be reintroduced this year. Other legislation sought to change current tax laws that affect artists inequitably as a result of the uniqueness of their profession. The bills address such issues as artists' inability to deduct the market value of their own works of art which they contribute, while art collectors are permitted to do so; estate tax liabilities resulting from the market value of their artistic endeavors at the time of their death; and the difficulty of deducting home studio space as a legitimate business expense when the income derived from this work is small. Hearings were held on several of the Senate bills, but none were close to passage. Copyright issues, including royalties for performances on sound recordings, were also the subject of congressional hearings and will be addressed again during the 97th Congress.

Passage of the National Historic Preservation Act assures the continuation of the historic preservation fund through 1987. This legislation reaffirms Federal commitment to historic preservation and provides better definitions of and guidance to Federal, State, and local government roles in this field. The bill also establishes a National Buildings Museum in the beautiful old Pension Building in Washington, D.C.

Many arts programs and projects funded under the Comprehensive Education and Training Act (CETA) were sharply cut back or phased out during 1980 as a result of reduced appropriations of CETA, especially in title VI, the public jobs component of the program. Arts organizations in New York City suffered particular hardship because of a sudden decision to terminate their contracts months before they were scheduled to end. I led the New York congressional delegation in strong protest against these drastic cuts. As a result of our efforts and those of the New York arts community, the Department of Labor made sufficient funds available to New York City to complete the projects. Nonetheless, prospects for all CETA programs in 1981 are not bright, as congressional sentiment against public service employment programs continues to grow.●

ELIMINATE THE TAX ON MARRIAGE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join with 200 of my colleagues in reintroducing Congresswoman FENWICK's marriage tax bill last week. It is time to eliminate the tax on marriage. Two-wage-earner families pay an $8.3 billion penalty each year just for being married, and they face the highest marginal tax rates of any group in the country. The disincentives for married women who want to go to work are overwhelming.

The first dollar of income a wife earns is taxed at the same rate as the last dollar earned by her husband. This means that a husband with a nonworking wife and a $15,000 salary pays $1,635 in Federal income tax—assuming he does not itemize his deductions—if the wife goes to work for the same salary of $15,000, the couple's tax liability increases by $3,958 to $5,593. They increase their tax bill by a whopping 342 percent when the wife takes a job, and they pay an extra $903 for filing as a married couple instead of as single.

This marriage tax hits hardest those low-income families which need two incomes to simply make ends meet. Two people who earn $3,750 will pay an extra $168 in Federal income tax if they are married—an increase of 133 percent above the $63 each would have paid if single. And a study by an IRS economist found that 74 percent of the people paying the marriage tax in 1974 had incomes under $20,000.

Congresswoman FENWICK is to be commended for her leadership on this important issue, and I am pleased to again cosponsor her bill, which would simply allow two-earner couples the option of being taxed as if they were single. This approach would preserve the benefits of filing jointly for one-earner couples, and it would not change the tax rates for singles. It would merely eliminate the current requirement that two-earner couples pay more simply because they are married.

The 1980 Republican Party platform condemns the marriage tax and calls for equity in the tax treatment of families. More than 38 million Americans may be affected by the marriage tax next year. Is it not time we joined together to bring an end to this unfair tax policy, once and for all?●

TRIBUTE TO ALPHONSE MIELE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of participating in a dinner honoring one of my friends and constituents, Mr. Alphonse Miele of West Orange, N.J. Together we celebrated the 25th anniversary of Al Miele's presidency of the service organization, Unico National. His participation in Unico, spanning almost four decades, includes an outstanding list of committees and every elective office in the Newark chapter and at the national level.

Although a quarter of a century has passed since Al held the organization's highest office, his level of involvement has not diminished. In recognition of his extraordinary contributions, he has received innumerable honors, including Unico's most coveted award, the Vastola Medal. Most recently he received a Presidential Commendation Medal for his work on an Italian American awareness project. An annual Unico National scholarship has been awarded in his name for the past 20 years.

Al Miele's record is legendary. The original chairman of the Garden State Festa Italiana, he was the executive secretary of the National Coordinating Committee which later became the NIACA—the National Italian American Coordinating Association. A list of Al Miele's Unico and other civic activities looks more like a dictionary than a résumé.

Al's life story reads like the classic American success story. He was an orphan in Italy at the age of 4. Brought to the United States by his grandparents, Al Miele started life in America at the very bottom of the economic ladder. He has been an achiever since the age of 8. He sold newspapers, dug ditches, and held several jobs while attending high school and college in the evenings.

Now the managing owner of one of the largest independent insurance claims firms in the East, he has achieved an outstanding reputation among jurists, attorneys, physicians, and other professionals in the insurance field.

Al Miele's valuable efforts for the Boys' Club of Newark will long be remembered. He has been instrumental in establishing 17 Unico chapters and has been a major force in shaping the format of the Unico magazine.

I am proud to be Al Miele's friend, and equally proud to call him one of my constituents. It was my privilege to join in the tribute to him.●

FIRE CHIEF EDWARD P. SCHWEITZER

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, the city of Brookfield, Wis., will lose an exemplary public servant who has given his community many years of dedicated service. Fire Chief Edward P. Schweitzer is retiring on March 7, following a 32-year career with the Brookfield Fire Department. I believe this is an appropriate time to recognize and honor Ed for his accomplishments.

Ed is the first and only full-time fire chief the city of Brookfield has ever had. However, Ed's service predates the city itself, beginning as a volunteer firefighter with the old town of Brookfield Volunteer Fire Department in 1949. When Brookfield was incorporated as a city, he took over as fire inspector, later as assistant chief, and finally as chief of the volunteer firefighters in 1962.

Ed was appointed full-time city of Brookfield fire chief in 1965 with the task of organizing and developing a full-time city fire department. He began with three full-time men and a small fire station.

Under Ed's administration and guidance, the department now has three well-equipped stations, strategically located for quick response to all areas of the city, and a force of 42 men, well trained in all aspects of firefighting and disaster response.

Ed has also served as the city's civil defense director and the careful planning that went into the city's disaster preparedness plans was carried out under his direction and supervision.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Brookfield regretfully loses Ed Schweitzer to retirement and its citizens will miss his presence. However, it also takes this opportunity to thank Ed for his service and to wish him good health, happiness, and fulfillment in his retirement. I want to join in expressing these sentiments and to say thanks, Ed, for a job well done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

TENSIONS IN POLAND—PART I

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, tension appears to have temporarily eased in Communist Poland, but all the basic problems remain. None have really been solved. Many of the so-called pundits have analyzed this situation in terms of United States-Soviet relations and Polish-Soviet relations, but few of the experts have delved into the overall picture, and such subjects as the Western role in supporting Communist nations economically as well as communism in the general context of today's world. Prof. Hans Sennholz, the distinguished economist from Grove City College, has analyzed the problem in a three-part article. In the first part he discusses the nature of the Communist system as well as the role played by Western economic policies in the development of Communist policies. In the second part Professor Sennholz outlines the reasons for the failure of socialism in Poland and why only private enterprise could restore Poland's economy, a thing the Soviet Union would never tolerate. Plain old nationalism is a greater problem in the Soviet Union than Poland, he concludes. In the final part, Professor Sennholz outlines why the Soviets compulsively expand into other people's territories and suggests some ways in which the West might better

respond to Soviet aggression. This article will appear in the May issue of the Freeman magazine published by the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y. 10533, a very fine organization promoting fundamental principles of economics. Part I follows:

TENSIONS IN POLAND

The workers' revolt in Poland raises momentous questions not only about the future of communism as a poltical-economic system, but also on its many implications for the West. Does it signal a terminal ideological crisis that in due time will bring about changes in communist thought and practice? Is it shaking the foundation of communism as a system of political rule and oppression? Is it damaging the engine of Soviet power and influence? And how can and should the West respond to the proletarian revolution in Poland? The answers may be found in the thoughts and aspirations of the Polish workers who are voicing their frustrations about the economic order and the humiliating role they are playing in that order. In final analysis, we must search for our answer in diverse politicial and economic philosophies that are creating insoluble tensions and conflicts.

Communism is the most extreme form of totalitarianism. It is the root and prototype of all others, such as Nazism and Fascism that sprang from it. Since the destruction of German Nazism it is the only surviving power that constitutes a real danger to the West. In fact, it is far more dangerous than its other variations ever have been because, at this very moment, it is conquering the hearts and minds of millions of people around the globe. For Nazism and Fascism it was surely a difficult task to convince the peoples of Africa or Asia of the superiority of the Arian race or the rejuvenation of the Roman Empire. But it is rather easy to indoctrinate them with the slogans and potions of communsism.

Communism bears little resemblance to the despotic regimes of kings and dictators who continue to make their brief appearances in many parts of the world. It is totalitarian, all comprising, subjugating the individual and sacrificing him to the State. It is the total politicalization of life that permits no exceptions or limits, no sphere without the state. It is a secularized faith, a religiously fervent atheism.[1]

It is built on the socialistic economic order. Economic life hinges around the omnipotent and sovereign center that can tolerate neither private property in production nor individual enterprise. Every economic transaction becomes a political transaction that aims to sustain the omnipresent state. Every trade is used to strengthen the regime and, if at all possible, to weaken the capitalistic world. Its lack of prices and markets makes it a chaotic system that stumbles through waste and corruption, from crisis to crisis. If it were not for the capitalistic production structure and Western technology that are copied or imported, the Soviet economic order would operate in utter darkness, unable to sustain its hapless population. In fact, living conditions in the Soviet Union that always have been on the level of underdeveloped countries have worsened considerably in recent years. Death rates are rising for almost every age group. There is not a country in Europe in which individual lives are so short and children's death rates so high as in the Soviet Union.

Wherever communism comes to power, a peculiar law of population and trade takes effect: the people seek to escape wherever and whenever they can; but the authorities forcibly keep them in the country through high walls and barbed wire, mine fields, tanks and machine guns. While many individuals lose their lives in desperate attempts to escape, a few succeed every day in reaching safety in the capitalistic West.

The flow of goods proceeds in the opposite direction, from the capitalistic countries to communist areas. They flow as alms or extortions, through lies or deception, or as the result of credits and loans that are repayable in the distant future.

The communist economies are straining and reaching the breaking point in a desperate effort to sustain the ruling class and build a powerful military machine. While the masses of people under communist rule linger in hopeless poverty, a bloated state bureaucracy enjoys all the perks and privileges the system can provide. The manifest disparity between the lifestyle of the working population and that of the party establishment is a source of chronic discontent. Despite all the impudent boasts of the Soviet leaders, there is no hope whatever that socialism will ever provide the amenities of life to which the working people in the capitalistic countries are accustomed.

And yet, two circumstances come to mind that may actually give substance and truth to the communist boasts. If the West, in utter blindness and stupidity, were to destroy its own economic order by adopting the methods and policies of socialism, or by ravishing its own productivity through currency and credit destruction, the West may actually sink to Soviet levels. Moreover, if the West, for any reason, were to transfer its productive capital and technological know-how to the Soviets and modernize communist production along capitalistic lines, new life could be imported to the barren system.

It is an undeniable fact that in incredible blindness the West actually has moved in this direction, giving new hope and comfort to world communism. It has severely weakened its own currency and credit structure through rampant inflation and extended massive loans and credits to the Soviet Empire.

THE WEST IS FINANCING SOVIET OPPRESSION

In recent years, mostly since 1970, Western governments and financial institutions loaned the Soviet bloc countries at least $88 billion. According to some estimates that include the credits granted by suppliers and other lenders, this amount may actually exceed $113 billion. The West is bailing the socialistic countries out of their inherent difficulties through massive transfusions of capital. It is buying the bread for the restive masses and capitalist technology for socialized industries.

Why are we propping up the socialistic economies and their dictatorial regimes? Three factors may have contributed to this awful blunder: Western ignorance about the nature of communism, rampant inflation, especially in the U.S., that triggered the outflow of funds to all corners of the world and, finally, Western euphoria about detente.

It is gross ignorance to view the relationship of a communist government and its people as normal and healthy. Communist governments are not the representatives of the people, and the people are not the constituency of the government. When we are dealing with communist officials we are not dealing with the people, but with the political agents of a monolithic apparatus of oppression that lacks any legitimate claim to represent the people. To grant a loan to a communist state is to join cause with the oppressors, to see them through their difficulties and preserve intact the dictatorship, which the people are risking their lives to dismantle. And yet, in their incredible confusion the big banks in the capitalist West, encouraged and goaded by equally confused government officials, supported the regimes to the tune of $88 billion or more.

Surely the banks were under severe pressure to invest huge funds rolling off the printing presses and credit systems of their respective governments. The 1970's were years of rampant inflation as Western governments were indulging in massive deficit spending that was financed primarily by currency and credit expansion. Commercial banks were the happy depositories of these new funds that needed to be invested securely and profitably. To the eager bankers it was a pleasant coincidence that the communist governments were ready to receive those funds in large and convenient blocs. Moreover, the banks were obligated to "recycle" the massive influx of O.P.E.C. petrodollar that were flowing from the oil-consuming countries to Arab producers and back to commercial banks in the consuming countries. Some deposits found their way from the banks to the national treasuries that spent them on massive deficit schemes. Third World countries in Africa and Asia managed to borrow a total of $365 billion, the communist countries no less than $88 billion. Of course, this grant of loans constituted a huge transfer of real wealth from the capitalist West to socialist and communist governments all over the globe. It sustained and supported the oppressors and mortal enemies of capitalism at a rate and magnitude unprecedented in history.

The euphoria that followed the detente blinded many Western leaders. Although Moscow continued its psychological warfare with all available methods, aiming at the political attrition of the capitalist West, Western neutralists and appeasers rejoiced about the detente and eagerly promoted the wealth transfer. The Kremlin continued to wage its war at alternating fronts, either psychological or economical, or military, or all together; the West simply disregarded the challenge and acted as if the incessant blows and contemptuous injuries simply did not exist.

By now the banks probably have come to realize the full meaning of lending to the Soviet bloc. But it is too late for them. The Communist debt has long since passed the point at which it could simply be written off. The magnitude exceeds by far the bank's capital and surplus, the loss of which would bring instant ruin and bankruptcy. As they cannot cut their losses they are likely to make every effort to protect their old loans through new loans. As long as they finance the interest falling due, they can live by the fiction that the loans are perceptible and secure. But the protection of loans implies the protection of the debtors, i.e. the communist states. The banks as creditors thus become partners of the communist debtors and the loans become political intervention on behalf of the communist regimes. When seen in this light, the $1 billion bank loan extended to the Polish gov-

[1] The writings of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn are a living memorial to the untold millions of Soviet victims.

ernment by West German and American banks during the present crisis is political intervention on behalf of communism.

If the Polish government should default on its debt because Western banks cease to finance it or because the Kremlin decides to rattle the financial structure of the West, the 400-500 billion dollar pyramid of debt built on the ability and willingness to repay may come crashing down on the gullible West. A communist default, which appears inevitable to this observer, would have a domino effect on those debtor countries that have virtually no chance of ever repaying their debts. It is almost certain that sooner or later the Soviets will use this threat of default to gain political concessions from the West.

Given the financial structure of the West and the dominant role of governments in those structures, it is doubtful that such a default would actually crush the debt pyramid. But it probably would alter its color and nature. No Western government would permit its banking system to collapse as a result of foreign default, with the inevitable consequences of severe depression and mass unemployment. Instead, the governments of creditor countries could be expected to issue instant guarantees for the defaulted obligations and thus assume the communist and Third World debt. The crisis would be averted by Western governments through the assumption of another $400-500 billion of debt, which in time would exert its powerful influence toward more inflation and credit expansion in the West. It would contribute its share to the gradual and utlimately total destruction of the world monetary order. Unfortunately, such a destruction would devastate the capitalistic countries without a single shot being fired.●

INFANT FORMULA IN THE THIRD WORLD

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, since 1977 many consumers all over the country have boycotted products made by the Swiss-based Nestle Corp. to protest the firm's misleading promotion of infant formula in the Third World. The distribution of such products is not limited to Nestle, and several American multinationals are involved in these activities to a lesser extent. However, responsibility for the tragic consequences of improper marketing techniques must be shared and stronger controls on the promotion of infant food products in poor regions of the world should be imposed.

The following article from the Village Voice, "Nestle's Good Fortune," examines this controversy and the corporation's response to increasing public awareness of the problem.

NESTLE'S GOOD "FORTUNE"

(By Geoffrey Stokes)

Nestle, the giant Swiss-based multinational corporation, has since 1977 been working to defeat a boycott of its United States operations by consumers protesting the parent firm's aggressive merchandising of packaged infant formula in third world countries (see box). The company has tried to be unobtrusive, but internal Nestle documents cited in The Washington Post earlier this month and subsequently obtained in full by The Village Voice reveal Nestle funneling money through a tax-exempt "public policy" conduit in an attempt to influence "third-party" coverage of the infant-formula issue. The document names the Washington-based Ethics and Public Policy Center, Fortune magazine, and Fortune's Washington editor Herman Nickel as actors in the previously hidden drama. It is unclear precisely to what extent these figures were willing conspirators and to what extent they were Nestle's patsies, but the publication of the memorandum—from Nestle's international vice-president to its chief executive officer—has severely damaged Fortune's reputation. More seriously, this example of covert corporate manipulation poisons the well and forces readers to question the entire world of "objective reporting."

Nestle originally adopted a plan of direct confrontation with the boycotters. Oswaldo Ballarin, president of Nestle-Brazil, attended a 1978 Senate hearing and capped hours of medical testimony about the damage caused by the improper or unnecessary use of his company's products with the assertion that the charges were "actually an indirect attack on the free world's economic system. A worldwide church organization, with the stated purpose of undermining the free enterprise system, is in the forefront of this acitivity." He was virtually laughed out of the room, and in the wake of his blunder a newly-hired public relations firm advised Nestle to keep a low profile on the issue. The recent memorandum, a 1500-word summary of "intensive discussions" held last August 2 to 4 in New York and Washington among international and United States Nestle officials, confirms that the strategy still operates. In the memorandum (whose authenticity has not been disputed by the company), international Veep Ernest Saunders reports that "the Fortune article, together with the interest of the Ethics and Public Policy Center, is the best opportunity we have had yet to put the record straight, and *must be fully exploited* [his italics]." The story behind that article—Herman Nickel's "The Corporation Haters," which ran in the June 16, 1980, Fortune—is a textbook example of hidden corporate influence in the media.

The origins of the article begin at the Ethics and Public Policy Center (EPPC), a Washington think-tank generally described as conservative, but which its founder and president, Ernest Lefever, prefers to think of as "mainstream." In 1979, the center published a 126-page attack on the World Council of Church's social activism in the third world. The study came to the attention of neoconservative social critic Irving Kristol, who suggested to Lefever in September 1979 that a study of the infant formula controversy would be "a natural for you because it involves churches."

"A few weeks later," according to the principals, Lefever had lunch with Herman Nickel, Fortune's Washington editor. During that lunch, at Washington's F Street Club, Lefever proposed that Nickel study the infant formula issue for EPPC and offered a $5000 fee, half to be paid on submission of the manuscript (due March 1980 but not yet completed), and half when the foundation published it.

Nickel says that at the time he knew nothing about EPPC's funding and "didn't think to ask about it." This was perhaps naive, but as any journalist will testify, the prospect of a significant fee can often lead to a willing suspension of cynicism.

Nickel expressed interest in the project but said he could not accept it until he cleared the outside assignment with his editor. Richard Lubar, then managing editor, gave his approval. Though time has rendered the circumstances of that go-ahead murky, the Post article describes the okay as "conditioned on [Fortune's] getting a 'spinoff' article," a description which current editor William Rukeyser vigorously denies. Nickel remembers that Lubar said he'd "always been interested" in the story and gave his approval with the explicit comment that "you can get a good Fortune story out of it." In any event, it is clear that Nickel began the research leading to the Fortune story with the promise of EPPC money.

Before he had actually begun work, he discovered to his dismay that the money came with strings attached—in particular that a three-person panel, including at least one representative from the infant formula industry, would review his manuscript before EPPC published it. Nickel was disturbed enough by this news that he got Lefever's agreement to terms he set forth in a letter stating that the presence of an industry reviewer on the panel "will in no way impair the independence of my study and my right to reach whatever conclusions I find are warranted by the evidence . . ." He did not, however, seek to alter the basic agreement, meaning that his article would go unpublished—depriving him of $2500—if it was vetoed by the panel's industry representative. Nickel, who has a decent reputation for independence, stoutly maintains he "will come to no other conclusions than those justified by my research into the evidence," but admits that "strictly, legalistically" such fealty could cost him $2500 if his evidence leads him in a direction contrary to that favored by the industry.

Nickel, still unaware of EPPC's funding, began his work toward the end of 1979. Meanwhile, EPPC itself, which had been affiliated with Georgetown University, was coming to what both sides describe as an "amicable" separation. In January 1980, it became an independent, fully tax-exempt institution, eagerly seeking public and corporate donations. Among the first companies Lefever contacted was Nestle.

By all indications, Nestle hadn't even heard of EPPC until Nickel began interviewing corporate officers for his study. But, as a spokesman at the company's PR agency explained, "if a study is undertaken in something in which you have an interest, you are curious about it. [Nestle was] curious about EPPC and looked into it." They read some of the center's publications, and met with Lefever, who cheerfully says he told them that while the center didn't undertake contract work on specific projects, its general fund did accept contributions: "They raised it," he reports, "and I said, as I always do, 'We'd welcome it—and please make it a big one.'" In what Lefever and Nestle officials maintain was sheerest coincidence, Nestle gave the center $5000—the amount Nickel was to receive—in March 1980—the month he was to receive it.

Because of assignments abroad and a personal health problem, Nickel missed his original deadline, and he was still working on the project for EPPC in the late spring when someone at Fortune asked him for an article on church activists, corporate re-

sponsibility, and the infant formula controversy. Whether the timing of this request was spontaneous or represented management's expectation that his EPPC work should by then have "spun off" a Fortune story is unclear. In any case, Nickel says, "I spent more time looking into the infant formula issue than I could have spent just for a Fourtune article. In that sense, I was a good deal for the magazine."

Nickel's Fortune article, though it is slanted in a way that routinely reflects the magazine's editorial policy, is not a loonily unbalanced attack on the industry's critics. There are some factual problems with it (his estimate of rising formula use in Algeria despite nationalized distribution comes slolely from industry sources and was flatly contradicted by the Algerian delegation at the May 1980 World Health Assembly), but the major objections to the piece have been directed less to its factual content than to its characterization of religious leaders active in the boycott as "Marxists marching under the banner of Christ."

The phrase, as it happens, wasn't written by Nickel, but was contributed by Fortune's editor, Richard Armstrong. Nickel, indeed, says, "I would not have used it. I did not use it. He felt that the evidence warranted it." But, in a way that implicitly undermines his protestations of independence in the forthcoming EPPC study, Nickel accepted the change.

Needless to say, the article was greeted with great rejoicing in Nestle's corporate headquarters, and a major proportion of the meetings Saunders held in this country last summer were devoted to the question of how best to exploit it. Enter ever-ready Ernest Lefever.

Under the "Actions Proposed" section of the leaked memorandum, Saunders writes: "There must be maximum exploitation of the opportunities presented by the Fortune article and the Ethics and Public Policy Center's willingness to undertake additional activity." Nestle USA's president, David Guerrant, was apparently less than enthusiastic about all this, for Saunders further notes that "Mr. Guerrant is somewhat concerned that Nestle should not be seen to be the dominant subscriber to the Ethics and Public Policy Center." Help, however, was at hand in the form of Nestle's Washington consul, Thomas Ward, of Ward, Lalos, Leeds, Keegan, and Lett. "Mr. Ward," the memo continues, "informs us that there are ways in which this matter can be handled, and . . . I suggest that Mr. Ward remain closely involved in follow-up activity with the Center."

Even a mind untainted by memories of the colorful methods of laundering money revealed during the Watergate investigation would read this passage as a suggestion that Nestle's contributions to the center be hidden, but a Nestle rep claims that the senior partner of a Washington law firm was merely suggesting that there was no problem because Nestle wasn't a dominant contributor.

Ward himself was unavailable for comment, and no one else in his firm was able to discuss the matter, but there was no question that Nestle—already planning to give the center an additional $20,000—was about to become EPPC's dominant corporate contributor. Lefever pooh-poohs the notion, claiming that the center received donations from 26 corporations during 1980. But he also admits that $25,000 was the largest contribution received from any single firm. More importantly, in May 1980, two months after Nestle's first gift, Lefever issued a report estimating EPPC's entire corporate budget for the year as slightly under $100,000—making Nestle the source of one-fourth of the center's corporate donations and indicating that Guerrant's fears were well founded.

But they were overridden, for the Saunders memo continues: "We should review the optimum mailing list for the Fortune reprint and then decide how to finance the operation."

Shortly after these meetings, Lefever's center received another $20,000 from Nestle. Lefever says that he had independently decided to reprint the Fortune article (with a preface identifying it as "a direct outgrowth of a comprehensive study of the infant formula issue that Mr. Nickel is writing for the Ethics and Public Policy Center") as an EPPC fund-raising device; but admits that "when Nestle saw Nickel's piece, they decided it would be good to use it." Shortly after receiving this second Nestle contribution, EPPC rented a mailing list of "community leaders" from a New York firm and sent out the largest promotional mailing in its history. Lefever says the mailing—including, of course, a reprint of Nickel's article (now retitled, without *Fortune's* permission, "Crusade Against the Corporation: Churches and the Nestle Boycott")—went to "several thousands" of community leaders, adding that "normally, we send out a few hundred." The mailing list, Lefever says, was not provided by Nestle, though he admits the center had never used the list, or any like it, before.

Fortune did its part as well in indirectly underwriting the distribution. When Lefever's center had reprinted an earlier piece of Nickel's on South Africa, it had been charged *Fortune's* standard rate of 10 cents per copy. "With all we wanted to reprint this time," says Lefever, "that wouldn't be possible. So I went to *Fortune*—to the top of *Fortune*—and pleaded for a flat-rate sale. They agreed to let us print as many as we wanted for a single fee of $150." Editor Rukeyser denies that he was "the top" in question, but confirms that the center got reprint rights for "a token fee." Thus *Fortune*, which had had an article's research partially underwritten by EPPC, donated the equivalent of several thousand dollars to Lefever's operation. And thus, of course, community leaders all over the country received, from a center which had no official connection with Nestle, reprints of an attack on the boycotters from a magazine which had no acknowledged connection with the center.

How well the strategy would have worked had the memo not been leaked can only be guessed; disclosure has certainly backfired on the company. But no crime seems to have been committed; Nestle's giving five times what the study cost to an organization that was supposedly studying it is surely in bad taste, but if processed-food companies went to jail for bad taste, the prisons would be overflowing. Rather, the memo and an investigation of the circumstances surrounding it give us a rare look at the operations of an informal Corporate Ministry of Disinformation—which we must prudently fear is the operative force behind much of the "objective" information we read.

A case in point is a recent *Wall Street Journal* article entitled "Politics and Baby Formula in the Third World," by our old friend Ernest Lefever. Though the article was published 10 days *after* the *Washington Post* revealed his connections with Nestle, Lefever is identified only as "president of the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington and author of 'Amsterdam to Nairobi: The World Council of Churches and the Third World.' " Asked if he had told the *Journal* that Nestle was a major supporter of the center, Lefever replied, "Of course not."

BEHIND THE BOYCOTT

Though there is no doubt that breast milk is the ideal food for infants—it is free, nutritionally complete, transfers immunity, and requires neither sterilized bottles nor potable water—the use of various bottled substitutes has increased dramatically during this century. Among non-breast-milk foods (absolutely necessary for some percentage of mothers), specially prepared infant formulas appear to be preferable on a purely nutritional basis, though they are markedly less cost-effective than other substitutes.

Until relatively recently, the sale of these formulas had been concentrated in the urbanized West, but with the decline in Western birth rates during the '60s and '70s, manufacturers faced flat or sinking sales and turned their attention to third world mothers. Since their aggressive campaign began, third world sales of infant formula have consistently grown at a rate of more than 10 percent per year, and some six million babies in less-developed countries now receive it.

Nestle supplies about a third of this formula, with estimated annual sales of $200 million to $250 million in the third world. Perhaps because of its background as a food company (virtually all United States formula manufacturers are pharmaceutical firms), Nestle became a leader in direct consumer advertising of infant formula on television, radio, and billboards.

In addition to its direct advertising, Nestle promoted itself in more insidious ways: Nestle employees, dressed as nurses, regularly "assisted" in "educating" new mothers in hospital maternity wards, and the company established "milk banks" where new mothers could purchase Nestle formula at a discount for the first couple of weeks after they left the hospital (i.e., until their milk dried up and they had little choice but to purchase the cripplingly expensive formula at its full price).

Though it is exceedingly difficult to prove scientifically that there is a link between promotion and sales (companies certainly believe in it; otherwise they wouldn't spend the money), it is clear that the decline in breast feeding which followed the aggressive merchandising of infant formula has created a number of public health problems in developing countries. A 1973 World Health Organization publication reported that a study of rural Chilean mothers, "There were three times as many deaths among babies given bottles before the age of three months as among those who were wholly breast fed. . . . As living standards improved, weaning was accelerated and a higher proportion of children were fed on the bottle alone. The anomalous consequence was that infant mortality rose with income."

Largely under the leadership of third world health professionals, an international campaign for the regulation of infant-formula sales was begun. Working through the United Nations (primarily UNICEF and WHO) and through national governments, the campaign showed marginal success. In 1975, for example, the manufacturers im-

plicitly admitted that something was wrong, when they formed the International Council of Infant Food Industries (ICIFI), whose aim was to establish self-regulation as the way of controlling the industry.

The changes recommended by ICIFI—described as unprecedented by the industry and as superficial by its critics—seem in either case to have been only half-heartedly implemented, and in 1977 a number of American religious and consumer groups announced a national boycott of Nestle products. The boycott, perhaps the only way for American citizens to influence the behavior of a Swiss-based multinational, has had only mixed success. Though it has clearly affected sales in some Nestle operations—most notably Stouffer's and the "fund-raising" division (which promotes sales of Nestle chocolates to high schools and civic groups)—its overall effect seems more successful as public relations than as an economic lever (Nestle has not hesitated to increase its U.S. holdings during the boycott, even of such "natural" targets as Beech-Nut Bady Foods).

But for all its troubles at home, the boycott—and the very real threat of further WHO and national regulation—has had some effect in the third world. In October 1979, ICIFI announced a new set of self-determined policies that would eliminate the most egregious marketing practices. Since then, the boycott's leaders have published a report charging 682 violations (by 34 companies in 50 different countries) of the self-imposed code. The industry specifically denied 112 of the initial 202 charges (the boycott coalition subsequently withdrew five of the 112 for lack of documentation), but has not responded to the remainder. As a result, the working coalition of third world health professionals and American boycott leaders is actively compaigning for stiffer national and international regulation at the upcoming WHO meetings in Geneva.

Thus the boycott—which the leaked memorandum describes as a "smouldering fire"—continues to disturb Nestle, which wishes to minimize consumer influence on the WHO (where it has continued to cultivate its own power by such time-honored mechanisms as job offers to prominent WHO officials whose terms of office are expiring). Thus, the corporate decision to discredit both the boycott and it organizers.●

KEEPING AN UNPOPULAR DESPOT AT ARM'S LENGTH

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of Pope John Paul II to the Philippines has served to focus attention on the Philippines and the government of Ferdinand Marcos. It was particularly significant—and appropriate—that the Pope issued a call for greater respect for human rights in the presence of President Marcos.

Stephen Cohen, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights under the Carter administration and presently a professor at the Georgetown University Law Center, has written an interesting and timely analysis of the current political situation in the Philippines. In his assessment of the Philippines under Marcos, Mr. Cohen draws on firsthand information he acquired during two extended visits to the Philippines.

Mr. Cohen offers several specific recommendations with respect to U.S. policy toward the Marcos government. I hope that the new administration will adopt the policies outlined by Mr. Cohen. Mr. Cohen's observations underscore that an effective and consistently applied human rights policy truly is in our own national interest.

I commend Mr. Cohen's article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1981]

KEEPING AN UNPOPULAR DESPOT AT ARM'S LENGTH

(By Stephen B. Cohen)

Last Wednesday Pope John Paul II visited the slums of Manila. Afterward, a student spoke to the pope about his people's need for political freedom and economic justice. As the student knelt to kiss the papal ring, the pope lifted him up by his arms to embrace him and the crowd cheered.

Before mass audiences and face to face with President Ferdinand Marcos, the pope called for "greater respect for human rights" and electrified the Filipino people. He arrived in the Philippines one month to the day after Marcos declared an end to eight years of martial law.

The pope's strong appeal and the response he evoked raise a serious question: How much was really changed by Marcos' declaration? The answer is important to us because of our military bases there and the Philippines' role as a pro-Western country in Southeast Asia.

Despite the end of martial law, Marcos' exceptional powers are vitually intact. He can still legislate by personal fiat. He can detain, without trial, anyone he regards as "subversive." His family and friends, who seized all significant newspapers and radio and television stations when martial law began, continue to control the mass media.

Lifting martial law was more public relations than substance, designed to impress the new Reagan administration as well as the pope. The Marcos government is still regarded by a broad cross-section of Filipinos as corrupt, incompetent and frequently repressive.

How bad is official corruption? Filipinos from all walks of life say that it is more pervasive than ever before in their history and that the worst corruption involves Marcos, his wife Imelda and their families and close associates. One popular Philippine riddle goes: "How do you do the Marcos dance?" The answer: "One step forward, two kickbacks."

It is widely believed—and, in political terms, perception is reality—that the Marcoses demand a cut in major investment projects as the price of governmental approval and that the amounts accumulated by them run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Even defenders of Marcos' record freely concede, as one said, that "he can be faulted for one thing: failing to stop corruption."

Filipino businessmen who are not part of the inner circle are expressing strong opposition to Marcos, at least in private, as they find themselves victimized by official favoritism and extortion. Using his power to legislate by fiat, Marcos exempts certain firms from taxes applied to all others. One Marcos ally in the filter cigarette business, for example, is relieved from customs duties that his competitors must pay. Another, who manufactures television sets, can import Japanese component parts without paying the usual taxes.

Another Marcos tactic is to force the sale of successful businesses at a bargain price to his close associates. Filipino businessmen fear doing too well lest, as one told me, "they notice your success and make you an offer you can't refuse."

A former correspondent for the Asian Wall Street Journal described the effect on the economy: "People are afraid to go into a new line of business, because one of Marcos' cronies, some of whom are just into primitive accumulation, may take it over."

The more desperate members of the business community have resorted to violence. Several, including one Harvard MBA, were arrested last year for joining a so-called "Light a Fire Group," which allegedly conspired to set fire to properties belonging to Imelda Marcos. Others have begun to finance the communist insurgency, in the belief that it will never be strong enough to seize power but may cause enough trouble to force a change of regime.

The Catholic Church, as well, has become increasingly open and strident in its criticism of Marcos. Last year a Catholic conference in the Southern Philippines began with a morality play about the pharaoh's abuse of Hebrew slaves in ancient Egypt. The Egyptian pharaoh, shown beating the slaves, bore an unmistakable resemblance to Marcos, and the Hebrews were dressed as Filipino peasants. The political message was clear: "Let my people go."

Over 80 percent of Filipinos are Catholic. They are by and large devout, and the church is the most important nongovernmental institution in the Philippines, with an extensive network of schools and hospitals. A large majority of the priests are staunchly anti-Marcos, and a significant minority now argue that violence is justified and required to achieve change.

The church hierarchy—about 50 bishops—periodically criticizes specific practices of the Marcos regime, including corruption, election fraud and the imprisonment and torture of political dissidents. The archbishop of Manila, one of two Philippine cardinals, has warned of civil violence if Marcos does not end authoritarian rule and permit fair elections.

Among all segments of the population, anti-Marcos sentiment has grown as the economy has deteriorated. Per capita income has fallen about 15 to 20 percent since Marcos declared martial law. Inflation ran 20 to 25 percent in 1979 and 1980, and wages have not risen to make up for the increased cost of living. While unemployment officially hovers at 5 percent, underemployment is four to six times as great. Roughly three-quarters of Filipino households have an income at or below the poverty threshold. The Philippine government estimates that 60 percent of all children are malnourished.

Every informed observer believes the economic position of the average Filipino will deteriorate further over the next five years. The best hope is that the decline will not be too abrupt or severe.

Although the Marcos regime is authoritarian, the repression has been neither indiscriminate nor unrelenting. Marcos' approach is to employ the minimum coercion

needed to maintain control, and even to ease up when to do so poses no threat.

For example, opposition politicians may speak out against the regime, provided the audience is not too large and the gathering is closed to the general public. In Manila, one opposition weekly newspaper is permitted and it regularly attacks Marcos' policies; but the editors are told that if circulation exceeds 20,000, they will be shut down. A critical account of martial law was circulated in an English language edition. But an edition in Tagalog, the native language of about one-third of Filipinos, was suppressed by the secret police and the author, a former Philippine president, was charged with sedition by a military panel.

During the first years of martial law, 70,000 individuals in Manila alone were detained for political reasons, and reports of torture and mistreatment were common. Most detainees have now been released, although about 1,000 political prisoners remain, and occasional cases of torture still occur. The government continues to use preemptive arrest when a mass protest or demonstration threatens.

Meanwhile, there has been an alarming increase in reported military abuses against civilians, with the Ministry of Defense registering 150 complaints a day during one period. Soldiers rarely come from the area where they serve and often abuse the local population to deter cooperation with local insurgents.

A typical incident was reported in the American press a few weeks ago. Alexander Garsales, a farmer, father of four and lay worker in a Christian social action group, was seized at home by soldiers. Five weeks later his body, hands tied behind his back, was discovered in a deep hole in a nearby field.

What are the chances of a popular explosion, as in Iran? Filipinos do not appear likely to engage in mass action against the regime, either at this moment or in the immediate future. While anti-Marcos sentiment is increasing, the opposition to the regime is neither well organized nor particularly effective, in part due to restrictions on the exercise of political rights.

The moderate opposition centers around half a dozen former members of the pre-martial-law Senate. They waged an effective political campaign against Marcos during the 1978 parliamentary elections, and polls predicted that their slate would win most of the Manila area seats. The election, however, was marked by pervasive fraud, ballot-box stuffing and voter intimidation. When the votes were counted, the opposition failed to gain a single Manila seat; in some precincts, the Marcos candidate was reported winning unanimously. Since that campaign, the ex-senators have limited their activities to speaking before small audiences, circulating political newsletters and manifestos and organizing occasional demonstrations and protest marches.

The other major organized opposition is the New People's Army (NPA) communist insurgency. The Philippine government estimates its armed strength at 3,000 to 5,000, with sympathizers in the tens of thousands or more.

Over the past few years, the NPA has acquired a Robin Hood image because of its "good behavior." Unlike the Philippine armed forces, which are notorious for preying upon the civilian population, the NPA actively seeks the allegiance of Filipino peasants.

One attorney, practicing in an area where the NPA is active, commented: "Local inhabitants are concerned when the NPA moves out. I have clients worried that cattle rustling and robberies will start again. The NPA represents law and order. They say they feel more secure with the NPA than the military."

Despite its increasing acceptability, the NPA does not now threaten the regime, nor is it close to mounting an effective challenge. It is many times outmanned and outgunned by the 250,000-man Philippine army.

But can one confidently predict that popular opposition will not threaten Marcos over the next five years? With the trends in anti-Marcos feeling and the deteriorating economic position of the average worker, spontaneous protests could erupt. If the NPA continues to exploit its Robin Hood image, it could create a broader-based movement over the next decade. Assassination also is a constant danger to Marcos. Two hundred current and former military officers were reportedly arrested last year for planning a New Year's coup attempt.

Even if Marcos is not forced out by others, he is approaching age 65. Some time in the not too distant future, if nothing else intervenes first, either ill health, old age or death will end his rule.

Whether or not Marcos survives the next five years, our interests will be affected by the evolution of Philippine attitudes toward us. The long-run prospect is for increasing nationalism, assertion of Philippine self-worth and anti-Americanism.

We have benefited so far from widespread pro-American feelings. Filipinos admire the United States and most things American. A university professor who is a vociferous opponent of Marcos and of American aid to his regime told me, "Our problem is that Filipinos are American-lovers."

In the future, however, pro-American feelings are likely to lessen. There is a wide difference in how older and younger Filipinos view the United States. Among the older generation there is strong pro-American sentiment, a product of our joint struggle against Japanese occupation of the Philippines in the 1940s, the granting of independence in 1948 and American aid over the years since.

The younger generation (over 50 percent of the population) knows less of World War II and the immediate postwar years. Its formative political experience has been government under Marcos, and younger Filipinos increasingly resent us for supporting his regime.

The critical issue for our foreign policy is how to protect U.S. interests in the Philippines—not just for the moment, but for the longer term as well. As of today, our position is not as secure as it should be, because we are too closely identified with the Marcos regime.

A centrist Filipino journalist told me: "There is a perception that the U.S. is selling the Filipino people down the river, that the U.S. is willfully supporting Marcos. You need to be less supportive."

The primary cause of this perception was a new agreement in 1979 which doubled the amount of military aid provided to the Philippines in return for the use of our bases there.

The object of increasing aid was to secure our access to the bases. Instead, the new agreement has increased the risks by associating us with a regime that so many Filipinos find repugnant. One opposition leader recently commented that our support for Marcos could lead to "widespread and open hostility [which could] render these bases eventually untenable."

Moreover, while the term of the previous base agreement ran until 1991, the new one provides for review of its provisions by January 1984. At some earlier date, the process of review and renegotiation will begin, thereby increasing once again our identification with Marcos.

How will the Reagan administration conduct relations with the Philippines? There are already signs that it will read—or choose to read—the end of martial law as genuine progress, justifying warmer relations with the Marcos regime. President Reagan met with Imelda Marcos in New York for an hour last December, one of the few exceptions he made to his own rule against seeing foreign leaders before his inauguration. And a meeting between Marcos and Reagan (something that Marcos assiduously sought but never obtained from Carter, Ford or Nixon) is being considered.

Instead of seeking warmer relations, the United States should distance itself from the Marcos regime. While there is essential business which we must conduct, the relationship should be more cool, correct and formal than it is today. In concrete terms, how might we conduct a diplomacy of distancing?

We should abstain from unnecessary public acts that indicate our support for the regime. There should be a ban on high-level official visits to Manila, such as the 1977 trip of Vice President Mondale. Our ambassador should be instructed to avoid public appearances with the Marcoses that are trumpeted in the Philippine press and taken as a sign of our approval. And Marcos must not be invited to Washington.

Furthermore, we should adopt a position for the 1984 review of the new base agreement designed to disassociate us from the worst practices of the regime. As a sign of concern over widespread military abuses, for example, we might propose shifting part of the base compensation package from military to economic assistance.

A prudent foreign policy would recognize the growing opposition to Marcos, the approaching end of his rule and the unfavorable trends in Filipino attitudes toward the United States. It would therefore be designed to lessen our identification with Marcos and his government.●

SUMMARY STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to share with the House of Representatives the attached summary of the statement given by Mr. Morton A. Harris on behalf of the Small Business Council of America, Inc., to the Senate Finance Committee Subcommittee on Savings, Pensions, and Investment Policy on February 24, 1981.

Mr. Harris and I began our practice of law in the city of Columbus, Ga., about the same time, and Mr. Speaker,

I know you will understand the pardonable pride which I take in his life and service. Morton's accomplishments include presidency of the Small Business Council of America, Inc. and immediate past chairman of and presently special adviser to the professional service corporations committee of the American Bar Association's tax section. He is a leading lawyer in the Southeastern United States, and I commend his views to the attention of all the Members.

STATEMENT OF MORTON A. HARRIS

This statement is submitted on behalf of the Small Business Council of America, Inc., a nation-wide organization of business and professional men and women whose aim is to monitor and comment on federal tax and employee benefit legislation on behalf of small business corporations.

The Small Business Council of America, only two years old, has a growing membership, presently covering 43 states. The organization has both a legal and a business advisory board which includes leading tax attorneys, accountants, tax and employee benefit consultants and, well-known business owners located throughout the country.

I am President of the Small Business Council of America and am also a practicing attorney in Columbus, Georgia. Many of my law firm's clients are owners and principals of small businesses.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT—S. 12 AND S. 243

In general

The Small Business Council of America (SBCA) strongly supports and commends Senator Dole and Senator Chafee (and others who may become sponsors of S. 12 or S. 243) for seeking ways to encourage savings by individual employees for their own retirement and the education of their children.

The SBCA generally supports both S. 12 and S. 243 which, the SBCA believes, will provide a significant incentive to encourage employees to voluntarily contribute to either a qualified retirement plan, if they are covered and if the plan contains provisions for such contributions, or, in lieu thereof, to an individual retirement account (IRA).

The SBCA strongly supports the traditional concept that there are three fundamental elements of retirement security: (1) Social Security as a base, (2) private employer sponsored retirement plans, and (3) individual savings. Therefore, the SBCA favors and supports economic incentives which encourage the adoption and expansion of privately sponsored retirement plans and which encourage employees to individually save for their own retirement.

Although economic incentives of the kind embodied in S. 12 and S. 243 will not, alone, "cure" inflation and will not totally protect employees in their retirement, these bills are constructive steps which will tend to mitigate inflation and assist employees in providing for their own retirement.

The SBCA has previously supported similar bills and has submitted a position paper to the President's Commission on Pension Policy on November 29, 1979, dealing with matters of the kind involved in these bills. Since there is not time to restate all of the points which can be made in support of these bills at this hearing, I refer you to our position paper for detailed information and statements of our support for legislation of the kind here under consideration.

Recommendation for improvement

If the incentives provided in these bills are to give meaningful encouragement to private savings, two changes in the legislation should be considered.

1. Need for Equality Between Qualified Plans and IRA's. There should be no distinction between an employee who is covered under a qualified retirement plan and one who is not insofar as the dollar limit of the voluntary deductible contribution; otherwise, there will remain incentives for employees in certain instances to opt out of the qualified plan.

2. Need for Higher Deductible Contribution. The amount of the deductible contribution should be increased to a higher level, at least $5,000.00 per year, to encourage savings at a meaningful level for both lower and middle income employees earning less than $35,000.00 per year. The SBCA feels that the amount of the deductible contribution should be: (1) large enough so that the deductible amount will adequately encourage a level of retirement savings which is significant for a majority of America's employees; and (2) large enough so that the administrative costs involved will not be so great in relation to the amount of the deduction that it diminishes the incentive intended by these bills. For example, with a $1,000.00 per year limit, there can be only a maximum of $20,000.00, plus earnings, saved over a period of 20 years. In light of present inflationary conditions and future expectations, this level of savings cannot give many people a feeling that they could adequately save for their own retirement.

Conclusion

To summarize, it is important that there be an equal deductible contribution limit (whether or not covered by a qualified plan) as provided for in S. 243 which will remove any incentive for individuals to withdraw from participation in a qualified plan in order to participate only in an IRA and receive a higher deduction. Thus, if $1,000.00 is the limit on deductible contributions as provided for in S. 12 while $1,500.00 is the limit on IRA's, then some individuals will still find it to their benefit to drop out of qualified plans in order to establish IRA's.

Of the two legislative proposals dealing with employee contributions, we urge the format of S. 243 with a $5,000.00 deductible limit for the reasons stated above.●

REALISM AND RHETORIC IN THE BUDGET BATTLE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there is general agreement in the Congress and the Nation of the need for reductions in the Federal budget. Surely the major job of the 97th Congress will be the thorough examination and paring of Federal expenditures. As we undertake this task, I think it is extremely important that we make clear to the American people just how difficult the job will be and how dramatic the impact of budget reductions will be on the rate of inflation.

It is my hope that the administration will keep in mind the need to use realism as well as rhetoric toward this mutually desired end. Utilization of inaccurate statistics and jumbled analyses in order to serve partisan political purposes would be very unwise. The American people have indicated their support for budget cutbacks, even if they are painful; the Congress will hopefully join the administration in challenging the vested interests of the powerful as well as assaulting the programs designed to assist the unemployed, the ill, the poor, and the hungry.

A recent column in the Washington Post by Clayton Fritchey illustrates the rhetorical excesses of some recent administration statements about the economy. Mr. Fritchey suggests that we utilize more realism in describing the severity and nature of our economic plight: perhaps then we would find Americans better informed about our problems and more willing to cooperate in solving them.

The article follows:

* * * OF THE BUDGET MELODRAMA

(By Clayton Fritchey)

Two months ago, an admirer and backer of Ronald Reagan predicted (in The American Spectator) that when the president "sits down with his advisers to consider budget recommendations for the first fiscal year of his administration, he will be forced to confront—as policymaker rather than campaigner—a set of facts that may well make him wish he had gone into some other line of work."

Things have hardly come to that. Nonetheless, if the public is confused over how Ronald Reagan's much-heralded economic package is going to work, it has good reason. Even some of the president's longtime advisers, including six former chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers, have some misgivings about its size, shape and timing.

This much seems certain: when the first flush of excitement over the Reagan package wears off, there are going to be many surprised and disappointed Americans, especially those who believed everything they heard during the recent presidential campaign.

As things are shaping up, the 1981-82 tax bill, regardless of what the new administration intends, is not going to be less than it was in 1980, but much more. As the fiscal 1982 budget stands, it calls for an increase of $107 billion in tax revenues. The Reagan men hope to lop $50 billion or so off the tax bill, but even if they succeed, the bottom line will still be an increase of $50 billion or more over last year. So what is really at stake is not a tax reduction in the accepted sense, but simply a potential reduction of the scheduled increase.

President Carter's budget projects expenditures of $739 billion. Reagan hopes to cut that by about $40 billion, but it is a sound bet that the final spending figure will be closer to the Carter mark. When Congress gets through with the Reagan program, the proposed cuts will probably not greatly exceed $25 billion, and that saving would be cancelled out by the administra-

tion's plan for increasing military expenditures by $25 billion or more.

The 1982 budget estimates a deficit of $27 billion. Obviously it will be much larger than that if expenditures remain about the same, while estimated tax revenues are cut by around $50 billion, as planned. In that event, spending would total $739 billion as against receipts of around $660, leaving a deficit of almost $80 billion, or even more with continued stagflation.

President Reagan is being ill-served by his advisers when they provide him with melodramatic statements and statistics that can't stand scrutiny, as was notably the case in his recent television speech on the state of the economy. Who, for instance, is going to believe that we are in "the worst economic mess since the Great Depression"?

Back then 25 percent of our workers were unemployed, the banks were closed, and we were fighting deflation rather than inflation. Today, the banks are secure, and 60 percent of all persons of working age are employed, and all-time high. That adds up to 97.7 million jobs, with another 415,000 added last month.

Reviewing the American standard of living since 1960, Reagan says, "We all know we are very much worse off," whereas in fact, average personal income, even after allowing for inflation and taxes, has almost doubled in that period. Gardner Ackley, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, bluntly says, "Clearly in every respect we are better off than we were then." Much better off, other economists would say.

The president says "we have too much money chasing to few goods," although the problem is just the reverse in many of our largest industries, such as autos and steel, where supply far exceeds demand. Plants in the United States are operating at less than 80 percent of capacity.

Finally, the president warns that business is being taxed so hard that it is "being priced out of the world market." Actually, exports in 1980 were 22 percent higher than in 1979. Foreign trade, reports The Wall Street Journal, "which once played only a minor part in the country's economic picture, now occupies a huge, rapidly expanding role."

Are we, a Reagan asserts, "threatened with an economic calamity of tremendous proportions"? In the wake of that speech, the financial pages have been dominated by headlines like these: "Corporate Profits Rise 10 Percent," "Gross National Product Jumps 5 Percent," "U.S. Industrial Production Gains Fifth Month In a Row, Dollar Scores Fresh Gains."

The moral seems to be: Don't sell America short.●

AFTER TITO, A STRUGGLE—PART II

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, part I of this article appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 16, 1981, on pages 392 and 393. Part II covers World War II events up to the present. I recommend this concluding article by Hilaire du Berrier to the attention of my colleagues. A future chapter in this story will record whether President Reagan supported the forces of freedom in Yugoslavia, minus the heavy hand of Tito, or the forces of communism. Part II follows:

AFTER TITO, A STRUGGLE—PART II

General Dragoljub-Draza Mihailovich was 48 years old when a message reached him in the Bosnian town of Doboj, on April 16, 1941, ordering him to surrender the motorized unit of the IV Yugoslav Army. Disregarding the order, Mihailovich and his aide-de-camp, Miodrag Palosevich, sabotaged the materiel they could not take with them and led their followers into the hills of Upper Serbia. On April 19 he planted his flag on the plateau of Ravna Gora and launched what was to be his war cry: "With faith in God, for King and Country!" Again and again Mihailovich and Captain Hudson tried to establish a common front against the Germans, but the aim of the partisans was to survive the war, to let the Germans exterminate the royalists and hold Yugoslavia when the war was over.

Towards the end of 1942 Generals Glaise and Globotschnik, the German commanders in Yugoslavia, established a permanent arrangement with Tito and his partisans. Regularly they exchanged prisoners and information, and Tito's former comrade, Milovan Djilas, tells in his book, "Wartime," how Tito arranged a truce with the Germans in early 1943. The partisan leader was to be recognized as supreme chief of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, his partisan groups were permitted to leave areas where they were encircled and the Germans would be free to concentrate on the British while the partisans were destroying Mihailovich. The truce lasted until the end of 1943 when the German High Command assured Hitler they could wipe out Tito's 12,000 guerrillas and 130,000 supporters anytime he gave the order. Still, the British tried to bring Tito into a unified war effort. Sir Fitzroy Maclean and Randolph Churchill, the son of the Prime Minister, were sent to plead with the partisans but Tito continued to take orders from Moscow and as the flow of duped Americans assured him of Washington's support he was less inclined than ever to listen to the British. Milton Katz, the man to whom Averill Harriman turned for the green light on Jimmy Carter, gave all the assistance he could from his OSS base in Caserta. Colonel Henry Mays was to earn Tito's eternal friendship and a decoration and Colonel Richard Weil, Jr., the son of the owner of Macy's Department Store, was invaluable to Tito and his reds. It was easy for a young American during the years when Stalin was Roosevelt's "Good Old Joe" to be taken in, but others in that list too long to name were out-and-out communists.

Tito's attacks on isolated German groups, after the Germans broke their truce, became heroic battles when recounted to the Americans attached to the Tito camp. What they never realized was the frightfulness of the German reprisals on helpless civilians. Over 7,000 Serbs were massacred to avenge Tito's killing of 123 Germans. When Mihailovich tried to take the German strong point at Kraljevo, Tito remained in his camp and let the Germans encircle Mihailovich's 4,000 attackers. Not only did Tito kill more Yogoslavs than the Germans but because of him the Germans killed more Yugoslav hostages than Hitler ever lost to Tito. Shortly after the Germans broke their truce and in so doing forced Tito to look like a patriot, an attractive communist agent named Vera Posic gained the confidence of the British mission to Tito, with the assistance of two known communists on the inside. From that moment the partisans were given credit for Mihailovich's victories and London was conditioned for a change in alliances. General Albert Seitz, one of the Americans who had no delusions about the reds, protested with all his might, but he was up against Vera Posic's recruits and Americans such as Major Louis Huot, the Minnesota OSS officer who joined the reds on his own initiative.

The Teheran Conference of December 1943 decided Mihailovich's fate. Abandonment of Mihailovich meant the death of 500,000 loyal Yugoslavs. Between September and December 1944 Tito executed over 30,000 Mihailovich's soldiers under the approving eyes of General Tolboukhine of the Soviet Army. Between 200,000 and 300,000 more were handed over to Tito by the British after the German surrender in May 1945. All were executed. Of the 3,677,777 Yugoslavs who entered Tito's prisons between October 1944 and May 1951, there is no record as to how many came out. Churchill always maintained that he hoped to limit Russian expansion in the Balkans but that Stalin and Roosevelt lined up against him at Teheran and forced the signing of an accord with Tito in June 1944, which was violated clause by clause. Shortly after the June 1944 agreement, Tito was wounded and had to be transferred to Rome for treatment. There Churchill met him in the Grand Hotel and British authorities later agreed that the man who charmed Churchill was not the original Tito but his substitute, the polished Lebedev whom Tito's mother refused to recognize as her son. Churchill left Rome filled with enthusiasm for the man who had promised eternal gratitude and friendship for Britain. Where he had anticipated meeting an awkward Balkan peasant, he thought he had found a gentleman on whom he could count. "That man isn't a communist," he told his friends, who opposed forcing King Peter II to make the famous broadcast of September 1944 in which he called on all Yugoslavs to rally to Tito. Tito showed his gratitude by refusing to let the King return to his country. Years later, at the marriage of Princess Elizabeth, Churchill saluted King Peter and confided in an undertone: "Forgive me, Your Majesty. I was shamefully deceived."

Mihailovich continued to fight on. Lieutenant-Colonel Robert MacDowell, the American assigned to him, was probably Mihailovich's closest friend among the allies. Yet, Mihailovich continued to believe that America would see what was going on and send him supplies. The Serbs were loyal to him to a man and he was still successfully blocking German passage of the Danube when Tito-Lebedev received orders from Stalin to invade Serbia at all costs and link up with Marshal Malinovsky, the Russian commander in Romania. Lieut-Colonel MacDowell told Mihailovich to stand firm, that American aid was coming, and twenty-four hours later Tito proclaimed himself head of the government of Yugoslavia. As head of government and commander-in-chief of the Yugoslav Army, he called on Russian forces to come to his aid. It was a move that has since become classic and may soon be repeated in most of the states in the Yugoslav federation.

The first reaction of British commanders was to go to Mihailovich's aid, but a telegram from Churchill called them back and

the red army entered Serbia. Still believing in America, Mihailovich withdrew to the mountains of Upper-Serbia and Bosnia for a last stand. Before flying out on November 15, 1944, MacDowell begged him to go with him, to live out his life in exile, in America. Mihailovich refused. Sacrificed by the accords of the head of Teheran and Yalta he continued to hold off Tito and the Russians until his capture by the head of the Yugoslav GPU (Military Intelligence) in April 1946. The official version states that Mihailovich was executed by firing squad at the camp of Jajinci, 8 miles south of Belgrade, on July 17, 1946. Reliable witnesses state that he was thrown to savage police dogs in the prison courtyard, under the eyes of Milovan Djilas's wife, who was known as the Yugoslav "Passionaria," before her husband himself went to prison.

The story of Tito's substitution by a double could be verified if any nation found it in its interests to do so. On September 28, 1948, the Berlin editor of the Flensburger Tagblatt received a report from Belgrade on the Tito-Lebedev mystery. As late as 1971 a Belgrade woman who knew the original Tito wrote a confidential report stating that the Head of State was not the Tito she had known. Your correspondent has talked to people who knew both the nine-fingered Tito and the Tito with ten. The London Sunday Telegraph, of October 29, 1978, suggested that Mr. Norris McWhirter write a book on the Tito-Lebedev exchange. An abundance of papers and letters exist providing reasonable doubt as to the true identity of the man in the coffin before which the estranged Jovanka wept in the great hall of the Parliament in Belgrade. The question that remains is: Why did the man who was placed in power by the Kremlin defy Stalin in 1948?

One explanation is that the man we knew as Tito was a Stalinist by ambition, Djilas by imagination, Rankovitch by passion and Kardelj by conviction. The Stalinist Tito with a missing finger would have been willing to follow Moscow's orders at the head of a Balkan federation, but he had seen too many men disappear to be willing to put himself completely at Stalin's mercy. The medal-bedecked ex-czarist knew how determined Stalin was not to tolerate any Yugoslav leader with too many friends in the Italian, Albanian and Bulgarian communist parties. His break with Moscow came at a period when Stalin was unleashing another purge. Old comrades from the International Brigade in Spain were disappearing for knowing too much and Jewish communists who refused to forget the pact with Hitler were poor insurance risks. The final break came in early 1948 when Stalin installed the new Komintern in Belgrade. To a man who knew Stalin's methods it was time to break ranks and arrange for a fall-out of secrets that would shake the world if anything were to happen to him, and this is what Tito did.

Twenty-one days after Stalin died, Tito sent his trusted lieutenant, Josipovic, to Moscow on a secret mission and the same sort of truce that had been arranged with the Germans in 1942 was ironed out. It has held until this day. But now Tito is gone.

There was no threat of an open attack on Yugoslavia over the years, but as in all the other communist countries, men waiting for Moscow's orders wormed their way into ministries and key services in the communist parties of Yugoslavia's six republics and two autonomous regions. And America has guaranteed the independence of this mosaic of infiltrated nations! There are two alphabets, Latin and Cyrillic, eleven minorities and at least nine languages, including Serbia, Croatian and Slovenian-Macedonian in the Yugoslav package of peoples. There are four religions: Islam, Orthodox Christian, Catholic and Judaism. Nationalist break-away movements have kept the Serbs, Croatians, Slovenians, Montenegrans and Macedonians plotting for years, and surrounding the lot are seven neighbors, four of them communist, Italy, communist in all but name, Austria, neutral, and Greece unstable.

The politically astute Carter dodged any formal commitment when Yugoslav Defense Minister Nikola Ljubicic went to Washington to purchase arms in September 1978, but U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown declared: "Any aggression against Yugoslavia, any violation of its territorial integrity or its independence will be considered a serious menace by Washington." Certainly it will, but what will Washington do if Yugoslav communists invoke the Brezhnev doctrine and call on Moscow for aid? European consensus is that Afghanistan was a test case, to see how far America will go. The conclusion is that America is weak and Europe afraid.

Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko was not lying when he told the Yugoslav ambassador to Moscow on May 5, 1980, that the Soviet Union would not attack his country. Communization of Yugoslavia when it comes will be an expression of the will of Yugoslavia already in place and if the Russians come it will be by invitation.

The last chapter of the Tito-Lebedev story is not going to be changed by America unless a great strengthening of will takes place.●

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Legal Services Corporation has played a crucial role in our Nation's civil justice system since its establishment in 1974. The following article appeared recently in the New York Law Journal by Acting New York State Supreme Court Justice Leonard Cohen in support for continuing the excellent work of the Corporation.

[From the New York Law Journal, Feb. 3, 1981]

DECREASED FUNDING IMPERILS LEGAL SERVICES

To the Editor:

The recent Law Journal articles "Cutback in Funds Feared by Legal Services" by Martin Fox and "Funds for Legal Services Corporation Urged to Provide Court Access to Poor" by Archibald R. Murray, point up the necessity to mobilize the bar and public opinion in support of this sole federally funded program for equal access to the civil courts of our nation by those unable to afford private counsel.

Judges have a stake in the Congressional reauthorization of an adequately funded Legal Services Corporation, without restrictive amendments, because of our unique responsibility to ensure that justice is administered equally and fairly in the courtrooms. This is especially important in our city's civil courts where pro se litigants, lacking funds for counsel, are often deprived of adequate representation. Moreover, hundreds of thousands of people in our city, mostly blacks and hispanics, have no one to turn to for advice and counsel prior to litigation involving their non-criminal legal problems.

Decreased funding is one peril facing the Legal Services Corporation. Other perils are Congressional proposals which may undermine this program by imposing unreasonable restrictions on the legal services permitted, such as migrant labor and alien representation; abortion related litigation; and administrative and legislative advocacy. In addition, there are proposals to allocate 50 percent of federal funds to the private bar, often mislabeled "Judicare." Characterizing such proposals as "Judicare" implies an element of judicial approval which is untrue and therefore misleading.

Such efforts may serve as a prelude to cripple the morale of the dedicated staff, structured and attuned to the local needs of their clients.

Although the private bar has and ought to continue to make substantial contributions to the representation of the disadvantaged, it cannot adequately duplicate the structured commitment and continuity of independent and non-partisan staff concept, devoted exclusively to their disadvantaged clients. The training, experience and commitment which the Legal Services Corporation has developed for its professional staff should be expanded and encouraged rather than downgraded and reduced.

As judges, we sought to be in the vanguard of support for continuing the Legal Services Corporation which channels $20 million annually to our state, employing about 400 staff attorneys. Often we are the last resort for people in the resolution of their civil disputes and we should not sit back and watch the slow demise of a national policy and program protective of equal justice under the law.

Our city reflects the growing national gap of inequality because of race and economic class, the impact of which ends up in the courthouse. The Legal Services Corporation, imperfect as it may be, is one way to bridge this inequity. It seems to me that we, as judges, together with the organized bar and other concerned groups, ought to reinforce this bridge consistent with the true administration of justice and make our voices heard loud and clear in the halls of Congress.

LEONARD N. COHEN.●

COMMITMENT TO COUNTRY

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a voice of democracy contest. The contest theme this year was My Commitment to My Country.

The winning speech this year from Colorado was submitted by 17-year-old Michael Sarchet, a constituent of mine from Fort Lupton, Colo. Although patriotism has not always been fashion-

able in recent times, I feel Michael has articulately expressed what it means today to love one's country. I commend his comments to my colleagues.

1980-81 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM COLORADO WINNER

When I was five years old, my kindergarten teacher taught me these words: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America." I didn't yet understand what I was saying, but I was making a commitment, a commitment to my country.

Yet how could I or any one else be committed to a country, or to a flag? For a country is only a set of boundaries drawn on a map, and a flag is only a piece of cloth meant to represent something else entirely different. To these things alone I cannot be committed. Yet I do have a commitment. My commitment is to a nation of people who live within my country's borders, to their ideals of freedom and justice, and to the people all over the world who share these ideals, for they also are my countrymen.

It is to these ideals and to these people that I, and the rest of the nation must be committed, not only in word but in deed as well, for commitment is a reality that is shown through action. It is such an easy thing to say "I believe" but this is not commitment. Your commitment speaks for itself with every action you take and every deed that you do. To fulfill our commitment to these ideals and to these people to whom these ideals belong, we therefore must take on certain responsibilities: the responsibility of using our voice in government, the responsibility of defending our liberty, and the responsibility to our future.

Our first great responsibility is to use our voice in our nation's politics. To fail to do this is not only to fail to use and protect one of our greatest rights, but it is also a failure to insure that America continues to have conscience. America is capable of injustice as well as justice, it has the potential to be as wrong as it is right but by using our voice in government we the people can change what is wrong and unjust. By voting, by writing our representatives, and by standing up for what we believe is right we become our nations conscience.

The second great responsibility is that of defending our freedom. Our freedom was bought with blood. Men died so that we the children that they would never see could be free. We therefore must also be committed to insuring the freedom of our children, no matter what the cost.

This is our greatest commitment. It is to our future, to insure that the freedom, the liberty, and the justice that we inherited from out past will still be there for our children to give to their children.

If we leave this world a little freer, and a little more just than it was when we inherited it, then people will know that we did fulfill our responsibilities, and that we had a commitment, not to a boundary, or to a flag, but to the ideal of freedom, and to a nation of people who love that ideal, wherever they may be in the world. It is this commitment that made a few men fight and die for freedom in 1776, and it is this commitment that may someday let all human beings walk free.

To this end "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America" and to the commitment for which it stands.●

RECREATION FOR ALL CHILDREN AT ADVENTURE ISLAND

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, Adventure Island Playground located in Pascagoula, Miss., is a unique facility and a real treasure chest for children ages 14 and under. The new playground is especially geared to handicapped children in the area and is the first park not associated with a facility for handicapped children to center on developing motor and perceptual skills.

Many recreational facilities for handicapped children are isolated and set apart from areas reserved for so-called normal children. This new playground will allow mentally and physically retarded children to interact on a one-to-one basis with nonhandicapped children, allowing each to benefit from the other. It is intended to be not only a device for exploration but also an extension of the more traditional methods of teaching handicapped children.

An interesting aspect of the facility is its use as a device for the physical therapist. Both handicapped children with poor muscle tone as well as children with broken bones can benefit from a program of exercises designed to use the playground equipment in strengthening muscles and maximizing muscle tone and movement. In fact, a local physical therapist is developing rehabilitation programs using playground equipment as a part of the therapy. Regarding the equipment itself, each piece is to be accessible to handicapped children and surprisingly enough that includes almost all of the usual playground apparatus.

One of the most important parts of the program is the role of volunteers in making Adventure Island a success. If the time of these volunteers were to be counted in determining the total cost, the bottom line figure would be considerably greater than it is. However, numerous individuals in the Pascagoula area have given of themselves and their talents to make this a prime example of a program which successfully incorporates Federal and local efforts and financing to reach a common goal.

The people of the city of Pascagoula are bubbling with excitement over this novel idea which has become a reality. They deserve to be proud of such an achievement and I congratulate them on their success.●

INFLATION BENEFITS THE RICH, NOT THE POOR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear the hue and cry that President Reagan's proposals to cut Government spending, taxation, and inflation will hurt the poor when, in fact, the opposite is true. Government-fueled inflation, which reduces the purchasing power of the currency and pushes working Americans into higher tax brackets, is rapidly reducing the middle class into the ranks of poverty and making the poor worst off, while simultaneously benefiting the powerful and well off.

The Wall Street Journal of February 24 carried three articles of interest which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. The first is an editorial, "Crash Course," showing the illogical economic thinking of congressional Democrats and the news media on President Reagan's proposals.

The second editorial, "Meanwhile in Autoland," notes the tax revolt in Michigan by 3,500 autoworkers.

The third article, "The Rich Got Richer From History's Inflations," is a review of a recently published book reminding us that past and present inflations benefit the privileged while impoverishing everyone else, particularly the poor, the workers, and the small businessmen.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we stopped the game of political charades and move rapidly toward enacting the President's package of spending and tax cuts. Ending the price spiral will insure that the winners will be the poor, the retired, and the working American. The losers will be the rich and privileged.

The articles follow:

CRASH COURSE

The nation is getting a crash course in economics from President Reagan's plans for tax rate cuts, budget program reduction, regulatory relief and monetary restraint. The ensuing debate promises major advances in economic thinking.

A novel and intriguing explanation of inflation, for example, has already emerged in press and congressional reaction to Mr. Reagan's tax plans. To wit, the cause of inflation is a reduction in the rate of tax increases. At least, that would seem to be the logic behind the worries that it would be inflationary to pare back scheduled tax increases in the way Mr. Reagan's plan proposes.

We particularly loved the variant of this theme offered by columnist Tom Wicker. This is a bad time to cut taxes, he suggested, because the reduction would be "an added inflationary pressure to those already unleashed this year." Among the pressures already unleashed he included "a sharp rise

in Social Security payroll taxes." Whew, if tax cuts cause inflation, and tax increases also cause inflation, no wonder it is such an intractable problem.

Up on Capitol Hill, meanwhile, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee thinks he needs a couple of months to sort things out. Rep. Dan Rostenkowski is new to his job, and says he will need a lot of public hearings on the Reagan proposals. Last week he was saying a tax bill couldn't be reported to the House floor until mid-May, and by this week that had already slipped to late May. Since Mr. Rostenkowski was working on tax matters on Ways and Means long before he became chairman, we kept wondering what it was he needed to know.

The answer became clear upon pondering the Democrats' televised response to the Reagan message. They need a little time to figure out how to change the tax code in ways that will encourage more savings and investment, but will not give more money to those taxpayers who save and invest. Two themes ran through the broadcast by three Democrats—that the Reagan plan did not have enough economic stimulus and that by cutting taxes across the board it "gave" too much to "the rich."

On the other hand, New York Times reporter Steven Rattner has discovered that "the rich" are being discriminated against because the 10% rate reductions do not apply to the 50% maximum rate on "personal service income." The interaction between this provision and the reductions that do apply to the top 70% rate on investment income was complicated enough to confuse both the White House and tax cut leader Rep. Jack Kemp. In fact, everyone's total tax bill will be lower if Mr. Reagan's plan is passed, but Mr. Rattner has a point that for some taxpayers the marginal tax rate will be unchanged. Those taxpayers, that is, who have $215,000 in taxable income from wages and salaries and nothing from investment income.

How Mr. Reagan's proposals will fare against congressional nibbling remains to be seen. But at the moment he seems not only to have the only plan in town, but to have done a mighty job of sowing confusion in the ranks of the enemy.

Meanwhile in Autoland

While the U.S. House of Representatives does its tax-cut gavotte, auto workers in Michigan have taken matters into their own hands. In outright defiance of the federal income tax, some 3,500 taxpayers around Flint and Detroit are refusing to file returns or are claiming dozens of fictitious dependents. It is not necessary to defend this kind of illegal action to point out that tax revolts, like revolts of all kinds, have political means. They mean people think they aren't getting their money's worth from government. As the Democrats in the House make their fancy parliamentary steps, we suggest that they cast a wary eye over their shoulders.

The Rich Got Richer From History's Inflations

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Curbing inflation will necessitate, among other things, holding down federal handout programs, and that's bound mainly to hurt the poor.

That popular conviction, which sounds so logical, makes the fight against inflation, from a political standpoint, exceedingly difficult to carry on. How much simpler the inflation fight would be, politically, if the truth were that the powerful and well-off, and not the poor, would be the ultimate losers if the price spiral could once and for all be ended. How much easier for the Reagan people if they could honestly proclaim, while slashing the budget that the cutbacks were aimed ulitmately against the nation's privileged.

Impressive support for the view that inflation chiefly benefits the privileged shows up in a new book titled "The Penniless Billionaires" (Times Books, $15, 308 pages) by Max Shapiro, who has worked for various investment firms and written for a number of financial publications. The book focuses on periods of severe inflation. For instance, the author recounts in detail such notorious inflations as occurred in Imperial Rome, 18th Century France and Germany in the early 1920s.

The book, his first, is far from faultless. Mr. Shapiro, for all his grasp of economic history, is hard to read. Two favorite words are agglomerator and purblind. Parts of the narrative, moreover, are tedious, overusing quotations from earlier histories. But such faults are outweighed by the book's intriguing message:

That the worst inflations generally served, before they got out of hand, to benefit the privileged and, in fact, tended to be "created by the small majority at the center of power, in order to maintain and expand . . . power and simultaneously accumulate a mounting store of assets."

Mr. Shapiro stresses this point, among other places, in his account of France's price spiral in the late 18th Century. "Throughout the hyperinflation of the assignats [paper currency]," he writes, "the bourgeoisie, motivated by the desire to retain power and by the financial advantages which are ancillary to power, repeatedly chose the expediency of excessive money creation . . . and rejected the much-needed but considerably less popular course of diligent tax collection."

The author explains how the well-off managed to create a situation in France where the average person was "never able to secure enough money to buy anything but the barest necessities" because his income, though nominally rising, in reality was eroding from inflation. Mr. Shapiro further notes that persons "able to command a great quantity of money" meanwhile could acquire highly expensive items constituting a "reservoir of value" as inflation worsened. Extensive borrowing, he writes, further enabled "this privileged coterie . . . to buy up a considerable share of the nation's wealth."

A similar pattern is detected, for example, in Germany in the early 1920s. Recalling Germany's surging money supply in 1922. Mr. Shapiro states that "hordes of new marks were created for the sole use of the large German industrialists" to facilitate their grabbing up "hundreds of small firms" financially hobbled by the price spiral. In the period, he adds, "legislation abetting the formation of conglomerates was enacted."

Along the way, Mr. Shapiro sketches various beneficiaries of these inflations. There is Hugo Stinnes, the super-rich German said to have amassed in the early 1920s "more industrial, banking and mining companies than any other individual in recorded history." There is Gabriel Ouvrard, the son of a French grocer, who became the owner of 24 houses and in 1796 boasted an annual income "almost equal to the yearly stipend collected by Louis XVI for the maintenance of the entire royal court" during his reign.

When the various price spirals collapsed, as all eventually did, so did the inflation-built empires of such men as Hugo Stinnes. In the author's view, such inflations usually pass through three stages, starting with rapid money-creation to help finance governmental excesses. The second stage, where the privileged prosper most, involves investment-hedging in tangible assets. Then there is a so-called hyper period when things get out of hand and a currency's buying power virtually vanishes amid such economic dislocations that normal business dealings come to a near halt.

Mr. Shapiro suggests that phase two prevails today, and recent data tend to support that view. Government figures show, for instance, a slight recent rise in Americans deemed by federal analysts to live in poverty. Other data show a sharp rise in the nation's millionaire population, an appreciably swifter rise than can be attributed simply to the impact of inflation.

The author hopes, but is by no means certain, that phase three can be averted. Much will depend, of course, on the success of the inflation-fighting effort taking shape in Washington. It's interesting to note early complaints from the powerful likes of the American Medical Association and oil companies involved in the costly synthetic fuels program. As for the wealthy, a recent report shows that the housing market, while lagging in many areas, is booming as never before in Palm Beach, Fla.

A NEW EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, those who believe as I do that there is a need for clarification of the equality of rights of male and female under the law should start to consider where we go from here, since the prospects for ratification of the current equal rights amendment proposal look bleak indeed.

The time for ratification of that amendment expired on March 22, 1979, except for those who believe that the extension, passed by the 95th Congress, removed all doubt about the ultimate ratification of the ERA.

Although reports of opposition to the ERA have centered on such matters as the drafting of women into the military, abortion rights, and other controversial implications, I believe that an underlying concern in the minds of many State legislators is the fact that section 2 of the proposed ERA empowers only the Congress to enforce the principle of equal rights by appropriate legislation, thus potentially preempting considerable areas of current State authority. For example, could not an argument be fashioned that there should be a uniform, national law on the procedures for divorce, property settlement, and child custody? What about marriage, licens-

ing of occupations and professions, contract law, probate law, and perhaps other areas of law traditionally within the authority of the States, but potentially affected by differences related to sex?

Because I believe that there is a need for clarification of the law in this respect, I am again introducing a new ERA which recognizes and protects the appropriate jurisdiction of the States to share in the enforcement of equal rights.

I realize that the thought of starting all over again with another ERA is anathema even to supporters of the current ERA proposal. That was a major reason behind the push for an extension of the ratification period. Nevertheless, there is a need for the principle to be established and the pending proposal appears very unlikely to be ratified. Thus, I offer my alternative with the hope that those who believe in the principle of equal rights will come to support this new proposal.●

MORAL MAJORITY A REACTION TO ATTACK ON BASIC VALUES OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, throughout history, societies and their government have been based upon some set of values of morality. The totalitarian Communists have a strict code of morality, although such a statement will surprise many. The Communist morality is far removed from the set of values that made America great and far removed from what might be termed Western civilization values.

Communism is a militant form of humanism; that is, the placing of man at the center of the universe and the kicking out of God. Under such a moral code, whatever benefits man or society is right, good, and truthful; and whatever hinders man and his society is wrong, bad, and dishonest. Such a code or morality is technically humanism and for the Communists and their willing allies, a militant form of humanism. Karl Marx observed that Marxism is humanism and humanism is Marxism. He was right.

Our Nation, America, was founded upon an equally firm set of values—values that sprang from a Biblical basis of morality. These values have as a central point of understanding the knowledge that God is at the center of all things and that laws and society spring from God's Commandments—not man's whims. Basic rights, therefore, come from God, not man or government. Under Biblical morality, it is held that the function of government is to protect the God-given rights.

In the classical American view, our laws have as their foundation this Biblical basis of morality, and for a century and a half that view of morality has run through our society as a matrix or glue.

The problem today is that for a generation and a half the American society and its Government have embraced secular humanism as its new guideposts. This is evident in our entertainment, textbooks of government in our schools, general attitudes of many of our churches and their literature, sermons, pronouncements, and so forth, and unfortunately in our Government.

With the transition away from constitutional law as the basis of law to social law in our courts there has been concurrent shift away from Biblical morality to humanism with its adherence to shifting or relative values.

In my opinion, these changes of the past one and a half generations have brought a disaster. To combat and reverse these dangers and to restore sound—eternal concepts—values across the board, various groups have been formed. One of the most effective of these groups is the Moral Majority, founded by Rev. Jerry Falwell, of Lynchburg, Va.

In the January 1981 issue of the Conservative Digest, Dr. Falwell reviews the position of the Moral Majority. Perhaps Gen. Douglas MacArthur was right when he said that in the final analysis, the question is theological.

For the benefit and interest of my colleagues, the article follows:

WE'RE HERE TO STAY AND WON'T GO AWAY—MORAL MAJORITY A REACTION TO ATTACK ON BASIC VALUES OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS

(By Dr. Jerry Falwell, President, Moral Majority)

I wasn't the best physics student in college, but one law I do remember is that for every action there is an identical and equal reaction. Not only is this an absolute law in physics, but it also has repercussions in the moral and political worlds.

In any assessment of what is happening in the so-called New Right that has produced what may prove to be the most phenomenal political metamorphosis since the Roosevelt era of the early 1930s, it is important to remember that what is being observed is a "reaction" to the "action" that preceded it.

Many liberal columnists and commentators are waxing apoplectic about the election results of 1980. The American Civil Liberties Union and Playboy magazine have spent thousands of dollars in full-page advertisements in the New York Times to warn that the advent of the so-called New Right foretells a danger greater than the Black Plague. I think their biggest problem is that they and their philosophies are now "out" and they are used to being "in." How will they ever carry on an acceptable conversation at those Washington dinner parties, assuming that they'll be invited by conservatives?

I founded Moral Majority in 1979, not to take over the country, as some have charged, but because I believed that a majority of decent Americans were fed up to the teeth with having their values rejected and, in many cases, reversed by the power of a government to which they paid taxes and sent sons to fight its wars.

Let us remember that it was not the moral majority that in 1963 outlawed prayer in the public schools. Such prayers had helped produce young citizens with the kinds of values that opposed stealing and murder and supported hard work, integrity and honesty. It was not the moral majority that in 1972 decided it was all right to murder defenseless, unborn babies and then, Pilate-like, wash their hands of the whole affair, saying that "for purposes of this ruling, it is not necessary to determine when human life begins." It was not the moral majority that in the mid '70s gave credibility to the practice of homosexuality as a "valid, alternative lifestyle" and sought special legislation and court rulings that would provide civil rights protection to those who chose to indulge in homosexual behavior—the same type of protection that is afforded legitimate minorities.

Those in the Moral Majority of a religious persuasion (and we count among us fundamentalists, Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, Mormons and persons of no particular religious convictions at all who believe in the moral principles we espouse) had been virtually disenfranchised by our own government, a government and a republic founded by our pro-moral ancestors. We were told by our previous President that he did not consider religious convictions a high priority on his agenda for hiring personnel for his administration. So he hired persons who represented a "red flag" to the pro-moral forces: a top aide who argued the Roe vs. Wade abortion case before the Supreme Court, a large number of radical feminists, a humanist for Secretary of Education and other humanists and atheists for federal judgeships.

Our response to these 17 years of liberal insensitivity to pro-moral concerns was not only to cry "enough," but also to stop crying and organize to do something about it. Thus, Moral Majority, Inc., was born and grew faster than any of us could have predicted.

We grew because we touched a raw nerve in the American electorate. Pro-moral people, who felt disenfranchised, saw a rallying point, an organization that would speak to the issues they were concerned with but could never get discussed through the liberal-controlled media.

Many pastors, like myself, had in recent years preached against what we are doing now. But we saw no one else willing to "stand in the gap" and take the heat, so we acted, lest our beloved country go down the tube and not be fit for anything, including the spreading of the Gospel to the ends of the earth.

We have been called "ayatollahs" by government officials, "fascists" by those who don't know the meaning of the word and never experienced the terror of Adolf Hitler and "religious fanatics" by those who know little about religion and never believed enough in a cause or a principle to become "fanatical" about it. Of course the words hurt—sometimes worse than sticks and stones when they come from government officials and those within the church community.

But we are here to stay. We are not going away. We intend to broaden our base, to speak to more issues and, instead of being "reactors," to be leaders in the battle to restore this nation to her moral foundations and principles. We can expect more attacks, but we are not giving up. We don't pretend to have all the answers, but we believe we have more of them than the liberals whose policies have been so soundly repudiated at the polls. No less a liberal than New York Rep. Shirley Chisholm has acknowledged in print the failure of the nearly 50-year-old liberal agenda.

Let's just remember, as our liberal friends continue to impugn everything from our integrity to our intelligence, just who set in motion what we are observing today. The Moral Majority is simply a "reaction" to the "action" begun by the liberals as they sought to dismantle our moral heritage.●

THE SURPLUS SCHOOL CONVERSION ACT OF 1981

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to solve the economic and social evils of abandoned schools.

The bill, the Surplus School Conversion Act, would permit the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide funds to local educational agencies (LEA's), based on declining enrollment priorities, to renovate underutilized school buildings. It also provides funds to provide technical assistance for planning the best use of surplus school buildings. Additionally, the bill amends the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide that school facilities under the jurisdiction of LEA's which have experienced certain declining student enrollments will be given priority for the receipt of grants under that act.

In determining whether to approve an application submitted under this bill, the Secretary will give priority to applications requesting funds to renovate buildings for the following types of purposes: Community centers, day care centers, senior citizens' centers, recreational centers, private enterprise, educational purposes, or housing.

School buildings which have closed or are not fully utilized represent valuable resources which could be operated for other productive uses. Because most local educational agencies lack the funds necessary to adequately renovate such underutilized school buildings, the Federal Government could provide funds to convert such buildings to other useful purposes in furtherance of our national effort to preserve valuable resources. By providing this initial seed money to renovate underutilized or abandoned schools, we can save valuable financial and environmental resources and help preserve community assets.

Surveys from educational research centers have shown that the phenomenon of underutilized or abandoned schools is present not only in large urban areas, but also has taken place in rural regions. I feel that this bill will make use of these abandoned facilities in a manner which is beneficial to all communities.

A report issued by the General Accounting Office on January 19, 1981, found that there were nearly 2,500 vacant schools in 19 States, and that student enrollment in public schools is expected to continue to decline, with 34 States projecting a net decrease in enrollment of 2 million students over the next 5 years. This decrease in student population will force additional school closings. Because there may be opportunities for substantial cost savings by using more vacant schools, the General Accounting Office believes that an evaluation of the feasibility of using such schools should be required before construction funds are awarded to grantees.

There is no reason why abandoned schools should be neglected when they can be put to a useful purpose. Scores of abandoned school buildings that now serve no useful purpose represent potential solutions to the present problem.●

THE NEW YORK TIMES GIVES WARNING ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION'S HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, several actions of the Reagan administration signal a dangerous policy turn away from the important role of human rights in our international relations. The President's recent meeting with South Korea's President, the proposed appointment of a staunch antihuman rights advocate to the State Department's top human rights post, and proposed foreign aid budget cuts which would undermine U.S. foreign policy forewarn us of a growing trend in the administration's thinking.

A recent editorial in the New York Times discusses this series of actions by the administration and warns of the dangers such a policy could bring. I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the concerns raised by this editorial:

[From the New York Times, Friday, February 6, 1981]

WRONG TURNS ON HUMAN RIGHTS

A once-promising American commitment to human rights may have been swept under the red carpet rolled out this week for Chun Doo Hwan. During his White House visit, the South Korean President got about all he wanted: a legitimizing pat from President Reagan, a promise of hardware and an assurance that American troops will stay in South Korea. And butter would have melted on Mr. Reagan's toast to Mr. Chun: "In the short time you've had, Mr. President, you've done much to strengthen the tradition of 3,000 years' commitment to freedom."

Conservatives argue that a secure, self-confident Korean regime is more likely to follow a democratic path. They point out, plausibly, that the Carter Administration got nowhere with a human rights policy that was sufficient to annoy but too weak to sway an authoritarian regime. In the end, both the Seoul Government and its democratic opponents came to regard the policy as self-righteous humbug.

It is plainly true that, in the case of Seoul, the new Administration can already declare a victory. Just before his trip, President Chun ended martial law and commuted the death sentence of his most outspoken critic, Kim Dae Jung. Nonetheless, Mr. Reagan's approach risks signaling total indifference to whatever an allied government may do to its own people.

Case in point: to spare President Chun embarrassment, the Administration got Congress to delay for a week the publication of an annual report on human rights that the State Department is required by law to prepare. If that is worrying, it is altogether alarming that the Administration is considering Ernest W. Lefever as head of the department's Bureau of Human Rights. He is an ultraconservative who sneers at existing policy as sentimental nonsense and believes it is profound error to embarrass allies, however repressive, with talk about habeas corpus.

Not all conservatives share that view. William F. Buckley Jr., for one, has argued that there is precious substance in a policy of opposing all repression, on the right and left. There is strong appeal in his proposal to create an independent Commission on Human Rights, whose sole purpose would be to provide authoritative reports.

The human rights issue is not partisan or ideological. An American commitment to human rights serves both moral and practical ends. To dilute or, worse, to parody that commitment serves neither.●

MEMORIAL PLAQUE AT ARLINGTON FOR EIGHT WHO DIED

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which calls for the creation of a permanent memorial plaque at Arlington National Cemetery for the eight American servicemen who lost their lives in the ill-fated Iranian rescue mission.

Now that the excitement and the emotion surrounding the safe return of all of our hostages has begun to die down, I believe that it is important for us to remember those who will not be coming home.

Even though their mission ended in tragedy, these eight Americans were heroes in the truest sense of the word. They willingly laid down their lives trying to help their fellow countrymen, and this is the highest tradition of valor.

I am hopeful that a lasting memorial at Arlington will serve as a reminder to all of us of the courage and the sacrifice of these eight men, and serve as an inspiration for all Americans.

The original idea for a memorial was first suggested to me in a letter from one of my constituents, Mrs. Mary V. Cunningham of Nashville.

In her letter, Mrs. Cunningham said:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BONER: I think it would be a good idea to institute a motion to have erected in Washington a memorial plaque with the names of the servicemen who gave their lives in the rescue attempt of our hostages. God bless them.

I thought it was a wonderful idea, and so I began to research the question with the Department of Defense and others. The response was uniformly favorable, and so I went ahead and developed the legislation.

I have always been a strong believer in staying close to the people back home and paying attention to their ideas, and I am delighted to have had Mrs. Cunningham's input on this legislation.

I suspect that her feelings on this issue are representative of many of the people in our country, and I hope that they will feel as much a part of this legislation as she does.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

WASTE IN THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the Christian Science Monitor which discusses President Reagan's proposed increase in defense spending.

President Reagan's proposed increases in defense spending would amount to $31 billion by next fiscal year. The Reagan administration should look at this increase carefully in the light of their policy of searching out waste and extravagance in the Government.

The Congressional Republican Study Committee reported that the Pentagon could save $15 billion if it reduced waste and abuse of funds. The House Appropriations Committee report on the defense appropriation bill for 1981 cites many ways in which the Defense Department wastes the taxpayer's money. Keeping these reports in mind, President Reagan should require housecleaning in the Pentagon as well as in the many social programs he proposes cutting. The establishment of this criteria for all departments will insure that any increase in defense spending passed by Congress will be used efficiently.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

STUDY CITES 46 ABUSES—WASTED DOLLARS AT PENTAGON: HOW MUCH WILL REAGAN SAVE?

(By Stephen Webbe)

Admirals and generals are striding Pentagon corridors these days with a new spring in their step.

But their elation at the prospect of billions of dollars' worth of additional defense expenditures may be tempered somewhat as they are required to ferret out waste in the nation's sprawling defense establishment. According to a congressional report, US armed forces squander billions of dollars yearly.

The Reagan administration plans to ask Congress to boost the Pentagon's budget for this fiscal year and the next by $31 billion. About $6 billion extra will be sought this year and another $25 billion will be asked for fiscal 1982.

Former President Carter had submitted a $194.6 billion defense budget to Congress for the latter fiscal year, the largest such request in peacetime history.

But with the additional billions comes President Reagan's injunction to Defense Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger to "search out" waste and extravagance at the Pentagon. He might well have added fraud and abuse to the list.

The Congressional Republican Study Committee has estimated that the Pentagon could save $15 billion yearly if it puts its house in order. A House Appropriations Committee report on the defense appropriation bill for 1981 lists 46 ways in which the armed services fritter away taxpayers' dollars—to the tune of tens of billions yearly.

According to the little-publicized report, failure to levy "proper and complete" charges on countries receiving military equipment under the Foreign Military Sales Program—notably for training and transportation—is a habit that incurs considerable losses. Indeed, the General Accounting Office (GAO) estimates that the Defense Department is more than a billion dollars out of pocket as a result.

Losses are also incurred, adds the report, by failure to return to depots millions of dollars' worth of equipment that needs repair, a practice that results in simultaneous disposal and procurement of costly items.

Poor record-keeping and accounting practices have permitted the theft of millions of gallons of fuel, it adds.

Altogether, the report asserts that billions of dollars are wasted by such practices as:

Repeatedly paying "outrageous prices" for small, simple-to-manufacture items.

Paying maintenance contractors for work never performed.

Storing clothing at supply depots thousands of miles from training bases where it is issued.

Failing to reduce the theft and "misappropriation" of supplies and materials.

Operating duplicate facilities for the overhaul of air-launched missiles and falling to consolidate various training and education activities.

Scrutiny of the published hearings of the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee discloses additional, dramatic wastage in the armed forces.

Last year, for instance, an inspection of the Naval Supply Center in Oakland, Calif., revealed that 240 propellers, propulsion shafts, and other components valued at $8 million were rusting in the open air for lack of warehouse space.

The subcommittee also discovered that in fiscal year 1978 the Defense Logistics Agency lost $6 million worth of goods, much of it from the Defense General Supply Center in Richmond, Va. It declared that warehouses at the depot were "literally stuffed with pilferable and nice-to-have items." Security at the center has since been tightened up.

According to the committee's investigative staff, the Navy's research and development effort wastes "millions of dollars" each year by leasing computers an average of 48 months "beyond the period at which purchase would have been the best decision."

Moreover, the committee cites defense auditors for the assertion that the Department of Defense employs 17 obsolete computer systems costing $1.8 million annually to operate when more modern equipment exists that could do the work.

The Navy often seems to suffer from greater abuse than its sister services. Its clothing and tools are regularly pilfered by personnel and last year it was alleged that its exchange system (on-base stores) had lost more than $100 million through kickbacks, mismanagement, and cover-ups.

Navy shipbuilding practices do not seem to be dictated by economy, either. Rep. Norman D. Dicks (D) of Washington claims yards could build warships a lot more cheaply "if there wasn't all the Navy bureaucracy superimposed upon them with its apparent inability to make up their minds on the design of ships." He is also critical of the "tremendous" number of costly changes the Navy makes once a ship is under construction.●

MONTANA'S WINNING SPEECH IN THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS' VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. RON MARLENEE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share with my colleagues Montana's winning speech in the Veterans of Foreign Wars' voice of democracy contest. This speech, entitled "My Commitment to My Country," was written by Michael Stoeckig, a 17-year-old from Glendive, Mont.

America. A word that stands for more than merely a large chunk of earth that some quarter of a billion people occupy. America stands for so much more than only a portion of a continent, a slab of ground, a country if you will. The word does not, cannot stand for only one thing. America stands for something entirely different to each and every citizen of the great bastion of freedom that was labeled America some 204 years ago.

There are some 220 million people that call this country home. 220 million minds that each have a different idea that they call America. To the artist, America means a place where he or she can work without censorship; without fear that the government will intervene and change the meaning of a work of sculpture, a line of poetry, or a stroke of a brush. To the critic it means the ability to point out, perhaps make fun of a flaw in the makeup of our social system. To the immigrant, America may mean not having to look over one's shoulder, not to worry about unfair imprisonment for one's deeds. America means all things to some people, some things to all people, but no matter who is asked, America has some meaning to all. All people who are referred to as Americans have some meaning associated with the word America.

And that leads to the theme of my dissertation, the statement, "My commitment to my country." Before a person can be committed to anything, he must first ask himself what meaning it has to him and where it comes on his list of priorities. That is what I have done in finding exactly what my commitment to my country really is. I have asked myself what my country means to me. I have asked what matters most to me, my country, my family, my friends or something entirely different.

And I have come up with some answers. At first, it was hard to find where my country placed on my list of priorities. I worked and re-worked the list a dozen times, got a dozen different answers, and got a dozen more questions. But suddenly, I realized that I would have none of the things that matter most dearly to me if I did not live in a place called America. Indeed I may not have even been born, for my ancestors were among those who came to this country under the label "immigrant." Had they not come here at the times they did I would not be speaking here today.

So I saw that America is indeed a lot more than a slab of ground or a portion of a continent. America is my home.

My home, my country, means a great deal to me; so much so that I cannot put into words the extent of the feelings that it evokes. Something that has had so much meaning to me, deserves an extremely large commitment from me. I must be dedicated to upholding the principles and ideals that this great nation has represented throughout history. I must help to make the way clear for forthcoming generations to appreciate the things that I have been privileged enough to come in contact with. And I must do so with pride. A pride that our people have so often shown. A pride in their nation that the whole world recognizes as uniquely American. A pride that our founding fathers would be proud of, for America was their home too.

I know not what form this dedication will take. Whether it is through public service, political office, military life, or just through the responsibilities that the average citizen possesses, matters not to me. What matters is that I may make this country and this world a better place in some way, no matter how small, no matter how tiny, for some people who are yet to come. That is commitment to my country, one which I will uphold.●

AN ALASKAN'S NATIONAL COMMITMENT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a voice of democracy contest. The entrants in this contest are required to speak upon a particular theme, this year's theme being "My Commitment to My Country." From the State of Alaska, as one of 250,000 students nationally who competed in this contest, Miss Kimberly Marie Judge of Ketchikan, Alaska, will be competing for one of five national scholarships. A sophomore from Ketchikan High School, Kimberly Marie Judge, hopes to pursue a career in medicine at Iowa State University upon graduation from high school. Miss Judge will have an opportunity to visit the Nation's Capital both for final judging and to be honored for her eloquent expression of her commitment to our country which follows:

MY COMMITMENT TO MY COUNTRY

There is no just one way I can commit myself to my country. I must do it in many ways. I must commit myself not only to my country's government, but also to her people.

I must commit myself to keeping my country clean. I feel a clean and beautiful country is one people will want to talk about and people will feel proud to live in.

I must commit myself to getting a good education. The more you learn and know, the more people will listen to you and the better you can serve your country.

I commit myself to obeying and upholding all my country's laws and rules. For in doing this, I will have given my country's law officers one less person to worry about.

I will walk down my country's streets and, instead of picking out the bad things of our country, I will pick out and point out to all the people all the good things of our country. And then I will teach them to appreciate their country as I do.

I feel I must open up my mind and my eyes to new ideas. I feel I must look at and learn from others. Those others, being not only the rich and the powerful, but also the poorer and less noticed people—for they too have good ideas.

People often close their eyes to the sick and the old. Another of my commitments is to open up these people's eyes and to show them that just because these people are this way doesn't mean they are of no value to society. They just need a few people to take the time to listen to their ideas. I will commit myself to this cause.

I will also commit myself to learning and upholding our democratic system. My first step in doing this will be to learn and uphold this system in my own school in the Student Body.

There is a saying that "All men are created equal." Some people don't believe this saying and to these people I must show great strength. I must show them that just because a person's skin or beliefs is different, he is still a person and every person's life is valued.

When someone asks me if I would fight for my country in war, I'd probably take a while to think about it. I'd probably ask myself many times over, "Am I willing to die for my country?" I must think about this for a while too. I must think about the freedom this country offers me. Am I willing to die for this freedom? Then I will think about the opportunities this country offers me. Am I willing to die for these? Then I have my family and my friends. Am I willing to die for them and their freedoms and opportunities? I feel I must say yes to all these questions, not only for my family and friends, but also for the government that represents us and for this country we live in.

Our country is made up of people, their ways, ideas, and beliefs. And to these people I give my services and ideas. I hope I can benefit everyone and everything; the people, the government, and the land in giving these.

Though I may be young and inexperienced in my country's ways and government, I still feel it is my duty and my responsibility to do everything in my power for my country and its people.●

MANDATORY SENTENCING IN COMMISSION OF FELONIES WITH FIREARMS

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some information with my colleagues on the bill which I have joined in sponsoring today regarding mandatory sentencing for individuals who commit felonies with the use of firearms.

Specifically, the bill would impose a sentence of no less than 5 years' imprisonment to those individuals convicted in a U.S. court of a felony in which he or she used or carried a firearm. This sentence would be additional to that required for the commission of the offense. In effect, it raises the existing law's minimum penalty for criminal gun use from 1 to 5 years, and raises the minimum penalty for a second or subsequent conviction from 2 to 8 years. Furthermore, this bill makes what I consider to be an important stipulation regarding the possible parole of such offenders. It specifies that the imposition of any term of imprisonment under this section: First, may not be suspended; second, may not run concurrently; and third, may not include parole.

I feel that the need for such legislation is obvious when one considers statistics which, rather than shocking or horrifying the average American, are being accepted more and more as the way things are these days. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's uniform crime report indicates that there were 21,456 reported murders in 1979; 50

percent of these were committed with handguns, 5 percent with rifles, and 8 percent with shotguns. Out of 456,881 reported robberies in 1979, 40 percent occurred with the use of firearms. And in 614,213 cases of reported aggravated assaults that same year, more than 23 percent took place with the use of firearms. The FBI "Crime Clock" shows that, in America—the land of opportunity—a violent crime occurs every 27 seconds, a murder every 24 minutes, a robbery every 68 minutes, an aggravated assault every 51 seconds, and a forcible rape every 7 minutes.

Firearms predominate as the weapons used most often in the commission of murders throughout the Nation. Available data suggest that an attack with a gun is five times more likely to be lethal than an attack with a knife. The greatest percentage of murders result from arguments, and most offenders are recidivists—that is, people with prior arrest records. According to a 1978 report to Congress by the Comptroller General, 64 percent of those arrested for assault and 68 percent of those arrested for murder had prior arrests. The statistics go on and on—and they are frightening.

I for one feel that we, as a nation, must redefine and reexamine our approach to handgun violence. Dr. Charles H. Browning of the University of Oregon has reported that, in comparison with other countries, the handgun homicide rate in the United States is 3.5 to 10 times greater than the total homicide rate of at least 13 other nations. Even as we sit in this Chamber, it is estimated that 24 Americans will be murdered with handguns within the next 24 hours.

A 1978 Harris poll indicated that more than 80 percent of the American public—including gun owners—favors some form of gun control legislation. Mandatory sentencing is, in my opinion, a viable alternative to usual gun control proposals.

Mandatory sentencing was reported by the Comptroller General's Office in 1978 as being a relatively new method of reducing gun-related crime. I believe that it deserves further examination.

As quoted from the Comptroller General's report to the Congress:

> The concept of mandatory sentencing is that is will discourage crime as well as counteract the "abuse" of judicial or prosecutorial discretion. Many people feel that the criminal too often receives probation or suspended sentence, only to return to crime.

This concern is understandable.

Opponents of mandatory sentencing criticize it because they fear: First, it will curtail judicial discretion in delivering a just sentence; second, it could be costly in terms of court time and prison facilities; and third, it may not curb crime. Yet, mandatory sentencing for crimes committee with guns has been enacted in approximately 13 States. A Harvard study of mandatory sentencing in Massachusetts showed that it resulted in a dramatic increase in compliance with the existing gun control law. The Bartley-Fox amendment in that State imposed a mandatory minimum prison sentence of 1 year for carrying firearms without an appropriate permit:

> The introduction of Bartley-Fox and its attendant publicity radically increased compliance with the law. On the one hand, issuance of F.I.D. (Firearms Identification) cards and licenses to carry surged dramatically throughout Massachusetts. At the same time, the evidence suggests that those who still lacked these permits were less likely to carry firearms on a casual basis.
>
> Boston's crime statistics for the twelve months after the law's effective date show a reduction in the use of firearms in assaults. * * * Our research suggests—but cannot firmly establish—that without this shift away from firearm use in assault, firearm homicides could have increased significantly in 1975. In fact they declined somewhat.

Much discussion has taken place in this Chamber and throughout the country on deterrents of crime in addition to, or in place of, gun control. Punishment does deter. If I may quote again from the Comptroller General's report:

> If we raise the cost (length of imprisonment) and the risk (probability of going to prison) of committing a crime, *fewer people will become criminals.* (Emphasis added.)

Of the three major pieces of firearm legislation passed in the United States in this century, all were instigated by public outrage to violence involving the use of guns. Gangster-type violence of the "Tommy-Gun Era" prompted the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. The assassinations of the sixties led to passage of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and the Gun Control Act. With the recent tragic deaths of John Lennon and Dr. Michael Halberstam, once more are we reminded by editorials and by concerned constituents that the United States is the only leading Western nation without sufficient curbs to firearm violence.

Law enforcement, the courts, and correctional institutions can have a deterrent effect on crime. It is the probability of apprehension, conviction, and punishment that dissuades potential lawbreakers. What is important—and what this bill will establish—is that the potential criminal knows that the stakes are high, that he or she will be sentenced for an established time period for felonies involving firearms, and that this time will not be reduced for good behavior. As our present criminal justice system now exists, this one factor remains unmeasurable; we cannot continue to ignore the fact that the potential offender's concept of the severity, and more importantly, the certainty of punishment, is not harsh enough to prevent him or her from committing violent crimes with handguns.

The frequency of gun use in assaults continues to rise. This bill would correct what I and many others consider to be a wretched situation by imposing a mandatory 5-year penalty for felonies committed with firearms, and by eliminating the chance for parole. I ask each one of you for your support.●

THE 63D ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1981

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of having this opportunity to join my colleagues in marking the anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Baltic State of Estonia is marred by the realization that this small nation shares with its neighbors of the Baltic the oppression of Soviet domination.

During this month, as we have recalled the brief moments of freedom shared by the Baltic States earlier in this century, we cannot but sympathize with these proud people as they yearn for a life of the freedom to choose, to share, to move about, which we in our great Nation take for granted.

In the recent past the United States and the Soviets engaged in the Helsinki discussions and came to agreements regarding the right to freedom of choice and lack of oppression to which all peoples are entitled. It is so easy for us to overlook the situation faced by millions of people in Eastern Europe, including the Baltic, whose lives have been lived in the shadow of the Soviet bear for so many years.

Let us hope that this anniversary of Estonian independence will mark a new beginning in the process of freedom, that the coming months and years will see a new dedication to the principle that the freedom of peoples around the world deserves our serious and continuing attention, and that it will not be too long before the struggle of the Estonian people will be rewarded with the freedom that all people have as a right.●

THE EUROPEAN INITIATIVE

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the Congress, and most of the people of the United States, have a common background of heritage and culture with the people of Europe.

Often, we look to our European allies to be counted on in the defense of freedom and democratic principles anywhere in the world.

Thus, it is with some surprise that I have become aware of something called the European Initiative. This is an effort, as it is currently being displayed, to seek yet another approach to a peaceful resolution of the long standing and difficult problems in the Middle East.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, a closer examination of the European Initiative reveals potentially a very counterproductive effort. This initiative is expected to be high on the agenda when Prime Minister Thatcher and her foreign minister meet with Members of Congress and the administration. I would like to call to the attention of Members and those in the executive branch the following article of Mr. William Safire, which appeared in the New York Times, Monday, February 23, 1981, and which sheds some light on this whole matter.

THE CARRINGTON SHADOW
(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON.—Not since the days of grand designers Roosevelt and Churchill has there been such a natural affinity between American and British leaders. The meeting this week of conservatives Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher should put the "Special" back in the special relationship between the English-speaking allies.

We can expect sweetness and light, in Jonathan Swift's phrase, as the two leaders reassure each other of the rightness of the rightward road in domestic affairs, and of the wisdom of a hard line against Soviet aggression in the world. However, when their talks turn to the Middle East, the "Carrington shadow" will fall.

Lord Carrington, the British Foreign Secretary, is a darling of the American left. With the strong backing of the Andrew Young faction in the Carter Administration, he persuaded Mrs. Thatcher to back the "forces of change" in Zimbabwe. He has been fretting at our new resolve in El Salvador and has been seeking to promote the cause of Yasir Arafat in the Middle East.

Sir John Graham, Permanent Under Secretary in the Foreign Service, followed Lord Carrington's instructions and last year became the first senior British official to meet with the P.L.O. leader. The object was to advance the "European initiative" in the Middle East, a scheme to replace the U.S.-Egypt-Israel Camp David approach with a simple sellout of Israel to appease the Saudis.

Sir John has been in Washington this past week, meeting with his U.S. counterpart, Walter Stoessel; another British official, Patrick Moberly, has been plugging in with the new Reagan Middle-East and political-military team. One of their key missions has been to pave the way for Reagan acquiescence in the Carrington plan.

As the British have explained it, the plan is eminently evenhanded. East Jerusalem would be taken away from Israel, with the city divided or internationalized; the West Bank would be cleared of all Jewish settlements and the area turned over to whatever state the world's Palestinian Arabs chose; the Golan Heights invasion route would be returned to Syria; and what is left of Israel's security would then be assured by the presence of a U.N. force ready to run as soon as the Soviets pulled the P.L.O.'s trigger.

For some strange reason having to do with survival, Israelis from Begin to Peres will have nothing to do with the Carrington capitulation. Even the Arabists at our State Department look askance at Carrington's approach, since it undermines U.S. efforts in the Middle East and endangers Egypt's Sadat. Lord Carrington brushes this aside with the assertion that U.S. and British efforts are "complementary . . . not identical." But in fact, he has placed our interests in direct conflict.

Why is the British Foreign Secretary so eager to press his "initiative" to the detriment of the Atlantic alliance, and the weakening of Western power in the Eastern Mediterranean and Persian Gulf? One reason was described by columnist Philip Geyelin in The Washingtion Post: ". . . a bid for European influence in the Middle East at the expense of the United States."

Lord Carrington sees the road to influence with Saudi Arabia and Persian Gulf states to be appeasement of the Arab desire for a Palestinian state carved out of Israel. The Reagan Administration, on the contrary, sees the road to power in the Middle East to be the military protection of oil states menaced by the Soviet military and subversive threat.

Those Carrington and Reagan approaches clash. If pursued, Carrington's appeasement of the P.L.O. will harm American interests; Prime Minister Thatcher cannot be unaware of this. When the Middle East subject comes up in the Oval Office, President Reagan is expected to make it clear that—contrary to whatever the Carter Administration might have secretly hinted—the U.S. now considers the "initiative" to be unhelpful and destructive of progress toward Palestinian autonomy.

In furtherance of his policy to answer power with power, Mr. Reagan has quietly persuaded Israel to accept the previously unacceptable—the provision of F-15's to the Saudis that have the capability of striking Tel Aviv. (Israel may be mistaken to tolerate this added danger, but on such close security decisions it is difficult to instruct a grandmother on the sucking of eggs.)

In return for tacit acceptance of our arming the Saudis, Israel will not only receive extra F-15's and other sophisticated weaponry to defend against the untoward use of the U.S. arms supplied to the Arabs, but the right to sell to Taiwan, Ecuador, South Africa and other countries its Kafir jets and other armaments produced in Israel with U.S. components. Such foreign trade is needed to stabilize Israel's economy; still, the decision to keep quiet reflects Israel's willingness to gamble on Reagan's reliability.

That reliability is on the line this week. If Mrs. Thatcher presses for Carrington's appeasement, Mr. Reagan must push back; if she decides not to play Trilby to her Foreign Secretary's Svengali, the Anglo-American alliance and the free world will be stronger for it.●

SHARON, PA., LOST A DEAR FRIEND

HON. MARC L. MARKS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. MARKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that, on February 3, Sharon, Pa., lost a dear friend with the passing of Bill Hoyle. No single person has had a greater impact on youth athletics in the Shenango Valley.

Bill devoted his life to bringing excellent basketball programs to the children of my hometown. I know Bill as a tireless coach and friend to hundreds of boys. In addition, Bill Hoyle was the founder of the Sharon Amateur Basketball Tournament, the name of which was later changed to the Hoyle Tournament. Last year, this nationally known tournament drew basketball players from more than a dozen States, as well as scouts and coaches from collegiate and professional ranks.

The hard work and dedication of this fine man have not gone unnoticed. Among the many honors bestowed upon Bill Hoyle over the years were: "Sharon's Friend of the Boy of 1956" by the Sharon Optimist Club; Distinguished Service Award in 1953 by the Shenango Valley Junior Chamber of Commerce; "Ten Commandments Award" for service to youth, by the Fraternal Order of Eagles; and an outstanding citizen award by the Shenango Valley Chamber of Commerce in 1971.

Indeed, the people of western Pennsylvania lost a fine neighbor and great humanitarian earlier this month. Few people in youth athletics have had Bill Hoyle's gift to teach the values of good sportsmanship, along with the rules and fundamentals of basketball. We will miss this fine man who instilled in so may young people his beliefs in fair play and loyalty.●

GAO FINDS CENSUS UNDERCOUNT IN PITTSBURGH

HON. EUGENE V. ATKINSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Census Bureau serves the purpose of identifying the population of each State. The underlying constitutional purpose for the census is to determine, as accurately as possible, the number of inhabitants of each State, so that representatives may be apportioned among and within the States to insure fair representation of the people and

to fulfill the fundamental goal of achieving equal representation for equal numbers of people.

The methods for determining what each State's population is need to be examined. In the case of *Kirpatrick* v. *Preisler*, 394 U.S. 526 (1969), the Supreme Court indicated that a State could use population predictions for purposes of redistricting where these estimates can be thoroughly documented.

This ruling was upheld and further broadened in *Republican Party of Shelby County* v. *Dixon*, 429 U.S. (1976), when a three-judge district court held that population estimates may be considered in establishing congressional districts if they are highly accurate and are accompanied by evidence sufficient to overcome the "presumptive correctness" of the head count upon which the 1970 Federal census was based.

The so-called Detroit case; *Young* v. *Klutznick*, Civil No. 80-71330 (E.D. Mich. 1980), is the present case most pertinent in the 1980 census problems. The legal theory of the plaintiffs was based on the concept that every congressional district within a State must be as nearly equal in population as possible. The plaintiffs alleged that since the Census Bureau was not as successful in counting blacks and other minorities as it was in counting whites, a district with a large minority population would have a larger percentage of uncounted individuals residing within its boundaries than other areas in the State. The court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs saying that there was an undercount which ultimately would lead to unequal representation.

The problem in all three cases stated above has to do with the method the Census Bureau used in reaching the final population figures. In a report by the Comptroller General on an assessment of the 1980 census results in 10 urban areas, they found that there was a significant difference in the expected population results in Pittsburgh and the actual findings. This suggests an undercount, in addition to leaving many questions unanswered. For one, no reason is given as to why there is this difference. If we knew what the expected figures were based on, we could identify the source of the problem. Second, if this significant difference was found in part of Pittsburgh one could assume that it happened elsewhere.

The Census Bureau claims that if there were an undercount that any attempts to identify the undercounted areas would result in the findings that proportionally, all areas were undercounted. More specifically, a recount would yield the same findings with additional people. But this may not be so. Based upon the Detroit case it would seem that an area with a high percentage of minorities would have been significanlty undercounted, while a middle- to high-income area would have been fully accounted for.

Pennsylvania will suffer because of the findings of the 1980 census. The loss of two congressional seats will impair the needs of the people in Pennsylvania because they will not be as fully represented. We contend that the census figures are incorrect based upon the methods and procedures of the Census Bureau in determining their figures.

Specific steps should be taken to insure that depressed areas are surveyed better. And in cases where a governmental report shows that there was a significant difference in expected versus actual findings, such as the GAO found in Pittsburgh, mandatory steps should have been taken to ascertain why this was so.

It seems that the fault lies with the Census Bureau. The remedy then also lies within the Bureau. A report by an unbiased agency on the methods of the Census Bureau is needed. Then perhaps we will be able to find if the results they found are accurate or if they are deficient.●

BIAGGI SPONSORS LEGISLATION TO CURB ANTIRELIGIOUS VIOLENCE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation imposing stiff new Federal penalties against those who seek to injure, intimidate or interfere with the free exercise of religious beliefs as secured by the Constitution and various laws of the United States.

While my bill is designed to protect the rights of all persons to freely exercise their religious beliefs—the primary motivation for my authorship of this measure is to try and curb the alarming increase in anti-Semitic activity in this Nation.

More specifically, according to a recent report by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—1980 witnessed the greatest outbreak of anti-Semitism in the United States in 20 years. A total of 377 reported anti-Semitic incidents occurred in the United States during 1980 as compared to 129 in 1979. These included such heinous acts as firebombings, swastika daubings, arson, cemetery desecrations. At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert the full text of an article entitled "Anti-Semitic Episodes Up in 1980," from the February 1981 ADL Bulletin.

ANTI-SEMITIC EPISODES UP IN 1980

Compared to 1979, there was a sharp increase in reported anti-Semitic episodes, including assaults and vandalism against Jewish institutions, houses of worship, cemeteries and private property last year, according to the nationwide survey conducted annually by the Anti-Defamation League. The findings revealed 377 reported anti-Semitic incidents in 1980 as against 129 in 1979. These included firebombings, swastika daubings, anti-Jewish graffiti and other vandalisms in 29 states and the District of Columbia.

The largest number of incidents—120—was reported from New York State, with 69 of these in New York City's five boroughs and 39 in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. New Jersey came next with 69 reported incidents, Massachusetts with 34, California 27, Michigan 21, Illinois and Rhode Island 12 each, Minnesota 10, North Carolina 9, Connecticut 8, Missouri 8, Virginia 8, Arizona 6, Oregon 5, Colorado 4, Wisconsin 4, Tennessee 3, Florida, Nebraska, Ohio and Washington, each 2. One incident was reported in each of the following states: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada, Pennsylvania and Texas, and DC.

In addition, there were 112 anti-Semitic incidents involving bodily assaults against Jews, harassments or threats by phone or mail directed at Jewish institutions, their officials or private Jewish citizens that were not included in the total of ADL's 1980 audit. This class of anti-Semitic activity was separately noted because it was not part of the 1979 audit and offered no basis for comparison.

The audit was based on reports from ADL's regional offices across the country. The data received indicated that 20 persons were arrested or apprehended in 11 of the total of 377 incidents. Of these, 14 were aged 17 or under. On such limited information, however, no firm conclusions can be reached that teenagers or juveniles were mainly responsible.

Two of those arrested—in connection with a fire at a Jewish temple in Los Angeles—were 24 and 35 years of age and were linked by police to the neo-Nazi National Socialist American Workers Party. The Los Angeles episode was the only one with charges brought against members of an organized hate group.

The increase in the number of tabulated incidents in 1980 may stem partly from improved reporting procedures following last year's audit, which revealed 129 anti-Semitic episodes as against 49 in 1978. As a result of making those findings public, the report said, there was heightened awareness by local Jewish communities around the country and a greater tendency for victims to report anti-Semitic episodes to ADL.

There are still Jewish institutions and communities, however, that are wary of reporting incidents because they fear publicity might encourage imitative behavior patterns that would result in further assaults. Even without improved reporting procedures and greater awareness of the problem, the number of incidents for 1980 is undoubtedly higher than 1979 and in any year is higher than reported. In general, the statistics of anti-Jewish incidents would seem to suggest that there is still a high quotient of anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish hostility existing just beneath the surface of American life.

Among the findings of the ADL survey were the following:

Almost 65 percent of the 377 anti-Semitic incidents were reported from five northeastern states—New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut;

Forty-one percent of the total incidents were directed against Jewish institutions—houses of worship, schools, community centers, cemeteries;

Forty-two percent took place at private Jewish properties such as homes or stores, while the remainder occurred on public property or in the streets.

In the view of ADL leaders, the findings underscore that anti-Semitism and other forms of racial and religious bigotry remain a virulent social disease. What is called for is greater public concern manifested through strengthened law enforcement, realistic penalties and expanded educational programs.

My legislation adds a new section 13 to title 18 making the following subject to felony criminal penalties of at least 5 years in prison or $10,000 in fines.

Any person or persons who willfully vandalizes, defaces, sets fire to, tampers with, or in any other way damages or destroys any cemetery, any building of other real property used for religious purposes, or any religious article contained therein or any religious article contained in any cemetery or any building or other real property used for religious purposes. Similarly anyone who attempts to do any of the aforementioned acts would be subject to the same penalties.

What is critical to my legislation is the fact that it is not necesssary to establish intent in order to be subject to the penalties in my bill. Those who commit acts of this magnitude should not be provided with loopholes from which to escape prosecution.

It is my intent to have the following be subject to the penalties in my legislation:

Painting of swastikas or other offensive emblems on religious buildings;

Stealing of religious articles such as Torahs, which would interfere with the ability to conduct religious services;

Vandalizing in any fa hion, religious buildings, grounds or ce.neteries;

Arsons or firebombings of religious facilities or property including cross burnings;

Bodily assaults and harassment;

Any other activity which interferes with the free exercise of religious beliefs including efforts to intimidate individuals from worshipping.

It should also be noted that my legislation imposes a graduated series of penalties dependent on whether the given action results in bodily injury or death. Life imprisonment can be imposed in the most severe of cases.

I have prepared this legislation after extensive consultations with legal officials and representatives of major Jewish organizations. It is critical that we remember that first amendment freedoms, especially freedom of religion, are considered the most fundamental of all in this Nation. Therefore we must be prepared to protect them from those who would threaten the free exercise of religion—any religion.●

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO CREATE A COURT OF THE STATES

HON. THOMAS N. KINDNESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. KINDNESS. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, a constituent who was concerned over the increasing usurpation of authority by the Congress and Federal courts of functions previously thought to be the responsibility of the States, suggested the creation of a Court of the States to hear cases from the Supreme Court involving questions of Federal versus State authority.

The legal basis for the suggestion was the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution which states:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Through the 19th and well into the 20th centuries, the U.S. Supreme Court gave an increasingly expansive interpretation of Congress commerce power. The 10th amendment was argued to be a limitation on the commerce power. But the Supreme Court in *U.S.* v. *Darby* (312 U.S. 100, 124 (1941)), said that—

> The amendment states but a truism that all that is retained which has not been surrendered. There is nothing in the history of its adoption to suggest that it was more than declaratory of the relationship between the national and state governments as it had been established by the Constitution before the amendment.* * *

The ultimate extension of this interpretation was the decision in the case of *Maryland* v. *Wirtz* (392 U.S. 183 (1967)), wherein the Supreme Court upheld the 1966 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which applied Federal minimum wage standards to school and hospital employees of the States. Justice William O. Douglas dissenting, said:

> If [on the basis of this decision] this can be done, then the National Government could devour the essentials of state sovereignty, though that sovereignty is attested by the Tenth Amendment. * * * In this case the State as sovereign power is being seriously tampered with, potentially crippled.

In 1976, the Supreme Court wisely overruled *Maryland* v. *Wirtz* in the case of *National League of Cities* v. *Usery*, 426 U.S. 833 (1976), the Court stating that the 10th amendment precludes the exercise of the commerce power "in a fashion that would impair the States' ability to function in a federal system."

In the current term, the Supreme Court has taken a case which will give it another opportunity to breathe life into the 10th amendment and give further definition to the line beyond which the Congress may not go in the exercise of its authority over commerce. That case is *Virginia Surface Mining and Reclamation Association, Inc.* v. *Andrus*, 483 F. Supp. 425 (1980), on which the Court noted jurisdiction on October 6, 1980. Oral arguments will be heard on February 23. In that case, Judge Williams of the Western District of Virginia found that certain of the reclamation provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 were in contravention of the 10th amendment, citing National League of Cities.

However promising these developments are, we are still left with the reality that the States ability to function effectively in the federal system is in the hands of the Congress and the Federal courts. For that reason, I put my constituent's suggestion into the form of a proposed constitutional amendment which provides for the establisment of a court of the States. The court would have jurisdiction to hear all cases arising under the 10th amendment appealed from the Supreme Court and would be composed of one judge from each State, whose method of selection, term, and compensation would be determined by the State. The court could sit in panels to hear such appeals, and panel decisions would be subject to the concurrence of two-thirds of the judges of the court.

On the surface, this may appear to be a considerable departure from our constitutional tradition; but it is certainly not a departure from the principles of federalism. In establishing the Senate and the Electoral College, the Constitution provides for State participation in two of the three branches of the Federal Government. The court of the States would provide an opportunity for the States to participate in the judicial branch in a limited but crucial manner and once again, as in the past three Congresses, I commend it to my colleagues.●

TRIBUTE TO SHIRLEY PALMER

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a tribute to my good friend Shirley Palmer. This person is a fine, dedicated citizen of our great country, the State of Alabama, and the Tuscaloosa community.

Shirley represents those persons who are active participants in the day-to-day life of the American scene. He cares about his country and is concerned about lawmaking decisions made on Capitol Hill. All of us have people like Shirley Palmer in our districts, for these men and women keep the wheels oiled in the affairs of our States and towns. They believe in America and are true citizens in every sense of the word.

Let me share with you today some of Shirley's fine, outstanding achievements. As a veteran of World War II and wounded in the Battle of the Bulge, Shirley is a special part of our citizenry who knows what it means to put your life on the line for your country.

Shirley has been a successful local contractor for the past 19 years. Now, semiretired, he still has ownership on the wholesale end as a heating and air-conditioning distributor. As an active farmer and cattle rancher, he carries a deep love for our good earth and the people and animals that are part of his daily activities.

Shirley is involved in his community as a member of the Tuscaloosa Exchange Club, a local business-civic organization. He voices his concerns for the agriculture industry by being involved in the County Farmers Association.

He has demonstrated the unique ability at the grassroots level to bridge the gap between labor and management, having served as county president of the Cattleman's Association, while also holding office as State president of the Roofing Subcontractors Association.

All of us should recognize individuals such as Shirley Palmer who continue to carry the ball at the State and local level, while we make laws and policies in Washington. These special people understand and live the problems of inflation and recession both as consumers and producers. They are energy conscious and are concerned about our future oil supplies. They pay taxes and want to know how the money will be spent when it comes to community development.

The Shirley Palmers of our society are the lifeline of America. They take life's ups and downs and put them in a proper perspective. We need today more citizens like Shirley Palmer.

I am honored to have a gentleman of this caliber in my district. This tribute, Mr. Speaker, recognizes men who we as Congressmen depend on for help and advice back home. It is a real pleasure to know Shirley Palmer and I appreciate his love of, and devotion to, the American way of life.●

TO ELLA GRASSO, LIFE WAS A CHALLENGE

HON. LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

● Mr. DeNARDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1981]

TO ELLA GRASSO, LIFE WAS A CHALLENGE

(By Lawrence Fellows*)

During a blizzard in 1978, Ella Grasso started out in a State Police car for the Armory in Hartford to direct rescue work, but the car got stuck in the deep snow on Farmington Avenue, a mile from the building.

"That's it," Trooper Bill Taylor said.

"That's not it," Ella Grasso replied, and walked the mile alone through the snow. She arrived at the Armory looking like a snow man and stayed until the emergency was over. That single effort probably assured her re-election that year as Governor.

It was a reminder to the people of Connecticut—not really needed by those of us who worked around her—that the woman had a will that could not be daunted, whatever she sometimes pretended.

Ella Grasso once said that she would not want to be Governor, that a woman could not be Governor and manage a family at the same time.

And she once said she felt somehow that her life was not really her own, that she had to move from one challenge to another, carrying the mantle of leadership on her shoulders wherever she could.

"It's an old Mount Holyoke attitude," she said. "One has a very serious responsibility, doing just for the sheer delight of doing."

For Ella Grasso, the daughter of hard-working Italian immigrants in Windsor Locks named Tambussi, school too presented a challenge—first at the noted Chaffee School in Windsor, then at Mount Holyoke College, in South Hadley, Mass.

She used to say sometimes that, as a girl from a poor mill town, she felt out of place at both schools, but that was not likely. She swept through both schools like an empress, standing out from the crowd all the way. In her yearbook at Chaffee it was predicted she would be the first woman to be mayor of Windsor Locks. At Mount Holyoke she was elected in her junior year to Phi Beta Kappa. In 1942, after receiving a master's degree in economics, she went to Washington, where she worked for four years at the War Manpower Commission.

She married Thomas Grasso, settled down for "20 minutes," as she put it, and then headed into politics, beginning with the League of Women Voters.

She joined the Republican Party briefly in Windsor Locks, but soon switched to the Democratic Party. She said she felt more comfortable there, probably because of her memories of the 1930's Depression in Windsor Locks.

She worked her way into the Democratic Party organization by the customary hard route, helping on other people's campaigns, writing speeches, registering voters, getting them out to vote on Election Day.

Ella T. Grasso served two terms as a member of Connecticut's House of Representatives, three terms as Connecticut's Secretary of the State, two terms as a member of the United States House of Representatives. Lieut. Gov. William A. O'Neill succeeded her in her second term as Governor of Connecticut.

In 1954, when she was campaigning for her second term in the State House of Representatives, she worked at Abraham A. Ribicoff's campaign headquarters when he was seeking re-election as Governor.

"I learned something there," she said. "I learned the importance, the integrity of compromise, the necessity to get varying opinions, varying points of view."

If she learned about the importance of compromise, she never got to be good at it. She was good at politics in her own way. But Ella Grasso liked to win, and did win all her election campaigns. She lost some political battles along the way, but they were not lost piecemeal through compromise. They were really lost.

She tried to replace William O'Neill as Democratic state chairman in hope of putting together a political alliance with the larger cities in Connecticut. With small-town backing, Mr. O'Neill stood his ground. Mrs. Grasso yielded, and two years later she took him onto her re-election ticket as Lieutenant Governor.

She kept her distance from the General Assembly and in 1977 allowed the budget to get stalled in committee until the small-town Representatives there gave up their fight to limit the spending. When the budget went to Governor Grasso she refused to sign it, and then asked the Assembly leaders to trim it. They refused, and the budget became law without her signature.

She alienated one group after another—old party regulars, labor, state employees, judges, veterans, the police. But the people loved her for her combativeness and what they saw as her straightforward ways.

She sold the state plane and limousine, and turned off the lights on the Capitol dome, and the people loved her for that. And she loved them. As Ella Grasso saw it, the people in the street were her real following.

"It's people," she said. "It's party zealots. It's guys on motorcycles who stop and talk to me, senior citizens sitting in the sun at the Bethlehem Fair, young people with families."

She had never been the protége of John Bailey, who ran the Democratic Party in Connecticut for more than a quarter of a century before he died of cancer in 1975. He would rather have seen the nomination for Governor in 1974 go to Robert Killian. Ella Grasso would not yield on that one.

"I was screaming at him," she said, recalling how she pressed Mr. Bailey to get the nomination. Mr. Killian was at the meeting, in Mr. Bailey's home in Hartford. Mr. Bailey did not make the big decision. He went instead for doughnuts, and asked the two to decide while he was gone from the house. By the time he returned, Mrs. Grasso had won the argument. Mr. Killian would be on her ticket as Lieutenant Governor.

She was in politics full time. Almost the only diversion she allowed herself was to weed her lawn in Windsor Locks occasionally. There were a lot of weeds in it and she thought of it as more a meadow than a lawn. Sometimes she gathered wildflowers by the road, and tried to get them started

*Lawrence Fellows, a former reporter for The New York Times, was press secretary for Ella Grasso's reelection campaign in 1978. He is now editor of The Westport News.

on her lawn. Al Binford of Connecticut Public Television suggested to her that it might have been a reflection on her strong urge to shape things, to make things happen.

"All of that, and the exquisite beauty of plants, and the fact that it is life developing in all of its fullness," Ella Grasso said. "Then, sometimes, with that beautiful chartreuse thumb of mine, they don't. They fade, fall apart. But that's all right, then I start over again. There's always another season."●

DOUBLE JEOPARDY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on Sunday, February 8, had a small editorial on tuition tax credit which my colleagues will find of interest if they have not read it already.

DOUBLE JEOPARDY

For government to pay tuition tax credits, says Terrel H. Bell, the new Secretary of Education, is a matter of "fairness and equity." Why? Because parents who send their children to private schools are "in effect, paying twice for education. They pay their education taxes and then they pay their tuition."

What a breathtaking principle of taxation. If tax policy is to be based on it, there should be tax credits to the fellow who pays twice for his right to enjoy the open spaces—once for a country club membership and again with taxes that maintain public parks. There should be reimbursement to all car owners for their tax contribution to maintain mass transit systems. There should be a tax rebate for every bottle of Perrier drunk in place of tax-paid tap water.

Fairness and equity? Self-indulgence and anarchy would be more like it.●

AGEISM HAS NO PLACE IN PRISON EMPLOYMENT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, with nine of my colleagues as cosponsors, a bill to correct a serious inequity in employment practices in the Federal prison system.

At present, all workers in Federal prisons—guards, secretaries, and cooks—are classified as "law enforcement officers", together with FBI and DEA agents, U.S. marshals, and so forth.

As such, they are eligible for early retirement and for augmented pensions under Public Law 93-350. I do not argue with providing benefits for any of these employees.

However, the same law that established these special retirement benefits also gave the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the OPM, authority to set a maximum age for appointment as a law enforcement officer. The Attorney General has decided that no one over the age of 35 could be appointed to a position in the Federal service within a prison—with a few limited exceptions for physicians and others.

This policy is one of unabashed ageism. In an effort to procure a vigorous workforce for the Federal prisons, the Justice Department bars from possible appointment just about all 36-year-olds—and everybody who is older—no matter how experienced, talented, or physically fit they may be.

This same law provides that prison employees may be involuntarily retired at age 55.

My bill provides that no regulations may bar individuals under the age of 45 from appointment as law enforcement officers working in prisons, and that such individuals may not be involuntarily retired solely by reason of their age before age 65. Nothing in the law would alter the authority of management to require that all individuals working in prisons be physically and mentally fit to perform their assigned duties.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. FISH, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. TAUKE, for joining me as original cosponsors of this measure. I urge my colleagues who have not yet cosponsored this bill to consider doing so, and for their information I request that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. —

A bill to amend sections 3307(d) and 8335(b) of title 5, United States Code, with respect to age limits for appointment and mandatory retirement of law enforcement officers engaged in detention activities

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3307(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the", and

(2) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) The maximum limit of age for original appointments to a position as a law enforcement officer whose duties primarily involve detention activities may not be fixed under paragraph (1) at an age lower than 45 years."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 8335(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ", or 65 years of age in the case of a law enforcement officer engaged primarily in detention activities," after "55 years of age", and

(2) by striking out "that age" and inserting in lieu thereof "the applicable age".●

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, the House Select Committee on Aging recently issued their annual checklist of itemized deductions for protecting older Americans against overpayment of income taxes.

The senior citizens of our country, many of whom are on fixed incomes, have been tremendously affected by high inflation rates in recent years. Since this is income tax time in the United States, I believe it is important that this checklist be made available to these people in order to allow them to take full advantage of the legal tax reduction avenues open to them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the Aging Committee's report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

(A Revised Checklist of Tax Return Information for Use in Taxable Year 1980)

A. FILING REQUIREMENTS

Single Individuals

Single individuals under the age of 65 must file a return if they had gross income of $3,300 or more for the year. Those over age 65 must file if they had gross income of $4,300 or more.

Married Individuals

Married individuals under the age of 65 must file a return if the couple's combined gross income was $5,400 or more. If only one spouse is age 65 or older, the filing level is $6,400. If both spouses are age 65 or older, the filing level is $7,400.

An individual who is married and whose spouse files a separate return must file a return if gross income was $1,000 or more.

Qualifying Widow or Widower

Qualifying widows or widowers must file a return if they had gross income of $4,400 or more during the year. For qualifying widows or widowers who are 65 or older, the filing level is $5,400.

Self-Employed Persons

Self-employed individuals must file a return if they had net earnings from self-employment of $400 or more.

B. PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS

Each taxpayer is entitled to a $1,000 personal exemption. Married taxpayers generally are entitled to an additional $1,000 exemption for their spouses. Furthermore, additional exemptions are provided for age (65 or older) and blindness. Finally, individuals may take an exemption for each person who qualifies as a dependent.

C. ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT

The zero bracket amount (formerly, the standard deduction) is the portion of an individual's income which is not subject to tax. The zero bracket amount is (1) $3,400 for married individuals filing jointly, or qualifying widows or widowers, (2) $2,300 for single individuals, or heads of house-

holds, and (3) $1,700 for married individuals filing separately.

D. EXCLUSIONS

Capital Gains

In general, 60 percent of net long-term capital gain is excluded from gross income.

Sale of Personal Residence

Individuals who are age 55 or older may elect to exclude, on a one-time basis, up to $100,000 of the gain from the sale of a personal residence. For the exclusion to apply, the taxpayer must have owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale.

Dividends and Interest

In general, individuals may exclude up to $100 ($200 on a joint return if each spouse has at least $100 of dividends) of dividends received during the year.

For 1981 and 1982 tax years (to be reflected on 1981 and 1982 tax returns), $200 ($400 in the case of joint returns) of interest and dividends may be excluded from gross income.

Disability Income Exclusion

Certain individuals may exclude up to $5,200 per year of disability income. In general, to qualify for this exclusion, an individual must be under age 65, must have retired on disability, and must have retired because of permanent and total disability.

E. ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS [1]

Medical and Dental Expenses

The portion of medical expenses that exceeds 3 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income may be deducted. (However, medicine and drug expenses are taken into account only to the extent that they exceed 1 percent of adjusted gross income.)

One-half of the amount spent for medical insurance (up to $150) may be deducted without regard to the 3-percent floor. The remainder is lumped with other medical expenses and is subject to the 3-percent floor.

Taxes

In general, State, local or foreign income tax, real property tax, personal property tax, and general sales taxes are deductible.

Interest

Interest payments are deductible by individuals who are legally liable to make them. Items commonly deducted as interest include: Mortgage interest, "points" paid by a borrower, mortgage prepayment penalties, separately stated finance charges, bank credit card plan interest, interest on personal loans, and interest on business loans.

Contributions

Contributions of cash or property to qualified organizations may be deducted. In general, the deduction may not exceed 50 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income.

Casualty and Theft Losses

Personal casualty and theft losses are deductible to the extent that they exceed $100 per occurrence and are not reimbursed through insurance or otherwise.

Miscellaneous Deductions

In addition to medical and dental expenses, taxes, interest, charitable contributions, and casualty and theft losses, a number of other, miscellaneous expenses may be claimed as itemized deductions. Some of the more common expenses in this category include: dues paid to professional societies, employment-seeking expenses, employment-related education, subscriptions to professional journals, union dues, investment counsel fees, safe deposit box rental, and tax counsel and assistance.

F. TAX CREDITS

Credit for the elderly

Individuals who are age 65 or older, or who are under age 65 and receive a taxable pension or annuity from a public retirement system, may be entitled to claim the credit for the elderly. The maximum amount of the credit is 15 percent of one of the following amounts: (1) $2,500 for a single person, head of household, or qualifying widow or widower; (2) $2,500 for a married individual filing a joint return, if only one spouse is 65 or older; (3) $3,750 for a married individual filing a joint return, if both spouses are 65 or older; or (4) $1,875 for a married individual filing a separate return, if the individual and his or her spouse were not members of the same household during the year.

Child and Disabled Dependent Care Credit

Taxpayers may be entitled to a credit equal to 20 percent of the amount paid for the care of a dependent under the age of 15, a disabled dependent, or a disabled spouse, if the payment is made to enable the taxpayer to work or look for work. For a taxpayer with one qualifying dependent, the maximum credit is $400. If there are two or more qualifying dependents, the maximum credit is $800.

Earned Income Credit

Taxpayers with dependent children generally are entitled to a refundable credit equal to 10 percent of the first $5,000 of earnings (for a maximum credit of $500). The credit phases out a rate of 12.5 percent as income rises from $6,000 to $10,000 (that is, a reduction of 12½ cents for each additional dollar of income).

Residential Energy Credit

Taxpayers are entitled to a credit equal to 15 percent of the first $2,000 spent on qualifying energy-saving items. Qualifying energy-saving items include: insulation, storm or thermal windows or doors, caulking or weather stripping, clock thermostats, furnace replacement burners, and meters that display the cost of energy use.

In addition, taxpayers may receive an additional energy credit for amounts spent on solar, wind-powered, or geothermal equipment for their homes. This credit is for 40 percent of the first $10,000 of those costs.

Credit for Political Contributions

Taxpayers may take credits for up to one-half of political contributions made during the year. The maximum credit is $50 on a single return and $100 on a joint return.

G. PRESIDENTAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND CHECKOFF

Additionally, an individual taxpayer may voluntarily earmark $1 of taxes ($2 on joint returns) each year for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. (This does not result in any increase or decrease of the tax liability.)

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

A. CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

Medical and Dental Expenses

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

Insurance Premiums

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to $150) without regard to the 3 percent limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3 percent rule.

Drugs and Medicines

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3 percent rule) but only to extent exceeding 1 percent of adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

Other Medical Expenses

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3 percent limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Acupuncture services.
Ambulance hire.
Anesthetist.
Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Artificial limbs and teeth.
Back supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Braces.
Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. You should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.
Cardiographs.
Chiropodist.
Chiropractor.
Christian Science practioner, authorized.
Convalescent home (for medical treatment only).
Crutches.
Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth).
Dentures.
Dermatologist.
Eyeglasses.
Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed).
Gynecologist.
Hearing aids and batteries.
Home health services.
Hospital expenses.
Insulin treatment.
Invalid chair.
Lab tests.
Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap).
Neurologist.
Nursing services for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you.
Occupational therapist.
Ophthalmologist.
Optician.
Optometrist.
Oral surgery.
Osteopath, licensed.
Pediatrician.
Physical examinations.
Physical therapist.
Physician.
Podiatrist.
Psychiatrist.
Psychoanalyst.
Psychologist.
Psychotherapy.
Radium therapy.
Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor).
Seeing-eye dog and maintenance.
Speech therapist.
Splints.
Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under medicare.

[1] For further details see itemized deductions.

Surgeon.

Telephone/teletype special communications equipment for the deaf.

Television set if individual has a hearing impairment and the set is specially equipped with a visual display of the audio portion of television programs. Similarly the cost of an adaptor for a conventional television that performs the same function is now considered a medical deductive by the IRS.

Transportation expenses for medical purposes (9¢ per mile, plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.).

Vaccines.

Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health).

Wheelchairs.

Whirlpool baths for medical purposes.

X-rays.

Expenses may be deducted only in the year you paid them. If you charge medical expenses on your bank credit card, the expenses are deducted in the year the charge is made regardless of when the bank is repaid.

Taxes

Real estate.

General sales.

State and local income.

Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, ordinarily you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables the sales tax paid on the purchase of the following items: automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., social security, veterans' pensions or compensation payments, railroad retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

Contributions

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20 percent of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible).

Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 9¢ per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in your home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to $50 per month).

Interest

Home mortgage.

Auto loan.

Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Other credit cards—you may deduct as interest the finance charges added to your monthly statement, expressed as an annual percentage rate, that are based on the unpaid monthly balance.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money and only if the charging of points is an established business practice in your area. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the separately stated "finance charge" expressed as an annual percentage rate.

Casualty or Theft Losses

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the $100 limitation. Report your casualty or theft loss on Schedule A. If more than one item was involved in a single casualty or theft, or if you had more than one casualty or theft during the year, you may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

Miscellaneous

Appraisal fees to determine the amount of a casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return.

Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for chamber of commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box used to store income-producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.

Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding $25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by your employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.

Expenses of an office in your home if used regularly and exclusively for certain business purposes.

Transportation expenses for business purpose (20 cents per mile for the first 15,000 miles, and 11 cents per mile in excess of 15,000 miles, plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, et cetera.)

B. OTHER TAX RETURN INFORMATION ITEMS

Tax Tables

Tax tables have been developed to make it easier for you to find your tax if your income is under certain levels. Even if you itemize deductions, you may be able to use the tax tables to find your tax easier. In addition, you do not have to deduct $1,000 for each exemption because these amounts are also built into the tax table for you.

Multiple Support Agreements

In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) support; (2) gross income; (3) member of household or relationship; (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a $1,000 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10 percent of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of Personal Residence

You may exclude from your gross income some or all of your gain from the sale of your principal residence, if you meet certain age, ownership, and occupancy requirements at the time of the sale. These requirements, and the amount of gain that may be excluded, differ depending on whether you sold your home before July 27, 1978, or on or after that date. The exclusion is elective, and you may elect to exclude gain only once for sales before July 27, 1978, and only once for sales on or after that date.

If you sold your home before July 27, 1978, and you were age 65 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude the gain attributable to $35,000 of the adjusted sales price if you owned and occupied the residence for 5 of the 8 years ending on the date of sale. If you sold the home after July 26, 1978, and you were age 55 or older before the date of the sale, you may elect to exclude $100,000 of gain on the sale if you owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale (or 5 of 8 years under certain circumstances). Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded.

Additionally, you may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of your person-

al residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale you buy and occupy another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence; (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces; or (3) your tax home was abroad. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling or Purchasing Your Home) may also be helpful.●

SPORTS FANS HAVE RIGHTS, TOO

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation designed to restrict the capricious movement of professional sports franchises. The bill, H.R. 823, would not preclude entirely the relocation of a sports team if the move proved necessary for the franchise's profitable economic survival. It simply takes into account the interests and the investments, the fans, and local governments.

The House Judiciary Committee has agreed to hold hearings on this proposal in early April. I invite my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this measure.

The following article, which appeared recently in the Washington Star, spells out in further detail the goal of the Sports Franchise Relocation Act.

[From the Washington Star]

STOPPING AL DAVIS—THE GOAL OF H.R. 823

(By Morris Siegel)

Nobody in the Oakland area except Al Davis and a few of his trained seals wants to see the Raiders move to Los Angeles, which is what the Raiders are dying to do.

In addition to the people who have supported the recently crowned Super Bowl champs comfortably during the years, the coach, Tom Flores, a number of his players, and NFL Commissioner Pete Rozelle, of course, have said in so many words that they think Davis' greedy plan stinks.

Running back Mark van Eeghen has called it "crazy" and Rozelle, who goes to court Monday to try and prevent the Raiders from cheap-shotting their loyal fans, labeled it "unconscionable".

Recently Pete Stark joined the movement to throw up some kind of preventive defense to kill off Davis' highly unsupportable scheme to become wealthier than he already is and than he needs to be as well.

Pete Stark is not just another voice in the Oakland mob shouting foul. He is not much of a spectator sports fan, but Pete Stark is in a better position to do something about Davis' attempted grand larceny than the other Oakland citizens.

Fortney H. "Pete" Stark represents the 9th congressional district in California, which covers Oakland, in the U.S. House of Representatives. Recently be brought the matter to the attention of his colleagues on the Hill.

He introduced a bill, technically H.R. 823, "to establish certain limitations relating to the movement of professional sports franchises, to require the equal sharing of revenues under certain professional sports broadcasting agreements and for other purposes."

In man-to-man talk, it is the Sports Franchise Relocation Act. Stark's bill does not prohibit a franchise from moving, but under the stringent terms only clubs as bad off as the Chrysler Corporation qualify for a change of venue.

To become eligible just to be considered for parole from its present location, a team must lose money for three years, or there must be disagreement over the stadium lease of "material significance" that cannot be remedied within a reasonable period of time or the stadium has become inadequate and the stadium authority is indifferent toward remedying the inadequacies.

The legislation is not aimed at at any particular team and it is mere coincidence nothing more, that the bill happened to be introduced by a congressman from Oakland, the only city currently facing the prospect of losing anything as major as an NFL franchise.

The Raiders would go 0 for 3 if they based the reason for their intended disloyalty on any of the above. Even before Davis announced his designs on Los Angeles, Rozelle declared "it would take a genius to go broke in the NFL today," alluding to the $5.6-million annual grant in aid clubs receive for TV rights.

So poverty is out and so is any hassle over the lease. Oakland might claim "inadequate" stadium facilities, but this is suspect. Davis has demanded a slew of luxury boxes to sell for $30,000 annually, which Oakland has agreed to but only if the Raiders consent to hang around long enough to pay construction costs. They have refused.

The Sports Franchise Relocation Act presently rests with the Judiciary Committee and Stark is not optimistic that it will give him an OK to hold hearings.

Stark, however, is not dismayed over this prospect. He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee, from which all tax favors flow, and feels comfortably sure that from Ways and Means he can exact a threat to cut off player depreciation benefits without which pro franchises cannot exist unless they are all owned by OPEC nations.

While individual congressmen are automatically sympathetic to developments that injure their constituency, Congress as a whole has been of little aid and comfort to the people's plea that "we have been robbed" when they air complaints that relate to pro sports.

The vote to lift the NFL blackout several years ago was not unanimous. Several congressional resolutions to bring baseball back to Washington, as another example are painful also-rans.

Stark is aware of this, but he will press on as a symbolic gesture that Raider fans do not deserve to be "dumped on" as he said, citing several benefits that sports entrepreneurs have already gotten from Congress. These include the NFL–AFL merger, which required special legislation, plus another special act, which permitted the NFL to negotiate its megabuck TV contracts.

"I am generally opposed to government meddling in private interprise," Stark said, "except where public interest overrides private interest, which appears to be the case (Raiders) here. To suddenly desert the city and county that made the Raiders' prosperity possible would be the height of corporate irresponsibility, a gross violation of public trust."

In the Federal courtcase scheduled to begin Monday in Los Angeles, the plaintiff, acting in behalf of Davis, is the City of Los Angeles. which has asked that the NFL rule requiring three-fourths majority approval to move a team be declared illegal.

Los Angeles' hands are not exactly clean either. For one thing the Ram franchise it "lost" is not a loss in any sense. It simply moved 28 miles south, to Anaheim, where most of the Ram season ticket customers live.

It is no more of a "loss" than the Lions' move out of Detroit to a domed facility in Pontiac. And L.A. city officials strike me as being somewhat phony or certainly victims of acute amnesia.

The Rams franchise they acquired in 1946 did not have its beginning in Los Angeles. It was filched from Cleveland.

Just how much support Pete Stark's Sports Franchise Relocation Act receives remains to be seen, but it certainly deserves the backing of Walter Fauntroy, who should not have to be reminded that Washington lost two baseball franchises to greed.

Unfortunately, Fauntroy's support must be moral. The District's sole voice on Capitol Hill is a non-voting delegate.●

BLACK LUNG BENEFITS

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is said that special interest groups will prevent President Reagan's economic package from total success. That may or may not be.

I represent a special interest group called coal miners, and I intend to fight for black lung benefits that President Reagan recommends be cut. Black lung benefits, in fact, need to be increased. The benefits are paid to those who suffer from respiratory, cancer-causing, and heart debilitating diseases and are paid for through a tax on coal.

Cut back on the program, Mr. President? It needs to be increased, not decreased, to include an automatic entitlement to benefits for those actually working in the mines for at least 20 years. Costly, Mr. President? Work in the mines for just 30 days, and then answer these questions. The cost must be borne by the coal tax, which needs to be increased to assure an actuarially sound program. You may argue that that is paid for by the consumers, but what tax isn't? I think the general public sympathizes with beneficial programs when they see good results. And this program is a good one.●

MENTAL HEALTH ACT OF 1981

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill entitled "Mental Health Act of 1981," which would provide adequate mental health care and psychiatric care to all Americans. I have been proposing such legislation for several Congresses and I hope that this legislation, aimed at providing comprehensive mental health coverage as part of a national health insurance program, will be given favorable consideration this year.

The purpose of the bill, at least one of its most important goals, is to give to all individuals residing in the United States a right to obtain adequate preventive mental health care at a price they can afford. During the past 20 years, outpatient mental health care has increased from 23 percent in 1955 to 70 percent in 1975. While this increase is promising in that it shows people are seeking the mental health care that they need, they are doing so at great personal cost since most do not have health insurance plans that will cover their treatment.

For people on fixed incomes, the poor, the elderly, and minorities, this burden is tremendous. Even though the Federal Government has supported community mental health centers which utilize a sliding fee scale, these services still remain inaccessible for the poor and many middle-income families. The poor also tend to be multiple users of human services and most of us know that it is the poor and middle-income who find it difficult to pay for such services.

An estimated 15 percent of the population is predicted to eventually suffer from severe mental illness. This can mean one or more of several serious conditions. Recent figures by the National Institute of Mental Health reveals that of all those who received mental health care, 3.1 percent were mentally retarded; 5.4 percent had organic brain syndromes; 22.5 percent suffered from schizophrenia; 15 percent from depressive disorders; 8.8 percent from alcoholism; 2.9 percent from drug disorders; 1.5 percent from other psychoses; 32.4 percent listed as "all others" including personality disorders and various neuroses; and a perplexing 8 percent classified as undiagnosed.

Mr. Speaker, since the vast majority of the population in this country are from the middle and lower income categories and the cost of mental health care remains prohibitive to them, there exists a need to provide funds for national mental health insurance.

The proposed program would be funded through a mental health tax with the funding mechanism similar to those under some of the pending national health insurance program bills. This program that I am recommending could be supplemental to any health insurance plan or could be implemented as a separate program. The major services provided for under this bill would include psychiatric hospital care, psychotherapy, prescribed drugs, community health center services, and home therapy. Innovative services provided would include halfway house care, day mental hospital care, and night mental hospital care.

I encourage my colleagues to take the time and remember the people they represent and consider their needs for responsible and affordable mental health care.●

ABELARDO VALDEZ PROPOSES A UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER FREE TRADE ZONE

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Ambassador Abelardo L. Valdez, former White House Chief of Protocol and U.S. AID Assistant Administrator, testified in Miami before the Trade Advisory Committee of the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. In his presentation, he outlined a very innovative proposal, the creation of a free trade zone along the United States-Mexico border. This idea is well worth bringing to the attention of my colleagues, and I am therefore inserting Ambassador Valdez's testimony in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

AMBASSADOR VALDEZ' TESTIMONY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Trade Advisory Committee: I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss North American Trade Agreements. My testimony will be relevant to this subject, but it also will have hemispheric dimensions.

This hearing is very timely in view of the social and economic challenges and opportunities which confront not only the United States but also the other countries of the Western Hemisphere. At this very moment, we in the United States are experiencing the results of economic underdevelopment and unbalanced ecomomic systems in Latin America and the Caribbean in the form of millions of undocumented migrants from the region. We are also witnessing violent upheavals in El Salvador and other countries in Central America resulting from these conditions. I believe that inter-American trade can contribute to the solution of these problems by fostering equitable economic development in Latin America and the Caribbean.

There are other reasons why this hearing is timely. In recent years, the United States has suffered record trade deficits, mounting inflation and a steady deterioration in the value of its currency. It is increasingly more difficult for us to compete in world markets. This is mainly due to decreased productivity and ineffective marketing.

While there are several possible remedies to our present ills, I believe that the best medicine is to improve our trading ability. Today we are competing for world markets with other nations which have needed to depend upon international trade for their economic survival. On the other hand, we have only begun to realize that our economic health at home now depends on our ability to compete in the international market.

ECONOMIC CHALLENGER AND OPPORTUNITIES CONFRONTING THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

There are exciting opportunities for increasing trade with Latin America and the Caribbean, and with Canada, but there is also increased concern with the existing socio-economic problems affecting the nations of the region. According to World Bank statistics, approximately 40 percent of the people of this region have annual incomes of less than $300 per person. The doubling of the region's population to more than 600 million people by the year 2000 promises to exacerbate the existing poverty and economic imbalance found in every country of the region.

The impact of these problems will be felt in the United States as well as throughout the region. Already the large numbers of persons forced to migrate to the United States and to other more developed countries of the region has become a source of social tension. It is estimated that there are from three to six million undocumented persons from Latin America and the Caribbean in the United States today. In Venezuela there are approximately two million undocumented persons, mostly Colombians. Also, there are approximately 200,000 Haitians in the Dominican Republic. Mexico is experiencing a migration of large numbers of Central Americans through its southern border; at the same time, it is sending approximately 50 percent of the undocumented workers from Latin America entering the United States every year.

The problem of undocumented migration is truly a hemispheric problem, which will continue to grow unless balanced economic development can be achieved.

The poverty and the accompanying economic imbalances within the region are the main causes of the political and economic instability of many nations of the region, particularly in Central America and the Caribbean. This instability has become a major foreign policy issue for the United States in recent years. It should motivate us to find ways and means to support economic development in the region before the results escalate to tragic proportions. Armed camps, locked in protracted conflict, is not the scenario which we desire for our neighbors.

In recent years, the principal markets for our exports have shifted from the industrialized nations to the developing countries. The largest share of our exports to the developing areas now goes to Latin America and the Caribbean. Last year United States-Latin America trade amounted to $75.7 billion. In 1980, United States exports to the region comprised 48 percent of United States exports to developing countries and about 18 percent of global United States exports. In the same year, United States imports from the region constituted 33 percent of U.S. imports from developing countries and 15 percent of total U.S. imports.

The top three customers for U.S. products in Latin America and the Caribbean in 1980, accounting for three-fifths of U.S. export trade with the region, were: Mexico ($15.1 billion), Venezuela ($4.6 billion) and Brazil ($4.3 billion).[1] These three countries were, also, the leading suppliers of the U.S. market in 1980. Imports from them comprised 58 percent of total U.S. import trade from the region. Mexico supplied $12.5 billion worth of goods and services, Venezuela accounted for $5.3 billion, and Brazil, $3.7 billion.[2]

In terms of foreign investment, Latin America and the Caribbean represent a prime area for U.S. investors. In 1979, U.S. investment in the region amounted to $38.6 billion and earned $6.3 billion. This investment represents approximately 20 percent of all U.S. investment abroad and more than 50 percent of U.S. investment in the developing world. In the period 1975–79, U.S. investment in the region nearly doubled (from $19.5 billion to $36.8 billion).[3]

These statistics confirm the importance of U.S. trade with the other countries of the hemisphere.

It is vital to our future prosperity to increase our trade around the world but especially with our neighbors in this hemisphere. This trade is also vitally important to create economic development in Latin America and the Caribbean. Only through this kind of balanced economic development can the people of this hemisphere improve their economic lot; create jobs for millions of unemployed and underemployed persons; and bring about the economic and social stability needed for the protection of human rights and democratic institutions.

While Latin America is a region plagued by severe economic problems, it also has the most potential for economic growth and development than any other developing region of the world. It is already the most economically advanced of the developing regions, with an average GNP/capita of more than $1,000. If the countries of this region can succeed in achieving economic development and political reform, at least in some of them, the possibilities for economic progress and for U.S. trade in the region are unlimited. Our own trading future is linked to the development of our neighbors in the Americas.

PROPOSAL FOR A FREE TRADE ZONE ALONG THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER

It is in this context that I appear before you today to propose a modest first step toward the creation of a Hemispheric Common Market: A Free Trade Zone along the United States-Mexico border. My proposal would establish a Free Trade Zone extending 200 miles into each country's territory and running along the border from Brownsville, Texas, to San Diego, California. In essence, it would constitute a mini-Common Market; *i.e.*, any product grown, produced or manufactured within the zone, on either side of the border, could move duty free, throughout the zone.

This Zone would exist for a period of time sufficient to test its feasibility. I would recommend a minimum period of ten years. If it proved successful, it could then be expanded to include a greater part of each country's territory or the entirety of both countries. My hope is that the Zone would succeed so that, in time, it could be expanded to include not only the United States and Mexico, but also Canada and the other countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Another possibility for the United States and Mexico to establish a free trade zone is to do it along sectoral lines; e.g., agricultural, manufactured goods, or other sectors. Building from sector to sector, two countries could eventually establish a complete common market between them. From there they could join the other countries of the hemisphere in establishing a western hemisphere common market. It is well for us to remember that the European Common Market first began as a European Coal and Steel Community and from there developed into a complete common market.

My proposal for a free trade zone, created or established along geographic limits or by sectoral arrangements, could also be implemented along the United States-Canada border, simultaneously with its establishment along the United States-Mexico border. However, it is my judgment that the critical point of departure for this initiative should be with Mexico, for this is the key to future integration with the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean. It is at the United States-Mexico border that the developed world meets the developing world; and it is there that the great opportunities and challenges for trade and economic cooperation in this hemisphere will be found.

Many benefits could accrue from this Free Trade Zone:

This project between our country and Mexico would become a focal point for concerted economic cooperation;

New jobs would be created on both sides of the border for the chronically unemployed and underemployed. And here we should recognize that one of the most depressed job markets in our entire economy is located on our side of the U.S.-Mexico border;

New opportunities for U.S.-Mexican joint ventures would develop wherein the best of U.S. and Mexican skills, resources and technologies could attack traditional economic stagnation;

And, the Zone would provide incentives for new industries and would stimulate innovative marketing approaches;

No doubt, other benefits for both countries such as urban development; new transportation links; and, in general, an expanded base for improving the quality of life would be generated by such an arrangement.

In addition to increasing trade within the Zone, I can foresee a skyrocketing of the competitive position of firms operating within the zone relative to world trade. The muscle and wit of two peoples could combine to produce goods and services which would be even more competitive in the world market.

There are several reasons which support my proposal for the establishment of such a zone at this time and in this geographic location. First, there has been a twin plant industry program in operation along the border for the last fifteen years. This program allows U.S. firms to export unfinished products to the Mexican side of the border, duty-free, for assembly and finishing work. Upon the return to the U.S. side for marketing purposes, these products are charged duty only on the value-added portion resulting from the work done in Mexico. This has been a very successful program, mutually beneficial to both countries, and resulting in increased job creation on both sides of the border and lower prices for products produced or manufactured under this program.

Secondly, the people who live in the region covered by the proposed Foreign Trade Zone have had a historical trade experience and cultural regionship. Many of the residents of the area are bilingual and bicultural.

Thirdly, the area covered by the Zone includes some of the most important industrial and agricultural centers of both countries. On the Mexican side, the Zone would include such cities as Monterrey, Saltillo, Chihuahua and Torreon. On the U.S. side, it would include Corpus Christi, San Antonio, Abilene, Phoenix, Albuquerque, San Diego and Los Angeles. This makes the Zone area adequate for a free trade experiment. Also, the historical movement of people, goods and services throughout this zone strengthens the possibility for the Foreign Trade Zone concept to provide mutual benefits to both sides of the border.

In my judgment, it is critical that both countries recognize the mutual benefits of such a zone. Only if both are convinced that they will benefit mutually will they both consider participating in establishing such a zone. The development needs of both countries along their portions of the Zone argue strongly for its establishment. On both sides of the border there are tremendous needs for increased job creation and infrastructure development (transportation, health, education and urban development). While not a panacea for solving the problem of undocumented workers, it would contribute positively to its resolution.

THE FOREIGN TRADE ZONE: A STEP TOWARD A HEMISPHERIC COMMON MARKET

Mr. Chairman, this Zone would be a practical experiment in developing a common market in the northern part of the hemisphere, which in time could join the integration movement which began in Latin America more than twenty years ago. The end result could well be a common market for the Western Hemisphere by the year 2000.

The proposed Zone is a manageable first step, and this is important because past North American Common Market proposals, especially those made during the past presidential campaign, have been perceived in Mexico as being one-way streets—the United States trying to monopolize Mexico's oil reserves or take over its industry. This experiment, however, can be mutually beneficial to both countries. It is also limited by time, geography and/or economic sectors so that any adverse consequences could be manageable. Any free trade proposal requires time, commitment and confidence by the parties involved. I believe that my proposed Trade Zone concept is sound enough to inspire these qualities on the part of both countries.

It is my judgment that the proposed Free Trade Zone could be the first step toward the creation of an inter-American equivalent of the European Common Market. For the last twenty years the United States has supported several initiatives for Latin American economic integration—the Latin American Free Trade Association

---

[1] Principal U.S. exports to these markets were machinery and transport equipment, manufactured goods of various kinds, chemicals and related products, and food products.

[2] The main imports from the three suppliers were petroleum and related products, food products and manufactured products of various kinds.

[3] This increase was led by investment in manufacturing industries primarily in Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela, and Argentina and by the growth of financial contribution in the Caribbean.

(LAFTA);[4] the Central American Common Market and the Andean Common Market—but it, itself, has never joined these efforts at economic integration. I think the time has come for the United States to consider joining these efforts and, with the participation of Canada, eventually to enlist all the countries of the Western Hemisphere in creating a common market.

There already exist several building blocks to forming the foundation for a hemispheric market. LAFTA, the Central American Common Market, the Andean Common Market and the Caribbean communities constitute those building blocks. While the experience of these regional common markets has been one of mixed results, this experience has been invaluable to further endeavors at economic integration. The fact is that the northern part of the hemisphere is twenty years behind the Latin American countries in economic integration experience.

While I understand that the mandate of this Committee is limited to North American Trade Agreements, I submit that South American participation in future U.S. trade agreements is important for your consideration and to the creation of a hemispheric common market. The reasons for this premise are clear. Aside from Mexico, the most developed countries in the Latin American and Caribbean region are in South America. I have already mentioned that Venezuela and Brazil, along with Mexico, are the principal trade partners of the United States in the region. The other countries in South America, with the exception of Bolivia, are all more economically advanced than the Central American and Caribbean countries. Thus, the South American countries all have greater trade potential for the United States than those of Central America and the Caribbean.

In my view, the South American countries, because of their trade potential and level of economic development, are an indispensable "building block" for a hemispheric common market.

For these reasons, I would suggest that your deliberations and preparation of the report required by the Congress from the President (pursuant to Section 1104 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979) consider this important factor.

CONCLUSION

My statement before you today is not a definitive blueprint for the estabishment of a Free Trade Zone between the United States and Mexico, nor is it a definitive analysis of its potential for both countries. It is, rather, a statement of concern and a call for action—to meet crucial economic needs in the United States and Mexico in an effective manner; and, perhaps, a way to turn perceived problems into exciting opportunities.

The proposed Free Trade Zone along the U.S.-Mexico border is a positive and concrete initiative which the United States and Mexico can take to spur economic development, increase trade, and promote a spirit of mutual cooperation. The economic challenges which confront both countries demand that urgent steps be taken to support and promote economic development and job creation to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population in Mexico. It is a concept which merits serious study by both countries to determine its feasibility. If it were to succeed, it might be only the first step of a broader application of this concept by both countries; and, perhaps, in time, the other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

It is time that the North joins the South in the great objective of establishing a common market for the Western Hemisphere. Such a market would help the fight against inflation by reducing prices of exports and imports; it would enable equitable economic development and job creation to meet the needs of a population that will double in twenty years; and it would provide a great and noble goal for cooperation among all the countries of the hemisphere.

The proposed Free Trade Zone could be the catalyst for a movement to create a Common Market for the Western Hemisphere. Thus, I would hope that your Committee will consider this proposal for inclusion in the Presidential Report requested by Congress on North American Trade Agreements.●

[4] Since 1980, LAFTA has been restructured and renamed ALADI under the Montevideo Treaty of 1980.

WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF LABOR PRACTICES

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to enable the Secretary of Labor to prohibit the awarding of Federal contracts to persons who have willfully violated orders issued under the authority of the NLRA.

Our national labor policy has been to protect workers who want to form associations and to encourage collective bargaining to settle differences between employers and employees. In one area, however, this national policy has been deficient. Flagrant and willful violators of the NLRA can virtually ignore the NLRA while continuing to collect millions of dollars in Federal Government contracts.

This bill will establish the authority and a mechanism for the Federal Government to debar flagrant and willful violators from lucrative Federal contracts. This mechanism will enable contracting officials to reject a low bidder because of a history of NLRA violations, after certification by the Secretary of Labor. It is important to note that this mechanism can be invoked only after certification by the Secretary of Labor.

I urge you to support this bill to assure the continued maintenance of our national labor policy of protecting employee rights and to eliminate unfair advantages one potential contractor may have over another in obtaining Federal contracts, because of willful violations of labor practices.●

TMI TASK FORCE—PART 1

HON. ALLEN E. ERTEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, this is the first in a series of papers discussing the activities of the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation Task Force on Three Mile Island, its recommendations, and the hearings and deliberations which led up to its recommendations. Current cleanup cost estimates are about $1.3 billion with insurance covering only $300 million. Where the remaining money will come from has been the principal area of investigation for the task force.

On August 27, 1980, the members of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PaPUC) met with the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation. PaPUC Chairman Susan Shanaman outlined the concerns of the Commission that the ratepayers of the TMI utility should not be forced to pay the cleanup costs after the accident. The PaPUC expressed the desire for Federal assistance to deal with the costly and difficult TMI-2 cleanup. Specifically, Chairman Shanaman stated:

> What form financial relief to the citizens of Pennsylvania should take is, of course, within your province and expertise. Whether it should be a national surcharge, an interest-free loan, an outright grant of money, or something else is for you to decide. All we and the ratepayers ask is a fair consideration of our needs.

This meeting resulted in the creation by the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation of a task force on Three Mile Island comprised of eight members of the delegation: Mr. ATKINSON, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. YATRON, and myself as the appointed chairman. The task force was charged with the responsibility of analyzing the financial difficulties associated with recovery after the accident at TMI—particularly as they relate to the cleanup—and to make recommendations back to the full Pennsylvania Delegation on a course of action for the Federal Government. The task force has now made its recommendations to the delegation and in the near future the delegation will be coming to some conclusion on the recommendations.

On Tuesday, February 17, the task force met and unanimously endorsed and sent a proposal to the full delegation to create a national nuclear powerplant property damages insurance program. This would address the deficiencies which the task force discovered in the presently available insurance in the event of a future accident, and would provide some remedial assistance for the TMI-2 cleanup effort. This recommendation is the

culmination of 6 months of investigations, hearings, discussions, and deliberations.

In discharging its responsibility, the task force was assisted by staff of the House Science and Technology Committee, the Congressional Research Service, and the PaPUC. Below is a chronology of the task force's briefings and consultations.

TASK FORCE BRIEFING AND CONSULTATION CHRONOLOGY

September 17—Washington: Task Force, Staff, and Representatives of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

September 29—Washington: Task Force, Staff, and Representatives of General Public Utilities Corporation.

September 30—Washington: Task Force, Staff, and Representatives of the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities.

October 8—Harrisburg: Task Force, Staff, and Representatives of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and its consultants, Theodore Barry and Associates.

October 17—Washington: Staff, Roger Sant, Mellon Institute Energy Productivity Center.

October 20—Harrisburg: Task Force, Staff, and Representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

October 22—Harrisburg: Task Force, Staff, and Representatives of the Amercian Society of Utility Investors.

October 24—Washington: Staff, Representatives of Edison Electric Institute.

October 30—Harrisburg: Staff, Representatives of GPU Creditors.

November 4—Washington: Staff, and Representatives of the Atomic Industrial Forum.

November 14—Washington: Staff, Representatives of GPU, American Nuclear Energy Council.

November 20—Washington: Staff, Task Force, Representatives of GPU.

November 21—Washington: Staff, Task Force, Representatives of Critical Mass and other organizations.

November 24—Harrisburg: Staff, Task Force, Representatives of Local Harrisburg Groups Concerned with Federal TMI Assistance Issues.

December 9—Washington: Task Force, Staff, and Representatives from the PA Public Utility Commission, the NJ Board of Public Utilities, GPU, the NRC, SEC, FERC, Nuclear Industry, and the Banking Community.

The assistance of the Congressional Research Service proved to be invaluable in the efforts of the task force. Within 6 days of the first formal meeting of the task force, the CRS presented an overview and options paper which helped set the course of the task force's investigations. In fact, the final recommendations of the task force incorporates a great deal of this early work of CRS. Specifically, in a memo to the task force dated September 23, 1980—which was distributed to the task force members—CRS described the current availability of nuclear powerplant property insurance and described how actions to address deficiencies in the current insurance could also be employed to deal with the difficulty of financing the TMI-2 cleanup. That memo stated:

A federal nuclear plant insurance corporation could be established with coverage made retroactive to include TMI. Under current procedures, insurors will not cover nuclear units for more than $300 million due to the risk exposure. Federal insurance would cover costs from $400 million up to perhaps $1.5 billion, with the upper limit indexed to construction costs.

The gap between private and public insurance would have to be covered by the utility as an incentive to be efficient. Funding could be derived from a tax on electricity, or as a premium levied on each nuclear unit in the rate base of a utility. Initial premiums would be set to cover the cost of rehabilitating TMI-2 and provide an adequate insurance reserve against future accidents. TMI costs would be amortized over a 10-20 year period. Initial funding would be obtained by either borrowing on the market, or from U.S. Treasury loans. This has the advantage of providing permanent protection for all nuclear units, being self-liquidating, and not being unduly burdensome on the ratepayer. At the same time it internalizes the costs of an accident, and spreads the cost of TMI over time and space.

This suggestion later proved to be the basic approach adopted by the task force with several modifications.

In November, at the request of the task force, this same CRS team, together with the task force staff, prepared 6 options outlining various ways in which Federal action could be brought to bear on the TMI-2 cleanup problem. A summary of the options submitted to the task force follows.

STAFF OPTIONS FOR POSSIBLE FEDERAL LEGISLATION RELATED TO THE TMI ACCIDENT RECOVERY

OPTION SUMMARY

All but one option are based on an explicit principle of distributed responsibility for bearing the costs and inconvenience of the accident. This distribution of responsibility includes the federal and state governments, the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Utility Commissions, company management, creditors, equity holders, and ratepayers.

Option 1 is a ten-year federal loan guarantee option for accident related costs not in the rate base. The loan guarantee would be contingent on a joint Pennsylvania and New Jersey Utility Commission financial recovery plan utilizing all possible financial options to solve current economic problems. It would also require that creditors provide adequate notification procedures to allow planning for service provision and public health and safety in the event of further economic crisis.

Option 2 suggests federal purchase (or state purchase with federal assistance) of TMI Units 1 and 2. The ownership entity would rehabilitate and clean-up the plants, and sell power back to the GPU corporation at rates compatible with recovery of costs.

Option 3 allows issue of federal bonds for the clean-up costs. The two states involved would back 50% of the bonds equity, and the federal government the other 50%. The GPU Corporation would dedicate annual revenues for bond repayment. In the event of default a nation-wide electricity tax would be levied to cover the federal share of the liability.

Option 4 establishes a mandatory national property insurance program for nuclear plants. It would include the TMI accident retroactively, and assess member companies an amount adequate to cover payments to TMI. A variation could involve making the current purchased power insurance program mandatory and retroactively covering TMI.

Option 5 is a condemnation option in which current owners would transfer ownership of the units to the federal government by a condemnation mechanism. Other details would be similar to option 2.

Option 6 is a court recovery option in which cost recovery is envisioned through court action designed to establish formal liability. A federal loan would expedite cleanup and recovery pending reimbursement from proceeds of legal actions.

As a result of the task force deliberations, sections and ideas were taken from all of the options except option No. 5. These options and the various memorandums represent only a small part of the overall assistance provided to the task force by the people of the Congressional Research Service. In future entries I will describe the provisions and reasoning behind the final recommendations adopted by the task force, why certain options were rejected, and why parts of the options were merged into the final product.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO JENNIFER R. FORD

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to again submit for publication in the Extension of Remarks the text of this year's winning voice of democracy scholarship program from Jennifer R. Ford of Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Jennifer is a sophomore at St. Michael's High School who has won this years scholarship contest for New Mexico. The text of that essay follows:

We all have numerous commitments to our country; the commitment to respect our national symbols; the commitment to uphold our constitution; and the commitment to abide by our laws.

Too many of us have an erroneous understanding of our commitment to vote. Too many of us decide when and how to vote for the wrong reasons.

What I want to talk with you about today is my commitment to learn when to vote and what to base my vote upon. Voting does not only require choosing between candidates and issues but also deciding whether to vote at all.

The growing emphasis in the United States today has been to vote—regardless of the amount of knowledge we possess about the candidates and the issues. Our own government, public service advertisements on television, and special interest groups encourage us to exercise our right to vote even if we do not understand the political issues or the candidates background and stand on such issues.

Too many of us vote without knowledge and for the wrong reasons. Political Scientist, Angus Campbell, states: "The average individual either votes or does not vote entirely out of habit".

When we do vote we tend to vote without knowledge simply because we do not have enough information. This lack of information leads us to be tempted by appealing advertisements and slogans. A book entitled "Public Opinion" proves this:

"The relatively low amount of information possessed by most persons means that they must decide their political preferences on the basis of comparatively simple slogans since the subtle analysis will pass them by."

Over one-fourth of us do not possess the information needed to make intelligent decisions regarding politics. On major domestic and foreign policy issues and questions, 10-39% of the voting public were willing to offer opinions unsupported by information. Social characteristics also determine our political preference as proven in a study by Paul Lazarfield; consequently, we unawaringly make political judgments based on family beliefs or social backgrounds. Often we support a political party, simply because our families have done so in the past.

This problem of being uninformed is easily corrected. We can take advantage of the news media by listening and paying attention to the issues and the candidates. We can also take advantage of such groups as the League of Women Voters who encourages intelligent voting and voting information. This was evident in their sponsoring of the 1976 and 1980 political debates in which we became more aware of the candidates and their stands on current issues. Those of us who are informed voters can encourage others around us to do the same. We all should make an active commitment to our country, but this does not mean we should simply vote to exercise our right to vote. We can live up to our commitment for the future by encouraging our friends, our children, and our other family members to make intelligent decisions on their political choices, and not to vote on elections and issues they know nothing about. We can set a good example by following this guideline ourselves. Santayana, the philosopher, once said: "To be an American is of itself almost a moral condition, an education, and a career." As I approach voting age and become more involved in that career, I will try my best to be an informed voter and not vote when I cannot make an educated decision. By doing this, and by realizing that the right to vote is a choice and not a duty, we can all live up to our commitment to our country.●

AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the actions of the Reagan administration in increasing military aid to the Government of El Salvador have grave consequences for all Americans. During my visit to Central America this January, I spoke to hundreds of refugees who testified to torture, brutality, and murder occuring in that country with the use of American weapons. I think this country stands for something better than that; and I don't believe the taxpayers want their money spent to help terrorize the people of a nation.

I submit for the RECORD an article I wrote for yesterday's Baltimore Sun about my trip and the situation in El Salvador.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 24, 1981]

AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY—REPEATING THE MISTAKES OF VIETNAM AND IRAN

(By BARBARA MIKULSKI)

I could have been killed on my recent trip to Central America because of the State Department. Tragically, others *will* be killed because of the State Department.

A whole region of the world struggling to be free will be pushed either into repression or extremism because of the State Department's gross misreadings and manipulations in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras and El Salvador. The State Department lies to the Congress, to you and to itself.

It is creating the false impression:

That all of Central America is a cockpit of extremism between the right and left, which it is not;

That there are clear definitions of "good guys" and "bad guys" which there are not;

That Uncle Sam is one of the "good guys," leading the way to a centrist alternative, which it is not.

Misinformation and manipulation can be seen concretely in what happened to me.

When a member of Congress goes to a foreign country on official business, he or she gets briefings, both in Washington and later at the local U.S. Embassy. This takes place regardless of who sponsors or pays for the trip. The trip I took to Central America last month with two other members of Congress was sponsored by the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee. In my four years in the House, I have found the Washington briefings shallow at best and inaccurate at worst, with lots of ideological editorializing in all cases. There are truthful, competent and courageous people within the State Department—but in my experience they have been hard to come by. Careerism seems to be the more dominant mode.

Officials at the State Department did not want Representatives Gerry Studds (D., Mass.), Robert W. Edgar (D., Penna.) and me to go to El Salvador, and they did everything they could to scare us out of it, emphasizing the immediate personal danger to us. They emphasized what desirable targets we would be. Yet, cables from State's own diplomats in El Salvador clearly stated that we would be all right if we did not draw attention to ourselves. We couldn't have been more discreet. Nevertheless, State Department officials opposed to our fact-finding trip leaked our plans to CSB—thereby violating State's own recommendations and placing our lives in jeopardy. I was outraged. This became intensified as the trip went on.

On the plane trip to Central America, I compared the information given to me by State with the package given to me by the religious community working in Central America. I learned more concrete information from a Maryknoll handout and Christianity and Crisis magazine than I had from my own government.

Throughout the trip, we found out that the State Department actually did not know what was going on—or did not want to tell us. Some of the techniques State employed were half truths, steering us only to people who supported the official position and using "buzz-words," (e.g., "another Cuba" as an inaccurate description of Nicaragua, another "Pol Pot-Cambodia" as a false description of El Salvador and its refugees). Officials of the State Department did not seem to be in very close touch with the people of the country to which they were assigned.

Regarding Costa Rica, for example, the State Department gave us a favorable assessment of that country's political and economic condition. Yet, the president of the Legislative Assembly in Costa Rica gravely told us of serious economic problems. He said his country was at a cross-roads that could lead to an internal political and economic crisis. Issues of food for the people, depressed export markets and paying the bills for social programs were paramount in his mind. The more Costa Rica imitates the United States in mechanizing agriculture and attempting to develop industry, the deeper into debt it goes and the more it suffers from inflation, the Legislative Assembly president told us. He was by no means confident about the future. This dedicated leader's portrayal of his own country was in direct contrast to that of the State Department.

In Nicaragua, I found a country that is trying to feed its people, save its children and get out from under the criminal corruption and debt left by the Somoza dictatorship, while recovering from the terrible effects of a civil war.

The U.S. Embassy in Nicaragua arranged for us to confer with leaders of the opposition party and representatives of private business (i.e., managers of multinational companies), all of whom said they were able to operate normally in Nicaragua.

Through the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee we made arrangements to get an alternative viewpoint. For example, we met members of the religious community, other American citizens and Nicaraguans themselves.

We were told many distortions about Nicaragua, but I will focus on health, my specialty. Our delegation had been told that the Nicaraguans would not accept American help in the field of health care and that they wanted only Cubans. With a great deal of probing, we found that the "help" offered by the United States consisted of military hospital administrators. Nothing had been offered in the way of civilian doctors, nurses or midwives.

From the Maryknoll nuns running the *barrio* health clinic to the nation's minister of Health; from the Junta to the Jesuits, we learned that one of Nicaragua's most important priorities is health, particularly saving the lives of children. Fifty percent of Nicaraguan children die before the age of five because of malnutrition and communicable diseases.

Anastasio Somoza—the ousted, now dead Nicaraguan dictator—left no money to buy polio vaccine, immunization drugs or the basic medical tools found in any doctor's kit. Instead he left an enormous debt to Western drug companies for unneeded or undelivered pharmaceuticals.

I specifically asked the minister of Health, "Would you accept free drugs from the United States to immunize your children against typhoid, meningitis, measles and polio? Would you allow U.S. civilian doctors and nurses to come to Nicaragua?" She said yes, as did officials of the ruling Junta and the parliamentary body.

Fouled up foreign policy of this kind is unconscionable because children die. It is chilling to think that a new government in Central America cannot turn to the United States to protect its children from polio.

But in some parts of Central America, women and children cannot count on the

United States for protection. Whether we were speaking with exiles from El Salvador and Guatemala or whether we were interviewing Salvadoran refugees near the Honduran border, we were told how women and children are particularly brutalized under two regimes supported by the United States.

We interviewed refugees who said they had been victims of atrocities or had witnessed them. Their accounts were corroborated in place by members of the religious community and representatives of international humanitarian organizations who either had seen the incidents themselves or had given medical treatment or spiritual comfort to victims afterwards. We made tape recordings of some of our interviews.

The atrocities reported to us had a macabre consistency. Rape, we were told, is used systematically as a form of terror and torture in Guatemala and El Salvador by the Army, National Guard and para-military groups. In Guatemala soldiers gang-rape teen-age girls. In El Salvador the military has sodomized 10-year-old boys and girls and children have been thrown into the air and used for target practice. Their dead bodies have been cut up with machetes and left for the dogs to eat. Pregnant women, when caught by the Salvadoran National Guards, have been tortured and killed by diswombing (i.e. their torsos are slit open and their wombs pulled out).

In each and every instance the killers were identified as military personnel—armed with weapons and equipment from the United States or its allies. In El Salvador, military helicopters were particularly lethal, we were told, because they are used for rapid pursuit of villagers.

I asked if the leftist guerrillas and members of the anti-Junta Popular Front in El Salvador had also committed these types of crime. The answers were consistently no.

In all the State Department "briefings" we got, little had been said about these atrocities.

The American ambassador in Honduras denied the validity of taped eyewitness accounts we played for him. Yet, neither he nor his staff had ever been to the border area to talk with any of the thousands of Salvadoran refugees there.

Although we did not go to El Salvador because of a sudden rise in military activity there, Representative Studds spoke by telephone to Robert White, the U.S. ambassador. Ambassador White said there had been no meaningful U.S. investigation into the murders of three American nuns and a lay volunteer in El Salvador. A report resulting from an investigation conducted by U.S. officials led to the resumption of U.S. military aid to the government. It has been reported that government soldiers controlled the road where the four American women were raped and killed. Now the Reagan administration says it's not particularly important to know who killed the nuns and who supplied the weapons. It wants to know who is supplying weapons to the insurgents.

So here the United States is in Central America repeating the mistakes of Vietnam and Iran. Once again some of its officials are lying about terrorism and exploitation that the United States supports and helps pay for.

I support Secretary of State Alexander Haig when he says we should stop terrorism. I hope we know how to identify the real terrorists and stop giving them the tools of repression.

[Barbara Mikulski represents Maryland's Third District in the House of Representatives. The Central American trip she describes here took her to Honduras, Costa Rica and Nicaragua from January 9 to January 19.]●

SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE FIELD

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, because March 1, 1981, marks the beginning of National Foreign Language Week, I thought my colleagues in the House would appreciate having a summary of achievements made in recent months in calling attention to the importance of foreign language study. Through the indefatiguable efforts of Congressman SIMON, along with persistent and thoughtful prodding on the part of Representatives MILLICENT FENWICK, TIMOTHY WIRTH, DON BONKER, DANTE FASCELL, JIM OBERSTAR, ED DERWINSKI, and a host of other dedicated colleagues, we truly have made important strides forward in this field. I am pleased to provide a progress report for my colleagues' convenience, and trust that you will be able to make valuable use of this information.

In November 1979 the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies issued its final report, "Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability." The report (GPO stock number 017-080-02065-3) expressed alarm at declining foreign language and international competence among Americans, with fewer than eight percent of American colleges and universities now requiring a foreign language for admission. The Commission called upon the Congress, the President, and the nation to support strengthened foreign language and international studies programs.

As a follow up to the President's Commission, the National Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies was created through a joint effort by private foundations, business corporations, and government agencies. The council's interests encompass all elements of language and international studies in the United States: advanced training and research; overseas study; global awareness; primary, secondary, and collegiate education; citizen and community education; and the needs of business, labor, and government. Executive director is Allen H. Kassof, 655 3rd Avenue, New York, New York (212) 490-2002.

A Washington office of the Joint National Committee for Languages was established to provide information to Congress and the executive branch concerning foreign language and international studies and to serve as a liaison with interested members of a variety of foreign language associations throughout the country. Director is Dave Edwards (202) 483-7200.

Congressman Panetta formed an informal international education group of Members of Congress to focus attention on issues of concern and to build support for legislative and other initiatives on foreign language and international studies. Thirty-five members of the House and four Senate offices were affiliated with this group last year. Those wishing to join should contact Matthew Cossolotto in Congressman Panetta's office.

Last year the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence expressed its grave concern about the shortage of linguists in the military and directed the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence to develop a program which encompasses a communitywide approach toward alleviating the linguist shortfalls. The committee requested that the program address personnel rotation policies, language training facilities, alternative approaches to language training, the adequacy of recruitment policies and techniques, and the adequacy of career ladders and pay policies for language-trained individuals.

As a result of amendments by Congressman Panetta in 1979, the General Accounting Office issued a report on April 15, 1980, concluding that more competence in foreign languages was needed among U.S. personnel stationed overseas. In addition, GAO agreed last year to a request by Congressman Panetta to review a variety of issues and concerns related to the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California, and to review a range of issues related to defense-wide foreign language programs.

Congressman Simon amendment to the Department of Education bill included foreign language and international studies as one of seven priority concerns of the new department.

The Congress last year approved an amendment by Congressman Simon and Congressman Panetta to the Foreign Service Act (H.R. 6790) requiring the establishment of at least two "foreign language competence" posts at U.S. Diplomatic Missions abroad.

The Congress last year approved an amendment by Congressman Panetta to the International Security and Development Cooperation Act directing the Peace Corps to develop a plan to better utilize returned Peace Corps volunteers in international education. This would help to strengthen goal three in the Peace Corps' original mandate.

The Congress approved last year's reauthorization for the National Institute of Education which included a provision prepared by Congressman Simon including the encouragement of the study of languages and culture as one of the Institute's research projects.

The Higher Education Act of 1980 authorized an increase of $8 million for international education programs, including an important new program, part B, which would provide U.S. businesses with a stronger international education base. That effort was sponsored by Senator Stafford.

Both the House and the Senate passed H. Con. Res. 301, expressing the sense of the Congress that local education agencies and institutions of higher education should consider strengthening the study of foreign language and cultures. This resolution was sponsored by Congressman Simon in the House and Senator Tsongas in the Senate.

CONDOS—BUY IT OR GET OUT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, increasing numbers of people who rent apartments are faced with the often awful dilemma brought about by conversions to condo or co-op status: Buy it or get out. In the name of providing homeownership and speculative opportunities for the young and able, we are allowing less mobile elderly and lower income people to be sacrificed. The Commerce, Consumer and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, which I chair, has been working on the condo co-op conversion issue and will continue to oversee Federal laws and programs affecting the conversion process. When faced with the dilemma, however, the unsuspecting tenant needs immediate advice and some of that is provided in an article in the March 1981 issue of Changing Times magazine. I commend it to my colleagues whose constituents are faced with a conversion problem.

The article follows:

YOUR BUILDING IS GOING CONDO. SHOULD YOU BUY?

Buy it or get out. That dilemma confronts thousands of apartment dwellers all over the country as the rental developments they live in are turned into condominiums or cooperatives.

For some the decision is easy. They welcome the opportunity to acquire property, build equity, qualify for tax breaks and share the gains if the place appreciates.

For others the decision is complex, painful, sometimes traumatic. Even if they can find a suitable place to move to, getting out is both disruptive and expensive. Buying almost always means a steep increase in monthly expense and disturbing uncertainty over whether the substantial investment is a sound one.

If this hard choice falls to you, there may be a number of things you can do in self-defense—knock down the price, get better terms, negotiate concessions, possibly even stay where you are without buying. The better informed you are, the better you're likely to make out. Here is guidance to help you make reasoned and dispassionate decisions.

First, some background. Condominiums are developments in which the resident-buyers own their living quarters plus a share of the common facilities—hallways, elevators, exterior walls, grounds and such. In a typical co-op the residents own shares of a corporation that owns the property, with the shares conferring the right to live in a specified unit. The condo form is generally considered preferable from a legal standpoint—residents get deeds to their units and usually have more control over them.

Generally, condos have been selling for considerably less than new detached dwellings. And resale values of condos have been increasing almost as quickly as those of houses, according to the Federal National Mortgage Association, which invests in home mortgages.

PROFITS FUEL THE BOOM

Why are rental projects converted to condos or co-ops? Because conversion can be profitable to the building owner who sells the units off. "It's the golden goose of the landlord industry," says John Atlas of the National Tenants Union. Example: The Promenade, a 1,072-unit luxury high-rise in a suburb of Washington, D.C., was acquired for $49,700,000 but could bring up to $100,000,000 from unit sales.

The spread of conversions has set off swirls of controversy and sometimes bitter clashes between owners and tenants. There have been protest demonstrations, lawsuits, demands for government regulations—even bomb threats. Critics say conversions inflate prices, put tenants at a disadvantage, drive the elderly from their homes, worsen scarcities of rental housing and mortgage money, and force tenants who purchase to pay from 30% to over 100% more a month just to live where they lived before, not to mention what they lay out in down payments and closing costs. Most of the increased monthly expense goes to mortgage interest and taxes, which usually double when the property is reassessed to reflect the selling price rather than its value as a rent producer.

Defenders respond that conversions enlarge tax bases, enable thousands of young and modest-income people to become homeowners and improve neighborhoods because homeowners maintain properties better than landlords do.

The boom has also spawned a new and controversial real estate specialty—buying up properties and selling the units. The biggest outfit, the Chicago-based American Invsco (pronounced IN-VES-CO), has logged more than 60 conversions around the country and is currently embroiled in about 40 tenant lawsuits. Along with professional converters have come lawyers who specialize in representing tenants. If there is no tenant organization, the lawyers usually help form one, then handle negotiations with the owner.

The furor has tended to magnify the conversion movement. Only about 366,000 rental units, or 1.3% of the U.S. total, were converted during the 1970s, a study by the Department of Housing and Urban Development found. However, the volume is expected to grow, with another 1,100,000 units, accounting for another 4.3% of the total, likely to be converted by 1986, according to the HUD study. About 6% of the rental units in the Chicago, Denver and Washington, D.C., areas have been converted, but in some localities the proportion runs as high as 30%.

TEN THINGS YOU SHOULD DO

Statistics cannot ease the anguish of a contented renter who receives a buy-or-move ultimatum. If one turns up in your mailbox, here are some strategies to consider.

Unite. A strong tenant organization may be able to negotiate far better terms than those offered—or even block the conversion. Maybe a tenant takeover and conversion would be possible. See the box on the next page for an example of how this works. Consider hiring a conversion lawyer. Though you are free to bargain on your own, individuals lack the clout of an organization.

Ascertain your rights. About half the states, the District of Columbia and a number of communities regulate conversions. Most jurisdictions that regulate conversions require that tenants be given time to decide what to do (120 days is fairly common, though viewed by many as inadequate) and be permitted to buy their units before they can be publicly offered. Most local ordinances also mandate such things as building inspections, engineering reports or disclosure statements. Some localities require warranties on major structural features, financial assistance for displaced residents, lifetime lease extensions for the elderly, retention of some units for continued rental, and the approval of a stated number of tenants before a conversion can take place.

Your state attorney general's office, a consumer protection or housing agency, or a real estate board should know where you can get copies of any laws in your area.

Canvass your options. What other housing is available? If you can't find a suitable rental, you may find a better purchase deal somewhere else. How do prices compare?

Ponder common ownership. In a condo or co-op you and your neighbors would run things. An elected board would set fees, adopt budgets, negotiate maintenance contracts, pay bills and enforce house rules. Board approval is often needed to sell, rent or remodel. Would this appeal to you?

Brace for a sales pitch. It could include enticing brochures, cocktail parties, assurances of rock-bottom prices, exciting talk about property appreciation and tax savings, discounts for buying early, and claims that units are selling fast and 15 people are lined up to buy yours. Listen and learn. Attend all gatherings but take nothing for granted. Sellers often exaggerate values, tax advantages, investment potential and sales volume.

Analyze the offer. You'll receive details on the conversion, a plan of ownership and a purchase contract. You may also get an audited schedule of operating costs, an engineer's report on the building's condition and an appraisal report. All of these documents are essential to reveal just what you're getting into. Study the documents by yourself—and then get a professional opinion.

Get expert advice. A savvy lawyer is a must. So are a competent appraisal and an evaluation of the building by a reputable, independent engineer. "That's crucial," says Errol Brett, a New York City lawyer who has represented about 50 tenant groups. "Nobody should buy property without checking it out." not only may serious defects exist, but also the structure may have to be brought in compliance with fire, electrical and other building codes. Many communities require such compliance when conversions take place. People are often shocked at the costs, which can run to hundreds of thousands of dollars, says Jerrily Kress, a consulting engineer in Washington, D.C.

A few developers have resisted demands for inspections and audits. That could be grounds for a suit, and you probably shouldn't buy under such circumstances.

Assess the investment potential. "The first thing we look at is the supply of condominiums and the prices being asked in the community for all types of housing," says Craig Distelhorst, a vice-president of the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corp. (MGIC), a provider of mortgage insurance. "Condominium prices must be in line with . . . other forms of housing if they are to compete effectively." The quality of the neighborhood as well as the building is all-important. Also consider the proximity to jobs, hospitals, schools, recreation centers, cultural facilities and public transportation. Crank in what you know about local population trends and housing demand.

Bide your time. The longer you wait to commit yourself, the more you may know. Are your neighbors buying? If sales are slow, the owner could drop prices, improve the terms or abandon the conversion. If sales are brisk, the owner may offer incentives for tenants to leave before leases or waiting periods expire. When a fashionable but aging building in Baltimore was converted recently, most of the tenants moved out. Prices were then slashed by 25%. At the Promenade, tenants used their waiting time to organize and present a number of demands to the owners. If the developer will agree, stipulate in the contract that if prices are later reduced, your price will be similarly adjusted.

It's not uncommon for investors to buy units in developments where prices are reasonable and prospects for appreciation are good. This too is something to watch. Large numbers of rental units can have a "negative impact on the economic viability and success" of a project, says a house subcommittee. Not only are speculators more likely to default on loans, but such absentee owners also cannot give the place the day-to-day attention that residents would. On the other hand, you might be able to keep renting your unit if a speculator buys it.

Obey all rules. When units are selling fast, developers prefer to have tenants move before deadlines. Some attempt eviction—especially of activists—for the slightest rules infractions. So be careful.

A FEW MORE THINGS TO KNOW

More and more building owners now provide buyers with a reserve fund for emergency outlays and some future maintenance. Get one if you can. "No one should buy without finding out whether provisions have been made for this," says James Dowden, executive vice-president of the Community Associations Institute, an alliance of residents' organizations.

Residents' organizations often have a rough time, at least initially, in taking over and managing a development. The CAI, through over 30 chapters, gives training programs for association officers. For information, write to the Community Association Institute, Dept. CT, 3000 S. Eads St., Arlington, Va. 22202. The CAI also offers two publications, The Homebuyer & the Community Association (70 cents) and The Homeowner & the Community Association (85 cents).

Be particularly wary if the seller tries to retain ownership of any of the common facilities, such as a clubhouse, pool, golf course or commercial space, to be leased to the unit owners. "If they are leased . . . instead of owned, they may not be completed or maintained to the satisfaction of the condo unit owners," warns the MGIC. "The situation can drastically alter the market value of a condominium unit." Also, watch out for long-term management contracts with the converter.

Finally, if the seller promises to improve or renovate the property, get a statement in writing of exactly what will be done, when and at what cost. The HUD study found that in most conversions, the proferred alterations were mostly cosmetic.

For a booklet published by the Cooperative Extension Services of the Northeast States that discusses and compares condominiums and cooperatives, send $1.25 for Booklet NE200 to Distribution Center—CT, Seven Research Park, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850.

TENANTS BUY IT AND SAVE

Residents of the Monroe House apartments in Washington, D.C., made the best of things when they learned that conversion was imminent. They bought the place and converted it themselves.

Result: a 20% average savings in costs of their units plus thousands of dollars in profits from sales of vacated units to the public.

"At least 90% of us couldn't have afforded to stay here if anybody else had taken over," says Sarah Maddox, head of the tenants' organization.

The District of Columbia requires that tenants of buildings slated for conversion be allowed to buy the property if they present an acceptable offer. Monroe House's owners wanted $4,400,000. After three negotiating sessions they accepted $3,950,000.

Tenants purchased 63 of the building's 112 units for prices that translated to $85 a square foot. Outsiders bought 35 units for $105 a square foot—and that was below market value. What's more, each tenant-purchaser will share the proceeds from those sales—up to $8,000 each, according to one estimate.

In the beginning nobody in the group had any real estate experience to speak of. Nevertheless, they chipped in $220,000 for a deposit, hired advisers, raised financing on favorable terms, obtained engineering and auditors' reports and arranged for about $800,000 in renovations. These included a new roof, new heating system and double-insulated windows.

"It's been a lot of fun," relates Maddox, but there was some difficulty. At least two lawyers demanded a share of the proceeds for representing the group. Some lenders and brokers quoted exorbitant rates. "It seemed for a while that everybody was trying to rip us off," Maddox says. Ultimately, however, the group assembled a "terrific" conversion team that included a broker, lawyer, accountant, architect and engineering firm. "Without them we would have been dead."

Multiple purchases were vetoed by the group to preserve the development's residential character, but some people tried it anyway, using fictitious names. Units of elderly and handicapped tenants were sold at insiders' prices to investors who agreed to let them continue renting for life, with no increases.

The tenants of Monroe House followed an unusual course in acting as their own developer. Tenant groups doing their own conversion usually contract with an outside developer who handles all of the rehabilitation and other work of the conversion; tenants then pay below-market prices for their units. Maddox's advice to other tenant groups: Do not attempt a conversion like theirs unless the leaders can devote a lot of time to it. Find out exactly what state and local laws require. Be very selective in hiring professional help (her group interviewed 16 brokers and five law firms). Get the vital facts and figures—including engineering and appraisal reports—before starting to negotiate. Be sure to get a thorough title search.

Incidentally, a building owner may welcome a tenant purchase. It can mean quicker action, fewer snags and no selling commissions.●

THE BENEFITS OF REGULATION

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the current preoccupation of the administration with cost benefits has made all regulations the scapegoat for low productivity, high cost overruns, and a lack of investment by businessmen. The least-cost approach coupled with the requirement that a new regulation be issued only if benefits to society are reasonably related to its costs ignore the very real advantages and improvement in the quality of life which millions of Americans enjoy thanks to many regulations. Perhaps we need to be reminded that regulations often were issued because a vacuum existed and necessary initiatives were not taken by the responsible parties. In this light, I wish to commend to my distinguished colleagues' attention Richard Cohen's recent column in the Washington Post entitled "Most Regulations Have a Worthwhile Purpose."

The article follows:

MOST REGULATIONS HAVE A WORTHWHILE PURPOSE

For a time, I went to college in the building that once housed the Triangle Shirtwaist factory. It was there, in 1911, that 145 garment workers, most of them women, died in a horrible fire that shocked a nation into thinking seriously about fire code regulations. All that remains now is a commemorative plaque on the base of the building and the regulations themselves. What has been forgotten, I'm afraid, is the tragedy that inspired them. As a nation, we have a short memory.

At the moment, for instance, politicians are extolling deregulation as if there were never any reason for regulation in the first place. Suddenly, it is as if the past never happened, as if nothing was ever learned, as if we have forgotten that regulation is often good and deregulation is sometimes just another word for irresponsibility.

People talk now only about the costs of regulation. It costs this and it costs that, and you have to have lawyers in Washington and that, of course, costs some more. You have to fill out forms and then do things the right way and answer to some jerk in Washington who knows from nothing about your business and never—and this is the operative cliche, so pay attention—had to meet a payroll.

Well, by George and by God, there is something to this. I, for one, can cite you horror story after horror story about what the pointy heads of Washington have done. They have ruined some businesses, and taken the profit out of others and their insistent paper work sure has spoiled the nights of more than one business person. Anyone who has read how Grumman tried to build a bus to meet all the federal regs would understand what I mean. It's a regulatory jungle out there.

But then people still do die in coal mines and people still die of black lung and even more would be dying if the government had

not forced the coal mine operators to do something about the problem. People are acting now as if the coal mine operators of the country had cleaned up their industry on their own initiative and then the government came in to muck things up. That's not the way it happened.

It did not happen that way in most industries. It was not the government that built the Corvair or, for that matter, the Edsel. It was not the government that marketed thalidomide or cars that disintegrated from little more than a dirty look. The government does not make cigarettes and tell kids how terrific they are and the government did not put poison in the ground all over the country. No cow was ever poisoned by a regulation.

Where are these awful government regs when chemical workers get contaminated? Where are these hated regulations when atomic energy workers get cooked and when they have to turn, as they did at Kerr-McGee in Oklahoma, to a medical officer who had studied something like animal husbandry? Show me the corporation that ever got radiation poisoning. Show me a board of directors who got black lung, who got Kepone poisoning or went into a coal mine where the cold is raw and you have to work hunched over in water. Show me.

How is it that we think the problems are solved when you still can't swim in the Potomac River and the marvelous Chesapeake Bay is dying and all over Long Island you can't drink the well water? Acid rain falls on the forests and fish die in the ponds and in the summer the air of Washington, D.C., keeps the elderly indoors, breathing through air conditioners they can ill afford to keep running. Deregulation will, I know, solve all this.

No one seems to remember these things anymore. Regulations that were designed to save lives, protect consumers and preserve the environment are now seen as examples of government excess. Well, times change and with it so do remedies. There is nothing wrong with rectifying mistakes, with redressing grievances, with what Vice President Bush calls "seeking a balance" and with trying new solutions.

But there is something wrong in forgetting the reason for the regulations, in pretending that the regulations were imposed by a malevolent government intent on doing nothing more than making things harder for American business. And there is also something wrong in pretending that the problems have been solved and that the last thing in the world American industry would do is endanger a worker or rip off a consumer or spoil the environment. They are the same guys they used to be.

Or have we forgotten?●

CHICORY ROOT IMPORT DUTY SUSPENSION

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to temporarily suspend to import duty on processed chicory roots for a period of 3 years. Currently this duty is 1½ cents per pound.

Chicory root, once it is ground and roasted, is used as an additive to coffee in many parts of the world and is particularly popular in Louisiana. It gives our coffee its distinctive and pleasant flavor. In addition to improving the taste of coffee, chicory is a very economical coffee extender.

At one point in our history chicory was produced in several areas of the country, in Michigan in particular. This tariff dates from that time. In checking with the Department of Agriculture I understand that chicory is no longer produced commercially in the United States.

Since there is no longer any domestic chicory production and since there appears to be no firm currently processing raw chicory root, it appears logical to conclude that the imposition of a tariff, however small, serves no purpose to protect U.S. agriculture or industry. Likewise the revenue involved is hardly worth the amount of time and trouble involved in processing and collecting the amount of customs duties which presently are imposed on imported chicory.

This legislation would temporarily suspend the duty and would give the Congress time to evaluate the need for a permanent suspension.

The bill follows:

A bill to suspend for 3 years the duty on ground or otherwise prepared chicory roots

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting in numerical order the following new item:

"930.64.....	Chicory roots, ground or otherwise prepared (provided for in item 160.35, part 11A, schedule 1).	Free ...	No change	On or before the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this item."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, inflation hits all Americans very hard, but our older citizens living on fixed incomes are hit hardest. Their problems of coping with the escalating cost of living are compounded by the serious economic situation in the country today.

While the President has proposed a bold plan for redirecting economic policy to curb inflation, increase employment, and encourage economic growth, many older people continue to feel the effects of a limited income.

A vast number of older Americans are overpaying their income taxes, based on reports from the Select Committee on Aging, because they do not take advantage of tax reduction provisions contained in the law.

To help our older citizens avail themselves of these provisions, I am submitting a revised checklist of tax return information for use in taxable year 1980.

Prepared by the select committee, the checklist should be helpful to our senior citizens and their families as they try to live with the economic stress we are all experiencing today.

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

(A Revised Checklist of Tax Return Information for Use in Taxable Year 1980)

A. FILING REQUIREMENTS

Single Individuals

Single individuals under the age of 65 must file a return if they had gross income of $3,300 or more for the year. Those over age 65 must file if they had gross income of $4,300 or more.

Married Individuals

Married individuals under the age of 65 must file a return if the couple's combined gross income was $5,400 or more. If only one spouse is age 65 or older, the filing level is $6,400. If both spouses are age 65 or older, the filing level is $7,400.

An individual who is married and whose spouse files a separate return must file a return if gross income was $1,000 or more.

Qualifying Widow or Widower

Qualifying widows or widowers must file a return if they had gross income of $4,400 or more during the year. For qualifying widows or widowers who are 65 or older, the filing level is $5,400.

Self-Employed Persons

Self-employed individuals must file a return if they had net earnings from self-employment of $400 or more.

B. PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS

Each taxpayer is entitled to a $1,000 personal exemption. Married taxpayers generally are entitled to an additional $1,000 exemption for their spouses. Furthermore, additional exemptions are provided for age (65 or older) and blindness. Finally, individuals may take an exemption for each person who qualifies as a dependent.

C. ZERO BRACKET AMOUNT

The zero bracket amount (formerly, the standard deduction) is the portion of an individual's income which is not subject to tax. The zero bracket amount is (1) $3,400 for married individuals filing jointly, or qualifying widows or widowers, (2) $2,300 for single individuals, or heads of households, and (3) $1,700 for married individuals filing separately.

D. EXCLUSIONS

Capital Gains

In general, 60 percent of net long-term capital gain is excluded from gross income.

Sale of Personal Residence

Individuals who are age 55 or older may elect to exclude, on a one-time basis, up to $100,000 of the gain from the sale of a personal residence. For the exclusion to apply, the taxpayer must have owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale.

Dividends and Interest

In general, individuals may exclude up to $100 ($200 on a joint return if each spouse has at least $100 of dividends) of dividends received during the year.

For 1981 and 1982 tax years (to be reflected on 1981 and 1982 tax returns), $200 ($400 in the case of joint returns) of interest and dividends may be excluded from gross income.

Disability Income Exclusion

Certain individuals may exclude up to $5,200 per year of disability income. In general, to qualify for this exclusion, an individual must be under age 65, must have retired on disability, and must have retired because of permanent and total disability.

E. ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS [1]

Medical and Dental Expenses

The portion of medical expenses that exceeds 3 percent of a taxpayer's adjusted gross income may be deducted. (However, medicine and drug expenses are taken into account only to the extent that they exceed 1 percent of adjusted gross income.)

One-half of the amount spent for medical insurance (up to $150) may be deducted without regard to the 3-percent floor. The remainder is lumped with other medical expenses and is subject to the 3-percent floor.

Taxes

In general, State, local or foreign income tax, real property tax, personal property tax, and general sales taxes are deductible.

Interest

Interest payments are deductible by individuals who are legally liable to make them. Items commonly deducted as interest include: Mortgage interest, "points" paid by a borrower, mortgage prepayment penalties, separately stated finance charges, bank credit card plan interest, interest on personal loans, and interest on business loans.

Contributions

Contributions of cash or property to qualified organizations may be deducted. In general, the deduction may not exceed 50 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income.

Casualty and Theft Losses

Personal casualty and theft losses are deductible to the extent that they exceed $100 per occurrence and are not reimbursed through insurance or otherwise.

Miscellaneous Deductions

In addition to medical and dental expenses, taxes, interest, charitable contributions, and casualty and theft losses, a number of other, miscellaneous expenses may be claimed as itemized deductions. Some of the more common expenses in this category include: dues paid to professional societies, employment-seeking expenses, employment-related education, subscriptions to professional journals, union dues, investment counsel fees, safe deposit box rental, and tax counsel and assistance.

[1] For further details see itemized deductions.

F. TAX CREDITS

Credit for the elderly

Individuals who are age 65 or older, or who are under age 65 and receive a taxable pension or annuity from a public retirement system, may be entitled to claim the credit for the elderly. The maximum amount of the credit is 15 percent of one of the following amounts: (1) $2,500 for a single person, head of household, or qualifying widow or widower; (2) $2,500 for a married individual filing a joint return, if only one spouse is 65 or older; (3) $3,750 for a married individual filing a joint return, if both spouses are 65 or older; or (4) $1,875 for a married individual filing a separate return, if the individual and his or her spouse were not members of the same household during the year.

Child and Disabled Dependent Care Credit

Taxpayers may be entitled to a credit equal to 20 percent of the amount paid for the care of a dependent under the age of 15, a disabled dependent, or a disabled spouse, if the payment is made to enable the taxpayer to work or look for work. For a taxpayer with one qualifying dependent, the maximum credit is $400. If there are two or more qualifying dependents, the maximum credit is $800.

Earned Income Credit

Taxpayers with dependent children generally are entitled to a refundable credit equal to 10 percent of the first $5,000 of earnings (for a maximum credit of $500). The credit phases out a rate of 12.5 percent as income rises from $6,000 to $10,000 (that is, a reduction of 12½ cents for each additional dollar of income).

Residential Energy Credit

Taxpayers are entitled to a credit equal to 15 percent of the first $2,000 spent on qualifying energy-saving items. Qualifying energy-saving items include: insulation, storm or thermal windows or doors, caulking or weather stripping, clock thermostats, furnace replacement burners, and meters that display the cost of energy use.

In addition, taxpayers may receive an additional energy credit for amounts spent on solar, wind-powered, or geothermal equipment for their homes. This credit is for 40 percent of the first $10,000 of those costs.

Credit for Political Contributions

Taxpayers may take credits for up to one-half of political contributions made during the year. The maximum credit is $50 on a single return and $100 on a joint return.

G. PRESIDENTAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND CHECKOFF

Additionally, an individual taxpayer may voluntarily earmark $1 of taxes ($2 on joint returns) each year for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. (This does not result in any increase or decrease of the tax liability.)

ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS

A. CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

Medical and Dental Expenses

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

Insurance Premiums

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to $150) without regard to the 3 percent limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3 percent rule.

Drugs and Medicines

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3 percent rule) but only to extent exceeding 1 percent of adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

Other Medical Expenses

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3 percent limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Acupuncture services.
Ambulance hire.
Anesthetist.
Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Artificial limbs and teeth.
Back supports (prescribed by a doctor).
Braces.
Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. You should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.
Cardiographs.
Chiropodist.
Chiropractor.
Christian Science practioner, authorized.
Convalescent home (for medical treatment only).
Crutches.
Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth).
Dentures.
Dermatologist.
Eyeglasses.
Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed).
Gynecologist.
Hearing aids and batteries.
Home health services.
Hospital expenses.
Insulin treatment.
Invalid chair.
Lab tests.
Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap).
Neurologist.
Nursing services for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you.
Occupational therapist.
Ophthalmologist.
Optician.
Optometrist.
Oral surgery.
Osteopath, licensed.
Pediatrician.
Physical examinations.
Physical therapist.
Physician.
Podiatrist.
Psychiatrist.
Psychoanalyst.
Psychologist.
Psychotherapy.
Radium therapy.
Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor).
Seeing-eye dog and maintenance.
Speech therapist.
Splints.
Supplementary medical insurance (Part B) under medicare.
Surgeon.
Telephone/teletype special communications equipment for the deaf.
Television set if individual has a hearing impairment and the set is specially equipped with a visual display of the audio

portion of television programs. Similarly the cost of an adaptor for a conventional television that performs the same function is now considered a medical deductive by the IRS.

Transportation expenses for medical purposes (9¢ per mile, plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.).

Vaccines.

Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health).

Wheelchairs.

Whirlpool baths for medical purposes.

X-rays.

Expenses may be deducted only in the year you paid them. If you charge medical expenses on your bank credit card, the expenses are deducted in the year the charge is made regardless of when the bank is repaid.

Taxes

Real estate.

General sales.

State and local income.

Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, ordinarily you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables the sales tax paid on the purchase of the following items: automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., social security, veterans' pensions or compensation payments, railroad retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

Contributions

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonprofit foundations, veterans organizations, or fraternal societies are limited to 20 percent of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible).

Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 9¢ per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct insurance or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated student in your home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to $50 per month).

Interest

Home mortgage.

Auto loan.

Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Other credit cards—you may deduct as interest the finance charges added to your monthly statement, expressed as an annual percentage rate, that are based on the unpaid monthly balance.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money and only if the charging of points is an established business practice in your area. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the separately stated "finance charge" expressed as an annual percentage rate.

Casualty or Theft Losses

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the $100 limitation. Report your casualty or theft loss on Schedule A. If more than one item was involved in a single casualty or theft, or if you had more than one casualty or theft during the year, you may use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

Miscellaneous

Appraisal fees to determine the amount of a casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return.

Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for chamber of commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box used to store income-producing property.

Fees paid to investment counselors.

Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding $25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer.

Cost of installation and maintenance of a telephone required by your employment (deduction based on business use).

Cost of bond if required for employment.

Expenses of an office in your home if used regularly and exclusively for certain business purposes.

Transportation expenses for business purpose (20 cents per mile for the first 15,000 miles, and 11 cents per mile in excess of 15,000 miles, plus parking and tolls or actual fares for taxi, buses, et cetera.)

B. OTHER TAX RETURN INFORMATION ITEMS

Tax Tables

Tax tables have been developed to make it easier for you to find your tax if your income is under certain levels. Even if you itemize deductions, you may be able to use the tax tables to find your tax easier. In addition, you do not have to deduct $1,000 for each exemption because these amounts are also built into the tax table for you.

Multiple Support Agreements

In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) support; (2) gross income; (3) member of household or relationship; (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a $1,000 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10 percent of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Sale of Personal Residence

You may exclude from your gross income some or all of your gain from the sale of your principal residence, if you meet certain age, ownership, and occupancy requirements at the time of the sale. These requirements, and the amount of gain that may be excluded, differ depending on whether you sold your home before July 27, 1978, or on or after that date. The exclusion is elective, and you may elect to exclude gain only once for sales before July 27, 1978, and only once for sales on or after that date.

If you sold your home before July 27, 1978, and you were age 65 or older before the date of sale, you may elect to exclude the gain attributable to $35,000 of the adjusted sales price if you owned and occupied the residence for 5 of the 8 years ending on the date of sale. If you sold the home after July 26, 1978, and you were age 55 or older before the date of the sale, you may elect to exclude $100,000 of gain on the sale if you owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale (or 5 of 8 years under certain circumstances). Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Personal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded.

Additionally, you may elect to defer reporting the gain on the sale of your personal residence if within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale you buy and occupy another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the

old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence; (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces; or (3) your tax home was abroad. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling or Purchasing Your Home) may also be helpful.●

PRESERVING THE ACEQUIAS OF NORTHERN NEW MEXICO

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to assist in the preservation of the acequias of northern New Mexico.

Some of these acequias are over 200 years old and have been in almost continuous use as irrigation canals since their origin. The fact that they are still in use is a testament to the quality of work that went into their building, and which provides for us today a good foundation for the repair work that is needed.

Unfortunately, over the years, the need for repair has increased while the actual rehabilitation has decreased. We are now faced with a situation where the estimated price of improving these systems is $40 million, and my bill calls for this. If passed, it will not only preserve these historically important structures, but will also assist the many small farmers in New Mexico whose livelihood depends on their use.

A similar bill has already been introduced in the Senate and I hope that together Senator DOMENICI and I will be able to see this through to enactment in this Congress.

Thank you.●

IN HONOR OF DOROTHY AND FORTNEY STARK'S 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, my parents, Dorothy and Fortney Stark, are celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary February 26, and I pay tribute to them for the gallantry, humor, and good sense they have brought to their lives and to their marriage.

My brother Tom joins me in thanking them for the steadfast and unfailing support they have given to us all our lives. We are proud of them and we hope we can make them proud of us.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 26, 1981, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 27

8:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Strategic and Theater Nuclear Forces Subcommittee
To resume closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for sea-based deterrent programs of the Department of Defense.
224 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.
To continue hearings on alleged corruption in the International Longshoremen's Association's influence and control over the waterfront industry along the east and gulf coasts.
3302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Tactical Warfare Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for missions and requirements of the U.S. Navy, Department of Defense.
212 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 270, to provide for the deregulation of the radio broadcasting industry.
235 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works
To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1982 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the Public Buildings Service.
4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
International Economic Policy Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine current U.S. interests in developing countries and alternative strategies to advance U.S. interests.
4221 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Human Development Services, and for certain departmental management programs and the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 2

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
*Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings to assess the Nation's critical shortages of strategic materials and minerals and evaluate the impact of the National Materials and Minerals Policy, Research and Development Act.
235 Russell Building

Environment and Public Works
To hold joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the recent report of the National Commission on Air Quality.
318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for elementary and secondary educational programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1982 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Water Resources Council, and the Office of Water Research and Technology.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture
322 Russell Building

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the American Battle Monuments Commission, Army Cemeterial Expenses, the Office of Consumer Affairs, and the Consumer Information Center.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the steel tripartite agreement.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for impact aid programs, and emergency school aid programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

11:50 a.m.
*Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive the Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982.
318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
*Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for library and learning resource programs and vocational and adult education programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

*Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Transportation; and the Civil Aeronautics Board.
S-126, Capitol

MARCH 4

8:30 a.m.
*Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review Governmentwide debarment and suspension practices.
3302 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
*Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Water Research and Technology, Department of the Interior, the Holocaust Memorial Commission, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.
1318 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting.
S-126, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 234, to encourage the establishment of home health programs and to provide expanded coverage of home health services under the medicare and medicaid programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for educational, rehabilitation, and research programs for the handicapped of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
To resume hearings on the conduct of monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1982 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the Environmental Protection Agency.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain energy research and environmental programs of the Department of Energy.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain student financial assistance programs of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1982 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 5

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To continue hearings to review Governmentwide debarment and suspension practices.
3302 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain school improvement programs, special institutions, and Howard University of the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To continue hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1982 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, receiving testimony from officials of the Economic Development Administration, Appalachian Regional Commission (title V), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
To resume closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institute of Education, fund for the improvement of postsecondary education, educational statistics, educational research and training activities overseas on the Department of Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 6

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the

Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on S. 533, establishing public buildings policies for the Federal Government, permanently establishing the Public Buildings Service in the General Services Administration, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the construction, renovation, and maintenance of public buildings and related activities of the Public Buildings Service.
4200 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on the proposed extension of the West Front of the Capitol Building, the status and progress of construction of the Hart Senate Office Building, modifications to the Russell and Dirksen Senate Office buildings, and to review the U.S. Capitol Master Plan.
301 Russell Building

MARCH 9

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the aspects of problems facing the domestic automobile industry.
2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on S. 533, establishing public buildings policies for the Federal Government, permanently establishing the Public Buildings Service in the General Services Administration, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the construction, renovation, and maintenance of public buildings and related activities of the Public Buildings Service.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

MARCH 10

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Institute of Building Science, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Credit Union Administration, and the Office of Revenue Sharing (NYC).
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Indian health service programs, and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.
1318 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 398, permitting certain employees to work four 10-hour days.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Community Services Administration.
1114 Dirksen Building

*Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Metro), and the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.
S-126, Capitol

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
To resume closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, and the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 11

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous proposals to balance the budget.
2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Railroad Retirement Board, domestic operations programs of ACTION, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.
1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to continue consideration of those matters and programs which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view toward submitting its views and budget recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4200 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the President's Commission on Ethical Problems in Medicine.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 12

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building

Judiciary
To hold oversight hearings to review the administration's budget recommendations to the Federal Trade Commission, relative to the Commission's retention of antitrust authority.
2228 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 351, to transfer certain surface mining operations

from the Mine Safety and Health Administration to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and other pertinent proposals.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
*Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
To mark up S. 533, establishing public buildings policies for the Federal Government, permanently establishing the Public Buildings Service in the General Services Administration, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the construction, renovation, and maintenance of public buildings and related activities of the Public Buildings Service.
4200 Dirksen Building

MARCH 13

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).
235 Russell Building

MARCH 16

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 17

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Veterans' Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building.

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the proposed budget for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Agriculture.
1223 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal years 1982 and 1983 for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).
1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building
*Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 18

9:00 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
To resume closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407 Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the office of Inspector General, Department of Agriculture, and the General Accounting Office.
1224 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation on youth employment.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 19

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Science and Education Administration, Office of the Secretary, Departmental Administration, Office of Governmental and Public Affairs, and the Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture.
1224 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation on youth employment.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.
1318 Dirksen Building
Select on Intelligence
To continue closed hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for intelligence activities of the United States.
S-407, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 20

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain public

health categorical programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.
1114 Dirksen Building.

MARCH 23

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for national centers for health statistics of the Department of Health and Human Services
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

MARCH 24

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Foreign Agricultural Service, Office of International Cooperation and Development, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Economics and Statistics Service, and the World Food and Agricultural Outlook and Situation Board.
1223 Dirksen Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review supplemental assistance and restructuring policies for Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) of the U.S. Railway Association.
235 Russell Building
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 348, to increase job opportunity by allowing employers to pay young people the minimum wage at a reduced rate.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).
1224 Dirksen Building

MARCH 25

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for alternative fuel programs and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings to review supplemental assistance and restructuring policies for Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) of the U.S. Railway Association.
5110 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 348, to increase job opportunity by allowing employers to pay young people the minimum wage at a reduced rate.
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building

MARCH 26

9:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on proposed reauthorization of food and agriculture programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.
322 Russell Building
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of the Interior and certain related agencies.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain public health professional education and nurse training programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of State; and to review certain foreign assistance programs.
S-126 Capitol

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain public health categorical programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture.
1223 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings to review family planning programs.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Management and Budget.
S-146 Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Agency for International Development; and to continue review of certain foreign assistance programs.
S-126 Capitol
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the White House Office, Office of Administration, official residence of the Vice President, executive residence, special assistance to the President, compensation of the President, and other unanticipated needs.
S-146 Capitol

APRIL 1

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 and for the Federal Emergency Management

Agency and the Selective Service System.
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and the Farm Credit Administration.
1223 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain adolescent pregnancy programs of the Department of Health and Human Services.
4332 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Secretary of the Treasury.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Secretary, international affairs programs, Bureau of the Mint, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and Bureau of Government Financial Operations of the Department of the Treasury.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 2

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior; and the Smithsonian Institution.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982 from officials of Paralyzed Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, Military Order of the Purple Heart, and Veterans of World War I.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Postal Service.
S-146 Capitol

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1982 from AMVETS.
412 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Agency for International Development, and certain foreign assistance programs.
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Customs Service, U.S. Secret Service, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.
S-146 Capitol

APRIL 7

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Food Safety and Quality Service, Department of Agriculture.
1223 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1982 for the National Science Foundation.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the U.S. Railway Association and Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail).
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the General Services Administration.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Agency for International Development, and certain foreign assistance programs.
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Personnel Management, Merit Systems Protection Board and Special Counsel, Federal Labor Relations Authority, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries, and the President's Commission on Pension Policy.
1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 8

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Council on Environmental Quality, and the National Regulatory Council.
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain health maintenance organizations of the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Transportation.
1224 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Administrative Conference of the United States, Federal Elections Commission, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Domestic Policy Staff, U.S. Tax Court, and the Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped.
1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 9

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for strategic petroleum reserve programs, the Energy Information Administration, and naval petroleum reserve programs, Department of Energy.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, and to review budgetary recommendations.
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Internal Revenue Service, and the savings bond division of the Bureau of the Public Debt.
1318 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain international security assistance programs of the Department of State.
S-126 Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Council of Economic Advisers, National Security Council, and the Council on Wage and Price Stability
1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 21

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for Forest Service programs, the Office of the Federal Inspector for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings on alleged sex discrimination in the workplace.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1224 Dirksen Building

APRIL 22

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Environmental Protection Agency.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of the Secretary of Energy.
1114 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Food and Drug Administration, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Agricultural Marketing Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Office of Transportation, and the Agricultural Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture.
1223 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain community/migrant health centers and the National Health Service Corps of the Department of Health and Human Services.
4232 Dirksen Building

APRIL 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain international aid programs of the Department of State.
S-126 Capitol

APRIL 28

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain international monetary programs of the Department of Treasury.
S-126 Capitol

APRIL 29

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Consumer Cooperative Bank, and the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
1318 Dirksen Building

APRIL 30

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Science Foundation.
1318 Dirksen Building

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
1114 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1224 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the multilateral development banks of the Department of the Treasury.
S-126 Capitol

MAY 5

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Export-Import Bank of the United States.
S-126 Capitol

MAY 6

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
1223 Dirksen Building

MAY 7

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for conservation and fossil energy programs.
1223 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Agency for International Development, and certain international aid programs.
S-126 Capitol

MAY 12

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Na-

tional Aeronautics and Space Administration.
1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Peace Corps.
S-126 Capitol

MAY 13

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Gallery of Art, and the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.
1223 Dirksen Building

MAY 14

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Office of Territorial Affairs, Department of the Interior.
1223 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1114 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for certain international programs.
S-126 Capitol

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1114 Dirksen Building

MAY 20

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
1224 Dirksen Building

MAY 21

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.
1224 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
District of Columbia Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the government of the District of Columbia.
1114 Dirksen Building

JUNE 2

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1982 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and certain independent agencies.
1224 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

FEBRUARY 27

10:00 a.m.
Budget
Business meeting, to continue markup of proposed revisions to the Second Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1981.
6202 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1982 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
235 Russell Building

MARCH 4

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the U.S. Fire Administration of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
235 Russell Building