

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IF MR. REAGAN'S POLICIES
FLOP, THEN WHAT?

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House an article by Wassily Leontief which appeared in the New York Sunday Times, entitled "If Mr. Reagan's Policies Flop, Then What?" Mr. Leontief's thoughts merit serious contemplation. He is one of our outstanding economic thinkers; a 1973 Nobel Prize winner in economic science.

Professor Leontief advised the late Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, who was, in my opinion, a giant in political economics. Humphrey was constantly conceiving new concepts in political economics. Senator Humphrey's Balanced Growth and Economic Planning Act to which Mr. Leontief contributed is one concept that holds promise for solving our current economic problems.

By contrast, I think that this administration's economic plan may well fail. It is filled with contradictions and inconsistencies. It calls for spending cuts that are not matched by tax cuts. This will increase the size of Federal deficits, which they claim to be reducing. Worse yet, this administration doesn't seem to realize that one of the greatest capital assets that this country possesses is a well educated, skilled labor force. They are asking for budget cuts in educational programs. Ten years from now these cuts will take their toll of our economy in reduced productivity.

Administration spokesmen explain their policy by saying that if the public believes that cutting the budget will lower inflation, it will. Most economists, liberals, and conservatives, believe that budget cuts in and of themselves will not have any significant effect. But this administration is counting on the public's perceptions to lower inflationary expectations. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the psychological judgments made by administration economists are an unsound basis for setting public economic policy.

If my constituents see gasoline prices rising and heating bills rising and grocery bills rising, they know that inflation is not subsiding. They will seek to increase their monthly incomes. They are not so naive as to believe that their standard of living will stay the same while costs rise faster than their wages.

At hearings held by the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee on February 25, 1981, Paul Volcker defended the administration's policies but admitted that indexing—a serious problem in our economy—is not even addressed by the President's program. When confronted with the question of how we can lower inflation if energy prices continue to rise, all Mr. Volcker could say was that " * * * that is a contingency we must all live with." In other words, external forces, can, and probably will, prevent the President's program from being successful. Even David Stockman's famous memo asking President Reagan to declare an "economic Dunkirk," recognized that oil prices probably would continue to rise, reverberate through the economy, and cause more inflation.

Is it any wonder that many members of the committee, both Republicans and Democrats, are skeptical of the President's program?

Many people seem to realize that the collision between high unemployment, rising deficits, and a static money supply will create a shortage of capital for legitimate purposes. When Mr. Volcker was asked why he didn't allocate credit for legitimate capital needs, his answer was "we do not have the tools to do that—we cannot make decisions [about] what the legitimate and illegitimate uses are."

If this is true, it is up to Congress to provide the framework for those decisions. Congress is the policymaking body. We should decide. Most members of the committee feel, for example, that housing is a legitimate use for which capital should be allocated. However, if we look at all the potential uses for capital, housing may not have such a high priority. The sensible way to go about making such choices would be to create a congressional commission to outline priorities and make suggestions on the best mechanisms to allocate capital.

Legitimate needs for credit and capital are enormous. Retooling the automobile industry is one example. Billions are being spent to rebuild the insides of our automobile factories so we can manufacture small, energy-efficient cars. The steel industry in this country needs to replace its old open hearths with basic oxygen furnaces and even newer technologies. The capital necessary to keep our environment clean is also enormous.

The potential economic problem inherent in these massive needs is whether satisfying them with credit will inflate prices. Credit will not in-

flate prices if labor and material are available. On the other hand, if they are in short supply, credit will bid up their price. We must know more about labor and material availability as well as the flows of capital through our economic system. But as Professor Leontief points out, and as Senator Humphrey was saying as early as 1950, for that we need a better information system in this country. Call it what you will—reindustrialization, strategic planning, allocation of resources—we must have the information and the institutional framework that will enable us to take more precise economic actions and therefore, more successful ones, than these massive but random budget cuts and miscellaneous tax cuts. With the information from such a system, the allocation of credit can be done without creating a vast bureaucracy to tell people what they can and cannot do. We could decide ahead of time on a program of subtle reinforcements for investment behaviors so that capital flows would be almost automatic. The market which today serves to allocate capital is imperfect because it is uninformed. Today, we do not know the secondary, tertiary, and even more remote effects of our actions. We ought to.

We now doubt that Keynesian attempts to have stable prices and full employment at the same time by regulating demand can work in our current complex economic world. But neither can the so-called supply side economics, which in reality is nothing more than a new version of the old Republican trickle down theory, solve the problems we have today.

Decisions by big industries made without complete information will affect not only that company's shareholders but other industries and wage earners as well. We do not have the simple economy of 100 years ago, where businessmen took risks, went broke, and caused suffering to relatively few others. Today unnecessary and widespread suffering can occur from miscalculations that send capital to inappropriate places. As Leontief points out, we are slipping behind in developing information about our economy. Today especially, his words are worth pondering. "Having entered what is proudly called the Information Age, neither the Government nor the private sector can afford to make crucial decisions while groping in the dark * * *". We are in an era of scarcity, with our strategic materials in short supply. I suggest that capital, just as much as oil, iron, or gas, is a strategic material also. We cannot

afford to have it misused because of our own ignorance.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1981]
IF MR. REAGAN'S POLICIES FLOP, THEN WHAT?
(By Wassily Leontief)

President Reagan has four years to demonstrate that tax cuts, accompanied by a spectacular increase in the military budget, but balanced by sharp reductions in social and other nonmilitary spending, can put the badly listing economy on an even keel. He must prove that the engine of private enterprise, freed from the shackles of environmental laws and other restrictive regulations, will propel it full speed ahead.

Let's hope he succeeds—that the inflation rate falls to 5 percent and the unemployment rate to 4 percent, while the average family's real income will resume what was considered its normal rate of growth: at least 3 percent.

But what if the new policies do not work? What if inflation continues unabated, if unemployment is not substantially cut, and the economy does not resume its prior growth rate? After new elections, the present team of supply-side economists likely will be sent back to their corporate offices, and the old team of Keynesian demand-side experts will be called in with their familiar tool kit of fine-tuning devices to regulate fiscal and monetary policies, and precision gauges to measure full-employment gaps. They might even start by imposing a general price-and-wage freeze that would bring us back to where we were in the fall of 1971.

If the supply-siders fail, not only the politicians but even the general public might finally realize that something is fundamentally wrong with the entire process by which the United States designs, implements, and monitors its national economic policies.

Fundamentally, there can be two approaches to formulation, and implementation of national economic policies: A trial-and-error, hit-or-miss approach, or a strategic-corporate management calls it "planning"—approach.

The first consists in putting together a conventional package of policy measures, usually chosen on the basis of theoretical or doctrinal considerations; then introducing another package if the first fails; and if that fails as well, inaugurating a third. Sometimes, however, there is a tendency to stick by the original policy, even if it is obviously not working and threatens to bring the country to economic collapse.

Strategic planning, less simplistic, is more ambitious and thus more complex. To put it into practice, it is not enough to have a theoretical understanding of the principles on which the economic system works and to be possessed by a strong determination to attain certain national goals.

Trial-and-error is bound to fail because policies directed at one particular area—taxation, spending, industry, labor, the environment, foreign trade—will affect not only the areas to which they are addressed, but they are bound to have mostly unintentional and often negative repercussions in all the other fields. A modern economy is a complex body, all parts and functions of which are interdependent.

Strategic planning, on the other hand, is aimed at producing an internally consistent description of different states in which the national economy would find itself after the application of alternative combinations of economic-policy measures.

Effective implementation of such an approach is hindered by a lack of necessary

factual information. The continuous unwillingness of academic economists to give up their traditional reliance on abstract mathematical formulas—linked to reality only by a very fragile bridge of indirect statistical inference—is to a large extent responsible for this. Engaged in constructing elegant theories, they fail to press for creation of a reliable systematically organized data base, which is indispensable for any empirical science.

Creation and maintenance of a comprehensive data base that would permit a marked reduction of the amount of guessing now involved in policy making is a major task that could be easily carried out by the coordinated efforts of all elements of our statistical establishment. The example of Japan demonstrates that this is not impossible.

Japan is as much ahead of America in compiling the so-called input-output tables describing in detail the structure of national economies as it is in manufacturing efficient cars. The construction of the most recent American input-output table was assigned to a small team in one of the Commerce Department's bureaus. But in Japan, it was carried out by the combined efforts of 13 different ministries under the general supervision of a special Cabinet committee. The amount of detailed information in the Japanese tables is about four times as great as in ours; its compilation took only about half as much time.

Having entered what is proudly called the information Age, neither the Government nor the private sector can afford to make crucial decisions while groping in the dark. It will take our automobile industry four years to tool up to produce an up-to-date car. It will take America at least as much time and effort to close the economic information gap. Let us not postpone that task any longer. ●

HUMAN LIFE BILL IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last week, I have received the learned views of several of our Nation's leading constitutional experts on the subject of H.R. 900, the human life bill. Today, I would like to share with my colleagues the comments of three additional experts, Profs. William Cohen, Thomas C. Grey, and Paul Brest, all of my alma mater, Stanford Law School.

The comments follow:

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Tempe, Ariz., April 9, 1981.

Congressman DON EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: I apologize for the delay in responding to your letter of March 19. It was forwarded to me here from my permanent academic home at Stanford.

To avoid further delay, I will be brief. H.R. 900 is unconstitutional insofar as it attempts to reverse and dilute a decision of the United States Supreme Court interpret-

ing the minimal guarantees of liberty contained in the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment. I would have supposed any school child would give that answer and many of them could even supply the proper citation of authority—Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in *Marbury v. Madison*.

That there should be any controversy about this in 1981 is possible only because of some confusion engendered by selective misreading of language in some cases dealing with the contentious issue of Congressional power to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment. There is indeed controversy over how far Congress can go to restrict state governments beyond the restrictions imposed by the self-executing provisions in the first sections of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. I have written on that confused topic. (The article appears at 27 *Stanford Law Review* 603 [1975]. I don't, I'm sorry to say, have a reprint with me at this temporary base to include with this letter.)

The controversy over the extent of Congressional power to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment would arise in the unlikely event Congress were to outlaw all state restrictions on abortion. That controversy is, however, quite simply irrelevant with reference to H.R. 900. Beneath the welter of theories, every Justice of the Supreme Court, and all of the divided commentators, agree on two bedrock principles: (1) Congress has no power to authorize states to act in ways that would otherwise be forbidden by the Fourteenth Amendment; and (2) the final arbiters of the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment are the courts. One could elaborate the points endlessly, or could quibble as to why they are so. But no one, until now, has disputed that they are so.

I happen to be one who believes that Congress has considerable power under various clauses in the Constitution to enlarge the protections against state action contained in section one of the Fourteenth Amendment. But my conclusion, like that of everyone else, is that Congress cannot diminish those protections. In short, to the extent that the 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade* protects a woman's free choice in the abortion decision, that freedom cannot be qualified by ordinary legislation at the state or federal level. To state another truism, the Constitution can be amended only by an amendment, and not by legislation.

I was rather shocked to discover that the article my Mr. Galebach introduced into the Congressional Record (Jan. 19, 1981, S. 288) to support S. 158 quotes only one commentator to support his contrary conclusion—and that was language, out of context, from my *Stanford Law Review* article. One should note that Mr. Galebach is careful not to note my ultimate conclusion, which is diametrically opposed to his. Mr. Galebach does the same thing with every judicial source he cites for his conclusion.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM COHEN,
Merriam Visiting Professor.

STANFORD LAW SCHOOL,
April 10, 1981.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDWARDS: We have both received your request for comments on the constitutionality of H.R. 900. Since our

views on both sections of the bill are very similar, we are responding jointly.

Section 1 declares that fetuses are human beings from the moment of conception. In our view, this goes beyond the power granted to Congress by Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

This provision of the bill is an attempt to override the Supreme Court's holding, in *Roe v. Wade*, that fetuses are not persons for Fourteenth Amendment purposes. Such a substantive departure from the Court's interpretation of the Amendment rests on the theory that Section 5 of the Amendment grants an "interpretive" power to Congress, a theory that is doubtful at best under the case law. As the "Galebach memorandum" recognizes, *Oregon v. Mitchell* left the very existence of any such interpretive power in serious question. But contrary to what that memorandum asserts, neither *Fullilove v. Klutznick* nor *City of Rome v. United States* did anything to resolve that doubt. Both of these decisions were based upon Congress' power to provide remedies beyond those independently exercised by the courts against judicially recognized constitutional wrongs—in *Fullilove*, against racial discrimination in the award of public contracts; in *City of Rome*, against racially discriminatory electoral gerrymandering.

But, even under the broadest reading of *Katzenbach v. Morgan*, Congress' interpretive power can not sustain Section 1 of H.R. 900. The Court in both *Katzenbach v. Morgan* and *Oregon v. Mitchell* expressly denied the existence of congressional power to cut back on judicially declared Fourteenth Amendment rights under the guise of "enforcing" those rights. Section 1 of the bill would undermine the constitutional right of women to free choice in procreational decisions, as established in *Roe v. Wade*.

We believe that Congress can properly substitute its own reasonable and good faith reading of the Fourteenth Amendment for that of the Court so long as that reading does not undermine judicially declared individual rights. This limitation is essential if the role of the Court as a relatively detached guardian of constitutional liberty, free from the pressures of constituency politics, is to be preserved.

If *Roe v. Wade* can be effectively overruled by congressional erection of the values held by its many opponents to the status of constitutional rights, none of the Court's sometimes unpopular decisions protecting minorities will be safe from similar legislative reversal. Any such result would be a serious departure from a constitutional order that has its roots in *Marbury v. Madison*.

Finally, Section 1 is seriously misleading in its declaration that "scientific evidence" supports the status of the fetus as a human being. The question of the full humanity of the fetus is not a scientific matter at all. It does not turn on the facts of embryology. It is rather an ultimate philosophical or religious question, as to which the Supreme Court has ruled that neither itself nor the state legislatures nor Congress can impose an authoritative answer. We are confident that your committee will not be misled into thinking that enactment of H.R. 900 can be justified on the basis that it merely substitutes Congress' factual judgment for that of the Court.

Section 2 of the bill deprives lower federal courts of jurisdiction over actions challenging the constitutionality of state anti-abortion legislation. It is evident on the face of section 2, and from the context of the entire

bill, that the provision is designed to curtail the enforcement of federal judicial decisions applying the Fourteenth Amendment to state anti-abortion legislation. Under these circumstances, we believe that section 2 is not a legitimate exercise of Congress' Article III authority to regulate the jurisdiction of federal courts.

Article III, section 1 grants Congress broad discretion to establish inferior federal courts and to define the scope of their jurisdiction. But even if Congress need not grant federal courts any jurisdiction to hear constitutional claims, Congress may not restrict federal jurisdiction for the purpose of impeding the enforcement of judicial interpretations of the Constitution.

Every constitutional grant of power to the Congress is limited to the purposes for which it was made. This self-evident principle was made explicit by Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch v. Maryland*. After establishing the breadth of the Congress' powers, Marshall cautioned:

[S]hould Congress, under the pretext of executing its powers, pass laws for the accomplishment of objects not entrusted to the government, it would become the painful duty of this tribunal, should a case requiring such a decision come before it, to say that such an act was not the law of the land.

Although the Supreme Court has struck down various laws on the ground of "pretext," it has hesitated to strike down others. Its hesitation has not, however, reflected doubts about Marshall's underlying premise—that congressional powers may only be exercised for the purposes for which they were delegated.

Rather, it is based on the difficulties and improprieties attending judicial inquiry into legislative motivation necessary to determine whether the exercise of power was a "pretext." This was the basis of *Ex parte McCordle*, 74 U.S. (7 Wall.) 506 (1869), in which the Court acquiesced in Congress' restriction of the Court's appellate jurisdiction in certain habeas corpus actions. Chief Justice Chase wrote: "We are not at liberty to inquire into the motives of the legislature. We can only examine into its power under the Constitution; and the power to make exceptions to the appellate jurisdiction of this court is given by express words."

However appropriate judicial reluctance to inquire into Congress' motives may be, it provides no warrant for Congress refusing to inquire into its own motives in enacting a law. Indeed, the very fact that the judiciary is inhibited from inquiring whether a jurisdictional statute is a pretext for pursuing objectives not entrusted to Congress, imposes a special burden on Congress to monitor the constitutionality of its own action. See Brest, *The Conscientious Legislator's Guide to Constitutional Interpretation*, 27 *Stan. L. Rev.* 585 (1975). The purpose of section 1 of Article III is to grant Congress the power to determine the need for inferior federal courts and the general scope of their jurisdiction. Neither the language of Article III, nor anything in the history surrounding its adoption, suggests that it was designed to give Congress the power to impede the enforcement of judicial interpretations of the Constitution.

The belief that the Supreme Court has ultimate authority to interpret the Constitution, however deeply ingrained in our history and tradition, is of course not incontrovertible. But even were Congress to determine that in some or all circumstances it has the ultimate authority to interpret the

Constitution, we believe that to use a regulation of jurisdiction as a pretext for asserting its substantive disagreement with the Court's constitutional interpretations would be an abuse of the power delegated by Article III.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. GREY,
Professor of Law.
PAUL BREST,
Professor of Law. ●

DISC TREATMENT OF EXPORT TRADING COMPANIES

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Export Trading Company Act of 1981 is presently making its way through the legislative process. H.R. 1648 which I introduced on February 4 has attracted more than 75 cosponsors, and the companion bill in the Senate, S. 734, recently passed that body by a 93 to 0 margin.

The Export Trading Company Act contains a number of important features to stimulate U.S. exports and to facilitate the entry of small- and medium-sized firms into the export market. Those provisions could be the cornerstone for a far-reaching and comprehensive national export policy.

H.R. 1648 does not contain two tax provisions which were included in the original version of the Export Trading Company Act, H.R. 7310, which I had introduced on May 8, 1980. After extensive consultations, I and other supporters of an export trading company bill decided to delete the tax provisions, in order to avoid having the export trading company issue become embroiled in the whole tax cut issue. This was a reluctant, albeit necessary, decision.

However, I continue to support those tax provisions for export trading companies and today I am introducing a separate bill to accomplish that goal. This bill has two major features.

First, the Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC) treatment should be extended to all of the income of export trading companies. That would include income from export services, which is at the present time not covered by DISC. This is very necessary, because services could be a very significant component of exporting and of export trading companies' business.

Second, there is an exemption for export trading companies from some of the subchapter S requirements of sections 1371 and 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code. This would allow these companies to use the provisions of the subchapter without limiting the foreign source income of these companies to less than 20 percent per year, as

stipulated in present law. Export trading companies simply could not comply with that existing statutory restriction by the very nature of their business, and this provision of the bill would insure that small businesses would receive fair tax treatment, if they joined together to form their own export trading company.

Mr. Speaker, my first priority, of course, is passage of the Export Trading Company Act, which would be one of the most important actions Congress could take to provide increased incentives for exports. However, I also strongly support this bill's proposed tax changes, because tax incentives for export trading companies will help make them into a much more effective tool for boosting U.S. exports. ●

REAGAN BUDGET: A POOR DECISION

HON. DON BAILEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Reagan budget. I have reached this decision after many hours of hard study. Though there is great political pressure to go along with the President we have a responsibility here to do what is best for the Nation. As always we need clear and earnest decisionmaking, we need to act for long-term American interests not short-term political benefits.

First of all some issues should be addressed which compare these budgets. Incidentally, I shall vote against the Reagan budget. I support the House Budget Committee resolution (the Jones budget). My reasons are best presented in a context where misconceptions are dispelled and facts are brought forward.

First. Misconception: Reagan boosts defense while Jones cuts it? Fact: Mr. Speaker, this impression is false. I was shocked to hear the President make such a reference during his nationally televised presentation here in this Chamber. I can only conclude that he was given incorrect information by his staff. Comparing the two proposals is easy. Outlays for defense, that is actual money spent, is higher in the Jones budget for fiscal 1982 than even the Reagan budget allows. The difference in budget authority for the first year is dissipated by different budget authority figures in the outyears of \$4.3 billion. This assumes that Pentagon spending levels will move in to fill up the authority given. Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, I have been personally told by some of our top military people that they are not sure they can

even spend the Jones level this quickly. They are afraid of moving without proper planning. Regardless, the misinformation the administration has advanced that the Jones budget would not increase defense spending is totally incorrect. Given the President's own computational analysis it is still a great increase and not a cut—and that accounts for inflation. In any event, we have given the President the benefit of the doubt by passing the Hefner amendment—it simply gives the President his figures. It was the first amendment passed here and I will admit I worked hard for it. Now no one can argue that there is a difference among us in our strong support for defense. We are together at last. But what purpose was served in confusing the public on this vital issue? Perhaps the President should have indicated his disagreement with our figures and his desire for closing a small gap—rather than leading the American people to believe that the Jones proposal was shortchanging our defense needs. But that issue is now resolved—we are together on the defense figures.

Misconception: The Reagan budget is a balanced budget? Fact: Mr. Speaker, that impression also is false. The Reagan budget is not a balanced budget. Its projected deficit is almost twice as great as the Jones budget no matter whose figures you use. And that, Mr. Speaker, is its greatest weakness. If, as we have learned, large deficits drive monetary, interest, spending, and revenue policy, then the Reagan approach is a dangerous gamble. A perfectly balanced budget is not a panacea—but we all agree that it should be brought to heel as soon as possible. In short, the smaller the deficit the better. But the Reagan proposal abandons that approach based upon a highly questionable hope that the economy will perform exactly according to plan if certain policies are followed. However, very few people outside the President and his closest advisers feel strongly that the performance will meet those policy projections. And if the President is wrong our deficit next year could be \$90 to \$100 billion instead of the \$45 billion which he expects under the plan before us. Furthermore, the crucial impact on interests rates under his policy—as the Government continues to compete with the private sector for credit—could be particularly frightening. We shall not be able to move forward or make strong, reliable, long-range plans until the price of money comes down. And if a tight money policy is followed by the Federal Reserve Board about 90 percent of the \$45 billion deficit will be financed by borrowing—that is if you accept the Reagan deficit figures which most observers calculate to be quite low.

Misconception: There is no tax cut in the Jones proposal while the Reagan budget does cut taxes? Fact: This is also false, Mr. Speaker. It is a complete falsehood. Just as both budget recommendations request defense increases and cuts in other areas so do both of them assume tax cuts. Admittedly, this area is outside the authority of the Budget Committee and is wholly within the power of the Ways and Means Committee. But both Reagan and the Budget Committee expect significant tax changes. And here, Mr. Speaker, is the kicker. Jones hopes for approximately \$38 billion in cuts and assumes significant latitude in how most of that revenue is going to be lost. Bear in mind that a revenue loss to the Government should be expected to stimulate something in the private sector. President Reagan has a specific plan for the cuts he wishes to see. This part of the Presidential plan explains why Wall Street, many leading economists and many businessmen of all political persuasions, express serious fears about the Reagan plan—which includes this budget. Most of the differences between the Jones figures and the Reagan figures, most of the controversy over "rosy" administration economic projections, are derived from the impact of this Reagan tax proposal that enjoys little congressional support and dubious credibility in business and economic circles anywhere. The problem for President Reagan is that almost all the economic assumptions which guide his budget proposal were derived from the highly speculative assumptions about the impact of a tax package that enjoys very little backing. It is sort of a chicken-egg argument, except that he is starting with neither. Neither of these ideas, not the budget proposal before us—which is based upon questionable economic assumptions, which in turn is based upon the performance of an unrealized tax proposal, that is based upon speculative econometrics that purport to justify it—nor the political base to enact it, is in place. Reagan proponents say the budget proposal will accommodate a wide variety of tax ideas including Congressman Rostenkowski's. That is difficult to accept however, when one takes into account Reagan's econometric tax cut projections that are integrated with this budget proposal. All the expectations concerning the future deficit, resulting interest, and spending priorities that are taken from those projections are written into the budget.

In short, I would not be surprised if the President lacks the votes he needs on the tax package. Yet if he lacks those votes it is because of the poor confidence in the questionable revenue impact, investment impact, sav-

ings and consumption impacts of the very same tax plan that is being used to argue for the accuracy and dependability of the figures we are being asked to accept in making this decision here today.

Mr. Speaker, the Jones budget is more realistic in its economic assumptions. It is more politically and intellectually honest about the tax package that will be accepted by this Nation needed to fund it. I hope we will put these matters into proper perspective before we vote here today. Many Democrats and a large number of Republicans have already stated their opposition to the Kemp-Roth-Reagan tax proposal saying they would not vote for it. If they have no faith in it they should at least be more conservative about this radical budget proposal and avoid its obvious pitfalls, since it is in part based upon that very questionable tax program.

Mr. Speaker, though I am quite sure this vote is lost today, I sincerely hope that we shall prove adept at writing a tax package that can avoid the high interest rates and inflationary pressures that this Presidential proposal is likely to bring.

Last then, what are the actual differences between these proposals? In a nutshell the Jones proposal—utilizing more realistic analytical methods—maintains the same defense spending support, while providing more help to the aged, the handicapped, veterans, the truly poor, the working poor, those who need educational assistance—but denies help to the underserving—by being more honest about what this Nation will accept in its need for a noninflationary tax cut. Actually, except for the deficit they are not that far apart. It is interesting, however, that by the end of fiscal year 1983 the Jones Budget Committee recommendation will report a budget surplus of \$25.8 billion while the President's figures indicate less than 9. All we heard here last session was balance the budget—balance it now—and here are those same people financing an even greater deficit than we all felt we could live with. They justify that vote by arguing that a tax plan that they would not even support will perform in ways they agree will overly benefit the extremely rich at the expense of the elderly, the poor, and our large middle class. Of such things are foolish decisions made. I hope that we on the Ways and Means Committee can and will write a tax bill that will prevent the harm the approach we are apparently going to take today may cause. In spite of this proposal today, I am sure that we will meet our responsibility to do just that.●

A TRIBUTE TO MR. JACK PATTEN

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, in May 1981, a distinguished member of my district, Mr. Jack Patten, will be recognized by his many friends and colleagues in the Santa Maria School District for his many years as an outstanding educator and community leader.

Jack Patten has been a teacher and principal in the Santa Maria School District at Miller Street School for 31 years. During that time Jack earned the admiration and respect of his students, their parents, and his colleagues by his leadership and his dedication to quality education.

As a community leader, Jack has contributed his time and talent in many areas. He has served as president of the YMCA board, as commissioner of the parks and recreation commission, as a Cub Scout master and Boy Scout merit badge counselor, a member of the Red Cross board, president of the county outdoor science education board, and has been active in several service clubs including the Exchange Service Club and Kiwanis Club. He is the past congregational president of First Christian Church and is active as a member of the Central Coast Good News Board.

I wish to extend my congratulations to Jack, and my appreciation for his dedicated service to the entire Santa Maria community.●

THE COURT MUST STAY SUPREME

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent Washington Post column by BOB KASTENMEIER, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice. This column addresses a serious legislative threat to the independence of the Federal judicial branch inherent in 15 bills pending in the House which seek to eliminate the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the Federal courts to consider cases which relate to school prayer, abortion, school desegregation, and some sex bias cases. As Mr. KASTENMEIER has pointed out, basically the proponents of these bills are saying, "we don't like the way the Federal judiciary has resolved these

issues, so we are going to take away their power to make such rulings."

I find this approach to admittedly difficult legal and social policy issues to be totally without merit. The supremacy of the U.S. Constitution and the Supreme Court which interprets it cannot be altered by Members of Congress who are bent on trying to "correct" Supreme Court decisions with which they may disagree. There is an established procedure for amending the Constitution. It is intentionally a difficult procedure, not designed to permit facile and unwise alteration of constitutional law. The back-door approach to creating change in constitutional law can only reek havoc on the rights of citizens, the role of courts, and the balance of powers between the Congress and the other equal branches.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1981]

THE COURT MUST STAY SUPREME

(By ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER)

Congress and the nation are now facing an attack on the vital role and nature of the Supreme Court the likes of which has not been seen since FDR's court-packing plan. The current attack is even more serious because it strikes at the independence and integrity of the Supreme Court's most basic function—to review the constitutionality of state laws and actions. This current assault is embodied in 13 bills pending in the House, which are designed to eliminate the jurisdiction of the federal courts to consider any cases that relate to state laws on prayer in public schools, abortion or school desegregation plans.

Basically, the proponents of these bills are saying, "We don't like the way the federal judiciary has resolved these issues, so we're going to take away their power to make such rulings." This attitude is particularly pernicious because it is focused on three of our most precious liberties—the separation of religion and the state, the right to equal public education free of racial bias and a woman's right to personal liberty and privacy. The Supreme Court has been on the front lines on these issues.

Whatever differences one may have with the court, its role, since the enactment of the Constitution, has been to be the final arbiter of fundamental questions, the articulator of rights, the last best hope for the maintenance of our freedoms. It has served us well. To now cut away at the court's authority cannot be in anyone's interest.

The basic questions facing the Judiciary Committee are: Does Congress have the power to withdraw federal court jurisdiction over constitutional rights cases? And, if so, are there good policy reasons to do so? I believe that the answer to both of these questions is no.

At least two arguments suggest that the legislation is constitutionally flawed. First, there is the "essential role" argument, which asserts that Congress does indeed have power to regulate the court's jurisdiction, but not to the degree that such regulation impinges on the essential role of the court to maintain the supremacy of the Constitution by reviewing the constitutionality of state laws and actions. Of importance is a relevant due process/equal protection issue. An admitted premise of this legislation is that by relying on the state courts

to determine final constitutional law, persons who are similarly situated and are asserting the same constitutional right may well be treated differently in different jurisdictions, violating the tenet of equal protection under the law. The Supreme Court would, for the first time, have no authority to rectify conflicting state court judgments.

There are also policy objections to the legislation. First, the law is not a static text, but an evolving set of principles, ideas and judgments. An end of Supreme Court jurisdiction for any of these types of cases would freeze federal constitutional law in the area, eliminating the possibility of aggrieved citizens' seeking further development of the law. To cut off a full hearing of important issues cannot be a reasonable public policy goal.

Also, Congress must not offend or jeopardize the legitimate prerogatives of the other two equal branches of government. Chilling the ability of the federal courts to deal with constitutional questions suggests that the judicial branch is not competent to consider such questions.

Further, as the Carter Justice Department suggested last year, this legislation would run afoul of the public interest in affording a definitive and nationwide resolution of issues of constitutional magnitude.

It is no doubt healthful to review the nature and role of our nation's institutions. However, to attempt to emasculate the vital function of an institution as fundamental to our liberty as the federal judiciary can have only disastrous consequences.●

ANNIVERSARY OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this month we honor the anniversary of the American Jewish Committee, founded in 1906. For the past three-quarters of a century the American Jewish Committee has stood strongly for freedom, for justice, and for equal opportunity, both in the United States and Israel.

The turn of this century was a bad time for Jews. They were persecuted, robbed, and murdered in Russia and Rumania. The czars used the Jews as scapegoats for revolutionary troubles. In 1903 the world was stunned by the pogrom at Kishinev, obviously held under official protection. In 1905 there was another massacre at Odessa.

Millions of Jews fled to America, from the ghettos of Vilna, from the shtetls of the Jewish Pale. They did not know the customs of this country. They were exploited by politicians, by landlords, by sweatshop owners. Still they came, seeking a better life.

That was why the American Jewish Committee was founded. It aimed to help the Jewish immigrant, to obtain decent working conditions, a livable wage, a limit on hours. The American Jewish Committee sought better housing. It got the children of these immi-

grants to schools, to special classes to teach them English.

The American Jewish Committee, like other groups, helped the Zionist pioneers in Palestine. It got them tools, supplies, and seed. Later, the AJC helped mobilize American opinion to support the State of Israel.

In the darkest hour of the Jewish people—during the holocaust—the AJC aided refugees, did what it could to save a few victims from the fate in store for them.

Today the AJC continues its fight for equal opportunity, for justice under law, for an end to all discrimination.

Voluntary organizations like the American Jewish Committee are what make America great. They form the great tapestry of our diverse national existence. I offer my congratulations on 75 years—I offer them all best wishes for their next 75 years.●

A SALUTE TO BERNICE R.
KRUMHANSL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House the achievements of Ms. Bernice R. Krumhansl of Cleveland, Ohio. Although most of my colleagues are not familiar with Ms. Krumhansl, I can assure them that her work and dedication to quality housing are almost legendary within the St. Clair-Superior Coalition and the Cleveland metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, this is Ms. Krumhansl's last year of service as the president of the St. Clair-Superior Coalition where she has been the guiding force in terms of resolving the housing crisis and stimulating revitalization since the inception of the organization.

Ms. Krumhansl currently serves as the president of the St. Clair-Superior Coalition which is a position she has held for three consecutive terms. Her involvement in the organization started when she became one of the founders. Since that time, Ms. Krumhansl has served as the vice president and secretary of coalition. Through her years of active service, I suppose you could sum up her contributions by saying that she has been the cornerstone for the housing revitalization that is currently flourishing in the St. Clair-Superior neighborhood in Cleveland.

As a token of their esteem and gratitude for her unflinching efforts in this regard, on Saturday, May 16, 1981, at

the fourth annual convention of the St. Clair-Superior Coalition, the members of that organization will honor Ms. Bernice Krumhansl for her work and efforts on behalf of the organization. Mr. Speaker, I deem this an appropriate time to join in that salute and send my best wishes to her from every resident of the 21st Congressional District.

Incorporated in this salute, Mr. Speaker, I think that it also would be appropriate to enumerate her achievements so that my colleagues in the House of Representatives can get a clear understanding of the work of this pioneer in housing revitalization and this person of great vision.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Krumhansl has been a lifetime resident of the St. Clair-Superior neighborhood. In her role as a founder, she has always been supportive of the coalition and has worked steadfastly with them over the years.

From limited beginnings, Ms. Krumhansl sacrificed and worked diligently to build the coalition to its current stature as one of the most active housing coalitions in the Cleveland metropolitan area. As a result of this commitment, she attended and organized local and national meetings and strategy sessions. Mr. Speaker, everywhere she went, Ms. Krumhansl spread the word about the St. Clair-Superior Coalition while also gathering the necessary tools to enhance the work of this community-based coalition.

As a result of her extraordinary determination to make the St. Clair-Superior neighborhood a model for others and a source of pride, she amassed an exhaustive list of victories. To be brief, Mr. Speaker, they include the rehabilitation of properties which were previously owned by an absentee landlord, the establishment of the Cleveland housing court, and the establishment of COHAB, a local housing rehabilitation organization. Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Bernice R. Krumhansl's hard work and achievements has created a new vitality and a new beginning in the St. Clair-Superior neighborhood. Simultaneously, she has earned a special place in the hearts of not only the residents of the neighborhood but also in the hearts of the people throughout the Cleveland metropolitan area.

With those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in saluting Ms. Bernice R. Krumhansl, president of the Cleveland St. Clair-Superior Coalition as she enters her last year in that office.●

A REFRESHING LETTER ON THE
REAGAN BUDGET

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, not every recipient of Federal aid is going to roll over and play dead over the Reagan budget cuts. Some of them have even decided that the sky has not fallen in. In that connection, a letter I recently received from the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children is particularly refreshing. It mentions "voluntary" efforts and "revitalizing" existing agencies. I applaud Mr. Katz' sentiments. His letter follows:

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE
PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN,
Princeton, N.J., April 27, 1981.

Representative LARRY P. McDONALD,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McDONALD: During the past two weeks this office, like your own, has been contacted by various groups who claim to represent the interests of children in this country and who are seeking to block the President's budget cuts in the area of "social services for children."

At first I was alarmed by their stories of children who would starve, children who would die and services that would be cut thereby inflicting all forms of hardship on the children of America.

My alarm waned as I began to examine the programs, the people and the policies that were being criticized and the alternatives that were being overlooked.

After careful examination of arguments on both sides of this issue and after conceding that it is never pleasant or easy to reduce one's income or budget, I have come to the conclusion that the proposed cuts in the federal contribution to these programs need not disadvantage the children of this country.

It is important, to understand that, self-seeking and vindictive state and local bureaucrats can, and in some cases will, attempt to deprive children of necessary services rather than tighten their own belts and shape up their obese establishments.

Clearly, on the other hand, these cuts could be used as an opportunity to revitalize existing and create new voluntary services which require no government funds. Some voluntary agencies have been corrupted during the past decade by the overwhelming temptation of this "Federal Free Lunch." Others have resisted that temptation, maintained cost effective operations and provide quality community services at a small fraction of the cost of government funded services and they do so at no cost to the taxpayer.

I, therefore, urge that you support the President's recommendations in this budget area.

I and my staff would be pleased to provide any additional information in this regard that you may deem helpful.

With best regards,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM KATZ,
Executive Director. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PENNSYLVANIA'S AMERICAN
LEGION BOY SCOUT OF THE
YEAR

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, all of my family has been actively engaged in Boy and Girl Scouting activities over the years, and I believe it is one of the most valuable experiences that a young man or woman can have.

I am very proud to note for the RECORD that this year's American Legion Boy Scout of the Year in Pennsylvania comes from Cresson, in the 12th Congressional District.

He is Patrick J. Lenz, son of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Lenz. He started his career in Cub Scouts and attained the Arrow of Light, the highest award in Cub Scouting. He attained the various ranks leading to the Eagle Award, which he received in 1979. Since then he has earned bronze, gold, and silver palms for additional merit badges. In 1978 he received the Ad Altare Dei Award and in 1979 the Pius XII Award, both Catholic Scouting awards, from Bishop James Hogan of the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese.

Patrick is a member of troop 92 sponsored by the Cresson Rotary Club.

I am glad to enclose a copy of the essay prepared by Patrick as part of the American Legion oratory and essay contests. He won first place in the essay contest and was runnerup in the oratorical contest.

I certainly extend my congratulations for this outstanding record in Scouting, and I am sure it has laid the framework for an outstanding future for Patrick.

MY INTERPRETATION OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

(By Patrick J. Lenz)

Good citizenship means many things to many people. To me, being a good citizen is something that has to be planted in an individual at a very early age, then nurtured until, like a living object, it grows and develops until it matures to its fullest.

Beginning as early as grade school, citizenship is stressed as part of the student's education. Being proud to be an American, honor of our flag, awareness of our responsibilities toward the local policeman, law and order are the basic themes stressed during this stage of development.

High School is a continuing factor in stressing the importance of citizenship. The basic rules are similar but here the awakening of broader interpretations is required. One must now realize just what our duties as a good citizen are. Young people, at this time, learn good citizenship through democratic practices. For example those who take an active part in student government, band, sports, and clubs learn how to work together in a friendly, democratic and cooperative society.

In today's fast moving society it is hardly enough to just peacefully exist. The mediocre attitude of those who let Joe do it

May 12, 1981

cannot be condoned. One must be aware of what is taking place in his local, state, and national government. If one is in agreement with the politician, one must be willing to support him. If in disagreement, one must try to correct or amend his views to benefit the good of the majority. A citizen has political rights, even if he or she is not able to vote.

All have the power to make their opinions known simply by taking advantage of article one of our Constitution. This important document guarantees each of us freedom of speech. To follow through we have a second alternative. As citizens we have the option of writing our public officials and telling them what our position is on a given subject. America, being the great country she is, allows us to take such action without fear of punishment of any kind.

Locally, a good citizen is a resident who is willing to give his time and talent to better the community in which he lives. By being active in organizations one becomes involved in many local projects.

The Boy Scouts, for example, conduct a yearly clean up project to rid the litter from our surroundings. This useful activity contributes to the beautification of our environment and provides both adults and youth a chance to participate and to increase their civic pride.

The J.C.'s, a young adult group, contribute to the breeding of good citizenship with their interest in youth. The active participation of these gentlemen provide programs for the children with special needs. Their toys for tots Christmas program give underprivileged children a holiday worth remembering.

The Lions organization also exemplifies many traits of good citizenship. The many different programs for the community, the youth and the blind are most admirable.

American Legion sponsored events such as the oratorical and essay contest provide students with an opportunity to broaden their scope of knowledge about our government and our part in its working.

Being a good citizen is one of the greatest privileges we Americans possess. It provides us with the opportunity to express our gratitude for the many blessings we sometimes tend to take for granted. To fully realize how important our citizenship should be to us, we only need to attend the Naturalization ceremony held yearly at our county court house. These immigrants have labored long and hard to become citizens of our great country. Coming from a foreign land, learning a new language and becoming familiar with laws are obstacles few of us have the fortitude to overcome.

Nation wise, a good citizen is one who respects his country and the principles for which it stands. Displaying the flag properly on holidays and other occasions is one of the easiest ways anyone can show civic pride. To follow through, if one is truly sincere and dedicated to good citizenship, one must be prepared to sacrifice if necessary. Men more than women must be willing to answer the call to serve his country such as in World Wars I and II, Korea, and Viet Nam. He must perform this service without malice or complaint.

Contributions to such worthy causes as The Red Cross, Salvation Army, Cancer Society, Heart Fund, and March of Dimes are a painless way of participation.

After close examination of what activities one should perform in quest for good citizenship, each of us must then examine our own conscience. This question can only be

answered by each of us on the validity of our own actions.

To conclude I think a quote by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy best interprets my opinion of good citizenship, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather ask what you can do for your country."●

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PRO- GRAM

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent resolution endorsing President Reagan's economic program which has been adopted by the board of directors of the American Concrete Pipe Association, an independent trade association representing more than 325 concrete pipe manufacturing plants across the United States. Support of groups such as this is especially important now that committees are working to carry out the economic blueprint for the country set forth by the fiscal year 1982 budget resolution. The American Concrete Pipe Association should be commended for its action.

The text of the resolution follows:

Whereas the growth of the Federal Government, deficit spending and excessive taxation have led the United States to the brink of economic calamity, and

Whereas the American people expressed their will in the November 1980 elections to have the scope and cost of government vastly reduced, and

Whereas President Reagan has proposed a comprehensive program to reduce the growth of government spending and the proliferation of Federal regulations, coupled with individual and business tax reductions, and

Whereas immediate action by the Congress is necessary: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the American Concrete Pipe Association endorses President Reagan's economic program; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Concrete Pipe Association urges immediate Congressional approval of this economic program.●

WHO RUNS EL SALVADOR?

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be strong support among the American people for a negotiated solution of the conflict in El Salvador. Unfortunately, efforts to encourage negotiations have foundered upon the unwillingness of the Salvadoran military to engage in negotiations, and the disinterest, if not hostility, of the

Reagan administration to such an approach.

On April 24, for example, President Jose Napoleon Duarte gave an interview in which he indicated that he was prepared to engage in a dialog with opposition leaders in an effort to promote a peaceful resolution of the present conflict as long as no preconditions were imposed. However, the following day Vice President Jamie Abdul Gutierrez, the commander in chief of the Salvadoran Armed Forces, flatly rejected the possibility of negotiations. Two days later his comments were reaffirmed by Col. Jose Guillermo Garcia, the Salvadoran Defense Minister, and other top-ranking officials of the Salvadoran military.

I find this very disappointing, Mr. Speaker, since it tends to confirm what critics of our policy in El Salvador have suggested all along; namely, that the real power in the present government is held by the military and that President Duarte has no effective way of enforcing his views upon the Salvadoran military forces.

Equally disappointing has been the disinterest of the Reagan administration in pursuing negotiations. As a recent article by Alan Riding that appeared in the New York Times suggests, there have been numerous efforts to move this conflict to the negotiating table since January. However, the Reagan administration appears to have done nothing to encourage those efforts, apparently convinced that El Salvador provides a good opportunity to win one small battle in what it perceives to be a larger East-West confrontation.

If such a victory is possible, Mr. Speaker, and I doubt whether it is, it is a victory that will have been won at the cost of many needless deaths in El Salvador.

For the benefit of those of my colleagues who may not have seen the various news items to which I referred, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting copies into the RECORD at this point:

DUARTE WILLING TO HOLD UNCONDITIONAL
DIALOG

(By Adrian Aldana)

SAN SALVADOR, April 24 (Latin-Reuters).—President Jose Napoleon Duarte today said he is willing to meet with the leaders of the guerrillas in an effort to bring peace to El Salvador as long as no preconditions are imposed.

Nevertheless, he described as a political maneuver an offer made by the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) to hold talks if certain conditions were met.

Over 16,000 persons have died in the undeclared civil war affecting this country for the past 15 months.

In a telephone interview with this agency, Duarte said that the FMLN, the main guerrilla group in the country, was not really interested in peaceful negotiations. He added, however, that he was willing to dialogue without any previous conditions.

He said the FMLN offer, in the light of its reiterated claims that the revolution is the

only way to gain power, shows the organization's lack of sincerity in its search for peace. He added that the guerrillas are only trying to confuse the public.

In yesterday's declaration, the FMLN said it was willing to hold peace talks whenever the government ends the alleged repression, releases the political prisoners, reopens the national university and lifts the state of siege and curfew.

The military authorities noted they were not surprised at the change of attitude of the guerrillas. "This shows that they are defeated militarily and believe peace talks are the only way to save something," they added.

These same sources said the state of siege and curfew cannot be lifted unless the conditions that prompted them disappear.

The government closed the national university, a bastion of the leftist activities, and suspended constitutional rights in 1980 in an effort to end political violence. The government has also repeatedly denied the existence of political prisoners in El Salvador.

Duarte said the only way to achieve peace in El Salvador is through a sincere dialogue between the opposing groups and through authentically free elections.

There are plans for constituent assembly elections for 1982, which will be followed by presidential elections in 1983.

When asked to comment on the reports that talks were already underway abroad between the government and leftist representatives, Duarte said: "Such reports are false. They are mere rumors."

VICE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

SAN SALVADOR, April 25 (ACAN-EFE).—The Salvadoran Government will not accept the mediation of any state or of any domestic organization in the country's conflict, Jaime Abdul Gutierrez, vice president of the Salvadoran Government junta announced today.

Gutierrez, who also holds the post of commander in chief of the Salvadoran Armed Forces, made this statement at an event to commemorate Telecommunications Workers Day, held in the Presidente Theater in this capital.

He added that "the peoples must resolve their problems by themselves, and the Salvadoran Government's position remains unchanged in the sense that it does not permit other states to interfere in the problems of El Salvador."

He also said that "the armed forces remain loyal to the proclamation of 15 October 1979 and it is in order to fulfill that historic commitment that elections have been foreseen for 1982-83."

The armed forces published a proclamation on 15 October 1979 when Gen. Carlos Humberto Romero, who was supported by the Salvadoran oligarchy, was overthrown.

In his speech, Gutierrez indicated that "the people must seek a political and democratic solution to the Salvadoran conflict. The government has already begun taking steps in connection with the electoral process to freely elect the new rulers of El Salvador."

ARMY BACKS REJECTION OF OUTSIDE MEDIATION

SAN SALVADOR, Apr. 27 (ACAN-EFE).—Salvadoran Defense Minister Col. Jose Guillermo Garcia closed ranks with the Salvadoran Army high command to support the

position neither to negotiate nor accept mediation with the opposing leftist forces.

In this way, the Salvadoran Army is supporting the concept put forth by the commander in chief of the armed forces and vice president of the governing revolutionary junta, Col. Jaime Abdul Gutierrez.

Last Saturday Colonel Gutierrez said "the governing revolutionary junta roundly rejects mediation in the current Salvadoran conflict, because to do so would mean to play into the hands of "a maneuver of international communism, which is trying to deceive world public opinion."

The statement did not coincide with that of the junta's president, Christian Democrat Jose Napoleon Duarte, who on several occasions has expressed his willingness to hold a dialogue with the left "any way, any time and anywhere."

The position of the junta now, however, is to talk with the opposition's leftist front on Salvadoran territory and without mediators.

Meanwhile, the left had drafted a strategy, according to a document seized by the armed forces from the opposition front. It implied mediation involving several Latin American countries, since the left will not sit at the same table with the junta.

At a news conference held today at the armed forces general staff in San Salvador, the defense minister said that the intelligence services had obtained the document, that it is authentic and that they have published it so that the Salvadorans can have an exact idea of the left's intentions.

In reply to other questions, Colonel Garcia said that there is no evidence of the involvement of six members of the armed forces in the murder of four U.S. nuns last 4 December.

"If we knew who they were we would have arrested them already," Garcia said.

The murder is being investigated by a Salvadoran commission with assistance from the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

The news conference held by the defense minister was also attended by Deputy Minister Col. Francisco Adolfo Castillo, Chief of staff Col. Rafeal Flores Lima, National Guard Director Carlos Eugenio Vides Casanova, 1st Brigade Commander Manuel Edmundo Palacios, and Bigoberto Ramos, commander of the armed forces broadcasting training center.

EL SALVADOR TURNS DOWN A PLAN FOR OUTSIDE MEDIATION

(By Alan Riding)

MEXICO CITY, May 6.—A major international effort to bring El Salvador's warring factions to the bargaining table has failed with the refusal of the Salvadoran army high command to accept an offer of outside mediation.

Hopes for an early breakthrough toward a political settlement of the conflict were further dampened this week when the Reagan Administration showed little interest in the latest peace initiative.

The mediation proposal, which had been endorsed by the opposition Democratic Revolutionary Front, was made last month to the President of the Salvadoran junta, José Napoleón Duarte, by a special representative of the Socialist International, the worldwide organization of Social Democrats.

The envoy, Hans Jürgen Wischnewski, a leading West German Social Democrat, also met with President Rodrigo Carazo Odio of Costa Rica, Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera of Panama and Fidel Castro of Cuba during his visit to the region.

In a recent speech, Col. Jaime Abdul Gutierrez, vice president of the Salvadoran junta and commander in chief of the armed forces, said that the Government would accept no outside mediation and intended to press on with its unilateral plan to hold elections next year.

In a statement earlier this week, the Reagan Administration said that it opposed negotiations that would lead to formation of a new Government in El Salvador, although it accepted the idea of political talks aimed at working out the conditions under which next year's elections could take place.

But while Mr. Wischnewski noted last weekend during a meeting of the Socialist International in Amsterdam that he was still awaiting an official response to his proposal from Mr. Duarte, European and Latin American diplomats involved in the Salvadoran problem believe that the negotiating process has now suffered a serious setback.

Since the failure of the armed left's "final offensive" last January, numerous efforts have been made to move the conflict to the bargaining table. These have been prompted by the Democratic Revolutionary Front's call for direct talks with the United States and by growing fears that the civil war might spill over into the rest of Central America.

The governments of Mexico and Nicaragua, both traditionally sympathetic to the Salvadoran opposition, pressured the left to accept the idea of negotiating with the junta in response to Washington's refusal to talk. Then, after the Democratic Revolutionary Front insisted that outside mediation was necessary, the Socialist International's Latin American committee offered itself as intermediary.

Several other negotiating formulas have also been debated. One suggestion was for mediation by individuals—one Social Democrat, one Christian Democrat, one Latin American and one American citizen—rather than by governments. Another was built around the offer by Mexico and Venezuela to lend their "good offices" to the search for a negotiated solution.

The political scenario most frequently mentioned by optimists in the region is based on Britain's successful initiative to bring independence to Zimbabwe. According to proponents of the idea, a regional mediating group would help the warring sides to negotiate the conditions for free elections.

The armed forces would then be restricted to their barracks and the guerrillas to their camps, while the country would be policed by an international force. After the elections, a new army would be formed, eliminating undesirable elements from either side. ●

LEGAL EXPERTS REVIEW OF H.R. 900

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing effort to share with this body the views of distinguished legal scholars pertaining to the constitutionality of the human life bill, I submit today the comments of Prof. Louis Henkin of Columbia University School of Law.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,

New York, N.Y., April 3, 1981.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EDWARDS, I have your invitation to comment on the constitutionality of H.R. 900, the "Human Life Statute." In my view, the proposed declaration would not be effective to achieve its apparent design: if adopted, a state abortion statute would face essentially the same constitutional obstacles as if Congress had not spoken.

In *Roe v. Wade* the Supreme Court held that a state cannot interfere with a woman's right to have an abortion except at certain limited times and in certain limited circumstances. That determination by the court in effect held that the woman's liberty outweighed any rights the fetus may have, or any interest the state may have in protecting the fetus. Congress, authorized to carry out the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, cannot deprive the woman of rights which she has under the Amendment by setting up new countervailing rights under it in the guise of interpreting the Amendment.

I add that if Congress could impose this definition of "person" on the states, the consequences might be far-reaching and baneful in other respects. For example, it might result in states having to treat every accidental miscarriage as a form of homicide as well as a tort. It might give the fetus a "right to be born" with claims against parents, doctors, the state strangers, who might interfere with it. It might vest property interests in every fetus, which the parents, others and the state itself could not modify. Congress should not enact H.R. 900.

Sincerely,

LOUIS HENKIN. ●

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR PRESIDENT SUPPORTS METRIC CONVERSION BOARD ACTION

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, most Americans believe that America's current involvement with metric measurement is of relatively recent origin. In fact, voluntary conversion has been underway for many years, although the pace has been steadily accelerating over the past decade or so. In 1866, Congress authorized the use of the metric system in this country and supplied each State with a set of standard metric weights and measures.

In 1875, the United States reinforced its continuing participation in the development of an international metric system by becoming one of the original 17 signatory nations to the Treaty of the Meter. Also known as the Metric Convention, this agreement established the International Bureau of Weights and Measures in Severs, France to standardize metric measures worldwide.

In 1893, the international standards which resulted were adopted as the fundamental measures of length and mass in the United States. Our so-

called customary measurements—the foot, pound, and so forth—have been defined in relation to the meter and the kilogram ever since.

In 1960, the United States participated in a conference held in Paris which replaced the standard meter bar with an isotopic source. This new standard was immediately adopted by the United States.

In 1975, the U.S. Congress, recognizing the increasing conversion in America, passed the Metric Conversion Act which created the U.S. Metric Board. The Board is currently active in programs of information and education to familiarize the American public with the metric system and in assisting all groups and individuals wishing to convert to the metric system to do so in the most cost efficient and least disruptive manner possible.

In recognition of National Metric Week, May 10-16, 1981, I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address by Mr. Robert E. Gilmore, president of Caterpillar Tractor Co. I find Mr. Gilmore's remarks particularly interesting at a time when we in the Congress are struggling to shape legislation which will remove disincentives to American firms competing in world trade.

Surely one of our difficulties in trying to expand U.S. markets is the attempt to market abroad products labeled or manufactured in feet, ounces, and the rest. Mr. Speaker, the United States is one of only four countries in the world—the other three are Brunel, Burma, and Yemen—not using the metric system. In addition to its inherent advantages—extremely easy conversion among units within the system—the metric system is the universal, international language of measurement today. How can we expect to successfully promote our goods abroad when the packaging must be translated from our unintelligible customary system into what is everywhere else the easily understood and daily language of measurement?

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Gilmore's address before the American National Metrics Council on April 13, 1981.

REMOVE THE HANDICAPS AND LET AMERICA COMPETE

One of our Caterpillar managers said a foolish thing to me the other day. He claimed that when he was transferred to Europe, it only took him about a week to learn metrics.

I said foolish . . . but I really mean irritating. Because if it only took him a week, I must be the biggest dunce of all time. I spent five years in Grenoble, France, and I still have difficulties.

The difference, I suspect, is that this manager didn't really have to work with metrics—except to learn the difference between three deciliters and five deciliters of wine . . . and to remember that a meter is about three inches longer than a yard, and a kilometer is about six-tenths of a mile. My job

in Grenoble was to find ways to manufacture products using non-metric blueprints and non-metric standards with people who only understood metrics . . . products that had to be interchangeable with those made on non-metric standards in the United States. Believe me, there's a big difference when you're working with volume, speeds, and extremely close tolerances in a manufacturing setting. We had complex, costly, and frustrating problems—and I spent many hours working with European managers to find solutions.

I still remember, by the way, one of the most startling sights in my Caterpillar career the first day I went through the Grenoble Plant. It didn't yet belong to us—we were buying an existing facility and my job was to convert it to Caterpillar production. I should preface my comment by saying that Caterpillar is extremely safety conscious. Workers in our plants wear safety glasses, steel-toed shoes, remove rings from their fingers if operating a machine, and so on. I walked into that facility in Grenoble and there was a man working a lathe—with no safety glasses—wearing shorts and open-toed sandals—and he had a liter of wine in a goatskin shoulder flask so he could hold it up and take a squirt every once in a while. I stopped cold . . . and I know my mouth must have fallen open.

I'm sure that's not typical of other French factories—and it most certainly is not a scene you'll find in our Grenoble Plant today.

The point is, that when Americans get more involved in overseas business—as surely we must if we are to grow and prosper in this increasingly interdependent world—as we get involved in overseas business, there are many, many new and unforeseen problems we must cope with.

Metrics is one of those problems. It is difficult to adjust to metrics.

Here's an example that just happened in Peoria the other day. A visitor from Switzerland was explaining that he was planning to build a house in Geneva. Land, he said, was now selling for about 250 Swiss francs—or about \$145—a square meter. That didn't seem to bother anybody. One of the men in the group asked how much a 100 foot by 200 foot lot would sell for—because, he said, that was the size lot he had in Peoria and he paid \$30,000 for it. Out came the calculators to see how much a 100 foot by 200 foot lot would cost in dollars at 250 Swiss francs a square meter. The answer: about \$275,000. The number suddenly had meaning. But it didn't gain meaning until it was expressed in feet and dollars, not meters and francs.

We must learn to cope with metrics. And whether we like it or not, we are the ones who have to change.

We sometimes seem to act as if we are the piper and the rest of the world will dance to our tune. That's not true today, and I suspect it never has been true.

We may be able to enforce safety regulations in an American-owned plant in France—but not all the power in this city could force Europe to drop metrics. We are the ones who have to adapt to metrics.

If we don't adopt metrics, we'll be forced to teach both systems to our children forever, because the United States cannot exist in isolation.

At Caterpillar, we started an internal metrication process in November, 1971. We did it not to make life easier for overseas plant managers, but because we had some wise, forward-thinking managers. They realized we would have to go metric to stay competi-

tive in the world marketplace. We could not stay forever with non-metrics, nor could we permanently maintain two systems of measurement.

We set up some basic guidelines. For example: "Start metrication in Engineering by designing new parts for all new prime product, new models, and their attachments in metric." That became company policy.

In our industry, the engineering drawing triggers the chain of events that ends in a new product. It was logical, therefore, that our conversion process start with the engineering drawing. Approximately 130,000 metric engineering drawings have been released to production . . . and we are now beginning to remove non-metric equivalents from specifications whenever practical. All new Caterpillar parts are now designed in metric measurement units.

Caterpillar's primary goal is to operate worldwide in one unit of measurement—which we are convinced must be metric.

Our transition is orderly, systematic, and unhurried. We do not convert all drawings, service manuals, and so on, at one time—but phase in metrics with new product and newly required literature and drawings.

We have made great progress, but we still operate under the cost and time burden of working with two systems. As we build new plants, we attempt to make them totally metric to eliminate the two-system problem.

This requirement—to function in both metrics and non-metrics—is one more handicap on American companies trying to compete in the world marketplace. I say "one more," because the list of handicaps on U.S. industry is very long . . . already far too long for the good of the nation.

What do I mean by handicap? You golfers know. It's an artificial disadvantage imposed on a supposedly superior contestant . . . something that makes achievement extremely difficult . . . something that helps the other guy win.

It may be a good way to equalize players on the golf links. But, I assure you, American industry has too many problems with competitiveness already. We are handicapped by double-digit inflation . . . high governmental spending . . . punitive tax systems . . . energy costs . . . trade disincentives . . . and excessive regulations.

I'd like to take a few minutes to discuss two of these handicaps that affect everybody in this room. Trade disincentives and excessive regulations hinder American industry's ability to compete . . . just as the cost and time to operate two measurement systems hurt our competitiveness.

The President's Export Council clarified some trade disincentives in its report submitted last December. The Council was chaired by Reginald Jones, retiring chief executive officer of General Electric—and one of America's leading exponents of international trade. The Council listed these disincentives to trade:

First, taxation of Americans working overseas.

The United States is the only industrialized country I know of that levies taxes on personal income earned abroad. Higher tax costs for U.S. employees overseas result in increased costs for their employers. Consequently, it costs a U.S. company far more than a Japanese or West German competitor to send its employees abroad to identify and pursue sales opportunities.

To sell American products and services overseas, there must be an American presence overseas . . . but U.S. tax policy motivates Americans to stay home.

Second, anti-boycott provisions in the tax code.

These provisions, in the 1976 Tax Reform Act, were intended as an interim measure until the Export Administration Act could be amended. That amendment took place in 1977, but the "interim" measures of the Tax Reform Act are still with us. The two sets of legislation are not only inconsistent—but they force American exporters to set up compliance procedures with two separate departments of the federal government.

The Tax Reform Act is administered by the Treasury Department and the Export Administration Act is administered by the Commerce Department. This dual compliance is both costly and confusing for exporters—a true disincentive.

The President's Export Council has urged action, as well, on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act—extraterritorial application of U.S. antitrust laws—export controls of various types.

These trade disincentives constitute a handicap on American industry—an "artificial disadvantage imposed on a supposedly superior contestant."

We are working under trade handicaps even though America's trade deficit last year was \$32 billion—and \$184 billion for the past ten years. We have handicaps even though the U.S. share of world trade fell from 21 percent in 1957 to 12 percent last year.

Unfortunately, there is another impending handicap: reduction in funding for the Export-Import Bank. The reduction is part of the Administration's economic plan to curb increased federal spending. It will become even more difficult to find adequate export financing—and financing is an important factor in competition for international sales. Some U.S. exports will be lost to aggressive financing plans of other countries.

The \$5.9 billion for loans in the Carter budget was far below what private-sector analysts had calculated as necessary for maintaining the Eximbank's present pattern of lending. The Reagan Administration's proposal is for \$5.1 billion in fiscal 1981, to be reduced to \$4.4 billion in fiscal 1982. This reduction is unfortunate, but let me quickly add that we fully support the Administration's economic plan.

The fight against inflation must be the primary target of national economic policy, and that fight requires cuts in a wide variety of government programs. In the long run, bringing inflation under control and restoring the health of the U.S. economy will bring benefits that outweigh short-term sacrifices.

But lack of Eximbank funding makes it even more important that there be early action to remove trade disincentives, as recommended by the President's Export Council. Removal of trade disincentives will help offset reduced competitiveness in the financing area—and it will contribute importantly to strengthening U.S. export performance.

Another major handicap on American industry is excessive environmental regulation. A prime example is the Clean Air Act. It handicaps industry in a number of ways.

It mandates expenditures that many overseas competitors do not have to make. Caterpillar has spent some \$27 million on technology to control emissions of coal-fired boilers—and now we face the possibility of spending another \$55 million because the equipment falls short of completely controlling particulates. A study for the Illinois

Pollution Control Board indicated the environmental benefit would be \$125,000 a year—\$55 million in capital investment versus \$125,000 a year in benefits.

At Caterpillar, we estimate our total U.S. Government regulation price tag at about \$100 million a year. Nationally, the cost by American industry to comply with regulations has been estimated at over \$100 billion annually.

As it applies to mobile power sources, the Clean Air Act wastes energy at a time when the nation has a goal to seek near-independence in energy in this decade.

The Clean Air Act was first passed by Congress in response to public demand for clean air. Results have generally been good, especially in some heavily industrialized areas. But now the "law of diminishing returns" is taking effect. It's costing more and more to get less and less additional improvement.

As it now stands, the Clean Air Act will needlessly hamper industrial growth, curtail productivity improvement, feed inflation, and waste energy. It's time to amend the Act so that America can still benefit from clean air . . . but industry can operate without the handicap of excessive regulation.

Regulatory reform should require that proposed regulations be worth their cost . . . and be based on documented needs. Regulations should be periodically reviewed to identify those which should be modified or discontinued. And, in the main, regulations should establish goals—not dictate methods of compliance.

These handicaps of trade disincentives and excessive regulation are mostly imposed by government. There is little the private sector can do except aggressively pursue business in hopes the handicaps eventually will be removed.

Not so with the metrics handicap. It is true that there ought to be a government commitment for a single measurement system and a legislated timetable. But the private sector can go a long way toward removing the metrics handicap, even without governmental action.

It is to industry's advantage to remove this handicap—and, much as we need federal commitment, industry can proceed on its own.

Our experience at Caterpillar is that there are significant cost advantages to metrication.

In 1976, we began conversion to metric sizes of steel. We are well along with the worldwide transition. About 95 percent of sheet and plate, and 40 percent of flat bar, are now being purchased in standard millimeter sizes. We found that the cost of implementation has been significantly less than anticipated—and plant disruptions have been almost non-existent.

We have seen these benefits:

First, elimination of redesign in overseas plants.

Second, reduction in the number of sizes—resulting in fewer and larger steel orders, and reduced steel inventory.

Third, improved design selection results from more logical sequence of sizes.

Fourth, cost reduction between \$900,000 and a million dollars a year.

Since Caterpillar adopted its policy to proceed with a gradual conversion to the metric system of measure, we have exposed all plants to a significant amount of metric production. Our new products—like the giant D10 track-type Tractor, the 992 Wheel Loader, and others—have been designed and built using metric measure. In Data Process-

ing, we will be ready to convert to kilograms. (I understand the problem of converting tariffs to kilograms has been assigned to one of the Council's committees. We urge your speedy resolution of the problem.)

Work is proceeding in our plants and offices to achieve our goal of one system of measure throughout our worldwide organization. Our advertising people and parts and service publications people are constantly improving their ability to handle metrics.

In short, we are following our convictions with action to help achieve a metric America. I solicit your support in removing the two-measurement handicap from American business—and your support in urging government to remove those handicaps which it has imposed. We need an end to trade disincentives imposed by government—now more than ever, since a reduction in Eximbank funding will add another burden on international trade—and we need a solution to excessive governmental regulation.

Remove the handicaps and let America compete.

Thank you for your attention.●

SOLUTIONS TO ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, with the subject of tax cuts soon to be debated in the House, I call to the attention of my colleagues a paper written by Monford Orloff, a corporate and philanthropic leader in the State of Oregon. His views on increasing productivity and controlling inflation should be considered as the debate continues on solutions to our economic problems:

TAX CUTS COULD GIVE BUSINESS NEEDED CAPITAL

(By Monford Orloff)

The new administration has a golden opportunity through thoughtful use of the proposed \$40 billion tax reduction to achieve the highly desired ends of increasing productivity, reducing the federal deficit, reducing unemployment and controlling inflation.

The key objective is the increase in productivity. Productivity only can be increased by the expenditure by the private sector of many tens of billions of dollars. The funds for such a vast program cannot be generated solely from presently foreseeable cash flow of additional funding from the already overburdened and high interest cost debt market.

Such additional funds only can come from a revival of the stock market to a level that will reflect more fairly the true economic value of the billions of dollars worth of equity that must be marketed if we are to achieve these objectives.

What type of tax program will accomplish this result? A program that will create in the investing public's mind the awareness that the purchase of stocks is an economic and profitable way of investing its savings. I believe the following program would achieve that result:

1. Enact a program that over the next four years would reduce the corporate

income tax from a 46 percent level to 20 percent. This would mean an annual cut of 6 1/4 percent per year. The annual reduction in tax collected from corporations would be \$3 billion. Parenthetically, this program would eliminate the pressures of tinkering with present depreciation schedules, the investment tax credit and the elimination of the so-called double tax on dividends.

2. Exclude from taxable income the first \$1,000 (per person) of income from dividends or interest. Cost—\$3 billion.

3. Eliminate completely the capital gains tax on profits from security transactions. Cost—\$2 billion.

4. Reduce the tax rate on unearned income to the same rate as that on earned income. Cost \$2 billion.

5. Reduce the tax rate on individuals by an across-the-board figure of 6-8 percent. Cost—\$30 billion.

It is my considered opinion that the prompt enactment of such a program would have an explosive impact on the stock market, resulting in an immediate transfer of corporate financing from the debt to the equity side of the market. The dramatic softening of the pressure on the short-, medium- and long-term debt market would result in lower rates not only as an effect of the reduced demand but because of the perception by investors that the entire program would be one to control and reduce inflation. Lower interest costs to the federal government obviously have a positive effect in controlling its deficit. Increasing productivity in the private sector resulting from the availability of lower cost equity financing will have the same positive effect.

Labor should heartily endorse such a program since the immediate result of increased expenditures for capital and related improvements would result in greater employment not only in the construction phase, but thereafter in the operations of the new or expanded productive facilities created by the program.

Increased employment broadens the tax base offering further opportunities to reduce our deficits.●

WELCOME TO HIKANATION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, we all know that saving energy is one of the primary issues affecting Americans today. The safe and efficient use of our natural resources guarantees our children and their children a secure and healthy environment in which to live.

I would like today to call your attention to a group of American citizens who have taken note of this need for saving energy and have undertaken a great task—to call our attention, and that of the entire Nation, to the size of the hiking community within our United States.

Last April 12, 65 hardy hikers left Golden Gate Park in San Francisco on a transcontinental journey called HikaNation. The purpose of this herculean trek, which is being sponsored by the American Hiking Society, the De-

partment of the Interior, and the makers of Postum Instant Grain Beverage, is to demonstrate the popularity, problems, and potentials of hiking as a recreational pastime, a form of healthy exercise, and finally as a way of conserving our great Nation's natural resources. As we head into a low-energy future, how we recreate will have a bearing on how energy efficient we can become. The American Hiking Society, through the medium of this great adventure, is encouraging Americans to stretch their legs and hike for pleasure.

Currently, HikaNation is just outside of Washington, D.C. The journey does not officially end until the hikers set foot on the Atlantic shoreline in Delaware. However, a welcoming ceremony is to take place on the steps of the Capitol on Wednesday, May 13. Along the route, towns and cities have joined in the excitement of HikaNation, giving the hikers physical and mental encouragement, by joining them, by giving dinners for them, or by simply saying hello.

I feel very proud as these hikers, who now number 54, finally approach the end of their journey. They each have portrayed remarkable courage and determination during the last 13 months and deserve our praise for their outstanding accomplishment. To have seen America as they did during their journey through 11 States is an achievement that most of us only dream about.

The hikers are: Philip Atkins, Chico, Calif.; Dave Backus, Manassquan, N.J.; Cindy Bain, Alexandria, Va.; Gerald Benson, Englewood, Colo.; Lyle Bialk, Port Huron, Mich.; Randolph Blymire, York, Pa.; Kurt Burke, Belmont, Calif.; Robert Burns, Benicia, Calif.; Tisha Butcher, Santa Barbara, Calif.; John Cannon, Tulsa, Okla.; David Chernow, North Royalton, Ohio; Sharon Chrostowski, Centerville, Ohio; Michael A. Collins, Havre, Mont.; Scott Davis, Dearborn Heights, Mich.; Edward Deschene, Mankato, Minn.; Bruce Dolinac, San Diego, Calif.; Terry and Tim Ernst, Fayetteville, Ark.; William Ewart, Decatur, Ga.; Gayle Fisher, Las Vegas, Nev.; Reggy Flater, Holland, Iowa; Timothy S. Geoghegan, Finlay, Ohio; Howard Gilby, St. Louis, Mo.; Marceline A. Guerein, Alexandria, Va.; Rex G. Halfpenny, Kailua, Hawaii; Michael Halm, Peru, Ill.; Jeanne Harmon, Concord, Calif.; Susan "Butch" Henly, Haymarket, Va.; Jerri Hudson, Alamogordo, N. Mex.; Linda Hull, Danbury, Conn.; Bennett Lazarus, Worcester, Mass.; Donna Lovely, Pontiac, Mich.; David Marple, Edgewater, Md.; Toni Martinazzi, Portland, Oreg.; Douglas J. Marshall, Flint, Mich.; Marika Matyas, Pacifica, Calif.; Peter McIntyre, Pierrfonas, Quebec, Canada; John Mills, Alexandria, Va.; Timothy Mingus, Lexington, Tex.; Shellie Newell, Graniteville, S.C.;

Bruce Ohlson Pittsburg, Calif.; Mary L. Oswald, Kailua, Hawaii; Janet Parsons, Arlington Heights, Ill.; Jeff Paul, Haddon Heights, N.J.; James Rawlings, North Little Rock, Ark.; Robert Rowe, Bizbee, Ariz.; Al Schneider, St. Louis, Mo.; Leonard M. Joe Shute, Seabrook, N.H.; Linda Stoneman, San Francisco, Calif.; John Stout, Seattle, Wash.; Phillippe Vermeyen, Vista, Calif.; Stacey Waring, Springfield, Va.; Richard Warnick, Port Washington, N.Y.; Keith Wright, Mahomet, Ill.

I salute each one of these outstanding people as they come to the end of their own personal Odyssey. I ask you to join me in giving thanks that they have at last arrived safely. I invite you to come witness the special type of camaraderie that has developed in the last year together as HikaNation. As William Shakespeare said in "Troilus and Cressida," "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin." I can honestly say—the HikaNation family deserves our congratulations.●

REACHING THE SOVIET PEOPLE

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important nonmilitary weapons of our national defense policy is the worldwide dissemination of the truth. This is so because whenever people under totalitarian rule are denied a free flow of information, their rulers can not only abuse them but can manipulate them into taking hostile actions against the United States, our allies or against the innocent Afghanistans of this world. So long as the United States supports human rights around the world, and so long as we are serious about utilizing all the effective means of national defense, we must continue to support the primary means of disseminating the truth: our international radio broadcasting capabilities. One person who understands this and has eloquently articulated such ideas is my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. LEBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that all members of this body read his article that appeared in the New York Times on April 12.

REACHING THE SOVIET PEOPLE

(By JOHN LEBOUTILLIER)

WASHINGTON.—Whatever differences of opinion there may be about President Reagan's policies, there is near-unanimous agreement that he has mastered the use of the electronic media to communicate. His entire career had been devoted to perfecting this ability. Beginning with his radio recreations of Chicago Cubs baseball games and moving on to Hollywood movies, and finally to live televised political broadcasts, he has demonstrated one of our predominant na-

tional political skills: reaching out directly to people through the use of the electronic media.

This skill is the missing link in our policy toward the Soviet Union.

Moving from détente to confrontation, we are ignoring a hidden ally: the Soviet people. As Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn has said: "The Kremlin leadership is immeasurably indifferent and remote from the Russian people."

What American leaders have forgotten is this: The more repressive and brutal the Soviet Government, the more the Soviet people need spiritual and moral support; the more the regime attempts to deny the truth to the people, the more factual nourishment the people need. These citizens, walled off from the free world, are not unreachable. Through radio and television we can reach them. Most Soviet families have radio sets—it is the only form of mass communication. Television sets, too, are becoming available.

Our communications arms, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, are at present incapable of reaching Soviet Central Asia, where the highest percentage of non-Russians live. We don't even have a transmitter capable of reaching east of the Urals. And our broadcasts into the Soviet Union are sloppy, timid, and poorly conceived. We are spending about \$100 million a year on them. Last year, the Soviet Government spent three times that amount just to jam our transmissions!

At a time when the new Administration is rearming militarily for a possible confrontation, I propose that we use a new weapon: the mind. Through new transmission techniques, we could reach virtually every Soviet family with radio or television messages. We could broadcast the truth to a people long starved for it. Just imagine the reaction if the average laborer knew of the latest happenings inside Poland! Picture what an effect TV images of the Polish strikes would have! With radio alone, we could fill the needs of a people starved for spiritual fulfillment. Religious programs, historical accounts, and readings aloud of books banned by the Government would begin to arm the Soviet people with the information they have been denied.

One of the United States' strengths is the use of modern news-media techniques. A national skill such as this should be utilized as a tool of our defense and foreign policies. Many elected officials here in Washington and elsewhere across the country are living examples of what eight weeks of heavy radio and television advertising can do. What was unheard of one day is common knowledge just weeks later. Can you imagine what an effect 10 years of heavy transmissions into the Soviet Union would have?

The use of television can be devastating. The Soviet Government only recently began to appreciate this. Within months after it started telecasting from Moscow, where the standard of living is appreciably higher than in the rural areas, there was an unexpected migration of peasants who left their farms for the "better" life of the city. The Government was taken by surprise: It had never considered that such behavior could be triggered by images on a TV screen.

President Reagan should make one change in his new defense budget. We should subtract the cost of one tank from the more-than-\$200 billion budget and use that money immediately to expand our broadcast capabilities so as to reach Soviet Central Asia and to perfect the satellite-transmission techniques that we will need to reach the entire Soviet population.

I also believe that we should develop and launch a new communications satellite to broadcast directly into the Soviet Union, bypassing ground transmission and thereby escaping Soviet jamming. We could accomplish this project for the cost of four fighter jets. I believe that this would be a wiser use of that money.

It is uniquely American to believe in the power of the truth. This proposal is not one designed to destroy life; rather it is a plan to give Soviet citizens the factual information and moral support they need to live.

We in America have a duty and an obligation to provide the Soviet people with this truth. Armed with the truth, they will act accordingly. ●

THE UNITED STATES MUST SUPPORT FUNDAMENTAL REFORM IN GUATEMALA

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the shift of U.S. policy toward Guatemala has raised the real concern that the United States is again beginning to make another serious foreign policy blunder. It is important that, as with El Salvador, the U.S. public and the Congress become fully involved so that we may intelligently assess the actions and proposals of the Reagan administration.

The present upheaval in Guatemala is not new. Since the early sixties Guatemala has been plagued by continued social and political violence. However, the Mayan Indians, who comprise 50 percent of the population, who live in abject poverty, and who have been traditionally apolitical, are now actively participating. And the violence and repression, from both the left and the right, has worsened considerably since the election in 1978 of President-General Romeo Lucas Garcia.

It is important that we review and establish a Guatemalan policy now before it becomes another Nicaragua, another El Salvador. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which recently warned of the dangers in Guatemala. I commend this editorial to my colleagues.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 6, 1981]

THE GATHERING STORM IN GUATEMALA

Preoccupation with El Salvador should not blind the Reagan administration nor the United States public to the potentially more explosive situation in Guatemala. Events in this larger country—five times the size of El Salvador—already portend even larger consequences. Violence, terrorism, repression are chronic. The toll in killings, bombings, and other incidents is rising sharply. A climate of fear has enveloped homes and offices, schools and factories, cities and countryside.

The violence comes from both left and right.

Leftist guerrillas, joined by their newfound Maya Indian allies, strike with deadly accuracy at the elites—including government officials, businessmen, and the security forces. Nearly as powerful as their predecessors in the 1960s who tore the country apart in a wave of violence that killed 10,000, the guerrillas control important areas, particularly near the border with Mexico and in the mountainous Quiché. The successful recruitment of the long-passive Indians by the guerrillas is a major new element in the picture.

Government vendettas against opponents, in turn, have virtually eliminated potential civilian presidential candidates; weakened the once-renowned university system, leaving it without its traditionally fine core of teachers; and reduced civic organizations, particularly social action groups, to mere shells of their onetime important positions. One statistic will suffice: 76 leaders of the centrist Christian Democratic Party have been killed within the last 10 months, presumably by paramilitary rightists linked with the government of Gen. Romeo Lucas Garcia.

Underlying the national malaise is one of the most anarchic social structures anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. Descendants of the original Maya Indian inhabitants total more than half the population, and are largely excluded from the economy. The rest are a mix of European and Indian descent, sharing Guatemala's wealth in varying degrees. All are controlled by the military-dominated, minority elite.

Recent terrorism and repression have undermined the economy. Economic growth rates, which in the 1970s were good by Latin American standards, are down sharply. Tourism, which for 25 years has been a key activity, is now virtually nonexistent. About the only bright spot on the economic horizon is oil exploration in the Petén area of northeastern Guatemala. Yet Guatemala is the wealthiest nation in Central America and could easily be the region's economic leader.

For the U.S., the escalating turmoil in Guatemala comes at a time when precious little attention is being directed toward formulation of a Guatemala policy. The U.S. has not had an ambassador in Guatemala since Frank Ortiz was removed last year by the Carter administration. Many Guatemalans saw the election of Ronald Reagan as the harbinger of improved ties with the U.S., an end to the human rights criticism of the Carter years, and the resumption of U.S. military aid, suspended since 1977. Conservative Guatemalan businessmen and their allies hailed the Reagan victory and inauguration with candlelight parades around the U.S. Embassy in Guatemala City.

Such obvious applause and the ever present concern over El Salvador, however, must not cloud the Reagan administration's vision on Guatemala. What is needed is a sound new policy that expresses official U.S. displeasure over the repressive tendencies of the Lucas Garcia government and nudges the regime toward carrying out a more equitable distribution of land and other wealth and addressing the grievances of the majority of Guatemalans. There should be no illusion in Guatemala City that the new U.S. administration will turn it back on repression and tolerate the status quo.

The White House now reportedly is willing to resume military aid to Guatemala to

combat "major insurgency," provided the aid is not used to engage in political violence. But, as in El Salvador, such assistance is not likely to be effective unless the government undertakes fundamental reforms. The pot is boiling in Guatemala. Nothing short of a firm U.S. policy designed to foster social and economic justice is likely to stem the tide of popular unrest. ●

PROBLEMS OF BUSINESS

HON. GUS SAVAGE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues an article that appeared in Sunday's Washington Post by Mark Green, an author, and the president of the newly formed democracy project.

I think this article is especially relevant now that Congress has, in its wisdom, seen fit to approve a budget based on the Reagan administration's rose-colored view that "unleashing" the business community from the fetters of government regulations and taxes, and by providing it with more money to borrow, will cause that business community now "unleashed," to funnel its resources into wealth and jobs. The supposition that the business community, once unfettered, will be the antidote for the poison of inflation, and thus, the cure for our economic ills, is a tenuous one, indeed.

I am a member of the Small Business Committee, and I am acutely aware that business in this country is in trouble—but it is the small businessman we should be helping—not the gigantic corporate interests to which the Reagan economic plan targets its aid! I believe that it is imperative that we, in Congress, come to the aid of these small businesses which are responsible for what productivity, innovation, and creation of jobs we now have in this country. Like Mr. Green, however, I do not believe that the Reagan economic plan does anything more than to free big, corporate business to do further what it does best and cares about the most, and this is making profits. There is simply no indication that once the big business community is relieved of its share of Government regulation, is treated to large tax cuts, and has the advantage of lots more money to borrow that it will help the rest of the country out of its economic troubles by creating wealth and new jobs. I agree with Mr. Green that all indications are that any trickle down from the benefits that big business is certain to enjoy from the Reagan economic plan will be small, indeed, and not "the rising tide that lifts all boats" as it is purported to be.

The travesty of the Reagan economic program is that the poor, the

hungry, and the aged of our Nation are being asked to suffer broad slashes in social programs which they so desperately need, to promote an economic program which will not create the economic revitalization that is being touted by the Reagan administration as the way to bring wealth and jobs to the Nation.

The Reagan economic plan is more likely to shift rather than share the wealth. Mr. Green pointedly states, "As designed, most of its benefits would likely end up not with the 'truly needy' but with the truly greedy."

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1981]

THE PROBLEM WITH BUSINESS, SAYS BUSINESS, IS BUSINESS

(By Mark Green)

Americans seem so willing to suspend judgment about Ronald Reagan these days that few have even asked a central question about his economic plan. The simple question is this: What reason is there to think that an "unleashed" business community can cure our economic ills?

The simple answer: Very little. Indeed, there is growing recognition in the business world itself, as well as among its allies, that big businessmen in particular are one of the major sources of the unproductive mess we are in. Why, then, should we expect the same people to lead us to economic, social and political salvation?

"The top 1,000 corporations . . . have produced almost no net new jobs annually." Those are not the words of a business critic but of George Gilder, a new high priest of Reaganomics. In an interview in Public Opinion magazine, Gilder correctly notes, for example, that "large corporations don't introduce many truly pioneering products in our economy."

Yet the Reagan program is based on the indiscriminate notion that if only we cut businessmen loose from government regulation, slash their taxes and free lots more money for them to borrow, they will suddenly produce an abundance of wealth and jobs. The rationale for cuts in health and safety regulations, business taxes and government aid to the poor, the hungry and the aged is to transfer these extra billions to business, which chiefly means the large corporations that dominate the business world. This is supposed to create "the rising tide that lifts all boats."

But judging by the growing criticism of business by business and its boosters, don't count on too large a trickle down, much less a rising tide, from such blanket corporate aid (or, for that matter, from Democratic alternatives with their own indiscriminate business breaks).

In a widely discussed article in the Harvard Business Review, for example, Profs. Robert Hayes and William Abernathy conclude that we are "managing our way to economic decline." Reginald Jones, until recently the head of General Electric, blames the low quality of American goods on "management malaise." Businessman and former Commerce Department Under Secretary Howard Samuels believes that "inefficient management may be the factor economists have underestimated in attempting to analyze our productivity failure."

The chorus goes on. Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-Tex.) last year told a business seminar that "part of our problem with competitiveness and productivity resides not in public policy, but right here at this seminar—in

the corporate boardroom." According to a Wall Street Journal report, 80 percent of the top managers at 221 companies cite "poor management" as a major reason for lackluster productivity. And Lewis Young, editor-in-chief of Business Week, charges that executives "are building corporate hierarchies and bureaucracies that are every bit as lethargic, obstructive and nonproductive as those in government about which business people complain so bitterly."

Those familiar with today's business world will recognize the validity of complaints about many of the managers in whose hands we are to place our fates. Top American executives are no longer so much risk-taking entrepreneurs, as much of the Reagan mythology assumes, as they are money managers who juggle accounting statements and acquisitions to show short-run paper profits.

This trend began in the 1950s with the arrival of the "whiz kids" at the Ford Motor Company—Robert McNamara, Arjay Miller and other corporate Red Adairs who could put out any fire with their brilliance and MBAs. During the go-go years of the late 1960s, the business press and business schools lavished attention on such financial conglomerateurs as James Ling (LTV) and Harold Geneen (ITT). The prevailing ethic was that if you were a professional manager, you could manage anything.

Indeed, at one hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee, Ling went so far as to have a flip chart with a page asking, "How many people in LTV know the steel business?" The answer on the next page was a big red zero. Ultimately, the joke was on Ling, who failed to make Jones & Laughlin Steel profitable and lost his entire empire.

Yet the image of the dynamic professional manager endured even as the image of the founding entrepreneurs—Thomas Watson, Robert Sarnoff, Henry Ford, Walt Disney, Edwin Land—faded into the romanticized past. By 1980, the consulting firm of G. Lightly & Co. reported that the number of company chairmen and presidents with financial and legal backgrounds—not exactly the chief source of creative entrepreneurs—had increased 50 percent over the past 25 years.

The costs of these interchangeable managers, often untutored in their industries, is becoming glaring.

Too many U.S. executives, for example, are more interested in short-run profits than in long-term growth, according to J. Peter Grace of W. R. Grace & Co., former SEC chairman Harold Williams and former Commerce Department assistant secretary Frank Weil. With a top manager aware that he'll only be running things for four or five years on the average, "he'll entertain no research, no development program that won't pay off for eight or 10 years," according to Grace. And SEC reports pressure executives to show continually growing profits, quarter to quarter, even at the cost of cheating the future.

Also, many executive compensation plans tie bonuses to year-to-year returns, which encourage managers to overstate profits during their few years at the helm. Says Michael Maccoby, author of "The Gamesman," the best-seller about who gets ahead in the corporate suite, "It's like the George Allen-type football coach who trades young draft choices for 35-year-old stars who have one or two good years left. He wins immediately, but in five years he has no draft choices."

Contrast this with Japanese firms. High officials there rise through their particular business and stay at the top longer, their bonuses depend on returns over a period of years; and, compared with the United States, far more of their financing is debt than equity, so they don't have to pay dividends every year.

For these and other reasons, Japanese managers pursue long-gestating technologies and strategies despite short-run costs. Executives in America, says Julian Scheer, a senior vice president at LTV, "try to deal with long-range problems in the short run. They want to demonstrate . . . that they'll meet this year's targets this year. What gets lost is the strategy that will take the company over 25 to 30 years."

Another problem is what has been called "the rise of the paper entrepreneurs." As Robert Reich, director of Federal Trade Commission policy planning, puts it: "An ever larger portion of our economic activity is focused on rearranging industrial assets rather than increasing their size. Instead of enlarging the economic pie, we are busy reassigning the slices."

One European manager told Profs. Hayes and Abernathy, "The U.S. companies in my industry act like banks. All they are interested in is return on investment and getting their money back. Sometimes they act like they are more interested in buying other companies than they are in selling products to customers."

In fact, the value of all mergers rose from \$12 billion in 1975 to \$20 billion in 1976, \$22 billion in 1977, \$34 billion in 1978 and \$40 billion in 1979. W.T. Grimm & Co., which tracks acquisition trends, reports that merger announcements were up 46 percent in the first quarter of this year, and it puts the value of the planned corporate marriages at a quarterly record of \$17.5 billion.

In the 1970s many consumer activists and Senate liberals attacked large conglomerate mergers on efficiency and political-power grounds; the business press defended them by contending that the resulting combination would be more efficient than the sum of its parts. Now many business spokesmen are doing an about-face by turning against such mergers—on efficiency grounds.

Harold Williams lectures business audiences against acquiring companies they "don't have the time to understand." According to Robert W. Johnson, former chairman of Johnson & Johnson, "never acquire any business you don't know how to run." A major study of why firms succeed by the management company of McKinsey & Co. concluded that the most successful ones were more single-industry than conglomerate enterprises—companies such as 3M, Procter & Gamble, Johnson & Johnson.

This urge to merge contributes to a growing and measurable decline in American innovation. U.S. companies in 1979, for example, spent more for acquisitions than for research and development. In fact, R&D expenditures in this country in noninflated dollars peaked in the mid-1960s, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of GNP.

We also have something of a "balance of patents" problem today, as more patents are granted here to Japanese and West German companies than to U.S. firms in those countries. While small American firms pioneered in xerography and instant photography a couple of decades ago, today our corporate research factories come up too often with feminine hygiene sprays and pet rocks.

Recent studies corroborate the assumption that expenditures for innovation—

rather than for me-too products—are what lead to productivity, profits and jobs. J. Hugh Davidson in 1976 looked at the reasons 100 new consumer products succeeded or failed in the United Kingdom between 1960 and 1970. Of new products, 74 percent succeeded; of imitative products, only 20 percent did so.

Still, U.S. managers seem to shy from the risks and rewards of innovation. C. Jackson Grayson, former Nixon wage-price controller and now president of the American Productivity Center, complains that management for 20 years "has coasted off the great R&D gains made during World War II, and consistently rewarded executives from the marketing, financial and legal sides of the business while it ignored the production man."

For these "paper entrepreneurs," acquisitions are more familiar than innovations. And safer. As Joseph Schumpeter wrote four decades ago in "Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy," new technology can make existing investment obsolete. If a corporation or corporations already dominate an industry, where is the incentive to take a chance on a new and costly product?

Several examples come to mind. American tire companies wouldn't market obviously superior radial tires and thereby allowed foreign penetration here. American auto firms have not had a major innovation since the development of automatic transmission in the 1930s and wouldn't significantly reduce the size of their fleets after the 1973 oil embargo, which opened up our domestic market to a flood of fuel-efficient imports. Similarly, it took a small Austrian company, one-third the size of the average U.S. Steel plant, to introduce the path-breaking oxygen steel-making process in this country.

No government bureaucrat told American industry not to market radials, small cars, small motorcycles, small computers, small reproduction machines and small TV sets. The fault, here as elsewhere, has been more with self-immolating managers than with federal regulators.

Many small- and medium-sized companies, after all, have been innovative and profitable regardless of government rules. Moreover, as management consultant Jewell Westerman reports in the current *Fortune* magazine, a study he did of hundreds of firms shows that the costs of "the bureaucracy of business management itself" are "far larger" than costs stemming from government bureaucracy.

Westerman raises the neglected issue of waste, which the Reagan administration somehow sees everywhere in big government but nowhere in big business. The bigger the firm, the bigger the costs of bureaucracy: excessive paperwork; committees reviewing committees; undetected sloth; institutional caution and delay; and the Parkinson's Law effect of superiors creating more subordinates.

The McKinsey study of corporate successes and failures found that one firm required 223 different committees to approve a new idea before it would be put into production—and few were. John DeLorean, author of "On a Clear Day You Can See General Motors," quit the auto giant as a vice president at age 48 because on the 14th floor of the GM building in Detroit "You were too harassed and oppressed by committee meetings and paperwork. It [GM] has gotten to be a total insulation from the realities of the world."

After 86 interviews with business managers, economist F. M. Scherer concluded that

"the unit costs of management, including the hidden losses due to delayed or faulty decisions and weakened or distorted incentives . . . do tend to rise with the organizational size. How typical it is for firms insulated from competition to operate with copious layers of fat can only be guessed. My own belief is that padding as high as 10 percent of costs is not at all uncommon."

There is waste not only in boardrooms but in the workplace as well. "I rarely find an analysis of a manufacturing or service industry," says J. Peter Grace, "where the potential cost reductions are not equal to 30-40 percent of the labor cost." But is labor or management really at fault here? Sony has plants in San Diego and Alabama that are about as productive as its facilities in Japan. Similarly, a General Accounting Office study showed that after a Japanese firm took over a Motorola color TV plant, defects fell from 150 per 100 sets to just 3-4 defects per 100.

It appears that U.S. labor could be competitively productive with the proper tools and motivation. Instead, our capital stock in autos and steel, for example, is aging and the equipment not the most advanced. As *Fortune* reports, "Japanese auto makers have achieved much higher productivity than their American rivals largely because they have invested more heavily in advanced production technology."

Moreover, management-labor tensions in the United States do not inspire the kind of loyalty and effort that seem to characterize the Japanese and West German labor markets. A recent *Wall Street Journal* story—"Poor Labor Relations at U.S. Steelmakers Cut Ability to Compete"—discussed the now familiar tale of how Japanese managers get more out of their workers by demonstrating greater concern for their welfare. American managers, by contrast, often treat employees with autocratic disdain.

All this is to say little of the matter of fraud in the boardroom, which has been documented in an avalanche of hearings, books, articles, criminal convictions and admissions of management-directed illegality over the past half decade. This, too makes one wonder whether aid for business will be promoting something other than productivity.

While the Reagan administration stresses "psychology" and "faith" to support its fundamental economic assumptions, a large body of evidence about managerial inefficiency contradicts its economic Peter Panism. Given companies' acquisition-mindedness and the "waste, fraud and abuse" in business bureaucracy itself, Reagan's program seems more likely to simply shift wealth than create it. As designed, most of its benefits would likely end up not with the "truly needy" but with the truly greedy.

With Congress agreeing to Part I of Reagan's economic package—huge spending cuts—it would do well now to step back and consider some longer-run alternatives for economic growth that are more realistic than merely throwing money at corporations in the form of untargeted tax breaks.

For example, stricter anti-conglomerate standards would frustrate merging and encourage investing. More worker democracy would motivate employees to produce more because they get more, as studies of workplace participation efforts demonstrate. If there is inadequate savings in America, let's stop subsidizing consumption through a tax code that allows deductions for interest payments on consumer credit, life insurance policies and second and third homes.

Since there's a consistent negative correlation in advanced economies between high military spending and high economic productivity, a less extravagant defense budget would be a boon to the economy. And if managers lack the nerve to invest in risky but potentially groundbreaking technologies, perhaps we need a version of a national development bank to encourage such innovation. After all, it was more government spending than private initiative that led to such products as microprocessing, computer chips and wide-bodied airplanes.

It would be disastrous if slashes in social spending and all the consequent personal suffering ultimately fail to create the promised economic plenty. This could not only destroy this administration's political health but deeply wound the public's long-term confidence in the business community itself. ●

TAX CUTS: TOO SIMPLE, TOO BIG, TOO SOON

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, as the omnibus tax reduction package nears, more and more economists, business leaders, and economic forecasters are raising objections to the administration's proposal to reduce the income tax rates by 30 percent over the course of 3 years.

Dr. Henry Kaufman, an internationally respected businessman and economist and often the most accurate economic forecaster on Wall Street, has labeled this proposal "inappropriate" because of the ensuing inflationary pressures on the economy. Many major businessmen privately share Dr. Kaufman's assessment and are hoping for a more restrained, more targeted, and a noninflationary tax cut.

From the other side, Dr. Kaufman has been joined by President Kennedy's chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Walter Heller. In a thought-provoking essay in the March 27 edition of the Washington Post, entitled "Tax Cuts: Too Simple, Too Big, Too Soon," Dr. Heller makes a persuasive argument against the administration's personal tax proposal. Dr. Heller is particularly well qualified to assess the merits of this proposal, because he was the architect of the 1964 tax cut, which is often used to justify the present tax cut proposal. I hope that all of my colleagues will carefully consider Dr. Heller's well-reasoned arguments, before we enact a tax cut which could push inflation through the roof and lead to unprecedented budget deficits.

The essay follows:

TAX CUTS: TOO SIMPLE, TOO BIG, TOO SOON
(By Walter W. Heller)

The Reagan-Kemp-Roth 30 percent tax cut is a prime example of "for every problem there is a solution: simple, neat and wrong." Or perhaps more to the point, too

simple, too big and too soon. Let me take up those charges in reverse order.

Too soon. Putting a \$142 billion personal income tax cut on the books all at once—the first-year cost of \$44 billion rapidly mounts to \$142 billion per year by 1985—involves unnecessary risks.

First, the Treasury might get a rude jolt on its expectations of a huge savings response to the tax cut. In recent years, inflation-wise consumers have been buying ahead to beat price rises. A huge three-year tax cut on the books is an open invitation to consumers to make a lot of purchases on the cuff. The tax cuts would be seen as "money in the bank" on which they could draw to meet future installment payments on present purchases.

Second, instead of calming inflationary fears, the all-at-once enactment may agitate them. Poll after poll shows people lukewarm about a big personal tax cut, mainly because they fear it would be inflationary. Tax cuts on the books versus budget cuts "on the come" are hardly a way to calm those fears.

Third, as this suggests, Kemp-Roth adopts a cart-before-the-horse approach. True, taxpayers deserve a tax cut as an offset to built-in tax increases, and our soft economy provides enough slack to absorb sizable personal tax cuts later this year. But beyond this, further personal tax cuts should be put in place only after they have been earned by further budget cuts and/or clear evidence of subdued inflation. That would be the path of fiscal prudence.

Too big. By 1985, President Reagan's tax cuts and defense boosts would outrun his budget cuts by about \$100 billion a year. By thus perpetuating large deficits—the Congressional Budget Office projects a \$50 billion deficit in 1984—the White House would put fiscal policy on a collision course with monetary policy. Much of the force of tax stimulants to investment would be blunted by tighter money and high interest rates. And much of the savings gained through lower tax rates would be absorbed by continued government borrowing. In moderation, tax cuts can strengthen the economy. In excess, they can be self-defeating.

In another sense, the 10-10-10 personal tax cut is simply too big. It preempts so much of the available tax cut money that the prime tax stimulant to investment—accelerated depreciation—has to be phased in over a five-year period. Meanwhile, many a business will postpone investments to qualify for progressively more liberal tax treatment.

By its own supply-side lights, the Reagan administration could do far more for the economy by cutting back its 30 percent personal tax cut and sharply stepping up the depreciation timetable.

Too simple. The present menu of across-the-board tax cuts would use up all of our elbow room for tax reduction and thus crowd out other measures that might have a far worthier claim for tax relief, for example:

Reducing the so-called "marriage penalty" would be more effective than across-the-board tax cuts in two ways: 1) it would provide relief for an obvious case of overtaxation, and 2) it would have a bigger payoff in stimulating additional work effort. Careful studies show that while tax cuts on existing earners don't have much net effect on work effort, second earners in the family do respond to lower tax rates.

Any evenhanded approach to adjusting taxes for inflation would have to boost per-

sonal exemptions and the standard deductions to overcome the erosion since 1978.

Though apparently low on today's agenda, cutbacks in payroll taxes—perhaps in the form of income tax credits on payroll taxes paid—would not only provide needed tax relief but also cut business costs.

The Kennedy cuts. Strangely enough, the Reagan tax-cut pattern reverses the approach taken in the Kennedy tax cuts, which the Treasury constantly invokes in behalf of its program. First came the supply-side thrust (or, as we called it, "tax incentives for capital formation and growth") in the form of the 1961-62 actions to initiate the investment tax credit (still the backbone of business tax incentives for growth) and liberalize depreciation.

With these supply-side cuts in place, and the economy still operating well below par, we followed through with the big demand-side tax cut of 1964. To be sure, it had beneficial incentive effects, as we were at pains to point out at the time. But there was no doubt then—and but for supply-side revisionists would not be now—about its primary purpose: to boost demand and thus put existing supply capacity—idle workers and excess plant capacity—back to work.

If the current tax cutters want to draw the right lesson from the Kennedy tax cuts, it would be this: Use much of the existing tax-cut margin for sharply focused investment incentives and then follow through with bigger personal tax cuts as budget cuts and ebbing inflation allow.

Let me add a word on the non-economic aspects of tax cuts. Nothing in the mandate for such cuts calls for suspending the rules of equity and fairness in taxation. If, in flaunting incentives, we flout equity, we will run a grave risk of undermining the domestic basis for confidence in the tax system. ●

THE PEOPLE RESPOND—XII

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which exemplifies the concern people are feeling over the proposed budget cuts. President Reagan's economic plan would not affect every segment of this society equally; minorities and the poor would have to shoulder the greatest suffering while businesses and the rich would be favored disproportionately. As part of my continuing crusade against the inequities in the proposed economic plan, I am inserting today's statement to show that there are still citizens who are concerned over the impact of this plan:

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF
COUNCILS ON ALCOHOLISM, INC.,
Albany, N.Y., March 30, 1981.

Re: rescission of alcoholism formula grant funds for fiscal year 1981.

To: Members NYS Congressional Delegation
From: Art Berman—President.

The purpose of this correspondence is to urge your support to reject the President's rescission of Alcoholism Federal Formula Funds for Fiscal Year 1981.

The proposed rescission would result in New York State suffering a retroactive cut of \$3.4 million back to October 1, 1980. These funds currently go to 57 programs in 37 counties and their elimination would halt prevention, intervention and treatment services to some 38,000 individuals.

Although recognizing and concurring in the need for stringency in budgeting on the part of the Federal Government, the fiscal constraints under which State and local governments presently operate will make it impossible for them to maintain the existing network of community-based alcoholism services currently funded through formula grant funds.

Federal moneys constitute an important part of the total funding system within the State and the loss of Federal Formula Funds would have a devastating impact on services.

This proposed rescission of the Formula Grant Dollars is in direct conflict with the current Administration's publicly expressed desire to promote increased responsibility and flexibility in the States in providing health and social services. The 1981-82 State budgetary decisions will be made by April 1, 1981 and the development alternatives to adjust to this retroactive cut will not be possible in this time frame. In fact, the rescission is a step away from grant consolidation, rather than a step toward increased flexibility. The alcohol and drug abuse formula grant funds represent the only tax dollars sent to Washington, D.C. which are returned to the States for the alcohol and drug abuse field, with any flexibility attached. These funds are allocated to those areas of particular need in the State; such as increasing the provision of treatment services to special populations, including minorities, women, elderly and youth.

The reduction of funds will force the elimination of services which can only result in shifting victims of alcoholism to more expensive, less appropriate health services.

You should be aware of the cost to society of inadequate, ineffective and inappropriate response to the treatment of alcoholics and their families.

Effective treatment of alcoholism, however, results in savings to the health care system, criminal justice system, social services system and in productivity in the workplace.

We ask that you take all possible actions to prevent the reduction and elimination of alcoholism services funds through the Formula Grant Program so that we can maintain an adequate system of services for all New Yorkers.

We appreciate your past support of alcoholism programs and we look forward to your voting not to approve rescission.

THE ASSEMBLY, STATE OF NEW YORK
Albany, N.Y., March 23, 1981.

HON. ROBERT GARCIA,
840 Grand Concourse,
Bronx, N.Y.

DEAR MR. GARCIA: As you are probably aware, the Office of Management and Budget, under the direction of David Stockman, has proposed to gut the Federal Trade Commission, and effectively lay waste to 65 years of Congressional activity aimed at strengthening the American market economy. In the name of fiscal austerity, OMB is proposing to eliminate the Commission's Bureau of Competition and all ten regional offices. These proposals will emasculate the Commission's ability to enforce the anti-trust laws, and will fragment investigations

and programs initiated by the regional offices at the state level. For these and the following reasons, I urge you to fight to modify the OMB proposals.

The New York Regional Office (NYRO) is the perfect example of the Commission's efficacy at the regional level. The NYRO has assisted my Committee (Assembly Consumer Affairs and Protection) in developing a multitude of pro-consumer and anti-inflationary programs, including generic drug legislation, mandatory arbitration, and product warranties. The NYRO and its sister offices across the nation have a broader impact as well:

1. Complaints received by the NYRO are usually indicative of economic abuses and illegal activity having a regional and national scope.

2. Small and medium-sized businesses are able to assess the desirability of commercial practices by consulting with the regional offices.

3. The visibility of the NYRO (and all regional offices) functions as the marketplace equivalent of the urban precinct house. The regional office, simply put, is available to all citizens of the economic "neighborhood."

The aforementioned functions of the regional offices, which accrue to the benefit of consumers and businesses alike, will disappear if the OMB proposals become reality. The OMB would have the Commission revert to being the "little old lady of Pennsylvania Avenue." This would be detrimental to the health of the business community and the people it serves, and I urge you to oppose the radical and unnecessary cuts now being proposed.

Sincerely,

JOSE E. SERRANO,
Chairman, Consumer Affairs and
Protection Committee.

F.A.C.T.S. (FINANCIAL AID FOR
COLLEGE AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS),
Brooklyn, N.Y., March 26, 1981.

HON. ROBERT GARCIA,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARCIA: As you will see from the enclosed article, we at F.A.C.T.S. serve thousands of New York City high school students.

Since 70 percent of our students are from minority groups, it can be assumed that the majority of students in New York City high schools have a family income which is at or near the poverty line. We can categorically state that many of these students cannot afford to attend even the most inexpensive colleges, such as the CUNY colleges or trade schools, unless substantial government financial aid is made available.

There is no future for these young people unless they have a "handle" of some sort: either a college degree or a trade school education diploma. It is obvious that leaving minority young people without an opportunity to secure a decent job is bound to worsen an already difficult situation in New York City with regard to welfare, crime, and drugs. The same is true, of course, of inner-city school populations all over the United States.

Any change in present educational funding which will deprive low income or poverty area students of the financial aid which they need will swell the already full ranks of the youthful jobless. We ask you, there-

fore, to use your efforts to legislate continuing aid for lower income students.

Sincerely,

MILTON HEIMLICH,
F.A.C.T.S. Advisory Chairperson.

PULLING TOGETHER THE CASH FOR COLLEGE
TUITION

(By Glenn Collins)

First, the bad news: College costs are rising rapidly, many parents feel they can't cope with the financial demands, and some students never ever apply to college and vocational schools because they think they won't be able to afford them.

But the good news is that the money is there, in grants, scholarships and loans—for students of modest means, for those from middle-class families, and even for those who are not star scholars.

"You just have to know where to look and how to look," said Milton Heimlich, founder of Financial Aid for College and Technical Schools, or Facts, a nonprofit service that will help an estimated 15,000 New York City students to find money for college and vocational school this year.

"Many parents and students are not aware that there is a lot of money available," he said. "In fact, Facts can guarantee that any student in New York City can finance a college education if he or she wants to. Actually, getting kids to want to do it is something harder than finding the money."

WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM

Mr. Heimlich's guarantee rests in part on the money available from Federal and state grants, from academic scholarships, from work-study programs, from labor unions, from religious and ethnic sources, and from Social Security and Veterans Administration benefits.

But the basis of his assurance is that both students and their parents are able to borrow up to \$5,500 a year a child, regardless of need, at an interest rate of 9 percent, with the money to be paid back over a maximum of 15 years. The Federal loans apply to all college expenses. As of the 1981-82 academic year, a student and his parents will be able to borrow up to \$27,500 for higher education over five years and \$30,000 more over five years for graduate-school expenses.

"The loans are the insurance policy—even for middle-class families—that they'll have the college money they need," said Mr. Heimlich. "Paying them back is not an onerous burden, given the rate of inflation, the time of repayment, and the fact that the Government is an easy lender."

Currently, Facts is assisting 12th- and 11th-graders in 32 New York City high schools in the five boroughs, providing them with information about where and how to obtain financial aid for colleges, for vocational, technical and nursing schools, and for other training institutions.

ONLY PROGRAM OF ITS KIND

Its staff members also help students and parents fill out the extraordinarily complex application forms. They keep track of filing deadlines, correct computer-processing errors, and even furnish students with stamped postal cards so they can apply for financial aid information.

Facts is the first program of its kind in the nation, said Mr. Heimlich, "and, unfortunately, it still is." The aides in the high schools work under the auspices of the schools' college advisers and guidance coun-

selors, who because of budgetary cutbacks serve an average of 640 students each.

Mr. Heimlich, a retired New Rochelle businessman who has been involved in community work for 40 years, created the Facts program 11 years ago for students at New Rochelle High School and brought the concept to New York City in 1976. With the help of Harold Doughty, the head of undergraduate admissions at New York University, Facts began a trial run in four high schools in Manhattan and Brooklyn.

In August 1979, Facts became an official unit of the New York City Board of Education's Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance. The board pays the salaries of an administrator, an assistant and a secretary, and provides office space. Mr. Heimlich raised \$30,000 last year from private sources to pay for materials and staffing needs.

Currently there are 53 Facts aides assigned to high schools. Fourteen are unpaid volunteers, many of them retired guidance counselors from the New York City School Volunteer Program, and official arm of the Board of Education since 1962.

The others are work-study college students from New York University, the City University of New York, Pace College, Iona College, Marymount Manhattan College and Columbia University. The students are paid \$3.50 an hour, 80 percent of which is provided by the federally financed College Work-Study Program. Private fund-raising by Facts supplies the rest.

AIM IS TO REACH ALL

"Our aim is to expand the program to reach 50 of New York's 100 high schools by June, to 75 by next year, and to all of them by June of 1983," said Daisy K. Shaw, director of the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance. She and Dr. Amelia Ashe, a member of the Board of Education and a former guidance counselor, were instrumental in making Facts an officially sponsored unit of the city school system. "Since many of those in our student population feel that college is completely out of bounds for them, Facts is extremely important in giving them vital information about the numerous sources of financial aid," she said. "It can change their lives."

Selma Covitz, special assistant to Dr. Ashe, said: "We are very enthusiastic about the success of the program. Facts makes every high school student realize that financial inability is not a stumbling block to further education, even if they don't have a penny behind them."

The money-attracting efforts of Facts, whose aides are armed with Rolodex files of financial sources, accomplish prodigious feats. Last year, Sol Schwartz, coordinator of career and vocational education at Sheepshead Bay High School, obtained \$3,569,896 in scholarships and grants for 382 of the school's graduating seniors. The Facts aide in Mr. Schwartz's office, 20-year-old Shirley Eng, a former student-government president at Sheepshead Bay High School, is in the work-study program at Brooklyn College.

"It makes all the difference to them, to know the money is there," said Mr. Schwartz of the school's largely working-class students. "And where was it our kids usually used to go, if they went to college? Brooklyn College. Now the door is opened so that even disadvantaged kids can be adventurous. They're attending schools all over the country—in Texas, California, Georgia, the Middle West." ●

PRESCRIPTION FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF AMERICA

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, until recently public elementary and secondary education held a position of eminence in America.

Public schools need to regain their former eminence. And, Prof. James Coleman has issued a report which provides public schools with a blueprint for doing just that.

The essence of the Coleman report is that schools which produce good students have certain common characteristics. Good students come from schools which are orderly and disciplined, schools which require high attendance, schools which require homework—and lots of it—and schools where high quality curriculum is emphasized.

These elements seem simple enough. Unfortunately, they are not present in far too many of today's public schools.

Parents, educators, government officials, and private citizens must join together and make every effort to revitalize the Nation's public education system for the sake of our young people and for the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, following is a column by Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, discussing the report of Dr. Coleman which I believe is worth reading.

The column which appeared in the New York Times follows:

WHERE WE STAND—GOOD SCHOOLS PUT PRESSURE ON STUDENTS (By Albert Shanker)

Some people seem to be accident prone. Others always seem to be misunderstood. Sociologist James Coleman easily fits the misunderstood category. Each of his reports, starting with 1966, made big headlines, often on page one. According to the newspapers and most researchers who read the 1966 Coleman Report, Coleman said that how well children do in school does not depend on class size, how much is spent on books and supplies or what salaries teachers earn. Students do well if they come from families which are of higher socio-economic status. They do poorly if they come from poor homes. And black children do better in integrated schools than in segregated ones.

Just as the liberals in the Great Society era were about to put more and more money into education, Coleman was interpreted as saying: "Stop wasting money on schools. Spending more won't do any good. If you want to be effective, try busing." But it seems that over all these years, that's not what Coleman really meant—according to Coleman in a letter to The New York Times printed last Sunday.

Now we have another Coleman Report—and another set of headlines. Again, the report is being misinterpreted (could it be the way Coleman writes?). Let's make sure

that this time we don't lose the real message. What does Coleman really say?

Coleman says: The interpretation of the 1966 report was wrong. Schools do make a difference. In "good" schools students will learn more, in "bad" schools they'll learn less. This is true no matter what kind of homes students come from.

Coleman does not say—and this is where he is misinterpreted—that private schools are good and public schools are bad. He finds good and bad private schools as well as public schools. Coleman shows that it is not whether a school is public, Catholic or independent which makes it effective—but what goes on in the school. High achieving schools have certain standards. What are they?

High achieving schools are disciplined and orderly. Action is taken against vandalism and drug abuse. Students know that some things won't be tolerated. There are fewer instances when students talk back to teachers, when they don't obey, when they get into fights with other students or engage in threats against teachers.

The more time spent in learning, the more learning will take place. Achieving schools press for good attendance. They take action when students cut classes. Each day and each period missed is time lost from learning. But there's more. The time spent learning in school is just not enough to get most students to read and write well or develop their language and math skills. Achieving schools give homework, so that student time spent in learning is increased by 10 percent, 20 percent, 50 percent or more. There was wide variation in what schools did. Some gave almost no homework, while others gave more than 10 hours a week.

High achieving schools put pressure on students. Let's face it, not all learning is fun. There's plenty of hard work, drudgery, some of it involving pure memorization or the development of habits and routines, some of it plain boring. Students resist doing unpleasant things—as we all do—unless it's more unpleasant not to do them. Some educators have the philosophy that we shouldn't put pressure on students—we should just wait until they want to do it. Or, they say, you can't really force a student to learn something. Or, it doesn't really make any difference if a student doesn't learn to read (after all, this is an age of television) or learn good handwriting (he can use a typewriter). This failure of nerve on the part of adults leads to poor learning and, worse, poor character development.

Part of the pressure comes in the form of tests and grades. Grades are not just given out because the student has been nice enough to come to school—or even as a reward for good behavior. Grades are for achievement—test results count. And, if students are learning, we can assume that teachers were not selected merely because some college awarded a degree. Some test was applied in the selection of teachers to make sure that they were competent in the subjects to be taught.

Achieving schools emphasize a tough quality curriculum. Students have fewer chances to substitute easy courses for hard ones. More students take geometry, trigonometry, calculus, chemistry, physics, foreign language. Shakespeare and Dickens are not replaced by courses in "modern media," nor is physics replaced by photography.

While there are good and bad among both private and public schools, historian Diane Ravitch concludes from Coleman's new report that "public schools have lowered

their requirements, decreased their expectations, made basic courses optional and learned to tolerate intolerable behavior."

Of course, private schools are selective—they choose their students. And parents who have chosen to pay tuition will, on the average, put more pressure on their children. Public schools are burdened with the most difficult cases, including many who are rejected or expelled by private schools.

But it's time to stop making excuses. School boards, administrators, teachers, parents should use these results of the Coleman Report as a basis for improving the quality of public education. The American people still support public schools and oppose aid to nonpublic education. But public school support is slipping. If schools don't offer both a safe and orderly environmental and a quality program, the public will surely go elsewhere.●

OPPOSITION TO REPEAL OF THE CLARK AMENDMENT

HON. HOWARD WOLPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues two informative letters I have received opposing repeal of the Clark amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. This amendment requires congressional approval for any military or paramilitary aid to groups in Angola.

The letter from Allan Adler, legislative counsel of the Center for National Security Studies, points out that under the Clark amendment the President would be able to obtain a speedy congressional decision on a request for military aid to Angola due to expedited procedures introduced last year. Thus the Clark amendment does not impede Executive flexibility in foreign affairs.

In addition, Randall Robinson, executive director of Transafrica, argues that congressional repeal of the Clark amendment would jeopardize Western efforts to find a peaceful solution to the dangerous conflict in Namibia, would probably increase Angola's reliance on Cuba for security needs, and would seriously undermine our business and political relationships in Africa, including Nigeria which is our second largest oil supplier.

CENTER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUDIES,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1981.

Representative HOWARD WOLPE,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WOLPE: We write to urge you to oppose any effort to repeal the Clark Amendment and to carefully consider the importance of its provisions as revised last year in section 118 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980, Public Law 96-533.

Officials of the Reagan Administration insist that their desire to repeal the Clark Amendment is based simply upon "a ques-

tion of principle." They assert that the prohibition against providing assistance to groups engaged in military or paramilitary operations in Angola hinders the President's ability to maintain a necessary flexibility in the area of foreign affairs. Although they deny that the repeal is sought in anticipation of an Administration decision to provide such assistance to Jonas Savimbi and the UNITA forces presently fighting in Angola, these officials contend that the repeal is necessary to give the President a broader range of foreign policy options which can be utilized without unnecessary delay.

If speed and flexibility in exercising foreign policy options were the true concerns of the Reagan Administration, satisfactory reassurances already exist through the revision of the Clark Amendment in the last Congress. The original Clark Amendment barred provisions of such assistance "unless and until the Congress expressly authorizes such assistance by law." The revised Clark Amendment, however, provides for Congressional approval by joint resolution under the expedited procedures provided in sections 36(b) and 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, Public Law 94-329, as amended. These procedures provide for rapid consideration of such resolutions by strictly limiting committee and floor action on them in both the House and the Senate.

It is our belief, however, that the Reagan Administration seeks the repeal of the Clark Amendment in order to avoid public debate over any decision by the President to authorize military and paramilitary assistance to warring factions in Angola.

As you will recall, the original Clark Amendment was enacted after it was learned that the CIA has covertly provided over \$25 million in such assistance to contending guerrilla forces in Angola in 1975 without the knowledge or approval of Congress. In order to insure public debate over such decisions in the future, the Clark Amendment required that Congress must expressly authorize the specifically-requested assistance by law after the President has submitted a detailed unclassified statement explaining the reasons underlining his determination that furnishing such assistance "is important to the national security interests of the United States." Although the revised Clark Amendment still requires the President to submit such a statement, Congress deleted the requirement that the statement be "in unclassified form." Thus, the requirement for enactment of a joint resolution of congressional approval is the only safeguard against the United States government secretly "choosing sides" again in the political strife in Angola without the knowledge and approval of Congress and the American people.

Congress has been warned, both at home and abroad, of the potential adverse consequences of direct U.S. intervention in the Angolan political conflict. If our government is to embark upon such a course, it should do so only after the issues involved in the decision have been publicly aired and debated in the forum most directly accountable to the American people. The revised Clark Amendment is the only guarantee Congress has provided of its intention to

fulfill its responsibilities in this regard and it must be preserved.

Sincerely,

MORTON H. HALPERIN,
Director.

ALLAN ADLER,
Legislative Counsel.

TRANSAFRICA,
May 4, 1981.

HON. HOWARD WOLPE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLPE: We note that last week the Subcommittee on Africa voted 7 to 0 to retain the Clark Amendment. We strongly support the recommendation of the Subcommittee. It is the Congress' only way to prevent what could become a major foreign policy mistake with far reaching consequences.

The Subcommittee has stated, and we concur, that a repeal of the Clark Amendment at this time would be contrary to U.S. objectives in Southern Africa particularly and Africa in general. It would jeopardize the United Nations and Western Five efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in Namibia; it would further add to the instability of the region as a whole, seriously threatening chances for peace and economic development; it would probably increase Angola's reliance on the Cubans for security needs; it would align the U.S. with the oppressive regime in South Africa; it would isolate the U.S. from our NATO allies, all of whom have good relations with Angola; it would damage the good working relations enjoyed by American companies operating in Angola; and it would seriously undermine U.S. relations with the rest of Africa and perhaps draw retaliatory action from some key African states such as Nigeria, our 2nd largest oil supplier.

For these reasons, we strongly feel that your support in the Foreign Affairs Committee to retain the amendment would serve the best interest of the United States in its still developing relations with Africa.

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL ROBINSON,
Executive Director.●

ALWAYS GOOD TO HAVE A WISE COUNSEL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, when I started my service on the House Ways and Means Committee in 1975 it did not take long for me, and my staff, to learn that tax laws are not simple or easily understood. There are many reasons for this.

In those days, my staff assistant, who was trying to keep up with our very first tax bill—the Tax Act of 1975—was Barbara Ruud. Her husband is Millard Ruud, who has served for many years as one of the best and most outstanding law professors in the history of the University of Texas School of Law in Austin. Naturally, when the going got deeper and deeper into the murky waters of tax law, Bar-

bara would seek counsel from the law professors at UT. She was personal friends with these people, and thus the inquiries were always received in a spirit of friendship and nonpartisanship. And, I, too, learned that talking to these professors when I could was a good way to get a quick handle on both theory and the specifics of a matter pending.

I believe the one man on whom we relied most was Parker Fielder, who has taught for a total of 25 years. Although Barbara Ruud is no longer on my staff—and we do miss her—we will still be calling on Parker from time to time.

The student bar at the University of Texas has named Parker as the recipient of this year's award for teaching excellence. Based on my personal experience with Parker as "my" teacher, I know he deserves the award, and then some.

I want to share the press release that the University of Texas has issued to announce the award.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
NEWS AND INFORMATION SERVICE,
Austin, Tex., April 30, 1981.

AUSTIN, TEX.—A longtime University of Texas law professor who is known for his ability to communicate clearly the complex concepts of Federal income tax laws has been named winner of the Student Bar Association's Teaching Excellence Award.

Parker C. Fielder, who holds the William H. Francis Jr. Professorship in Law, received the honor at UT's recent Law Week observance.

He not only teaches a basic income tax course in the Law School but also an advanced course on corporate taxation and a seminar on the taxation of natural resources.

His students report he is a master at giving practical grounding in tax law and using "hypotheticals that reflect the real world." On teaching evaluations by students, he consistently rates high marks for preparation and enthusiasm for subject.

Professor Fielder gained practical experience in the "real world," for from 1953 to 1961 he was a tax attorney in Midland.

He has taught a total of 25 years in the UT Law School. His first teaching assignment was from 1948 to 1953. He returned to the faculty in 1961. Among his research interests are the Windfall Profits Tax of 1980 and Federal taxation of energy resources.

Professor Fielder is a frequent lecturer at tax institutes, bar association meetings and continuing legal education programs for practicing attorneys. He lectures in the areas of business law, oil and gas taxation law, and estate and gift tax planning.

He is a member of the American Law Institute, which for those in the legal profession is the equivalent of the National Academy of Sciences for scientists. He also is listed in Who's Who in America.

The professor earned a B.S. degree in commerce from Northwestern University in 1941 and an LL.B. degree from UT Austin in 1948. As a law student he was editor of the Texas Law Review and was elected a member of Order of the Coif and Chancellors.

In 1974-75, Professor Fielder served as consultant to the Texas Legislative Property Tax Commission.●

MEDICARE MENTAL ILLNESS
NONDISCRIMINATION ACT

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that 15 to 20 percent of our Nation's more than 22 million older citizens have significant mental health problems. Restrictions in the medicare program effectively prevent many of these individuals from receiving adequate mental health care.

The Medicare Mental Illness Nondiscrimination Act, which I have reintroduced today, is designed to provide access to mental health services through three basic changes in the medicare program.

First, the bill eliminates the discriminatory 50/50 copayment formula for mental health care in favor of the 80/20 copayment formula now used for physical health care. Second, the bill eliminates the discriminatory annual \$250 maximum payment for outpatient care of nervous, mental, or emotional disorders. By eliminating the ceiling entirely, greater utilization of outpatient mental health services will occur. The third provision of the bill changes part A of medicare by eliminating the discriminatory 190-day lifetime limit for inpatient psychiatric care and substitutes the spell-of-illness definition employed for physical health care.

By increasing mental health care coverage this bill will actually lower the cost of other health care services. Several studies attest to this phenomenon. In a study of a single Texas county—which spanned the years 1973-77—it was demonstrated that increased access to outpatient psychiatric care reduced the average hospital stay of patients 65 and older from 111 days to 53 days. This halving of hospital time resulted in savings of \$1.1 million. When multiplied out over the entire population of seniors in need of mental health care services, it is quite possible that this effect will result in a significant reduction of overall medicare costs.

Dr. Robert Butler, Director of the National Institute on Aging, helps to explain the reason for these savings in "Aging and Mental Health":

(Medicare) exclusions may actually increase the Government's bill by discouraging preventive and early rehabilitative care . . . Some old people get themselves checked into a hospital just to get a physical examination (basing it on some physical complaint) because this will not be paid for on an out-patient basis.

The same pattern holds true for mental health coverage. Physical com-

plaints and symptoms often mask a psychiatric illness. In many of these cases, patients are inappropriately placed in skilled nursing homes or intermediate care facilities, because reimbursement is more easily available for care in these facilities. Generally, these places lack the resources to treat the emotionally disturbed, thereby prolonging the illness. This misuse of resources raises the cost of medicare.

It has been noted that as many as 30 percent of those described as senile actually have reversible psychiatric conditions which, if treated, would allow these individuals to become more productive members of society and would save a substantial amount of medicare dollars.

In 1979, in its report to the Budget Committee, the Ways and Means Committee stated that it is seeking "improvements in medicare to close certain gaps in coverage (some of which create incentives for the use of more costly services) and to eliminate certain defects in the benefit structure that result in hardships for aged beneficiaries when they become sick."

The Medicare Mental Illness Nondiscrimination Act will achieve these goals.

It is time to make major strides to benefit the large and special population of elderly citizens in need of mental health care services. It is time to act on recommendations that have been languishing for over a decade.

At this time I am inserting the full text of the Medicare Mental Illness Non-Discrimination Act in the record to be printed following my statement.

H.R. —

A bill to eliminate discrimination with regard to mental illness under medicare

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Medicare Mental Illness Non-Discrimination Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that—

- (1) mental illness is more prevalent in elderly persons than in younger adults;
- (2) in spite of potential benefits of treatment, elderly persons are not represented proportionately in the mental health care delivery system;
- (3) medicare benefits must be equalized to better assure care in appropriate institutional settings for those elderly persons in need of such services;
- (4) full outpatient care must be available for those elderly persons with mental, emotional, or nervous disorders which do not require institutional care;
- (5) elderly persons comprise 10 percent of the general population of the United States but account for 25 percent of the suicides;
- (6) 80 percent of the elderly persons who need assistance for emotional disturbances by 1980 will not be able to receive assistance under the present system; and
- (7) since its enactment seventeen years ago, those sections of title XVIII of the Social Security Act restricting coverage for

mental illness have not been revised and inflation has, in effect, further reduced the limited coverage originally envisioned by Congress.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide for coverage of mental illness on an equal basis with coverage of other illness.

MEDICARE PROVISIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1812(b) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "(subject to subsection (c))" in the matter preceding paragraph (1);

(2) by inserting "or" at the end of paragraph (1);

(3) by striking out "; or" at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and

(4) by striking out paragraph (3).

(b)(1) Section 1812 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d), and (e), and (f) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

(2) Section 1812(d) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) is amended by striking out "(c) and (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "and (c)".

(c)(1) Section 1833 of such Act is amended by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d) through (h) as subsections (c) through (g), respectively.

(2) Section 1866(a)(2)(A) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.●

INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE DISABLED PERSON

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this is the International Year of the Disabled Person. Throughout the year, several events will take place to commemorate this significant occasion and to draw attention not only to the serious problems our Nation's handicapped individuals face every day of their lives, but also to the good private and public programs and initiatives which have improved the lives of these individuals and have allowed them to become productive citizens.

One of the ways I would like to participate in this occasion would be to provide every Member of Congress the opportunity to better understand what it means to be handicapped. I am inserting in the RECORD an essay written by a constituent of mine, Mr. Charles Keller of Lyons, Colo. This essay, for which Mr. Keller received fifth prize in the national Ability Counts writing contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped and the participating Governor's Committees on Employment of the Handicapped, is one of the best descriptions I have ever read about what a handicapped individual faces in our society.

I urge all Members of the Congress to take a moment to read the perceptive remarks of Mr. Keller, and to use the insight provided in his essay in making decisions affecting handi-

capped citizens throughout our Nation. I feel that this is particularly relevant at this time, as the Congress is currently examining several budget proposals which call for significant changes in some very good handicapped programs, such as Public Law 94-142 and rehabilitation programs.

MAINSTREAMING OF DISABLED STUDENTS IN MY COMMUNITY'S SCHOOL

(By Charles D. Keller)

I am a seventeen year old physically handicapped student. Most of my twelve years in a public school have been spent on crutches or in a wheelchair. My experiences are an excellent example of what my school district is doing to mainstream physically disabled students. Both my parents and I faced many difficulties in trying to see that I was able to participate as fully as possible in all activities. Most of the problems were easily overcome with the understanding and co-operation of teachers and school staff.

Transportation both to and from school and to outside field trips was the first obstacle that was removed. At first the district required my parents to arrange all transportation. The district now has four buses equipped with hydraulic lifts and specially built to handle the sixteen wheelchair students. These buses go district wide five days a week.

When I began school, curbs and steps required someone to always be on the alert to lift me up and down. It was a slow and sometimes dangerous task and was very embarrassing to me. Two years ago the curbs and steps were ramped in all buildings.

Ten years ago, the district began to build what was termed an open space building. These buildings had very few interior walls and at first seemed to be an ideal situation for a wheelchair bound student. I was transferred into one of these new buildings and attended grades two through five in the open space building. However, after four years, the total devastation of open space floors resembled what the city of Atlanta might have looked like after Sherman's march to the sea! Tables, desks, chairs, books, coats, boots, gloves, lunchboxes and toys were strewn about the floor with abandon. Electric cords plugged into safe floor sockets and running in all directions were like a never ending maze! I felt trapped and frustrated. The need for placing my name on the blackboard for help became a very real obstacle. When I could get to the blackboard, which was on wheels and moved daily, I could not reach either the chalk or the board and if someone else put my name up I frequently found myself "wiped out" by a speeding eraser.

In sixth grade I transferred, at my request, into a strictly structured classroom situation and have found it much easier. Grade seven was the last building change I needed to make until graduation and once again I was faced with a whole new set of obstacles. One of the more serious ones, for my particular handicap, was the ever present danger of being "run over" by older, larger, boisterous students. One day I was the innocent victim of a domino type chain reaction and landed in a heap beneath a football player and a star wrestler. They had fun scuffling, I had a broken shoulder.

These last few years of school have seen many changes in attitude and aid available to handicapped students. Counselors and teachers seem readily available to me at all times and have a more acute awareness of

my needs. Other students are beginning to show more awareness by holding heavy doors and generally giving a helping hand when needed.

In my sophomore year, a series of fractures and surgery made homebound teaching essential. We were unable to obtain a teacher because of the distance they would have to drive, twenty-four miles round trip. A school staff member solved the problem. A retired teacher living in our community was employed by the district and with a great deal of cooperation from my regular teachers, I was able to keep up with all of my classes. Some of my teachers made it a point to stop in the afternoon for a special tutoring session when I had trouble and often brought extra reading material to supplement what I might be missing in lecture classes.

I was able to return to school on a full time basis for my junior year and found I could maintain a 3.5 average even though I had been homebound for a full year.

There are still many obstacles that must be overcome as our district begins to work for another bond issue to build more schools. Each school should have one door equipped with a smooth threshold. It is hard on teeth to be "popping wheelies" over two inch high thresholds. Telephones need to be lowered so they can be reached from a wheelchair. It is inconvenient and embarrassing to have to ask someone to insert the money, as well as dial the number, then hope the cord reaches far enough so you don't have to ask someone to talk for you too! Generally I use the office phone. Drinking fountains need better access. Two story buildings that are serviced by elevators need to have something done about the fact that the elevators are locked at all times. This could be a great hazard to a disabled student in the event of a fire or other disaster. Each disabled student has a key but there is the very real possibility the key could be dropped or lost in the rush of students evacuating a building.

The ramps in two story buildings are too steep. Portable buildings used as classrooms have ramps but very little thought has been given to where the wheelchair must travel to reach the ramp. In my case it was off a three inch drop onto the rough and bumpy grass or over a curb. Restroom usage must almost be determined on an individual basis. I have always had access to the nurse's restroom. Driver's education desperately needs one qualified instructor to teach hand control or pedal extension control. One building might also house both a shop and a home economics room designed for either regular or wheelchair use. Our homebound program could be greatly updated by our career center with the use of closed circuit TV, two way radio communication between the student's home and classroom and the use of student made films of science and other laboratory experiments.

Perhaps one of the greatest needs within our district to help improve the mainstreaming of handicapped students is communication between parents of the students and the administration. It is the duty of each parent to make his child's needs known and then to co-operate fully to see that those needs are met on a realistic basis.●

TESTIMONY OF REVEREND
HESBURGH

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Subcommittee on Immigration, Refugees, and International Law of the Judiciary Committee, which I have the privilege to chair, held joint hearings with the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy, chaired by the Distinguished Senator from Wyoming, ALAN K. SIMPSON, on the report of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy.

These unique joint hearings on the important subject of immigration and refugee policy have proved to be extremely useful and productive. We were privileged to have the Chairman of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, Father Theodore Hesburgh, appear as the opening witness at our hearings.

Father Ted, president of Notre Dame, besides being my good friend, has no parallel among individuals willing to devote their time and energies to difficult tasks in the public service.

Certainly the ability of Father Hesburgh to bring together the divergent views of 16 members of the Select Commission, including 8 Members of Congress, into a unified final report stands as an outstanding tribute to his leadership and dedication to public service.

His excellent testimony for our joint hearings summarizes well the finding of the Select Commission in this most thorny policy area. I commend his remarks to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that his statement before our joint subcommittees be printed in the RECORD in full at this point.

TESTIMONY OF REV. THEODORE M. HESBURGH

My name is Theodore M. Hesburgh, and I am here as the former chairman of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy which expired on April 30. I have with me Dr. Lawrence H. Fuchs, who served as Executive Director of the Commission and Dr. Ralph Thomas, his Deputy. I am particularly pleased to see so many members of our Commission here today.

Our Commission was unusual in two respects. First, it was initiated by the Congress and one half of its membership was from the Congress. Second, and a related point, it was intended not just to study a problem and make general long term recommendations, but to make specific recommendations to reform an extremely complicated law.

Our Commission held twelve regional public hearings, listened to seven hundred witnesses, conducted twenty-four public consultations with experts, sponsored a considerable amount of original research, systematically reviewed all existing research, and, after seven commission meetings, we

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

reported our recommendations to the Congress and the President on February 27th.

THE REDRAFT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND
NATIONALITY ACT

Within the past week, you had delivered to you the Select Commission staff draft of a new Immigration and Nationality Act based on the recommendations of the Commission. I strongly hope that members of the Congress who served on the Commission officially and Representative Mazzoli, who participated in our deliberations in December and January, will introduce this bill as a working bill. I know of no better way to get the Executive Branch, the Congress and the public generally to put this extremely important topic on their agenda than to have the particulars of a working bill to address.

I thought it might be valuable to the Congress for you to have a clear picture of just how the Commission went about its business. For the record, I would like to submit a work chart which depicts that graphically.

Within the next ten days you will receive eleven additional volumes completed by the staff last week as they worked through the nights of April 29th and 30th to ready the material for the printer.

THE STAFF REPORT

Of the volumes you will receive, the first of them is most important. It is the why and how companion volume to the final Commission report. Called the Staff Report, it is a supplement to the official Final Report of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, and provides a detailed analysis of the major recommendations made by the Commission and the implementation strategies and procedures for carrying them out.

Now, the final report is in your hands. But the problems raised by immigration face everyone of us; and they will not go away.

Some among us, often moved by deeply religious values, ask the question: Why should immigration be a problem? Why shouldn't people be free to move wherever they want to? We are all one species, all children of one God; and from the beginning of time, human beings have been a curious, migratory species. Why not let down the barriers of nation-states and permit people to move freely?

The questions almost answer themselves. Immigration is a problem because nearly all peoples believe in nationalism and wish to maintain the integrity of national ideologies and institutions. We believe this in the U.S., too, but not for narrow, nationalistic, selfish purposes only, but also because we believe that our nation has become a symbol of the possibilities of freedom and the potentiality for justice. The existence of our nation as a nation is tied to the realization of high goals for all of humanity.

THE THREE PRINCIPLES OF IMMIGRATION
REFORM

Our nationalism is not inconsistent with internationalism. In fact, the first of three principles which undergird the Commission's important recommendations is the principle of international cooperation. As a nation, we cannot survive without international cooperation. Consequently, the Select Commission made several recommendations guided by that principle.

The second of our important principles is the rule of law. To the Commission, the rule of law meant two things. First, enforcing the limits we set for immigration in a firm, unambiguous manner; and second, doing so with high standards of due process. Dozens

of the Commission recommendations are guided by the principle of the rule of law.

Our third principle is that of the open society. By the open society, we mean certain specific things. We mean that it is in the national interest of the United States to accept a reasonable number of immigrants and refugees each year to fulfill U.S. policy goals regardless of the color, nationality, or religion of those admitted. It also means that, once admitted to this country, that they should be entitled to get on a fast track to citizenship under the protection of the U.S. Constitution and the laws of this land without discrimination.

The open society does not mean limitless immigration. Quantitative and qualitative limits are perfectly compatible with the concepts of the open society as we understand them.

THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION
REFORM

Without first principles such as international cooperation, the rule of law, and the open society, it will not be possible to bring about fundamental immigration reform. Our efforts and yours will be picked at by special interest groups. In a letter sent to me by President Ford, who is joining me and many distinguished citizens today in forming a Citizens' Committee for Immigration Reform, he praised the work of the Select Commission and warned that we must guard against the parochialism and demagoguery of special interest groups.

THE ENEMIES OF PAROCHIALISM AND
DEMAGOGUERY

We cannot defang, to use Senator Al Simpson's phrase, the emotionalism which surrounds this issue entirely but we can recognize first principles and try our best to be guided by them. If they do not overcome the four horsemen of parochialism, demagoguery, knee-jerkism and perfectionism, at least perhaps they will temper the debate and provide the necessary framework for getting on with the work.

Each of the major recommendations I will discuss this afternoon is interrelated, and I urge the Congress to take such a comprehensive approach. For example, concentration on enforcement should be matched with an equal emphasis on a sound immigration law.

Of course, the first subject on the minds of most persons who worry about immigration is illegal immigration.

This Commission not only recommended a more rational system for admitting immigrants legally and for the legalization as resident aliens of a large proportion of undocumented aliens now in the United States, but it recommended many measures to enforce consistently, firmly, and fairly the limits established by law.

EMPLOYER SANCTIONS

There is no sense in pretending enforcement will work without demagnetizing the jobs which bring illegal aliens here. A centerpiece of the enforcement measures recommended by the Commission would be an employee sanctions law with a reliable, nondiscriminatory method of certifying employee eligibility that any of us would use when applying for a new job.

Would such a measure be worth the effort and cost and would it work? Thirteen members of the Commission believe that it would. Would such a measure discriminate against certain groups or be used to violate the privacy rights of Americans? While I understand the apprehensions of the many

people who raise those questions, issues which are of concern to me also, I strongly believe the answer is no.

Employer sanctions is not a panacea but it will take away the incentive for employers to hire illegal aliens and demagnetize the magnet enough so that with comprehensive, targeted enforcement strategies we should be able to reduce illegal migration to a relatively small number.

This Commission does not want draconian measures at the border, ports of entry or in the interior. Just the opposite. We made many recommendations to improve the professionalism of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and to protect the rights of those who come in contact with its investigators, inspectors and Border Patrol Agents. But we know that without employer sanctions, enforcement efforts will not be effective.

I would ask that those who sympathize with the aspirations and the plight of illegal aliens—and I count myself among them—to think about the aspirations of Americans whose wages and standards are depressed by their presence and also to think about the aliens themselves. Not the ones who slip into the system and make a decent living while they adjust to a fugitive life in the shadows—but the ones who die in the desert or in the ballast tanks of ships and the ones who are waiting patiently in line to come to the United States through legal immigration channels.

For those who are apprehensive about discrimination resulting from the application of employer sanctions, I would point out that the only system the Commission recommended would protect against discrimination more than at present because all persons eligible to work would have to identify themselves through a reliable method of identification. Employers who turn someone away would not have the excuse that he or she looked or talked like an illegal alien. Under the employer sanctions law proposed, employers would not be penalized if they were fooled by the job applicant.

I also am persuaded that concerns about the abuse of privacy are not warranted. What protects our society and individuals against the abuse of privacy is the existence of traditions, habits, and laws which sustain our first, fifth and fourteenth amendment rights concerning freedom and due process. These constitute a national will to resist governmental control or private misuse of personal information.

In fact, the employment eligibility system should be the occasion to make explicit in legislative language the privacy protections due individuals in our society. In this case, there would be strict limitations on the use of the employee eligibility card and on the access to and use of the data base behind it.

LEGALIZATION

Effective enforcement will depend on one other major Commission recommendation which also was guided by the principle of the rule of law. We called it legalization. We unanimously recommended the legalization of a large proportion of the undocumented aliens now in this country. We specified that persons should be eligible if they could show that they were in the United States no later than January 1, 1980. I know that Congress will pay particular attention to the reasons which produced this unanimous vote.

First, new enforcement efforts to curtail the future flow of illegal aliens, which the Commission said must be instituted if we are to have a legalization program, will

depend for maximum effectiveness on the knowledge which can be produced only through a comprehensive legalization program that provides information about migration channels, smuggler practices, and the characteristics of the aliens of themselves.

Second, through legalization we will learn for the first time the composition by national origin of illegal aliens and even be able to pinpoint the villages, towns, states and provinces from which they come. That knowledge will be invaluable when we try to deal with migration pressures at the source through bilateral or international cooperation.

Third, by legalizing this group, the Immigration and Naturalization Service will be able to target its limited enforcement resources where they count—in stopping future flows—instead of in the costly and ineffective cops and robber approach to catching people who already have learned how to avoid the authorities.

Fourth, these persons, while more capable of evasion than newcomers, live in an underclass outside of the protection of the law. As such, they are prey to exploitation by employers who violate labor protection laws and other more serious criminal activity—undermining the rule of law for all of us as well as depressing the wages and standards of some.

Fifth, legalization not only recognizes the fact that these people are already here, but that we will all benefit if they come out of the shadows and participate more fully in American life.

Ironically, legalization may permit many aliens to return home more frequently to their countries of origin than they now do. Rates of emigration for most immigrants have been about 30 percent of immigration. For this group, that would be higher once given a legal resident alien status in the United States since they no longer would be subject to the hazards of crossing illegally.

No one has to fear that legalization will cost the United States anything. Fees will pay for the entire program. Only those aliens who have a job and can meet the public charge requirements will qualify.

A LARGE TEMPORARY WORKER PROGRAM

Some are asking why it is necessary to confer the status of resident alien on those who qualify for legalization? Why not, they ask, give them a temporary worker status and include them as part of large scale guestworker program to be negotiated with interested countries?

The idea of a large temporary worker program is tremendously attractive. Perhaps a better word is seductive. Economists predict a large shortfall of U.S. service and agricultural workers in the decades ahead. There are certainly hundreds of thousands of people in the Caribbean Basin and in Latin American countries who would be happy to take those jobs. Some people believe that a large guestworker program might channel enough persons into the employ of ranchers, growers, garment and other manufacturers to such an extent that employer sanctions and other enforcement measures will not be necessary.

There is a superficial plausibility to this argument and the Commission gave it serious consideration for more than a year and a half. In the end, we were persuaded that it would be a mistake to launch such a program.

First, a large scale temporary worker program—say a half million or more a year—whether or not it included the newly legal-

ized aliens already here, would have some limits which had to be enforced. Would the program be for single men only? For agricultural employment? For the southwestern states? For six months, eight or more? Would individuals be able to renew their participation?

Whatever the answers to these questions, the limits would have to be enforced. Without an employer sanctions law and a reliable means of employee identification, the rule of law would be compromised extensively as aliens tried to slip the boundaries imposed by the program.

Second, it is difficult to turn off such a program once it gets started. A large scale program would build a dependency on foreign labor in certain sectors of the economy. Certain jobs would become identified with foreigners, putting at risk one aspect of the principle of the open society, as I tried to define it a moment ago. In effect, a second class of aliens would have been established in our country who were not fully protected by the law and its entitlements and who could not participate effectively in mainstream institutions. And a large program without effective enforcement measures would stimulate new migration pressures in the long run.

Third, one of the seductive reasons for such a program is to accommodate the population pressures of other nations and thus achieve foreign policy objectives. But there are few things more dangerous to friendship between nations than to have a large body of foreign nationals working in one country with the possibility of incidents being blown up by a demagogue in either country.

MEXICO

Many have suggested that a guestworker program would be helpful to Mexico. Apart from the fact that no Mexican official represented that position to us, we did not think it wise to propose a program with potentially harmful consequences to the United States as a whole.

The Commission has been mindful of U.S. relations with Mexico and other countries as charged by Public Law 95-412. We know that it is in our national interest that Mexico be able to shape its own destiny as prosperous and stable democracy. We know that Mexico, to some extent, relies on the safety valve of migration to the United States. But we cannot shape an immigration policy for the world—with sixteen million refugees and more than one million persons registered with visa numbers to come to the United States—in response to one nation only. In fact, that would be inconsistent with the principle of the open society which does not discriminate in the admission of immigrants and refugees on the basis of nationality.

However, we made several recommendations consistent with that very principle which will have the practical effect of increasing immigration from Mexico to some extent. We estimate that at the outside about 700,000 of the one and a half million persons who might avail themselves of the legalization program would be Mexican nationals who would then be in a position to petition for their spouses and minor children to come to the United States. It is conceivable that as many as two hundred and fifty thousand Mexican spouses and/or minor children would be admitted, although the actual number is likely to be less. Such persons would, of course, have to wait in turn under the numerically restricted immigration totals imposed by the new law. But

their admission to the United States and that of other spouses and minor children of resident aliens would be expedited by the emphasis which the Commission has placed on the reunification of immediate families. The modest increase recommended for legal immigration which would facilitate both family reunification and independent immigration is another recommendation which is likely, at least in the near term, to increase immigration from Mexico slightly. Finally, the clearing of backlogs, in conjunction with the introduction of the new system, also would help to some degree.

THE NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES TO BE ADMITTED

I know that there are persons who are wondering why the Commission recommended an increase in legal immigration. The answer is straightforward but not simple. It is clearly in the interests of the United States to do so. Once again I will summarize our findings with respect to legal immigrants.

Immigrants work hard, save and invest and create more jobs than they take. Thus, they contribute to economic growth in the United States. That is true even for refugees although the contribution takes place after a longer period of adjustment.

Immigrants rapidly pay back into the public coffers more than they take out.

Immigrants strengthen our pool of younger and middle-aged workers, thus strengthening our social security system and enlarging U.S. manpower capabilities.

Immigrants strengthen our ties with other nations.

Immigrants strengthen our linguistic and cultural resources.

Immigrants and their children embrace American ideals and public values rapidly and help to renew them.

Immigrants give a brilliant demonstration to the world of the advantages of a free society.

And finally, the children of immigrants acculturate well to American life and actually seem to be healthier and do better at school on the average than those of native born Americans.

In the face of all this, one well might ask why the Commission was so timid in recommending a modest increase in legal immigration from 270,000 to 350,000 annually.

One reason is that under the Refugee Act of 1980, whose fundamental provisions we endorsed, it is possible to admit more than the 50,000 refugees anticipated by that act as the normal annual flow.

Because refugee situations often are emergencies, we need to provide flexibility to meet them. Therefore, we must be cautious on the number of numerically restricted immigrants we admit.

A second reason is that some of our Commissioners believe that we should not increase the present ceilings at all until effective enforcement is in place. In fact, four Commissioners voted against the increase in immigration levels for that reason. The twelve who voted for it include many who are strong advocates of new, effective enforcement measures but see the value of increasing immigration modestly at this time for the good that it will do this country, and because the new system will help to reduce pressures for illegal migration slightly.

A third reason is the largely incorrect but widely held perception that immigrants take away from rather than benefit society. Because that perception is a social reality one must be cautious about numbers.

What will the numbers add up to if the Commission's recommendations are fol-

lowed? If the Congress adopts the recommendations of the Select Commission, we can make population projections based on reasonable assumptions—including one about illegal immigration—which you will find discussed in two chapters of the staff report. The result is that the United States will achieve negative population growth at a level of two hundred seventy-four million persons by the year 2050, less than seventy years from now. That is based on a projection of an annual net immigration of five hundred thousand, a reasonable and perhaps conservative projection as explained in the staff report, which I hope the Congress will reprint, since it goes into such detail with respect to the background and the implications of the Commission's recommendations.

Two hundred and seventy-four million does not strike me as high by any measure. The United States, if it followed those recommendations, would go from having 6% of the world's population now to far less than 3% by the year 2050, something that may happen in only twenty-five years. The U.S. would remain the least densely populated nation in the world with the probable exceptions of Canada and Australia. And our per capita wealth relative to the rest of the world would be much greater than it is now.

THE COMPOSITION OF U.S. POPULATION

There also is concern about increasing the percentage of foreign born in our nation's population. Right now there are eight Western countries with a higher percentage of foreign born than the U.S. and we are better at absorbing immigrants than any of them. Yet, the concern is understandable. Immigration means change and change brings the possibilities of conflict.

Let us take the worst case from the point of view of those who are concerned about a rise in the percentage of foreign born. Suppose Congress does not accept the Commission's recommendations which we believe will lead to a net annual migration of no more than 500,000 a year, a number that is certainly less than in the last few years. Suppose the net migration was 750,000 a year. That would lead to a population of 300 million by the year 2080—one hundred years from now, the equivalent of 5 generations—and of that population, one-third would consist of persons who had arrived in the U.S. after 1979 or of their descendants.

Why should that be so worrisome in the light of U.S. history? The fact is that about 45 percent of the people now in this country either arrived here or are descendants of persons who came here within the last four to five generations. In fact, at least one half of the Congressional members of our Commission are descendants of persons who came to the United States within the last four generations, not even counting that distinguished alumnus of Notre Dame, Ron Mazzoli. No one questions their Americanism in the slightest although many people vigorously opposed the arrival of their ancestors, predicting dire consequences for the United States because of their admission.

In years past it was argued that German immigrants, because of their strong love for the German language and culture, would destroy the ties that bind us as a nation. Then it was the Catholics, particularly the Irish, with their devotion to Papal authority, who, it was maintained, would prove incapable of contributing to a free society. Next, the Jews, Italians, Poles, Greeks and others were scorned as unfit to become good Americans. So strong was the feeling against Asians that they virtually were ex-

cluded as legal immigrants until very recently in our history. Only the American Indians can claim to be charter members here. But all of our ancestral groups in their own way can claim to have refreshed, renewed, defended and created the United States of America.

We all are fortunate that some of our ancestors were immigrants, others refugees, some contract laborers, others indentured servants, and still others survived the slave trade and made it to this land. Most of them suffered the migration passage and the problems of adjustment here, even those who chose to come, but few of us regret that they stuck it out.

While this nation should get its house in order by regaining control over immigration policy and while it is clear that we no longer can follow George Washington's advice to open our doors to all of the oppressed of the world, this would be a horrible time to impose additional quantitative restrictions on immigration. It would be a classic case of biting off one's nose to spite one's face. And it would be a betrayal of what is best in us—what the country stands for above all else—opportunity, freedom and respect for diversity based on the dignity and worth of human beings.

THE NEED FOR LEADERSHIP

In 1939, the Congress followed the public opinion polls and refused to accept refugees beyond the number allocated under our restrictive national origins quota system. Not only did that doom those persons to a fate determined by Adolf Hitler, but the United States lost the talent, ability and gratitude of those people and their descendants.

We can and should assert our own values and traditions and our self-interest by modestly increasing levels of immigration and instituting a legalization program as well as by enforcing the law firmly and fairly. What is required is a campaign of leadership to articulate those values, traditions and interests in relationship to immigration so that the American people will support the recommendations of the Commission.

Thank you very much. It has been a privilege to serve.●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL,
1981—THE ABRANZON FAMILY

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, all of the nations which signed the Helsinki Final Act, including the Soviet Union, pledged to do everything possible to reunite families separated by political boundaries.

Because the Soviet Union has failed to live up to that promise, Members of Congress are conducting a vigil on the House floor entitled "Call to Conscience" on behalf of Soviet Jewish families and individuals who are being forcibly detained in the U.S.S.R. as a result of the Soviet Government's repressive immigration policy.

Last year, I participated in a similar vigil, "Spirit of Helsinki," on behalf of Zina and Arkady Abranzon. It saddens me very deeply that my participation

in the "Call to Conscience" must again be directed toward the plight of the same family.

The Soviet police broke into Mr. and Mrs. Abranzon's apartment on October 5, 1979, confiscated all of their possessions, and incarcerated them at Ivano-Frankovsk Prison in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, where they were held without trial for more than 1 year.

The Abranzons are Soviet Jewish citizens who had planned to apply for exit visas before this unfortunate incident.

In November of 1980, Soviet officials found the Abranzons guilty of the crime of possession of resources. Arkady Abranzon was sentenced to 14 years in prison, while his wife, Zina, was condemned to a prison term of 6 years; both sentences are currently being served at Ivano-Frankovsk.

It is my belief that by releasing the Abranzons and granting them exit visas the Soviet Union would not only indicate to the world its willingness to comply with the Helsinki accords, but would also affirm its desire to ameliorate relations between our two great nations. This action would be particularly significant, coming at a time when the new Reagan administration is considering U.S.-U.S.S.R. policy initiatives, as well as a possible summit meeting.

I am deeply concerned over the Soviet Union's disturbing treatment of its Jewish citizens and ask that it abide by its international commitments by relaxing restrictions on immigration policies. I look forward to the day when there is no longer any need for such pleas—the day when families can be reunited in Israel.●

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY DOULOS

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, funeral services were held last week in Massachusetts for James Doulos, founder of Jimmy's Harborside, one of Boston's best-known restaurants. The late Leverett Saltonstall, while Governor of Massachusetts, nicknamed Jimmy Doulos the "Chowder King," and most New Englanders agreed. Indeed, after Mr. Saltonstall's election to the Senate, he was so appalled to find tomatoes in the Senate dining room's clam chowder that he arranged for Jimmy to instruct Senate cooks in the art of making real clam chowder. As all New Englanders know, it's a sin to put tomatoes in clam chowder.

But Jimmy Doulos was more than a restaurant owner. While proud of America, his adopted country, he never forgot his humble origins in the

small Greek town of Mytelene. He spent his entire life promoting improved Greek-American friendship, and eventually raised thousands of dollars for the construction of a new high school in his home town. Jimmy gave generously of his time and money to local charities in Boston as well. Mr. Speaker, this Nation of immigrants was built by men and women of courage and imagination, the qualities that made Jimmy Doulos the great man he was. Those of us who were his friends loved and respected him, and we will all miss him.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD two tributes to Jimmy Doulos that appeared in the Greek Sunday News of Boston.

JIMMY DOULOS, PEOPLE'S AMBASSADOR

(By Peter L. Caparell)

Beneath the Byzantine cupola of the N.E. Orthodox Cathedral in Roxbury, civic, educational and religious leaders, assembled for a farewell salute to the People's Ambassador of the Athens of America, James E. Doulos.

Delegations headed by House Speaker, Thomas P. O'Neill, Governor Edward J. King and the Mayor of Boston, joined ecclesiastic legates and university heads in paying final homage to a humble and benevolent Hellene, who set foot to these shores as a thirteen year old migrant, eager to earn his mark in this golden land of opportunity.

Celebrants of a high mass were the Metropolitan Meliton from Constantinople and Dean John C. Zanetos with parish pastors from surrounding communities participating. More personal and nostalgic eulogies were delivered by (interdenominational) clergy friends of the Doulos family.

This large congregation of friends, from all levels of society, shared together the tears of grief that truly revealed the measure of the man, known and beloved, simply as "Jimmy."

He was, said Dean Zanetos, a soul that was filled with:

"Goodness, Humility and Kindness."

Speaker O'Neill, who shared joyous moments with Jimmy, was surely speaking for many when he said: "We lost a fine friend."

Former Governor John A. Volpe, didn't have to utter a word. Brushing tears, from reddened eyes, conveyed his message. Michael Dukakis, another ex Governor from another party was observed leaving the Cathedral with bowed head and hands stuffed into pockets.

Veterans of the 26th (Yankee) Division and members of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery, resplendent in gold braid and maroon uniforms, served as the honor guard and stood rigidly to attention outside the Cathedral to honor a comrade they regard as a "Genuine Patriot."

Members of the Massachusetts House and Senate, huddled about, within the reception area of the Cathedral sharing memories. Among them was House Speaker McGee and Majority Leader, Jimmy Craven, of Jamaica Plain.

A stirring eulogy delivery by the Metropolitan, summed it up best when he recounted the early struggles and priceless quality of character and cited Jimmy's charitable deeds as, "Monuments to the heart and soul of the good and decent and harmonious way of life."

Jimmy Doulos did not wish to have his name chiseled into the cold granite for

marble walls of the temples of learning, the centers of research or the clinics of healing, that he personally and so generously supported. He was a day by day social activist, on a person to person basis. The legacy he leaves family and friends, is the way he lived. In his words:

"Each day is a preparation for tomorrow."

In other words, when you leave this earth, leave it a better place than when you first entered.

Interment was in Milton and the memorial repast was hosted at the family establishment, Jimmy's Harborside. The affair was prepared by an independent caterer.

Hundreds of telegrams from local and remote friends throughout the United States, Canada and Greece were received by members of the immediate family, Mrs. Irene Doulos (widow) and son Costes (Charlie) Doulos.

Many members of Congress and Greek government officials also wired their condolences.

Publisher William A. Harris and Staff of the GSN join our sister newspapers the Boston Herald American and Globe in bidding, "Godspeed" to a worthy Hellene.

Jimmy Doulos had style and class.

That grown up immigrant boy really showed a lot of us, how to live!

MILTON, MASS.—Funeral services were held at the Greek Orthodox Cathedral, Parker and Ruggles Street last Saturday for James Doulos, founder and owner of Jimmy's Harborside Restaurant, a Boston waterfront dining spot.

Mr. Doulos died last Wednesday night in his sleep at Eastwood Nursing Home Dedham. He was 75.

Jimmy, who died after suffering from Alzheimer's disease for a year, personified the American success story.

Mr. Doulos emigrated to this country from his native Greece, where he was born on August 24, 1909. When he landed in New York's Ellis Island, he had \$13 in his pocket, the clothes on his back and big dreams, which he made come true.

When he died, he was a wealthy man with a fine house in Milton, a devoted family and friends in all walks of life. They ranged from his Northern Avenue restaurant's busboys and cleaning women to celebrities.

Enormous energy and drive, vision and determination, a way with people and, obviously, food, plus lots of hard work were the ingredients for his success.

Mr. Doulos never forgot the land of his birth nor failed to sing the praises of the land he adopted.

In June, 1968, Mr. Doulos was given a replica of the classical bronze statue, "Youth of Marathon". It was presented by the Greek National Tourist Office for his service in behalf of Greek-American friendship and promotion of tourism to Greece. It meant a lot to him. Four years earlier, he had organized the American Development for Lesvos Fund, which, with the aid of Boston businessmen, raised \$50,000 toward building a high school for girls in his home town of Mytelene, on the Greek Island of Lesvos.

But to Mr. Doulos the greatest honor of his life came, as he put it, on the day in 1925 when "I raised my hand to become a citizen of this wonderful country."

"Where in the world could all this happen to me? Only in America", he said several years ago. "This country gives more opportunities than any other country. But nothing comes easy. You have to work for it, and

then you can enjoy it better." And work, he did.

Mr. Doulos was dubbed "Chowder King" in the 1930's by the late Senator and Massachusetts Governor Leverett Saltonstall, who found Jimmy's fish chowder fit for a king. Like most dyed-in-the-wool New Englanders, "Salty" has a strong aversion to the reddish stuff that passes for the real McCoy in other parts of the country. Crime of crimes: Tomatoes were put into it.

Jimmy more than agreed. "If they want tomatoes give 'em tomato soup," he declared. "If they want chowder, make it white." Genuine fish chowder, he explained, contains salt pork, chopped onions, sliced Maine potatoes, a dash of flour, seasoning, milk and lots of fresh haddock.

Mr. Doulos' title of "Chowder King, of the Nation" was made official in 1957 by *Holiday* magazine. Calling his restaurant "possibly one of the best seafood houses in America," the old travel magazine regularly gave it an annual Distinctive Dining Award, attributing its excellence to "the vivid personality of its owner and founder, the handsome, white-haired Greek-American, Jimmy Doulos."

The awards, which singled the Harborside out from thousands of restaurants sampled throughout the nation and which date annually from 1957 to 1972, are prominently displayed as one enters the restaurant lounge.

Other distinctions that came his way were White House invitations during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations: a citation naming him honorary mayor of New Orleans and commission as an admiral in the "Great Navy of the State of Nebraska", conferred on him by the state's governor.

Self taught in cooking and restaurant administration, Mr. Doulos once said: "Ninety percent of the Greeks who came to this country couldn't speak English, so they went to the restaurants to wash pots and dishes. But a Greek wants to have his freedom. So as soon as he would have \$100, he would open a restaurant. That's how come so many Greeks went into the restaurant business."

It was the route he had taken. His first job was at the old soapstone sinks of the Plymouth Restaurant on Bromfield Street, where besides washing the crockery and cutlery, he kept his eyes on the cooking procedures.

"Fortunately", he later related, "the chef liked me and gave me an opportunity. The iceboxes were downstairs and when he would send me down to get something, I would fly over the stairs and be back before he started making the sauce because, I would tell him, 'I want to learn this game.'"

Learn it he did. Two years later, he had replaced the chef. "I was making \$42 a week in 1922 cooking and I thought I was the richest Greek in America," he recalled. Two years after that, Jimmy and an older brother, John, 21, started the "Liberty Lunch" on Commonwealth Pier by taking over a small store and installing a kitchen, a counter and 17 stools. Jimmy was the cook and John was the baker. They were open from 10 a.m. to 11 p.m. daily.

In 1929, the brothers moved their eatery to the site of the present restaurant, a long light gray, two-story building that has been remodeled or enlarged more than half a dozen times, so it now seats 500 diners. But never on a Sunday. "That's our day of rest," explained Jimmy. There are many succulent dishes on the bill of fare, but the real specialite du jour or nuit was Mr. Doulos.

Weighing the same 142 pounds; that he weighed when he was 30, thanks to a daily set of pushups. Mr. Doulos was a familiar fixture—seating guests, moving among the crowded tables and pausing to chat with old friends, or beaming welcoming smiles to new ones.

"To me, this business will always be people" he said in an interview in 1973. "I prefer to be with our customers or preparing something special for them in the kitchen. . . . I know of very few professions which permit you to meet so many people from all walks of life. I've been in this one for 48 years.

"It's been a privilege to serve presidents, film and stage stars, sports celebrities. . . . I'll never retire. I've met and known them all." (The walls are peppered with photographs of Mr. Doulos posing with celebrities. "They know who I am and who Charlie is. The trouble with so many restaurants today is you seldom know who the boss is.")

Charlie is Mr. Doulos' son, Charles also known as Jimmy, Jr. A graduate of Harvard, he is president of the business. Mr. Doulos had stepped down to become treasurer.

In 1976, the restaurant came under attack by members of Massachusetts Fair Share. It contended the restaurant was one of a group of Port Authority tenants in the Commonwealth Fish Pier area that owed Boston back taxes amounting to \$600,000 which it said should be collected before any property tax increase for Boston was approved. Mr. Doulos said payment was deferred because of an unresolved legal question and agreed to remit his share, which amounted to \$50,000 plus interest.

Three years later, Mr. Doulos and his son expanded their activities to open Jimbo's Fish Shanty, directly across Northern Avenue from the Harbor Side.

Mr. Doulos leaves his wife, Irene, a son Charles, a daughter Despina Ayers, all of Milton; two brothers Eletherios and John; a sister Anastasia Haldesou, of Greece and seven grandchildren.●

A SALUTE TO NEW JERSEY SUPREME COURT JUSTICE MARK A. SULLIVAN

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday evening, May 13, 1981, a great citizen of New Jersey is being honored by the New Jersey Fellows of the American Bar Foundation at its 1981 annual dinner.

I have been privileged to know, through my practice of law, the high ideals and standards of the Honorable Mark A. Sullivan. He will be presented with the New Jersey Fellows of the American Bar Association 1981 Judicial Achievement Award.

Born and raised in Jersey City, he is the illustrious son of an illustrious father, Mark A. Sullivan, Sr., who also served on our State's highest court. Justice Sullivan, a graduate of St. Peter's Prep School in 1928, matriculated at Georgetown University where he graduated in 1932. A student at Harvard Law School he completed his

studies there in 1935 and was admitted to the bar as an attorney in April 1936, and as a counselor in 1939.

Having distinguished himself during World War II as an officer in the U.S. Naval Reserve, Mark Sullivan, then an attorney in private practice, was appointed to the bench of the second district court of Jersey City in October 1945. He was later elevated to the Hudson County District Court in 1949.

Judge Sullivan was appointed to the superior court where he served until March 1959. He was assigned to the appellate division of the superior court. Former New Jersey Gov. William T. Cahill appointed Judge Sullivan as an associate justice of the supreme court in 1973, and he was sworn in to this high office on March 23 of that year.

Mark Sullivan's steady rise in our judicial system is a testament to the skills and probity he has always displayed, whether from behind counsel's table or from the bench itself. He is married to the former Mary Josephine Hamill, a member of a prominent New Jersey family. They have one son, Mark, and are now residents of Spring Lake, N.J.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my best wishes to Justice Sullivan and congratulate the New Jersey Fellows on their excellent choice to receive the prestigious Judicial Achievement Award.

Justice Sullivan will retire on August 11, 1981. The New Jersey and Hudson County Bar Associations will sorely miss one of their most distinguished members.

It is this group, Mr. Speaker, which is joining en masse to pay tribute to Justice Sullivan. A large delegation of officers, trustees, and members will take part in this celebration, honoring a man who has served his State and Nation so well for so many years. In his years on our States highest court, Justice Sullivan has distinguished himself in his adherence to the most honored of our legal traditions: the principles embodied in our Nation's Constitution which state that "all persons are equal before the law; and anyone, rich or poor, can demand the protection of the law in the exercise of his rights, and that the Government is a Government of laws, not of men. No one is above the law. No officer of Government can use authority unless the Constitution or the law permits."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this outstanding judicial career to the attention of this Congress, and ask you and our colleagues to join with the New Jersey Fellows of the American Bar Association in saluting this distinguished American, Justice Mark A. Sullivan. We wish him well and look forward to many productive years to come.

Justice Sullivan epitomizes the ideals and goals expressed by Thomas Jefferson, who said in his March 4, 1801, inaugural address:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; . . . freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the test of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety. ●

FRANK PEPPER RETIRES FROM TV DUTIES

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a dear friend of mine and scores of thousands of others in northwest Florida, who happens also to be the kid brother of our esteemed colleague from Miami, CLAUDE PEPPER, recently retired from broadcasting after a 35-year career.

Frank Pepper, who became an institution on television station WCTV in Tallahassee, Fla., and Thomasville, Ga., switched from radio to television on September 15, 1955, when the new station went on the air. He had spent the previous 7 years as a news broadcaster on Tallahassee radio.

Frank, during those years, became as well known in the Big Bend area of north Florida as his older brother has become in Miami and Washington after his 38 years of combined service in both Houses of Congress.

We confidently hope that Frank's early retirement at age 63 will plant no similar ideas in the mind of his older brother who has so many years of valuable service left to contribute to his district, his State, and his Nation.

The following story in the Tallahassee Democrat details Frank's colorful career and I command it to my colleagues:

"GOOD MORNING" STAR IS SAYING GOODBYE
(By David Klein)

After 23 years as host of the "Good Morning Show" on WCTV-Channel 6, Frank Pepper will retire from television Thursday. It will mark the end of a broadcasting career that began in 1946 in radio and included 26 years on television—a record only a handful of TV personalities can match.

On Tuesday morning's show, flanked by program co-hosts Paul Bryar and Anna Johnson, Pepper, 63, made the announcement that he would take early retirement.

Bryar will take over as host of the "Good Morning Show" after Thursday, and WCTV's Dan Harmon will fill Bryar's post and do the weather every morning.

Pepper said he decided to quit because he didn't want to keep making the long drive every morning to the WCTV studios 25 miles out of town.

The "Good Morning Show" goes on the air live every morning at 7, which means Pepper has to get up every morning at 4. And he's been doing the show since 1958.

"Dave Garroway wasn't on that long, neither was Ed Sullivan and neither was Hugh Downs," Pepper said proudly.

During those years Pepper interviewed a number of famous guests, including Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, boxers Jack Dempsey and Archie Moore, writers Pearl Buck and Rod Serling and actors Don Ameche and Helen Hayes.

He said Dempsey was his favorite. He kept trying to convince the former world heavyweight champion—a hero of his—to let him arrange a rematch with Gene Tunney.

The days of news and interviews are over now, but Pepper said he planned to stay active after leaving Channel 6.

"This is retirement from television, not retirement from work. I'll probably get some part-time job—but it won't start at 4 a.m.," he said.

"It'll probably be in public relations or public information. I feel that I have as many friends as any one man around here in North Florida and South Georgia."

His friends at Channel 6 agree. The word from everybody there is that Frank Pepper is a living institution.

"And before TV, he was almost an institution in radio," said the program director, Jerry Williams.

Pepper started his career fresh out of the Navy at WTNT radio station—then known as WRHP.

He had no journalism training, but he got his break when the regular news announcer showed up drunk one day. Pepper has continued to work as a news announcer for the last 35 years.

Seven of those years were spent at WTNT, and then Pepper jumped to WTAL, a radio station owned by John Phipps.

When Phipps later put WCTV on the air to serve Tallahassee and Thomasville Pepper went with him.

In fact, Pepper read the evening news Sept. 15, 1955, WCTV's first day of broadcasting.

"Ed Sullivan had only been on for six or seven years then," he said. "We were feeling our way. Everybody was learning, and it just kept growing and growing."

When Pepper started at Channel 6, WCTV was an NBC station. But by 1957 the station managers had decided to swap allegiance to CBS, and that left them with a gap where NBC's early-morning "Today" show had been.

The solution was to create their own local early-morning news-weather-sports-talk show.

"It was done with Frank Pepper in mind," Williams said, and Pepper and Jack Ridner, another popular announcer for Channel 6 at that time, put the show on the air.

Within a few years, a female co-host was added to the show. Johnson, who currently holds this position, is the ninth co-host in the history of the "Good Morning Show."

"I can remember six of them," Pepper once said, "but I can see the faces of the other three."

With Pepper at the helm, the "Good Morning Show" has always dominated its time period locally, defeating the "Today Show" in the ratings even when that program had virtually no network competition.

"I attribute that to Frank's personality, and to the fact that viewers like to have local people telling them what's going on," Williams said.

"Frank's been an on-the-air friend, a member of the family."

The beginning of the end for Pepper came in 1976, when WCTV moved from its old location on North Monroe Street out to the wilderness near the Tall Timbers Research Station, a wearying 40-minute drive from Pepper's house.

Pepper also was bothered then by an arthritic nerve condition in his neck. He checked with doctors around the country, and one finally suggested that Pepper begin wearing a plastic brace to relieve some of the discomfort.

"It has helped tremendously," Pepper said. He doesn't wear the brace at home or around town, he said, "but I wear it for comfort at the TV station. It keeps my neck from throbbing."

Pepper has been thinking about leaving his early-morning job for some time.

Now he will have more time to play golf, his favorite hobby, and to keep up his reading of stories by Rudyard Kipling and Robert Service.

"One of the greatest satisfactions," he said, "is knowing all the good friends I've been able to meet through the medium of television, which reaches and reaches and reaches and reaches." ●

FREE SCHOOL LUNCHEES CAN BE MORE COST EFFECTIVE

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to provide for a study to be conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the costs and feasibility of amending the National School Lunch Act so as to permit free lunches to be served to all children attending school under the jurisdiction of a local education agency, LEA, in which at least 60 percent of the children attending such school are otherwise eligible for such lunches.

In the name of efficiency, economy, and health, I think this study will be well worth the effort. I am assured by the New York officials who manage the school lunch programs that the increased costs of a universal program in New York would be outweighed by the administrative cost saved. That is, by modifying or eliminating steps 1, 2, and 4 of the assessment improvement and monitoring system, AIMS, and making other efficient recording and administrative changes and allowing universal school lunch participation, New York officials feel they could at least break even, if not, save money. It is my understanding and the feeling of

experts in the national school lunch programs that other jurisdictions can accomplish the same results if given the chance. My proposal is to study the feasibility and cost of such a concept in say, five regional targeted jurisdictions representing various school districts. I am confident the study will prove that the feasibility and costs of universal feeding can exist within the budgetary restraints dictated by today's economics. I am confident that, if nothing else, the study will show that many school districts are capable of running the school lunch program more efficiently with universal feeding and should be given the option of using that method.

Let me emphasize that my bill does not seek to expand the school lunch program. Instead, it is my intention to streamline the delivery of service to children while cutting administrative costs and paperwork.

When my staff contacted the Congressional Budget Office and USDA to confirm my suspicion that serving all children in New York or in the entire United States could actually be cheaper than the current system, we were told that no appropriate data exist.

I believe it is time we have reliable data. We should know under what circumstances, if at all, it would be cheaper and more efficient to provide a universal free lunch program to a certain limited number of LEA's in urban and rural sections of the country with high concentration of poor children.

We have no evidence to suggest that this concept would greatly expand the program. For example, in New York City, 565,973 children were eligible for free lunch, yet of those eligible to receive free lunch only 446,379 or 78.8 percent participated in the program. There will always be children who prefer to bring their lunch, eat elsewhere, or skip lunch altogether. In these times of economic belt tightening, this bill makes economic sense and I urge my colleagues cosponsor the measure.●

FOREIGN POLICY CHAOS

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, amid criticisms of President Carter's foreign policy, the new administration promised us a decisive and constant foreign policy. Have they kept their promise? Like many in this House, and across the Nation, I fear not.

The administration would no doubt disagree, asserting that they have practiced a rare degree of firm

strength. And there lies the rub, for behind our disagreement would lie important principles. Consider only Central America.

Is decisiveness measured by the ability to announce bold confrontations, or is it measured by the ability to see the needs of the region, and be prepared to support the halting forces of progress? Does constancy mean shifting from one perceived threat to another, in the name of some continuing menace, or does it mean the willingness to take the long view, charting a positive course over shifting sands?

Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned that we have a foreign policy which, like all policy, must at times change in the face of an uncertain future. I am not concerned that we have foreign policy leaders who, like all leaders, must occasionally recognize that they do not know what to do.

Change and occasional indecision can be the result of a bold foreign policy that harnessed to a central vision is taking prudent risks. In those cases, I welcome them. But change and indecision can also be the result of a foreign policy that committed to creating the appearance of strength is caught in the contradictions of its own bravado.

I call my colleagues attention to two articles which freeze and then reflect on the chaos of Reagan foreign policy at two different times.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1981]

FOREIGN POLICY CHAOS

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON.—One of candidate Reagan's most telling campaign arguments was against what he called the disarray of the Carter foreign policy. It was time, he said, for the United States to stop sending conflicting signals to our friends and adversaries abroad. He promised policies that were clear, strong and above all consistent.

To recall that campaign oratory now is to laugh—or would be if the reality were not so painful. In 100 days the Reagan Administration has set a record for confusion and contradiction in foreign policy. On essential questions it has no policy at all: just rhetoric flying off at every angle and subject to daily correction.

The world was treated to an open, running debate between two members of the Reagan Cabinet on whether to continue the grain embargo against the Soviet Union. When the President lifted the embargo, the Secretary of State said it would be instantly reimposed in tougher form if the Russians intervened in Poland—only to have a White House spokesman knock that promise down.

The Secretary of Defense, in Europe for a NATO meeting, said we might respond to any Soviet intervention in Poland by selling arms to China. The remark raised a host of delicate political and security questions, none of which had been explored. The Administration has let the comment fade into hoped-for obscurity.

Will the United States voluntarily observe the limitations set in the unratified second strategic arms agreement as long as the Russians do? A Defense official said no, the Secretary of State said yes, right-wing Rea-

ganites denounced the Secretary—and the President said nothing.

Then there is the Middle East. The Secretary of State toured the area, announcing that the leaders he saw all loved the new Administration's policy. Those leaders in turn denied any agreement whatever.

And finally we have had, and will continue to have for painful months ahead, the affair of the Awacs sale to Saudi Arabia. Agatha Christie would have called it the Mysterious Affair. Who done it? How could any serious official fail to appreciate what an uproar it would cause? The controversy in Congress may well end by offending both Israel and the Saudis.

The Administration's performance in foreign affairs has been so inept that even Reagan cheerleaders among the columnists and editorial writers have begun sounding embarrassed. The Wall Street Journal, in an editorial entitled "The Foreign Policy Vacuum," was reduced—when it tried to find some pluses—to mentioning the cancellation of Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin's parking privileges.

But none of this should be an occasion for the scoring of partisan or ideological points. The chaos in American policy is far too serious. And the most serious aspect of it, I think, is the message being sent to the Soviet Union.

The Reagan Administration took office expressing above all a resolve to oppose Soviet expansionism. In the first concrete test, on the grain embargo, that asserted resolve turned out to be words—empty ones. The Reagan toughness amounts to keeping Ambassador Dobrynin out of the State Department garage and Georgi Arbotov off American television.

The embargo was imposed by President Carter in response to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. That occupation is no less brutal now, and evidently no nearer its end. An excuse for ending it is that it did not keep grain from the Russians; they were able to make up much of the shortage by purchases from Argentina. The Reagan people could have tried to reason with their great new friends in the Argentine military dictatorship. Instead, they just gave up.

The potential impact on the Polish situation is graver than the washing of hands on Afghanistan. If America's attention span is so short on the Afghan occupation, as it was a dozen years ago in Czechoslovakia, the temptation to Soviet hard-liners in Poland is that much greater.

The one real hope the West has of influencing Moscow toward restraint on Poland is to stand together on plans for economic retaliation if the worst happens. For our European allies that is a difficult thing, demanding sacrifice; they have very large sales to the Soviet Union. Now the allies see that a loud-talking American government will not sacrifice even a marginal political advantage with farm constituents.

What will Soviet leaders make of it all? Seweryn Bialer, the Columbia University specialist on Soviet affairs, says:

"It will confirm their view that there is not yet an American policy toward the Soviet Union—and they are right. There's a lot of rhetoric, but no policy. And we see more and more that the rhetoric is directed at an internal audience, the American audience, to create a political atmosphere here."

The lack of a recognizable policy on Soviet and other issues stems in part from the unresolved tension between Alexander Haig and the White House. Not a week goes by without some fresh indication of discon-

tent with Haig. At the State Department there is open talk that he cannot last. It is simply inexplicable that an Administration trying to project strength in the world should continue to tolerate such a situation.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1981]

ZIGZAGGING THROUGH FOREIGN POLICY

(By Philip Geyelin)

It's been two months now since the Reagan administration was supposed to be ready to "hit the ground running" and more than four months since President Reagan was elected with a solemn vow to end the "zigzagging and vacillation" in American foreign policy.

Finally, this country's allies and adversaries would hear one, clear voice. There was to be no more of this business of sending mixed signals that had so eroded the prestige and power of the United States in the world. So what has there been?

The performance, zigzagwise, has been almost ludicrous, even granting that it is early on; key departments are still shot through with unfilled policymaking vacancies; the whole process is still a long way from having shaken down. You could make a case, on the face of it, of incompetence and incoherence beyond remedy.

But when you examine the zigs and zags closely, you can make a stronger case of an administration, for better or worse, struggling to work its way free of antediluvian dogma and case-hardened arch-conservative doctrine—trying to come to terms with itself and the realities. Examples:

Zig: Secretary of the Navy John Lehman takes it upon himself to propound publicly the argument that there is no legal reason for the United States to honor the provisions of both the expiring SALT I and the unratified SALT II arms control agreements. He would be against doing so, even by tacit arrangement with the Soviets.

Zag: Rightly reading this as elbow-jostling from the far right at a delicate moment in the administration's review of arms control strategy, and mindful of European sensitivities, Secretary of State Haig swiftly repudiates Lehman by name. An unusually blunt State Department statement, rushed to reporters, says Lehman's remarks "were not authorized, nor did they reflect administration policy."

Zig: Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger announces that he is in favor of reviving the idea of equipping American missiles and artillery shells in Europe with "enhanced radiation" warheads (otherwise known as neutron bombs).

Zag: Keenly aware of how touchy the issue is in Europe, and of where it fits into larger alliance defense planning, Haig wisely takes steps to make clear to our allies that this is by no means a final decision.

Zig: With the most elaborate orchestration, "war-torn" El Salvador is elevated to the pinnacle of East-West concern. The State Department speaks of "massive" arms flow from Cuba. Haig warns of "striking at the source." The threat, Soviet in origin, is said to be hemisphere-wide. All Europe, and all Latin America, must join in drawing the line. The U.S. military adviser force is doubled; aid is tripled. This is war.

Zag: The president allows as how there was no real thought of "striking" at Cuba. Political solutions, and the importance of economic help and an end to repression by the U.S.-backed Duarte government, are given equal importance with military measures. Almost laughably, a State Department official complains that the whole story has

been overblown by the press. It was only supposed to be a "signal" that, once delivered, should now be turned off. Be good enough, the press was told, to turn your attention elsewhere.

Zig: The secretary of agriculture announces his undying opposition to the embargo imposed by Jimmy Carter on grain shipments to the Soviet Union.

Zag: After examining both the effectiveness of the embargo and the effect of lifting it in return for nothing, the administration sensibly puts that decision on hold.

In extenuation, let it quickly be said that these (and other) zigs owed much to preconceptions made plain, and promises firmly offered, in the course of the Reagan campaign. The president did say that the United States should not abide by SALT II's terms "prior to ratification." He did favor the neutron bomb, oppose the grain embargo and warn of falling "dominoes" in Central America—with Mexico and, ultimately, the United States, the last in line.

So some part of the problem has to be that the administration's top figures hit the ground still running for president, so to speak, still faithful to every jot and tittle of the Reagan line. Some part of it has also to do with the president himself. Left to his own devices (in the interview with Walter Cronkite), he betrays a sort of fierce fidelity to a lot of his much earlier thinking, without much recognition of what may be new and different about today's Cold War.

And some part of it has to do with a sort of "scorched-earth" approach by long-frustrated conservatives finally come to power and determined to erase every fingerprint of the recent past: the Law of the Sea, the Carter refusal to upgrade Saudi Arabian F-15's and—above all—human rights.

There remains that part of the zigzagging that has to do with getting organized; the system, quite obviously, is not firmly in place. Meantime, there is the thing to be said for the Reagan vacillation: The second-thought zags have in every instance been an improvement over the zigs. ●

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION PRESENTATION

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this month the American Automobile Association is presenting three young people the highest award given to the members of school safety patrols throughout the United States, the AAA School Safety Patrol Lifesaving Medal.

The lifesaving medal program was initiated in 1949 by the American Automobile Association to recognize and honor selected school patrol members for their heroic lifesaving contribution to their communities.

Since its inception, there have been more than 200 boys and girls from 27 States and the District of Columbia who have been honored with the lifesaving medal.

An award review board composed of representatives from active national organizations in the fields of educa-

tion, law enforcement, and safety selects deserving medal recipients from those candidates who have been officially nominated for consideration.

This year one of the recipients of the 1981 award is from my district. He is Christopher S. McConnell, 13, from Woodmont Elementary School, Arlington, Va. Christopher will be honored for his quick action and heroic act.

One afternoon while on duty, he saved several children from danger when he noticed a bus beginning to roll backwards as they were boarding it. He immediately jumped into the bus and set the emergency brake that accidentally had been released.

Christopher should be recognized for his exceptional judgment and courage in a dangerous traffic situation. He serves as a model for his peers and is an inspiration to us all. ●

REPROCESSING NUCLEAR FUEL MAKES GOOD SENSE

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will be making many decisions in the next few months which will determine our Nation's capacity to deal with our future energy needs over the decades ahead. One major issue will involve the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel in order to recover and use a tremendous energy supply.

One view on this issue was recently the subject of a well reasoned editorial in the San Diego Tribune entitled "Reprocessing Nuclear Fuel Makes Good Sense." In the editorial, the point is clearly made that the reprocessing plant at Barnwell, S.C., is an asset our Nation should utilize fully.

I ask that the text of this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD so that my colleagues may consider the arguments presented on this important issue.

[From the San Diego Tribune, Apr. 20, 1981]

REPROCESSING NUCLEAR FUEL MAKES GOOD SENSE

A decade ago, reprocessing of spent fuel from nuclear power plants seemed like a good idea. Today it is still a good idea, but it has fallen into disrepute.

The Reagan administration should rescue the privately owned reprocessing plant which stands nearly complete and idle at Barnwell, S.C. It should be operated by the government as part of the nation's nuclear energy program.

Each ton of spent fuel contains enough uranium and plutonium to generate, when reprocessed into new nuclear fuel elements, the energy equivalent of nearly 200,000 barrels of oil.

And reprocessing would reduce the waste disposal problem from nuclear energy plants.

The federal government persuaded Allied Chemical Co. and San Diego's General Atomic Co. to build the Barnwell plant. A permit was applied for in 1968. Construction started in 1971. The partners each invested nearly \$200 million of private money in the venture. The government invested nothing, but did help make a site available.

But in 1976 President Gerald Ford, in a surprise announcement, created a task force to study the wisdom of nuclear fuel reprocessing. And the next year President Jimmy Carter suspended hearings and declared that there would be no reprocessing.

Allied Chemical and General Atomic were left with no return on their investment and no way to recover the investment. They want the government to buy the plant and operate it.

The government has operated several reprocessing plants for spent fuel elements from the government's own military reactors.

A similar reprocessing plant for civilian fuel rods is justified by economics. France and Britain have big ones. There are 17 all told around the world on this side of the Iron Curtain.

The U.S. plant was shut down primarily because of fears that the spread of reprocessing technology around the world would increase the dangers of nuclear proliferation. But the technology is spreading, whether we like it or not. And we will pay a heavy economic penalty if we don't use it.

Other nations operate their reprocessing plants as government enterprises. We should too. Government regulations and political policy changes make it impossible for private enterprise to do the job in this era of public controversy over every aspect of the nuclear power industry.

It may go against the grain of policymakers in the Reagan administration to take over a private enterprise. But the government has an obligation to Allied Chemical and General Atomic, based upon the fact that they built the plant at the government's request. And a takeover would be in the national interest. ●

STUDENTS TOUR NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 11, 1981, 178 young men and women from Parkville Senior High School in Parkville, Md., journeyed to Washington for a firsthand look at their Nation's Capital as part of their studies of American Government.

These students toured the Capitol Building and the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum as part of their day's activities.

They were lead by the following teachers and parents: Ms. Majorie F. Bowerman, Mrs. Marcia Thompson, Mrs. Mary Any Opdyke, Mrs. Carol Slotke, Mr. Ray Kitz, Mrs. Karen Taneyhill, and Ms. Gerri Smith.

I am delighted they have taken an interest in our Nation's political process, and hope their interest will continue.

Students who visited us yesterday are: Robert Amos, Eric Benson, Pam Fuller, Jeanette Keller, Mike Annen, Laura Barr, Melanie Becker, Nick Bonamo, Karen Boyd, Dee Dobbins, Paul Duvall, Mike Fitzgerald, Jeff Flynn, Mark Fuhr, Michelle Gardner, Donna Gary, Debbie Gerlach, Allen Glassman, Laurie Hannibal, Dwayne Hudson, Evelyn Huth, Trisha Jackson, Tony Kelz, Stephanie Kostopoulous, Monica Leonard, Cheryl Martin, Paul McDonald, John Lewis, Stevell Harrison, Bob Howser, Lisa Ricketts, Jackie Rollison, Lisa Russell, Carol Russo, Alan Schutz, Pam Slovick, Robert Soutar, Cathy Stran, Debbie Thornton, Jeff Vogtman, Diane Wills, Scott Young, Bryan Donnelly, Steve Meehan, Lee Phair.

Other students are: Yong Il Park, Young Chae Park, Yong Doo Park, Min Ja Seo, Jeong Yoon, Eun Sang Yoon, Dahvie Chhim, Helen Chhim, Chong-Sook Kim, Nang Sy, Teddy Woldeclassie, Kit Li, Robin Elliott, Dawn Haslup, Karen Hostetter, Diane Martin, Gregg Richardson, Sharon Thompson, Jackie Walters, Doris Brown, Pat Houseright, Jennifer Johns, Angela Cornias, John Huber, John Baibakis, Henry Davis, Kirk Jansy, Joe Janowiak, Susan Gilden, Jeff Schmidt, Kelly Chase, Tom Fannin, Adam Kundratic, Lou Maunier, Ed Stefan, Greg Hindle, Joe Liu, George Stratos, Deena Thorpe, Ronnie Oberender, Denise Russell.

Patty Ziegler, Caris Schoich, Gary Lubber, Jim Brown, Carole Grimm, Cindy Moran, Germaine Miller, Dawn Steely, Brian Dodge, Mike McGinnity, Janice York, Leanna Boran, Jeff Speranzella, Susan Christian, Lisa Sorrentino, Diane Roesler, Michael Knight, Elaine Kokkanokos, Tina Kellner, Allison Mann, Steve Reisinger, Mike Skinner, Janna Koontz, Tim Kuchta.

Linda Cassidy, Debbie Merryman, Nancy Bonadio, Sara Lerch, David James, Earl Cassidy, Mike Denning, Robin Scott, Allison Hutchins, Teresa Blevins, Sherry Watkins, Lisa Koaneski, Tam Fels, Karen Rohr, Teresa Green, Robin Whiteside, Jenny Houston, Mark Bateman, Stephanie Bartleson, Joanne Conway, David Ellis, Kevin Earle.

John Ray, Scott Schmidt, Mary Horney, Joanne Stuart, Lori Chenworth, Pamela Hirsch, Joe Holmes, David Baker, Russ Roche, Victoria Wade, Nancy Brinkman, Mark Fuqua, Judy Emerson, Missy Gentry, Allison Kaufman, Mark Thrift, Shawn O'Neil, Susan Wade, Jay Hannon, Rosemary Reed, Bryan Kraft, Mike Lapinski, Jeff Johnson.

Janet Bodencak, Brian Freeland, Teresa Gittings, Hope Payne, Pat Doxzen, Robert Vickers, Tom Kilchenstein, Colleen McCrane, Tom Hall, Kim Raub, Becky Webb, Lisa Watson, Jeff Harrison, Kathy Schumck, Lisa White, Linda Hopkins, Dan Neidhardt,

Stephanie Biles, Fred Baker, Shirley Coker, Joe DePasquale, Ray Kilchenstein. ●

NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN ASSOCIATION OF DETROIT

HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, the year 1492 started the end of a way of life for American Indians in America. Through the years of struggle between Indians and an emerging nation many promises were made to our first American citizens, but none were kept.

Congress passed Public Law 93-638 in 1974 for the expressed purpose of restoring Indians to the vital mainstream of America, while at the same time respecting their cultures, languages, education, and unique outlook on life.

The act, known as the Indian Self-Determination Act, enabled tribes and urban Indian organizations to contract directly with the Federal Government to insure that Indians maintained their ability to participate in decision-making at local levels.

The budget passed by the House on May 7 includes budget cuts which will affect this important congressional policy toward American Indians. When Indian constituents from my district approach me with a solution to this termination by budget policy they urge me to ask Congress to help protect them by keeping the Federal congressional intent intact.

Relative to their concerns, the North American Indian Association of Detroit has asked that I share with my colleagues their Resolution No. 102-1981. I would like to insert the text of that resolution into the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it:

NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN ASSOCIATION OF DETROIT, INC.

RESOLUTION NO. 102-1981

Whereas, the North American Indian Association of Detroit, Inc. provides services to American Indians in Detroit and Southeastern Michigan and;

Whereas, American Indians are among the nation's poorest citizens and;

Whereas, the Reagan Administration proposed budget cuts could have a disastrous effect upon the provision of services to Indian people in the urban as well as reservation area and;

Whereas, the special trust relationship extending to Indian people because of the numerous treaties and trust responsibilities would be jeopardized if Indian people were to be categorized as a part of the urban "ethnic" group and;

Whereas, the Intent of Congress in establishing Indian programs was to insure that Indian people, a small racial minority within states, urban area etc., should not be neglected in the provision of services due them: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the NAIA of Detroit, Inc. does hereby support a policy that the Federal Government should establish Indian set aside amounts if funding goes in block grants to states, to insure that Indian people continue to receive the special support indicated in the trust relationship and; be it further

Resolved, That existing Indian organizations and their proven services be given priority to insure that flow of services is not interrupted or stopped during any re-organization in federal funds and/or services.

This resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the North American Indian Association of Detroit board of directors this 7th day of March, 1981 by a vote of 7 for, 0 against, 0 abstaining.

Attest:

ELMER SEBASTIAN,
Chairman.●

TWENTY-NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT RESIDENTS HONORED

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party enjoys a long and distinguished heritage in the State of California. The strength of the party has always been the strength of character, dedication, foresight and compassion of its members.

Therefore, I am pleased to inform this House that four residents of my district have been honored as "Democrats of the Year." From California's 47th State Assembly District, Ms. Regina Render and Mr. George T. Hamilton; and from the 48th State Assembly District, Ms. Elizabeth "Pat" Eastman and Mr. McKeever Toler.

In honoring these citizens, I am reassured once again that the Democratic Party will continue to prosper and foster progress for all America.●

IMPACT OF BUDGET CUTS ON THE ELDERLY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my most serious concern about the harmful impact the fiscal year 1981 rescission and the proposed fiscal year 1982 budget proposals relating to housing programs for the elderly will have on this Nation's senior citizens. Housing is of critical importance since the numbers of our older Americans are increasing dramatically now, and will continue to do so for many decades to come. I also under-

stand the great need to control the impact inflation is having on the lives of every American. For many of our older citizens living on limited incomes in particular, the burden is intolerable. Yet, we must make sure that in our desire to check inflation now, we are not just postponing crisis-oriented national action that will have to be taken at a later date when our alternatives will be fewer and less cost-effective. We must make sure that in our desire to reduce Federal spending, we do not cut off necessary assistance to those people who are most in need. Before we assume that the budget proposals will not impact severely on the "safety net" of housing and related services to those older Americans most in need, let us first examine the current housing experiences of this Nation's elderly population, and also consider the growing demand this segment of the population will place on housing and related services as their numbers begin to swell in the years to come.

It is unfortunate and unpardonable that in a country such as ours, at least 30 percent of our older citizens live in substandard, deteriorating, or dilapidated housing. Many thousands of these individuals are forced to live in older units lacking some or all plumbing facilities.

In addition, two out of every five older adults cannot afford adequate housing for one-fourth of their incomes. What is worse, on the average, individuals in the over-75 age group pay 48 percent of their incomes for housing. Yet, as inexcusable as this situation is now, the housing crisis for the elderly only threatens to get much worse.

At the present time one of every nine Americans is 65 years old and over—a total of 25 million people. We are experiencing rapid increases in the numbers of individuals in the over-65 age category, and particularly among those people over 75 years of age—that segment of the population which is most likely to be in the need of some kind of assistance. By the year 2000, approximately 45 percent of the elderly population will be over age 75, of which well over half will be 80 years or older. Yet, at the same time, as the numbers of these more vulnerable Americans are increasing dramatically, the availability of units appropriate for low-income households is dropping sharply. For the first time in a century, the stock of rental housing is shrinking instead of expanding. Not counting federally assisted housing, the production of low-income rental housing has come to a virtual standstill in this country. Even without considering the significant factors of quality, suitability, and availability, the rental housing crisis is acute given the fact that there has been a net loss of at least half a million units per year at

rents the lowest income households can afford.

Given these major forces at work in this country, it is easy to see that something must be done to address the housing needs of the elderly. I am happy to see that the section 202 housing for the elderly and handicapped program funding level will not be reduced in fiscal year 1982. This important program has been the vehicle through which most low-income housing for the elderly and handicapped has been built in this country. By retaining the current funding level, the administration has shown a sensitive awareness that the housing needs of many of our older citizens are indeed substantial, and that a large proportion of these individuals can be considered to be among the truly needy.

Nevertheless, it concerns me very much that the proposal to reduce the level of additional section 8 and public housing units by one-third in fiscal year 1982 will impact dramatically on many of our needy and most vulnerable senior citizens. Historically, the elderly poor have benefited substantially from Federal housing programs. In the variety of subsidized housing programs today, the elderly comprise almost half of the served; 100 percent of these older persons are low-income.

However, it is estimated that for every low-income occupant of subsidized housing, there are another three persons waiting for a unit. With the numbers of elderly Americans increasing so greatly and so rapidly now, and in decades to come, I wonder where many of the low-income elderly will find an affordable and adequate place to live. We cannot afford to put off addressing a brewing housing crisis for the sake of saving a few Federal dollars now. Sooner or later the problem of how to adequately house our rapidly growing numbers of senior citizens is going to have to be dealt with. Waiting until the crisis worsens before we react will be both inadequate and costly. Since it takes several years between the time a housing unit is planned until it is finally ready to be occupied, we do not have the luxury of waiting. In order to be the most cost-effective with our Federal housing dollars, we must be farsighted and prepared to handle the growing need before it is upon us.

I also question the necessity of raising the rent contribution of elderly residents of subsidized housing from 25 to 30 percent of their adjusted incomes. At a time when inflation has already hit the poorest of the poor particularly hard, we are asking them to absorb what amounts to a 20-percent rent increase. Let us not forget that we are already dealing with households whose incomes are well below the poverty level.

When matched against the Bureau of Labor Statistics' lower living stand-

ard, many of these elderly individuals can afford nothing for housing if they are to meet other essential needs. For the elderly living on fixed incomes, increasing the rent by even a slight amount would cut severely into the already overwhelming burden of meeting essential nutritional and medical expenses.

One argument that is often made in support of increasing rents for public housing/section 8 tenants is that those not in subsidized housing are already paying much more. However, comparing the rents of subsidized tenants with those who do not receive such a subsidy is not always accurate or valid since many public housing tenants actually pay 35 percent, 40 percent, or even more of their incomes for rent when utility costs are added in. Until we know more about the actual rent-incomes ratios, including utilities, I do not believe it is valid to assume that subsidized elderly tenants are not already carrying a severe housing burden.

In addition, I am concerned that even with the higher rents, money will not be put back into the public housing units themselves for badly needed maintenance and other operating expenses. Since each dollar of increased tenant rents will be offset by \$1 less in operating subsidies, I question whether or not we are proceeding in the most cost-effective manner with this change in policy. I wonder if in the interest of reducing Federal spending in the short run, we are not just paying a more expensive cost in the escalated deterioration of our public housing stock.

Finally, I find it difficult to understand the reasoning behind the rescission of \$10 million in fiscal year 1981 for the congregate housing services program, and the fact that no funding has been slated to continue this very important and crucial program in fiscal year 1982. The congregate housing services programs was adopted in 1978, with overwhelming bipartisan support, in response to the dilemma hundreds of thousands of our partially or impaired older Americans are confronted with. To remain in their residence means an almost insurmountable struggle to find the services they need to prevent further physical decline and social isolation. Yet, seeking refuge in medically oriented facilities often exposes the residents to more services than they require, resulting in unnecessary and exorbitant costs for both the senior citizens and the Federal Government.

In terms of costs, the congregate housing services program is clearly more cost-effective than nursing home care. Federal expenditures for an older person in section 202 or public housing are about \$1,800 per year (1980). If we combine that with the es-

timated cost of the congregate services, we have a total of \$3,675 per person per year. On the other hand, Federal reimbursement for skilled nursing home care under the medicaid program ranges from \$6,081 for Maryland, a State with the lowest Federal matching requirement, to \$7,117 for Mississippi, the State with the highest Federal match. If we compare even the lowest cost to the Federal Government for nursing home care, we see that it is almost \$2,000 higher per person per year than the cost of congregate services, and if we look at the highest cost, it is almost \$3,400 more per person per year.

Substantial testimony before the House and Senate committees has revealed that well over a third of nursing home residents aged 60 and over need only very little assistance in performing daily tasks, and that only 14 percent are extremely impaired physically. It is usually the lack of a friend or relative to help with these daily tasks that determines who stays in the community, and who ends up being placed in less cost-effective institutional settings. A great number of these older and handicapped people could live more independently, more satisfactorily, and at less expense to the Federal Government if they had reliable services that the congregate program provides. For these vulnerable elderly individuals, the impact of even a seemingly small reduction in program funding would be devastating.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Consumer Interests, of the Select Committee on Aging, I have talked to many of our senior citizens living in low-income housing projects. The elderly residents in these projects have told me time and again how much they fear premature placement in institutions. They view nursing homes and similar facilities as places which rob them of their dignity and independence, and as places from which they will never leave once they are admitted. Without the congregate housing services program, many partially or temporarily disabled older Americans now, and in the decades to come, are going to have their own worst fears realized.

In sum, let us make sure that in our heartfelt desire to control the devastating impact of inflation on every individual in this country, we do not overlook the need for caution in making sure that the most vulnerable of our older citizens are not accidentally swept aside in the process. Particular care must be taken when making budgetary decisions regarding housing production and related services, especially since budgetary decisions we

make now will impact on the availability of adequate housing for the elderly for many years to come.●

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMITATION LEGISLATION

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two legislative measures which, if enacted, would allow the senior citizens of our Nation the incentive to continue to make great contributions to our society beyond their normal retirement age.

I offer this legislation in the hope that we would give incentives to those industrious individuals of retirement age who seek to supplement their social security benefits by working. As you know, under current law, those receiving retirement benefits have \$1 deducted from their social security checks each month for every \$2 they earn over \$5,000 in 1981. A change in this law would encourage this industriousness and allow our country the benefits of a great storehouse of knowledge and wisdom from senior citizens that they have gained from a life of work experience.

The high cost of living fueled by inflation has a real impact on all of us, but particularly our senior citizens living of fixed incomes. Many of these citizens are willing and able to continue their jobs in the work force beyond retirement age, thereby enabling them to gain financially and also generating additional revenue for our Government. However, our current laws do not make this continued employment financially feasible.

One of the measures I am introducing today would increase to \$10,000 in 1981 the annual amount of earned income that a social security beneficiary of any age may have without suffering deductions from benefits. This amount would be adjusted automatically in the subsequent years to allow for inflation.

The second measure I am introducing would remove the earnings limitation completely so that the amount of earned income would not affect in any way one's social security benefits.

I am hopeful that the Congress will see fit to seriously consider both measures and, in the end, provide our senior citizens with the dignity they deserve in being productive workers throughout the latter years of their lives.●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN ARGENTINA—"QUIET DIPLOMACY" AND ANTISEMITISM

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, last week during the markup of the foreign assistance legislation, in discussing Argentina, Reagan administration spokesmen said that quiet diplomacy as opposed to Carter's open diplomacy is working in bringing about human rights improvements in Argentina. They also said that antisemitism is not the official policy of the Government of Argentina. Any acts of antisemitism are being carried out by private groups.

I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues two items of interest.

The first concerns a letter from Emilio Mignone, president of the Argentine Center for Legal and Social Studies and one of the foremost human rights activists in Argentina. He is one of the six who were arrested recently for their human rights work. In his letter Mignone states:

I believe that an open policy on human rights matters, as the one carried out by President Carter's Administration, is the most effective toward regimes such as the Argentine government. Carter's actions were immensely valuable to restrain the crimes of my country's military dictatorship, which applies the totalitarian principles of the ideology of collective security.

The second is a review of Jacobo Timerman's book called, "Prisoner Without a Name, Cell Without a Number." Jacobo Timerman, to refresh the memory of my distinguished colleagues, was editor and publisher of a leading Buenos Aires daily newspaper, *La Opinion*. He was arrested in 1977 and described his treatment while in prison. Timerman said each round of questioning began in the same way: "Are you a Jew? . . . Are you a Zionist? . . . When did your Zionist activities begin? . . ."

I commend to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the review of Mr. Timerman's book by Anthony Lewis which appeared in last Sunday's *New York Times*.

The review follows:

[From the *New York Times Book Review*,
May 10, 1981]

THE FINAL SOLUTION IN ARGENTINA
(By Anthony Lewis)

PRISONER WITHOUT A NAME, CELL WITHOUT A NUMBER—BY JACOBO TIMERMAN

The prisoner is blindfolded, seated in a chair, hands tied behind him. The electric shocks begin. No questions are put to him. But as he moans and jumps with the shocks, the unseen torturers speak insults. Then one shouts a single word, and others take it up: "Jew . . . Jew . . . Jew! . . . Jew!" As they chant, they clap their hands and laugh.

Germany in 1939? No, Argentina in 1977. Were the torturers an outlaw band, a gang of anti-state terrorists? No, they were part of the state: military men from one wing of the armed forces that controlled the Argentine Government in 1977 and still do.

And the victim: Was he some unlucky social outcast? No, he was Jacobo Timerman, editor and publisher of a leading Buenos Aires daily newspaper, *La Opinion*. And in a sense he was lucky. For, unlike 15,000 other Argentinians who were seized by the military over the last five years, he lived.

Timerman lived. And he has used that grace to write an extraordinary book about his experience. It is the most gripping and the most important book I have read in a long time: gripping in its human stories, not only of brutality but of courage and love; important because it reminds us how, in our world, the most terrible fantasies may become fact.

Not just autobiography, or political analysis, or a victim's cry in the night, it is all these things. Timerman describes what he suffered in prison and what he thought, and how he and Argentina got to where they were. The *New Yorker* came close in the title it used when it published part of the text last month: "Reflections." Timerman writes with passion, but a passion controlled almost to the point of detachment. The effect is devastating.

In spare words, Timerman shows us a sophisticated society falling into irrationality and savagery—a savagery in which nearly everyone silently acquiesces. He gives an unforgettable picture of our century's special contribution to civilization: state terrorism.

It happened in Argentina. But those who read this book around the world will understand the universal application. It could happen, it has happened elsewhere. Argentine anti-semitism copied the Nazis'. The guards' behavior was much like that described by Huber Matos when he got out of Cuban prison in 1979. In some of the cells where he was kept, Timerman suffered a humiliation and torment that Soviet psychiatric prisoners have described: having to ask a guard for permission to use the toilet and often being turned down.

The methods of modern tyranny repeat themselves. With this reality compare the political-science abstraction that has served since last Jan. 20 as a premise of United States human-rights policy: the theory that right-wing governments are merely "authoritarian" and do less damage to human rights than "totalitarian" Communist regimes.

The principal author of that theory is Jeane Kirkpatrick, United States Ambassador to the United Nations. Elaborating it in 1979 in the magazine *Commentary*, she wrote that, unlike Communists, "traditional autocrats" observe "traditional taboos." For example, they respect "habitual patterns of family and personal relations."

I thought about Ambassador Kirkpatrick when I read Timerman's description of the Miralles family: father, two sons and a daughter-in-law. Timerman heard them tortured, and they were not the only ones.

"Of all the dramatic situations I witnessed in clandestine prisons," he writes, "nothing can compare to those family groups who were tortured often together, sometimes separately but in view of one another. . . . The entire affective world, constructed over the years with utmost difficulty, collapses with a kick in the father's genitals . . . or the sexual violation of a daughter. Suddenly an entire culture based on familial love, de-

struction, the capacity for mutual sacrifice collapses. . . ."

"From my cell, I'd hear the whispered voices of children trying to learn what was happening to their parents, and I'd witness the efforts of daughters to win over a guard, to arouse a feeling of tenderness in him . . . in order to learn what was happening to her mother, to have an orange sent to her, to get permission for her to go to the bathroom."

The Argentine Ambassador to Washington, Jorge A. Aja Espil, writing to *The New York Times* recently in defense of his Government, cited the case of Jacobo Timerman as an example of its "independent judiciary." The Argentine courts, he said, "are open to him as they are to any person."

What happened to Timerman was this:

At 2 in the morning on April 15, 1977, 20 armed men in civilian clothes raided his apartment in Buenos Aires. They handcuffed him, covered his head with a blanket, threw him on the floor of his own car and drove off with him. They said they were acting on orders of the First Army Corps. When his wife telephoned that corps, she was told that no one there knew anything about it. He had disappeared.

The family next heard of him on May 25, six weeks later. Timerman telephoned and said he was now in national police headquarters and could be visited for three minutes. In June he disappeared from there—apparently, as he pieced it together later, because the United States Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, Patricia Derian, was coming to Argentina and would almost certainly ask to see Timerman; some in the military thought others might release him as a good-will gesture and wanted to prevent that.

In October 1977, he was taken before a military tribunal, which said there was no basis for charges against him and he should be released. He was not.

In April 1978, he was taken home and held there under house arrest: not allowed to leave the apartment, with armed guards present at all times.

In June 1978, the Argentine Supreme Court ruled that, because there were no charges against him, he must be released. He was not.

In September 1979, the Supreme Court for the second time ordered his release. The generals in the Government were divided on what to do. Under heavy pressure from the Carter Administration and members of the Congress, the generals reached a Solomonic decision. Without any authority in law, they annulled Timerman's citizenship, confiscated his newspaper and all other property, and expelled him from the country, without a chance to appeal to the courts, by taking him under guard to a plane for Israel. Timerman comments:

"Need one add that Argentine newspapers, jurists, political friends of the government, Jewish community leaders—all those who will one day claim they knew nothing, like the Germans who claimed total unawareness of the existence of concentration camps—congratulated the government for obeying a court ruling and faithfully respecting the majesty of Justice?"

He is not a forgiving man. He names names in this book: torturers, generals, anti-Semitic journalists, Jewish leaders who do not want to make a fuss. But then his role is not to forgive. It is to be a witness—for the rest of us.

Why was Timerman kidnaped, tortured, detained? There is no formal, legal answer

to that question, because no charges were ever made against him. And there is no clear explanation of any other kind.

His newspaper had printed stories the military disliked, but it had not carried on a sustained challenge to the junta; and Timerman had maintained personal relationships with some military figures. When United States officials asked the Argentine Government why he was being held, they got back only vague innuendos about his financial dealings or his connections with "Israeli terrorists."

The lack of a rational explanation is in fact an important aspect of what happened—to Timerman and thousands of others. For Argentina has been in the grip of unreason. One of Timerman's purposes is to explore the origins of that phenomenon, and he does so convincingly in terms both of Argentina's particular history and of right-wing fanaticism generally.

In the clandestine prisons where he was held, the guards and torturers were required to attend what was called "The Academy"—a weekly lecture, usually by an Army intelligence officer, on World War III. The war has already begun, they heard: an onslaught by left-wing terrorism that could not be resisted by democratic governments or democratic methods. Timerman thought the listeners might not realize it, but the logic was the same as that offered by the Nazi Party in Germany as it rose to power.

The Argentine armed forces, Timerman says, have long lived in a hermetic world, the officers linked by family with each other and with certain civilians who cooperate in intermittent military rule. They want life to be clear-cut, orderly; they resent to the point of hatred, of obsessive fantasy, the disorderly contemporary developments in science, religion, literature.

The fears and hatreds of the military were intensified in the 1970's by a real threat: widespread urban terrorism in Argentina. As the left-wing guerrillas conducted their killings and extortions, a right-wing secret organization matched those tactics, murdering not just alleged terrorists but lawyers who defended them in court and journalists who argued that the correct response to terror was not counter-terror but law. In 1976 the military took over the Government, and various military units began practicing terrorism with impunity.

The military Government indicated some of its fears of the modern world by its decrees, Timerman says. It imposed strict moral as well as political censorship. It banned sociology, philosophy and psychology as university majors. It forbade the use of Freudian techniques in hospital psychiatric services. Psychiatrists were a special target. Fifteen armed men came to abduct the president of the Argentine Federation of Psychologists from her hospital, dragging her down the hospital corridors by her hair.

"Argentina has three main enemies," one ideologue of the military regime said. "Karl Marx, because he tried to destroy the Christian concept of society; Sigmund Freud, because he tried to destroy the Christian concept of the family; and Albert Einstein because he tried to destroy the Christian concept of time and space." The enemies were three of the principal creators of the modern world—and all were Jews.

Timerman's picture of anti-Semitism at work in Argentina is especially significant. Anti-Semitic literature is studied in military academies and widely sold on the streets. Zionism is described as a more dangerous enemy than Communism. While in prison

Timerman was asked about a secret trip Menachem Began supposedly made to Argentina, and about Zionist schemes to seize Patagonia and turn it into a second Zionist state, "Andinia."

When Timerman was before the military tribunal, each round of questioning was begun in the same way by its president, Colonel Clodoveo Battesti:

"Are you a Jew?"

"Yes, Mr. President . . ."

"Are you a Zionist?"

"Yes, Mr. President . . ."

"When did your Zionist activities begin?"

"At the age of 8, Mr. President. My mother enrolled me in a sports club called Macabi."

Once Timerman was unexpectedly taken from prison and brought before the Minister of the Interior. (The reason, it turned out, was that Patricia Derian had forcefully raised the issue of his imprisonment that day with President Jorge Rafael Videla.) The Minister, who had known Timerman for years, wanted to see his physical condition. Timerman asked why he was in prison.

"You admitted to being a Zionist, and this point was revealed at a meeting of all the generals."

"But being a Zionist is not forbidden."

"No, it isn't forbidden, but on the other hand it isn't a clearcut issue. Besides, you admitted to it. And the generals are aware of this."

The very first questions put to Timerman after his kidnaping were: Are you Jewish? Are you a Zionist? Is La Opinión Zionist? Curiously, Timerman reckons that his answers—yes—saved his life. The interrogators thought they had a key figure in the world Jewish conspiracy and wanted to save him for a show trial.

It is of course only Jews who have suffered in Argentina—or the Soviet Union or the other tyrannies of the earth. Indeed Timerman, really speaking to himself, warns against feeling "sorry for ourselves as Jews." Most of those killed in Argentina, he emphasizes, were not Jews. "But in the solitude of prison," he goes on, "it is so sad to be beaten for being Jewish. There is such despair when they torture you for being Jewish. It seems so humiliating to have been born."

The other factor that saved him was international attention to his case. The point about international concern is more important, much more, than a single life saved. In some ways the most terrible aspect of life in Argentina after the military took over in 1976 was the silence. Some 15,000 people were kidnaped and never seen again. Sometimes bodies would be found, or a released prisoner would report seeing someone tortured or killed in a secret prison. Mostly they just vanished. When mothers of the disappeared tried to publicize the horror, they were ignored. With a very few honorable exceptions, the newspapers printed nothing. The Government resisted all attempts even to publish the names of those who had disappeared.

The silence may be the most chilling thing in this chilling book. Before he became a victim, Timerman spoke with a naval officer who said that all suspected terrorists must be exterminated. Timerman asked, "What do you mean by all? The officer answered: 'All . . . about 20,000 people. And their relatives, too—they must be eradicated—and also those who remember their names. . . . Not a trace or a witness will remain.'"

A Final Solution: and it depended on a silence that would eventually legitimize the

new state. That in turn depended on the world's acquiescence.

Last month Argentina's Foreign Minister, Oscar Camilion, dismissed the question of "so-called human rights" in diplomacy. "We Argentines will reach our goal of national conciliation," he said. "We will create reasonable stability in our institutions, and the world will sooner or later accept the way we Argentines find to live with ourselves."

But at the crucial time the world did not accept the Argentine military's way to reasonable stability, which was the peace of death. The world, in the form of Amnesty International and the Organization of American States and the Pope and the Carter Administration, provided the essential information.

"Only public knowledge," Timerman writes, "can alter, to some extent, the course of these events, this downward slope in the march of history." We are blessed as readers and as human beings that this witness survived. ●

MAY 12, 1981: 5 YEARS OF THE MOSCOW HELSINKI GROUP

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the work of a remarkable group of Soviet citizens: To the 11 people who, 5 years ago today, formed the Moscow Helsinki Group. Taking as their goal the implementation of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, these Soviet citizens withstand KGB repression, including the forced exile of six group members and the imprisonment of eight others: Malva Landa, Viktor Nekipelov, Yuri Orlov, Tatiana Osipova, Anatoly Shcharansky, Vladimir Slepak, Leonard Ternovsky, Feliks Serebrov, and Aleksandr Ginzburg.

Despite press reports that the Moscow Helsinki Group no longer functions, the four members of the group still at liberty (Elena Bonner, Sofya Kalistratova, Ivan Kovalev, and Naum Meiman) continue to issue reports on the steadily deteriorating human rights situation in the U.S.S.R. The success of the Moscow Helsinki Group is evident in several ways: The information which it has provided is the basis for a good understanding of human rights problems in the U.S.S.R.; the example of the group led to the formation of similar groups in Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, and Armenia and of affiliated groups concerned with religious rights and health issues; the citizens' Helsinki rights movement spread to other countries with the formation of charter 77 in Czechoslovakia, KOR in Poland, and the Helsinki Watch in the United States.

Unfortunately, the Soviet authorities have reacted to the success of the

Soviet Helsinki groups by a severe crackdown against the groups: There are 43 members of these groups and their affiliates currently imprisoned in the U.S.S.R. and serving total sentences of 278 years. Thereby, the Soviets not only flout their obligations under the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, but they reveal their fear of the truth about conditions in the country they rule so ruthlessly.

All of us in the West have a debt to the brave men and women in the Soviet Union and in the Moscow Helsinki Group who speak up for the truth in the face of a government monolith. As Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I would like to pay tribute to the many contributions which the Moscow Helsinki Group has made during the 5 years of its invaluable work. ●

DEREGULATING THE AIR TRANSPORT INDUSTRY

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request of the Civil Aeronautics Board, proposed legislation which would complete the process of deregulating the air transport industry, and which would sunset the CAB. We are also expecting to receive proposed legislation on the same issues from the Department of Transportation on behalf of the administration. The Members of this House can expect hearings by the Aviation Subcommittee on this subject this summer.

I also insert at this point in the RECORD the letter accompanying the proposed legislation from Marvin Cohen, Chairman of the CAB.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1981.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for your consideration and appropriate reference is a legislative proposal "to terminate the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and to transfer certain functions of the Board to the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes."

The Board's proposal on January 1, 1983, transfers its mail rate function to the Postal Service, terminates related authority, statutorily deregulates cargo and mail transportation, and abolishes the special administrative procedures for processing airline mergers and acquisitions. On October 1, 1983, the proposal would transfer to the Department of Transportation the Board's small-community air service program, its international functions, and its public-protection powers, and to the Federal Trade Commission the Board's enforcement functions concerning unfair and deceptive practices in the air transportation industry. Upon agreement of those agencies and the Board, the transfers

of such functions and termination of related non-transferring authority could occur before that date, but not earlier than January 1, 1983. Once all of the Board's functions were transferred or terminated, the Board itself would cease to exist.

In the 2½ years since the Airline Deregulation Act was passed, the process of deregulation has moved ahead according to the Congressional plan. There now appears to be no reason to continue the Board for 2 full years, as the 1978 Deregulation Act does, after its domestic route and pricing authority sunsets on January 1, 1983. We believe that the maximum time that may be needed to monitor the effects of the sunset of domestic route and pricing authority is 9 months, until October 1, 1983. If conditions warrant, the agencies concerned could agree with the Board to transfer their respective continuing functions, and terminate related non-transferring authority, earlier. Once all functions were transferred and authority terminated, the Board would sunset. This scheme will allow a high degree of flexibility in transferring functions, while ending those functions that are no longer needed and bringing about the Board's sunset without undue delay. It would keep intact the principle of a phased sunset for the Board as in the Deregulation Act, but allow the termination of the agency if conditions show it is possible.

While the sunset provisions of the Airline Deregulation Act dealt specifically with several Board functions, ending some and transferring others, it was generally recognized that more detailed decisions would have to be made in further legislation. The Board's proposal addresses those issues. In summary, the primary provisions of the Board's proposal would:

Eliminate certificates for domestic air transportation;

Leave to the FAA the responsibility of ensuring that carriers are fit to provide safe transportation;

Revise the Federal preemption provision of the Federal Aviation Act to (1) reflect the elimination of domestic certificates; (2) continue to bar the States from regulating interstate carriers and operations except those carriers that have only a minimal involvement with interstate operations; (3) clarify that the preemption provision does not exempt airport operators from the anti-trust laws with respect to airport access of carriers; and (4) clarify that carriers have a private right of action if access to a public airport is unreasonably withheld;

Eliminate the Board's authority to prescribe mail rates and the carriers' duty to carry mail, as being inconsistent with the Deregulation Act's direction that the Postal Service's mail rate authority is to be exercised through negotiation and competitive bidding;

Repeal the section 406 subsidy program, as proposed to Congress earlier this year in the Administration's budget for 1982;

Eliminate the Board's authority over mergers and acquisitions, replacing it with authority to intervene in antitrust cases in the courts and with a requirement to notify the court of its view on whether the merger should be conditioned upon the release of any international routes with eventual transfer of these provisions to DOT;

Transfer the authority to approve and immunize carrier agreements to DOT, repealing such authority for domestic transportation on January 1, 1986;

Transfer the Board's authority over the carriers' duty to provide safe and adequate

service, which is a primary source for public (consumer) protection, to DOT for the same limited purpose. This duty is clarified by the Board's proposal to apply it only to such service that the carrier chooses to provide. Based on Board precedent in enforcing this duty and on the Board's proposed language, there is no intent that this provision is to authorize the regulation of rates or routes of air carriers; and

Transfer the Board's authority to collect information and reports to DOT, along with the existing data systems.

The Board believes that its proposals will ensure continued progress in this first experiment in government deregulation. If it can be done, it will set an important example for future sunset of government agencies and deregulation of other parts of the economy.

Accompanying this proposal is a Section-by-Section Analysis and a Statement of Justification for its major positions, which explain the details and background of the proposed legislation.

I have dissented from the Board's approval of that part of this proposal that continues the Board in existence until October 1, 1983, as has Member Bailey. Our dissenting statements are attached at the end of the Statement of Purpose and Justification.

Sincerely,

MARVIN S. COHEN,
Chairman. ●

CENTENNIAL OF THE BOSTON HOME, INC.

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to inform my colleagues that this year marks the centennial anniversary of the Boston Home, Inc., of Dorchester, Mass., formerly known as the Boston Home for Incurables. The Governor of our State has issued a proclamation honoring the fine work of the home's staff and volunteers.

The institution was founded as a small chronic hospital in Brighton, Mass., in 1881 by Miss Cordelia Harmon, a trained nurse who had worked at the Massachusetts Hospital and recognized the difficulty of finding a place for patients who were permanently disabled and could not be properly cared for in their homes. Over the past century, with leadership from many persons including the late Charles R. Codman, the first president, to Charles E. Cotting, present honorary chairman, who has served as a trustee since 1927 and as president from 1939 to 1974, the Boston Home became one of the finest skilled nursing care, level II facilities in the Commonwealth and Nation, and is now open to women of varying ages, including many senior citizens. In 1978, as an accredited member of the American Health Care Association and the Massachusetts Nursing Home Association,

the Boston Home received the "E" for excellence Award of the Massachusetts Federation of Nursing Homes for its high professional competence.

As present president, John H. Gardner has stated, "A centennial is a singular benchmark for any nonprofit institution * * * a time to thank our past benefactors and workers and to plan ahead." I commend the record of compassion and care of the Boston Home, and I look forward to a vibrant future for this distinctive health care facility. ●

PROPOSAL FOR A MODEL
NURSING HOME

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, May is Senior Citizens Month and within the month 1 week has been designated as National Nursing Home Week. In keeping with this event, I think it is time we recognized the many excellent nursing homes around the Nation that are providing excellent services to their residents. Of course, serious problems remain and the House Select Committee on Aging has pledged to work with senior citizen groups and providers to bring about continuing improvement in the quality of care in America's long-term care facilities.

In its landmark series of reports, the Senate Committee on Aging in 1976 called upon the Congress to establish and fund a model nursing home to be operated in conjunction with the National Institute on Aging. This nursing home would serve as a teaching facility in which students and interns from medical schools around the Nation could serve and learn to specialize in geriatrics.

Our committee has held numerous hearings which suggest the importance of establishing the study of geriatrics more prominently in our schools of medicine. I think this is absolutely essential. We have long since recognized pediatrics as an area of specialization. It is time we recognized that the aged have unique medical problems which deserve to be treated in the same comprehensive way. I also think the model or teaching nursing home is an idea whose time has come.

Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest advocates for establishing divisions of geriatrics in our Nation's medical schools and for the establishment of a model nursing home is Dr. Robert Butler, the Pulitzer Prize winning author and Director of the National Institute on Aging. Dr. Butler has just authored an excellent article which appeared in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, April 10, 1981 edition. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous

consent that the article be reprinted in the *RECORD* at this point:

THE TEACHING NURSING HOME

Experiencing a rapid growth of its elderly population, the United States finds itself short of professionals trained in geriatric medicine, nursing, social work, and allied disciplines. Knowledge about aging, diseases of the elderly, and their effective diagnosis and treatment is being developed at a snail's pace.

A corrosive pessimism about later life and prejudice against the elderly still persist in many areas of our society, including the health care field. Many elderly persons and their families find scant comfort in the administrations of health care organizations. Physicians refer but tend not to follow up their patients in the nursing home. The image of the nursing home is scarred by scandal, abuse, ignorance, and fear—an image similar to that of the ancient hospital untouched by science.

It appears that the mainstream of U.S. medicine points away from its most prominent clientele. The nation's 25 million persons aged 65 years and older constitute 11 percent of the population but account for 30 percent of all personal health care spending. This older group benefits from 55 percent of all federal health dollars. Of the \$200 billion spent annually for health care in this country, about \$60 billion is accounted for by the elderly, chiefly those older than 75 years—the most rapidly growing segment of the U.S. population.

By "tomorrow" there will be larger numbers of the elderly in the physician's office and in the nursing home. The future contains 55 million elderly persons, or somewhere between 1 in 7 to 1 in 5 Americans in the year 2030. Twenty-five million of them, equaling today's total elderly population, will be 75 years and older.

It is time to "gear up" organizationally in research, training, an systems of health care and human services. There is a lot of catching up to do. The magnitude of the task is suggested by an estimate for 1977: based on population size and use patterns, this country then needed 7,000 physicians trained in geriatric medicine. According to a 1977 American Medical Association survey, only 629 physicians identified themselves as having a primary, secondary, or tertiary specialty in geriatrics. Few had any identification with research, and most showed none of the hallmarks of expertise in a specialty.

At about the same time, this country's nursing home expenditures were approaching \$15 billion per year, rising at an annual rate of 16 percent or more, much faster than the health care economy as a whole. Today, with 1.3 million people in nursing homes, the spending level is nearing \$22 billion per year. By 1990, it is forecasted to reach \$75.6 billion. In that year, there will be an estimated need for 7,000 to 10,300 geriatricians, chiefly as teachers in medical schools, as medical directors in nursing homes and retirement communities, as consultants, and, in complex cases, as primary care practitioners. The current pace of training in geriatric medicine will not satisfy that forecast.

A NEW WAY

This article proposes methods to deal systematically with the treatment problems that are rooted in inadequate geriatric research and training. In the area of long-term care, our society has lacked an institutional resource as powerful as the university-affiliated teaching hospital. Thus, an or-

ganizational focus for geriatric research and training should be developed: the academic or teaching-research nursing home.

Just as 450 teaching hospitals have been paradigms for 7,000 community hospitals, teaching nursing homes can be models for 18,000 nursing homes and several thousand home-health services, some of which already are based in or associated with nursing homes.

These teaching and research facilities would be affiliated with universities, most closely with medical, nursing and social service schools. In their most complete form, they would have an outreach or home care extension. Few facilities approximate this concept today.

A physician audience may be particularly well situated to appreciate the goals of a program to establish model facilities at selected academic sites, initially involving 25 medical schools:

To foster systematic clinical investigations of disease processes in the aged, and to develop diagnostic techniques (especially comprehensive assessment procedures) and methods of treatment adapted specifically for the elderly;

To train geriatricians, physicians in traditional specialties heavily used by the elderly, geriatric and other nurses, and a variety of other urgently needed professionals;

To establish a research base for (1) improving care in nursing homes and in physician practices, (2) designing community services and clinical strategies for postponing or preventing institutionalization, and (3) rehabilitating and rapidly returning patients to their own homes; and

To devise and demonstrate cost-containment strategies.

RESEARCH

Teaching nursing homes would, if successful, bring geriatrics into the mainstream of American medicine where a thriving intellectual atmosphere exists. Senile dementia provides evidence that this is needed. Because of exclusion at the hospital and mass release from mental hospitals, patients with senile dementia of the Alzheimer's type (SDAT) are not found in "mainstream" institutions. They are concentrated in nursing homes, which have virtually no ties to academia. The SDAT patient is virtually unrepresented in clinical research.

The SDAT and other forms of senile dementia afflict 3 to 4 million Americans, including 1 million so severely that they cannot manage by themselves. Many are in nursing homes. Because death certificate and morbidity data tend to ignore or slight these diseases, it is hard to estimate their costs. However, if through research we could succeed in reducing the nursing home population by 10 percent, savings would amount to \$2 billion a year.

Dementia would be one of a number of high-priority subjects for research in the teaching nursing home. Others, perhaps equally neglected at present, would be gait disorders and other problems of ambulation, proneness to thermal disorder (such as accidental hypothermia and heat exhaustion), and problems peculiar to age (such as orthostatic hypotension, nonketotic hyperosmolar coma, and nonvascular drop attacks).

Other priorities include studying the causes and management of bedsores, pain, and fecal and urinary incontinence. Special features of the aged patient would be studied, such as multiple pathological conditions, as well as polypharmacy and nutritional problems. The use of new methods of

diagnosis and the design and demonstration of prostheses developed by bioengineers would be examined.

Another class of research would involve development and testing of comprehensive patient-assessment systems. These would provide the multidisciplinary basis of recommendations for a plan of care. Currently, assessment procedures need strengthening, notably in history taking and physical examinations that are well adapted to the elderly. The examinations should reflect the medical and psychosocial changes characteristic of aging patients, their diseases, abilities, and disabilities, and the network of family, friends, and other supports for independent living. In particular, to characterize the patient fully and to prepare a well-tailored plan of care, improved neuro-psychological tests and lifestyle evaluations are needed.

The facility would study its patients in terms of adaptation to institutional life and response to interventions that may improve satisfaction with the nursing home environment on a continuing basis. One third of patients remain in a nursing home for at least three years. Such extended stays have implications for architectural design (which must differ from that of the hospital) as well as for the social and recreational dimensions of care plans. (The artificiality of dichotomizing social and medical models of care becomes clear in this context: the long-term patient must be approached holistically and flexibly.)

The facility would make studies of patient-family interactions, of the effect of nursing home environment and attitudes on behavior, of visiting patterns, of the physical and psychological aftermath of admission, and of the multiple reasons for admission and the selection of institutional or home care. The impact of death on surviving family members also would be examined.

TRAINING

Medical students always have had contact with older patients. But the contact characteristically has been narrow and prejudicial; the overwhelming impression given to medical students is that aging persons typically are sick. Actually only one in five ever is so ill or abandoned that he requires a nursing home episode and that only one in 20 aged persons is in a nursing home at any one time. Students have few opportunities to see in geriatric services anything like the well-baby clinic in pediatric services. They simply have not been able to observe healthy older people as they compensate for illness, if not recover from it.

Consequently, the teaching nursing home goes beyond its own walls. Conceived as a hub of services to the independent as well as institutionalized elderly, the teaching nursing home would show the student a spectrum of patient needs and services. It would bring the medical student into contact with peers in other professions. Because the geriatric patient often has multiple medical and psychosocial problems, interdisciplinary training patterns would be encouraged. Student physicians, nurses, pharmacists, physical therapists, social workers, and other professionals would participate in clinical teams. They would learn about health promotion as well as disease treatment.

The teaching nursing home would be most fruitful in a program having these features:

1. An established division of geriatrics in the academic medical center. The division would have the regular faculty of medical, nursing, dental, and other members, not an

adjunct or secondary faculty, and an ancillary faculty drawn from health care administration, health policy, and other areas. Bringing academicians into the nursing home is essential for an effective program.

2. Required lectures and courses in geriatrics for all medical students during their clinical years, and equivalent requirements for students in other professional curricula, particularly in nursing, pharmacy, social work, and physical, speech, and occupational therapies.

3. Required rotation of house officers and of medical and other health professional students through the teaching nursing home.

4. Provisions for special grand and bedside rounds in medicine, psychiatry, neurology, dentistry, dermatology, and other disciplines.

5. Preservice and in-service training for nurses' aides.

6. Shared use of laboratories by the nursing home and teaching hospital; ties would be needed between them and a hospice program and a "well-geriatric" clinic for health promotion and disease prevention (possibly at a senior citizen's center or congregate housing project).

7. Use of the nursing home as a hub for outreach services, including home care services, nutritional and family counseling, and information and referral for health, transportation, housing, and social services.

The training effort should be tied into the development and application of comprehensive patient-assessment systems, previously noted as a research topic. Another major aspect of the training and research program would be a measured rate of postmortem examinations.

As a place of employment as well as patient care, nursing homes in general have poor reputations. They have more beds than hospitals but more difficulty in recruiting and keeping nurses and aides. Yet these are the personnel most in contact with patients. The loss of adept and skilled personnel surely impairs the effectiveness of the institution. Hence, the teaching nursing home would examine characteristics, motivations, and expectations of nursing home staffs and help develop programs that improve and capitalize on their skills.

FUNDING

We live in austere times. This fact is not necessarily an argument against monetary expenditures for teaching nursing homes. Public and private sectors must ensure that the huge sums spent on long-term care are spent effectively. As long as this service area lacks a solid research and training base, health care programs will be characterized by ineffective methods of diagnosis, treatment, prevention, and rehabilitation, to procedures less efficient and more costly than need be, and to an arid intellectual and numbing emotional climate. If one needs a model for the contribution research can make in reducing human anguish and expense, one need only recall the polio epidemics of the past and the results of mass inoculation with vaccine, a product of basic, clinical, and applied research. Vaccine replaced the iron lung. Similarly, today's nursing home—the contemporary "iron lung" of geriatrics—will be transformed by a strong research effort.

All of this argues for investment in teaching nursing homes by public and private sources. Methods that have proved useful in supporting teaching hospitals might be adapted, including those of Medicare, Med-

icaid, philanthropy, and insurance, to help pay for physician and institutional services.

Competitive grants to develop model teaching nursing homes among the nation's 126 medical schools merit consideration. This could be a combined effort of public and private sectors. For-profit and nonprofit organizations of nursing homes have indicated interest in participating with academic sponsors. The sums need not be astronomical for a grant program. Assuming 25 grants at \$100,000 to \$300,000 each annually for key teaching, logistical, and administrative arrangements between a university and a candidate nursing home to establish the appropriate research-teaching environment, the program's cost would range from \$2.5 million to \$7.5 million per year.

Using this resource, investigators could make research proposals to conventional funding sources, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Training funds could be sought from a variety of government agencies, particularly the Health Resources Administration. The National Institute on Aging (NIA) has a Geriatric Medicine Academic Award to support the development of research faculty and curricula. A similar grant program in dentistry is conducted by NIA and the National Institute of Dental Research. In addition, the NIH operates a program within the Division of Research Resources to aid special research facilities. Already existing sources of funds could be applied to geriatric research and training once a recognized environment or laboratory was established for activities related to long-term care issues.

CONCLUSION

This article focuses on a new institution as a base for currently neglected research and training efforts in geriatrics. Affiliated with a university, teaching nursing homes would generate new knowledge about diseases affecting the elderly. They would furnish concepts and procedures for application in the nation's 18,000 nursing homes. Their effectiveness, quality, ability to attract and hold professionals, and public image would thereby be improved. The facility would serve as an educational crossroads for health and social service disciplines.

In a nation where the proportion of elders, now one in nine, is growing, an institutional focus for the growth of geriatric care grounded on research is long overdue. The entry of research and teaching forces into the nation's nursing homes would do much to counteract the general view of geriatrics as the medical-nursing nadirs, and of old age as societal abandonment.

The concept of the teaching nursing home is available. The next feasible step is for public and private sector leaders to explore it and plan for its implementation.

ROBERT N. BUTLER, MD

1. *Every Ninth American: 1979*, Senate Special Committee on Aging. Government Printing Office, 1979.

2. Freeland M, Calat G, Schedler CE: Projections of national health expenditures, 1980, 1985, and 1990. *Health Care Financing Rev.* 1980; 1:1-27.

3. Kane RL, Solomon DH, Beck JC, et al. *Geriatrics in the United States: Manpower Projections and Training Considerations*, Santa Monica, Calif. The Rand Corp. 1981, p. 31.

4. Senility reconsidered: Treatment possibilities for mental impairment in the elderly, National Institute on Aging Task Force *JAMA* 1980; 244:259-263. ●

**BREAK RELATIONS WITH
AFGHAN PUPPET GOVERNMENT**

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there is really no longer any sense in perpetuating the fiction that there is really an Afghan Government in Kabul that represents any sizable part, let alone a majority of the Afghan population. Babrak Karmal's hold on Afghanistan is only maintained by dint of Soviet bayonets, tanks, helicopters, and armored personnel carriers. So, today I am introducing a resolution calling for the termination of our diplomatic relations, and a forthright affirmation that we will aid the insurgents in Afghanistan in their struggle to retain their land and national identity.

We have arrived at a crucial point in the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. To everyone's surprise, the resistance to the Soviets has emerged stronger, not weaker, from the winter period. The insurgency is now better armed and coordinated. In a demonstration of that power, Afghan insurgents took and held the large city of Kandahar for a week. A massive Soviet effort was required to retake the city that involved destroying much of the city. The road between Jalalabad and Kabul was also closed by the insurgents for a week recently. The Soviets are rapidly going to have to decide whether or not to increase their forces in Afghanistan or surrender increasing areas of the country to the insurgents. The Afghan Army, on which they count to do most of the infantry combat is unreliable and its numbers continue to shrink, in spite of Karmal's draconian measures to conscript more men.

Therefore, in my strong view, the time has come to break diplomatic relations with the Soviet installed puppet Government of Afghanistan and send all necessary aid to the Afghans who are engaged in this life and death struggle for their nation. Morale of the insurgents is all important as regards U.S. policy toward the people of Afghanistan. They were initially very heartened by Reagan administration statements of possible support. However, they are dismayed by the lifting of the grain embargo by the Reagan administration. In this connection, it was ironic to learn that the Soviets plan to deliver 300,000 tons of wheat to the Karmal regime, something the U.S.S.R. might have hesitated to do before the lifting of the U.S. embargo.

Time is short and action is indicated now, unless a very proud and inde-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

pendent people are to be forced to choose between slavery and genocide.●

**ROY W. McDIARMID HONORED
FOR BEVERLY HOSPITAL WORK**

HON. GEORGE DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 16, 1981, the Beverly Hospital Foundation in Montebello, Calif., will hold its annual testimonial dinner-dance, and will be honoring Roy W. McDiarmid.

Roy McDiarmid has given of his time unselfishly for the past 32 years for the betterment of the Beverly Hospital. In 1949 he was one of the key organizers of the then-new Beverly Hospital. It all started when 19 doctors donated 5 acres of land and a 50-bed hospital to the newly formed Beverly Hospital Association. Since then dedicated hard work has produced one of the finest 212-bed hospitals found anywhere.

Roy has held the respect of his colleagues as a board member of the Beverly Hospital. They have elected him to the position of chairman for the past 28 years and a member of the board for 4 years prior to that.

Professionally, he began with Helms Bakeries in 1931 at the age of 28. In 1948 he opened the Helms Bakeries plant in Montebello. He worked his way up to vice president and general manager and, after 37 years of service, retired with a most impressive record of accomplishments.

Roy's civic activities include being on the board of directors of both the Salvation Army in Whittier and the Montebello Chamber of Commerce, and serving as president of the board of directors of the East Los Angeles YMCA for 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Roy McDiarmid on the occasion of this well-deserved honor.●

**SHORTSIGHTEDNESS OF THE
ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET**

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as opposing the Gramm-Latta budget resolution.

My opposition to the resolution is based on and encompasses almost all of its components. I think that the shortsightedness of this measure will soon become evident as we see over the long run the adverse effects of the action that the President has proposed.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the fiscal year 1982 budget is the massive increase in defense expenditures—a 16.5-percent increase in outlays over defense expenditures in 1981. Over the next 4 years, defense expenditures will rise to \$304 billion a year in fiscal year 1985, the last budget year figured by this administration. As desirable as it is to have a strong military, I find it incredible that the military buildup now being contemplated is three times as large as the one that took place during the Vietnam war. Not only is this buildup huge, it has sorely misplaced priorities. Few would argue that the most pressing need of any defense system is for effective and willing personnel. And still fewer would argue that the soldiers and sailors serving in the Armed Forces of the United States are ill-educated, poorly trained and grossly underpaid. It is curious that my colleagues across the aisle, who have so often accused us liberals of "throwing money at social problems" now find themselves in the situation of "throwing money at the Pentagon" without adequate thought of just what those billions of defense dollars will buy us in the next several years. After all, what good is complicated equipment if there is no one able or willing to run and maintain it?

Military spending on the scale proposed in the 1982 budget has another ominous component that many economists are now addressing. Simply, that such expenditures will have severe economic repercussions in years to come. Let us remember that military expenditures during the Vietnam war are now considered by many economists to be one of the main causes of today's soaring inflation rates. Interestingly, military expenditures that fueled inflation during and after the 1960's took place at a time when the annual inflation rate was less than 2 percent. If the massive military expenditures now proposed fuel the inflation juggernaut, what rates can we expect 3 years from now? I do not even wish to conjecture.

Contemplation of soaring inflation rates brought on by unprecedented military expenditures brings me to my next major objection to the Gramm-Latta proposal. These defense increases are accompanied by equally unprecedented cuts in social programs. And who do these cuts most affect? Who is being asked to bear the brunt of this "program for economic recovery"? The people least able to shoulder the burden. The so-called safety net which was supposed to assure us "bleeding hearts" that the truly needy would not be hurt by the budget cuts is now proved to be full of holes. This very day the administration is proposing large cuts in social security benefits, one of the supposedly "untouchable" programs. In my view, this

safety net has always been inadequate. Cuts proposed in school lunch programs and social services, large reductions in health programs, revisions of entitlement programs such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children, will eventually destroy the lives of many Americans.

I object to a budget that would cut 28 percent from such programs as basic education grants, school lunches, vocational education, job training—the very bridges by which many millions of Americans have escaped from the welfare rolls onto productive payrolls.

I object to a budget that would consolidate many vital health services into block grants that are 26 percent below the fiscal year 1981 funding levels for these programs, and 32 percent below the level required to maintain current services. It appears that States will not have to target benefits to the most needy under this block grant proposal, and in many cases will not be subject to any Federal regulation. The truly needy, who are the chief beneficiaries of these programs, are also the least influential politically, and will surely be the losers.

I object to a budget that provides 25.5 percent less for food and nutrition programs than was proposed by the previous administration. These cuts would particularly hit the working poor who rely on small amounts of food stamps and other Federal aid to supplement their earnings. Again, the administration is proposing the destruction of incentives to work.

Mr. Speaker, we have given the administration a fair chance to present its policies. We would, however, abrogate our responsibilities as elected Representatives if we do not critically question the assumptions on which this budget is based. It is my firm belief that these assumptions are wrong. I am confident that the American people will realize just how wrong these assumptions are when the full impact of this budget is felt in communities across the land. We will have other opportunities to reexamine these economic actions we have taken as appropriations bills come before the full House for consideration. In the interest of fairness and equity to all the American people, I urge my colleagues not to fear reexamining their economic priorities. ●

CHANGING CONFIGURATION OF FEDERAL REVENUE SOURCES

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the House Ways and Means Committee, along with its counterpart in the Senate, is deliberating some

very far-reaching tax proposals, which call for significant changes in our three basic sources of Federal revenues—individual, corporate, and social security taxes. The seemingly endless supply of facts and figures that are being tossed around during these proceedings are at times mind boggling. Nevertheless, only through such analysis can meaningful decisions be made.

During a recent meeting with one of my constituents, James E. Wheeler, who teaches tax matters at the University of Michigan, I discussed an important, but often unrecognized or overlooked, aspect—namely, the drastically changing relationship among the three basic revenue sources. Among the information we reviewed was that contained in two charts that I would like to make available at this time:

FEDERAL REVENUE SOURCES¹

[In billions of dollars and percentages]

	Actual 1965	Actual 1980	Estimated 1986
Individual income taxes.....	\$51.2	\$244.1	\$439.5
Corporate income taxes.....	27.0	64.6	72.8
Social insurance taxes.....	24.6	160.7	327.4
Excise taxes and other receipts.....	16.8	50.6	100.5
Total.....	119.6	520.0	940.2

¹ Daily Tax Report of March 10, 1981.

	Percent-age	1965 totals X7,8612 ²	Estimated 1986	Annual ²
Individual income taxes...	42.8	\$402.5	\$439.5	\$37.0
Corporate income taxes...	22.6	212.2	72.8	(139.4)
Social Security taxes.....	20.6	193.4	327.4	134.0
Excise and other receipts.....	14.0	132.1	100.5	(31.6)
Total.....	100	940.2	940.2	0

² Ratio of 1965 (actual): 1985 (estimated).

² Annual change in tax sources in dollars since 1965. ●

TRIBUTE TO DR. VINCENT E. REED

HON. WILLIAM L. CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 12, 1981

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1981, a testimonial dinner is being given in the honor of a very good friend of many years and a former St. Louisan, Dr. Vincent E. Reed, immediate past superintendent of the District of Columbia public schools. This is a most deserving tribute to an outstanding public servant and I am honored to bring Dr. Reed's accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress.

From October 1975 to December 31, 1980, he was the guiding force of the District of Columbia public schools. While Superintendent, he initiated many important programs which have earned him the respect and admira-

tion of his associates and have resulted in significant improvements in the District of Columbia public schools.

During his years of service as an educator, he has served in many capacities: football line coach at West Virginia State College; teacher at Jefferson Junior High School, District of Columbia; counselor at Jefferson Junior High School and Cardozo Senior High School, District of Columbia; assistant director for manpower development and training, District of Columbia public schools; assistant principal, Dunbar and Woodrow Wilson Senior High Schools, District of Columbia; principal, Woodrow Wilson Senior High School, District of Columbia—he was the first black principal to be appointed to a major senior high school serving predominately white students—assistant superintendent in charge of safety and security, personnel and secondary schools for the District of Columbia public schools; executive assistant to the superintendent with responsibility for identifying and resolving educational problems and needs throughout the District of Columbia school system; and associate superintendent for State administration. Dr. Reed is a man who has dedicated his life to the education of the youth of this country. He has been a model and inspiration for others to follow. Dr. Reed provided the vision of an educational giant, a man of great personal courage, a teacher and a mentor. He can be called a figure with true educational vision and the tenacity and skills to realize his goals.

Beside compiling an unblemished record of service as an educator, he has participated actively as a member of various organizations, for example, American Association of School Personnel Administrators, National Education Association, Goodwill Industries, Junior Achievement, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Cathedral School, Children's Hospital, Howard University Hospital, et cetera. In addition, he has been the recipient of numerous awards, for example, Who's Who in America (Marquis), Who's Who Among Black Americans, Catholic University's Outstanding Citizenship Award, Washingtonian of the Year Award, Education Award from Phi Delta Kappa, NAACP Community Service Award, Distinguished Leadership Award from National Association of College Admission Counselors, et cetera.

The highlight of his educational career was achieved by his recent appointment to the position of assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education, Department of Education.

Dr. Reed will be remembered by his fellow colleagues and the residents of the District of Columbia and the city of St. Louis as an outstanding citizen

and a man dedicated to improving and effecting educational excellence. I am honored to have the opportunity to express the gratitude and appreciation of the people of the District of Columbia and of my district, where he was born, to Dr. Vincent E. Reed. I know my colleagues will join me in commending this outstanding educator and in wishing him every success in his future endeavors.●

INFANT FORMULA AND THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF MARKETING

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) and I introduced legislation urging the U.S. delegation to the World Health Organization's May conference in Geneva to vote in favor of the WHO International Code of Marketing of Breast Milk Substitutes.

It is our hope that adoption of this Code will improve the health and well-being of infants in many parts of the world where unsafe water and other unsanitary conditions combine with inadequate knowledge about the proper use of infant formula to produce a critical threat to these infants.

A Washington Post editorial of April 23, 1981, shares our concern and underscores the need for an infant formula marketing code. I request that the full text of that editorial be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1981]

FORMULA FOR TROUBLE

The proposal being made in the World Health Organization that member governments restrict the marketing of infant formula, to encourage breast-feeding, is a tough one for this country and especially for this administration. The proposed code, sanctioning interference in the domestic marketplace to restrict the promotion of a legal product, cuts across the grain of a free-enterprise society and of an administration with a strong anti-regulation bent and—if the truth be told—of a newspaper that lives off advertising. That some part of the anti-formula effort arises from ideological antagonism to multinational corporations makes support of the code even more distasteful. It is understandable why the Reagan administration, inheriting a pro-code position, is contemplating a revision of American policy.

It is important, however, to grasp what is behind the anti-formula campaign, which is worldwide. Some part of it unquestionably does arise from political quarters unfriendly to multinationals and to Western capitalism. As it happens, this part has been extensively publicized in the United States, most recently in connection with the appointment to a State Department post of Ernest

Lefever, who as a private citizen vigorously joined that battle. He says, by the way, he is not taking part in current government deliberations on the WHO code.

The anti-formula campaign remains in essence a health issue. Study after study shows that infant formula, in the imperfect and unsanitary conditions commonly found in the Third World, is bad for babies' health. Formula requires clean water, or the means to sterilize water and bottles or to refrigerate the mixed formula, the money to buy enough formula so as not to have to overdilute it, and the information and training to manage the formula process. Breast-feeding, by contrast, works for all but a small percentage of women, even the undernourished. Typically, a malnourished woman would not have the money to buy formula anyway. Cow's milk is often a superior substitute. That is why experts would keep formula available but would expect it to be used by particular groups of women. Medical testimony puts the number of children's lives that could be saved each year by a return to breast-feeding at a million and upward.

Third World health professionals deplore the trend away from breast-feeding, but often they cannot counter commercial pressures. Students of American tobacco know the problem. Those professional and their political allies are in effect trying to make an end run. They would not try to band the export or sale of formula, but they would use the international network to apply moral pressure on the marketing activities—advertising, free samples, women in nurse-like dress peddling door to door, etc.—of the foreign formula companies. For, though changing life styles doubtless tell, marketing has been shown to help move women off breast-feeding. Switzerland's Nestle is the leader in this \$2 billion-a-year global business. Sales by American firms—Abbott/Ross Labs, Bristol Myers/Mead Johnson and American Home Products/Wyeth Labs—are put in the scores of millions of dollars.

The administration is being compelled to balance its strongly felt ideology and the clearly expressed interests of a business constituency against the dimly perceived health needs of foreign countries, many of which are not particularly sympathetic to some of the administration's other policies. But can it do anything but go with the babies?●

LEGISLATION TO AMEND TITLE V OF HOUSING ACT

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced, by request, legislation to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949. This is the act that authorizes the basic housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration.

In addition to extending the authorization for their programs an additional 2 years, the bill provides the following:

General authorizations—the authorization to insure and guarantee loans.

Subsidized loans—the program for interest subsidized loans.

Farm labor housing loans—the authorization for appropriations for financial assistance under section 514 to individuals, broadly based nonprofit organizations, nonprofit organizations of farmworkers, and public agencies to provide housing and related facilities for domestic farm laborers.

Low-income repair loans and grants—the authorization for appropriations for loans and grants for financial assistance under section 504 for very-low-income owner-occupants to make repairs to remove health and safety hazards to their homes.

Farm labor housing grants—the authorization for financial assistance under section 516 to broadly based nonprofit organizations of farmworkers and public agencies to provide housing and related facilities for domestic farm laborers.

Authorization for approval in appropriation acts for advances under the tax escrowing system.

Authorization for approval in appropriation acts of amounts for compensation for construction defects.

Rural rental housing loans—the authority to make loans to provide financial assistance to corporations, cooperatives, public agencies, individuals and partnerships to buy, build, improve or repair rental or cooperatively owned multifamily living units for occupancy by low to moderate-income families and persons age 62 or older.

Rural housing loans—the authority to provide financial assistance to low- and moderate-income families to buy, build, improve or relocate their homes in rural areas.

Rental assistance—the authority to provide rental assistance under section 521(a)(2). The bill would extend the authorization of appropriations for this program, and rental assistance would be revised to require the low-income occupant to pay not to exceed 30 percent of their income rather than not to exceed 25 percent. The latter change is consistent with changes the administration is seeking in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's section 8 program.

Mutual and self-help housing loans and grants—the authority to make loans and grants under sections 523(b)(1)(A) and (B). Grants are made to nonprofit organizations for the purpose of acquiring land and developing sites.

The draft bill also deletes the home ownership assistance program (section 521(a)(1)(C)) which has never been funded and for which funding authorization will lapse at the end of fiscal year 1981.●

ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN
HERITAGE WEEK

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as we have just observed Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week, I want to congratulate the Asian/Pacific American communities across the country on the occasion of the 3d anniversary of this significant week.

As one of the original sponsors of the resolution establishing the first Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week, I am proud of the response over the last years throughout the country to the celebration of this week. It has given our country an opportunity to recognize and pay tribute to those of Asian/Pacific heritage who have contributed greatly to the culture, medical, social, arts, professional, and political lives in our country.

I have been particularly aware, during these last 3 years since the first celebration, of the many accomplishments made by our Asian/Pacific American friends and have found that the celebration of this special week has not only given the Asian/Pacific American communities an opportunity to celebrate, but it has also given the country the opportunity to learn more of the contributions of this outstanding group of people to our American way of life.

I was pleased that President Reagan recently proclaimed the week of May 4-11, 1981, as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week. It is appropriate that we recognize this group of Americans who have been overlooked in years past. I urge the continuation of this annual event and look forward to the celebration for Asian/Pacific Heritage Week next year.●

WINNING ESSAY

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the winning essay as written by a young man from my district for entry in the DAR Constitution Week essay contest sponsored by the San Marino chapter.

Mr. William Ko is no stranger to receiving honors. On March 2 of this year Mr. Ko was lauded for his achievements in the field of science, winning the Westinghouse Electric Corp. science talent search, an honor bestowed on only 40 students in the entire United States.

Thomas Wolfe said:

If a man has a talent and cannot use it, he has failed. If he has a talent and uses only half of it, he has partly failed. If he has a talent and somehow learns to use the whole of it, he has gloriously succeeded, and won a satisfaction and triumph that few men have ever known.

Mr. Ko seems to be attaining this satisfaction at the early age of 18. Please join me in commending Mr. Ko for the patriotism shown in his essay, and for the achievements he has earned.

The essay follows:

WHAT THE CONSTITUTION MEANS TO ME

A lone bugler stands, silhouetted against the morning sun, sounding the call to awaken men in their defense of their country, the United States of America. Their primary interest is in the preservation of the American democracy, as set forth by the Constitution of the United States of America. The Constitution maintains a static democracy which has persisted despite wars, economic hardships, and political crises. The importance of the Constitution lies in the freedom of speech and of welfare it provides me.

The Constitution provides a chance for its citizens to vote, which I participated in last election year. I felt the need for a new change, a change which the Constitution provides for in an orderly fashion. It prohibits the transformation of our government into a totalitarian dictatorship. It provides for law and order and prevents an anarchy which has ruined countless other countries. Freedom of speech, in the form of books, magazines, and even the television media, enables me to comprehend what our country encompasses: I can make my own decisions with my own judgment.

The Constitution to me means freedom from fear of unlawful prosecution and malicious persecution. In court one is always innocent until proven guilty. Provided one is within the realm of law, one can speak his mind. No one is forced to believe in the religion of others. The Constitution separates state from religion for the good of all.

As the time changes, as new ideas come of age, people can make amendments to the Constitution. This flexibility allows me to help determine, in a small way, how our Constitution may be modified for the benefit of all. For example, recent amendments have been added to adapt the Constitution to changing times: the right of eighteen year old people to vote by the Twenty-Sixth Amendment, and the right of all its citizens to vote in the Twenty-Fourth Amendment.

Thus the Constitution is a very important document which has provided for the general welfare of all its citizens. I as a high school student, have, as I see, a bright future in our country, despite all obstacles and problems which grip our country. Our Constitution provides a basis from which we may strive to attain and maintain a true democracy.●

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS
WEEK

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's small business people

have special cause to celebrate during National Small Business Week. We, in Congress, offered them and all Americans the first hope from the Federal Government they have seen in years.

Passage last week of the Reagan budget put this country on a new course, a course that the shopkeepers, farmers, and manufacturers of this Nation have patiently awaited.

The new beginning is important to small businessmen, therefore to the Nation. Our Nation was built on a solid foundation of many and diverse small businesses. Small businesses employ more than 50 percent of all Americans working in the private sector—they account for more than 43 percent of our gross national product. Half of our country's inventions are credited to small business people who use their imagination and ingenuity to find better ways to produce the goods of this country. An unfettered small business community can make our economy vital again.

The need for a healthy small business climate should be obvious to Congress. We must unshackle small business by enacting the across-the-board tax revisions, regulatory reform, and budget changes proposed by President Reagan.

As a businessman, I know what it is like to meet a payroll, live within a budget even in austere times, and comply with burdensome Government regulations. I know as a Congressman that we have the ability to ease the regulations, to reduce the oppressive taxation, and to restore the incentive and opportunity that allowed this country to become the No. 1 Nation in the world.

As we salute the entrepreneurs of this Nation, let us remember that all the fine tributes we pay them must be backed up with action. The action is clearly outlined to this Congress by the President. We took the first step last week—we cannot falter now.●

IDEOLOGICAL COMPETITION IN
U.S. STRATEGY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jan Nowak, a consultant on international affairs to the National Security Council in the previous administration, as well as the present one, is a friend of long standing. A scholar and a keen observer of world events, he had served as director of the Polish Language Service of Radio Free Europe. By virtue of his background, Mr. Nowak is particularly well qualified to comment on Soviet imperialism and the responses of the free world and he is especially knowledgeable on

questions of international communications and international information policies.

Mr. Nowak has recently written a memorandum entitled "Ideological Competition in United States Strategy." In his memorandum, he has analyzed the sources of Soviet strengths and weaknesses, the latter point often being overlooked in Western circles. He is critical of the preoccupation with statistics and the neglect of the human factor in examining the East-West balance of power. He reaffirms the American commitment to human rights by proposing indirect and long-range strategies in support of free institutions everywhere. He calls for a dramatic expansion of the role of Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Voice of America. "It is in the area of ideological competition that the United States and its allies have the best chance of success," Mr. Nowak claims.

I commend Mr. Nowak's views to your attention. They are affirmative. They offer encouragement to those who seek positive ways to defend Western values and strength and promote human freedoms.

SUMMARY

Under conditions of nuclear parity, the US has not so far been able to prevent unilateral Soviet gains.

In addition to other measures, it is suggested that the US could reduce Soviet capacity to pursue expansionist policies and combat Soviet influence on the ground abroad by strengthening US capabilities for ideological communication and political action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The US should capitalize on declining Soviet ideological credibility at home and abroad with a political offensive including the following:

1) Limit trade, credits and technological sharing likely to ease deteriorating economic conditions in the USSR and thus to weaken domestic pressures against expansionist priorities.

2) Reconceptualize the human rights component of US policy to emphasize indirect and long-range strategies in support of the development of free institutions (e.g., press, business, scholarship, education, elections) everywhere while continuing direct focus on current oppressive official behavior only where tactically useful.

Abandonment of the Human Rights Policy or applying it only to Communist-ruled countries, with the loss of credibility that entails, would be disaster—not least for the dissidents and other opposition forces in the Soviet orbit.

3) Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Voice of America should be dramatically expanded in terms of transmitter power, staff, and operational funds. Similar efforts should be extended to Cuba and other countries which serve as a proxy for the Soviet Union. Research should be undertaken to improve short wave transmitting facilities, and to explore possibilities of internal broadcasting and televised programs by satellites.

Attempts to stabilize the existing status quo through negotiated agreements have been undertaken repeatedly in the post-war

period. (In Potsdam, 1945; in Moscow, 1972; in Helsinki, 1974.) Each time the Soviets took full advantage of an agreement recognizing their past gains, but continued to strive for further extension of their influence. The code of international conduct has been very differently interpreted on the two sides.

Unless the United States can find ways to prevent further expansion of Soviet influence without resorting to measures involving risk of self-destruction, the end of this decade may see a disintegration of alliances and the defeat of Western democracies without war.

SOURCES OF SOVIET STRENGTH AND WEAKNESSES

Soviet political will to implement ideological commitments and to accept necessary risks have been the main source of Soviet advantage over the United States in the post-war era.

A system based on compulsion has greater ability than any democracy to concentrate its resources on one selected target (military buildup). Spending 15 percent of GNP on defense in times of peace would be unacceptable to people under any democratically-elected government. Ruthless exploitation of Soviet society to pursue global objectives has become, however, not only the main foundation of the Soviet's military power, but in the longer run the principal cause of its internal vulnerability and weakness. In economic terms, extension of Soviet control and influence since World War II has brought more losses than profits. The Soviet people have to underwrite heavy military aid to satellites, clients and subversive forces manipulated by Moscow all over the world. Decline of economic growth compounded by increase of population and the inefficiencies of an overcentralized system are bound to cause further comparative deterioration of living conditions.

The widespread Western opinion that the endurance of the Soviet people has no limits, and that Soviet masses will remain forever submissive, is not borne out of Moscow's own perception of internal dangers. The Soviet reaction to the Polish crisis betrays deep fear of contamination. Extraordinary efforts to block Western broadcasts as the main carriers of ideological "infection" betray Moscow's sense of weakness. The Polish example may begin to undermine the self-defeating conviction, deeply rooted in the mind of Soviet people, that any resistance in whatever form is doomed and self-destructive.

At present, popular discontent in the Soviet Union finds its only manifestation in slow and sloppy work, absenteeism, and alcoholism as the main escape from the drabness of life. Compulsion cannot extract more work and better quality of goods than the absolute minimum necessary to avoid reprisals or loss of earnings. Workers have unlimited ways and means to sabotage production with impunity. Production in such crucial areas as coal and collectivized agriculture is already adversely affected. Polish developments may turn this subconscious behavior into the beginnings of passive resistance of people aware of their objectives.

NEGLECT OF HUMAN FACTOR IN UNITED STATES STRATEGIC THOUGHT

One of the main weaknesses of the United States in the present competitive relationship with the Soviet Union lies in our lack of will to accept even the minimal risks necessary to exploit the social and political vulnerabilities of the adversary. U.S. strategists

tend to assess the balance of power exclusively in numerical terms of modern weaponry. The example of Poland should serve as a reminder of the role played by the human factor which has been so far largely ignored in U.S. strategy. Polish workers have challenged the superpower which dominates them with no other weapons in their hands than their own courage, solidarity, and the readiness to accept supreme sacrifices. Actually, ever since 1956 the Soviet Union, faced with a risk of confrontation with the whole Polish nation, has tolerated considerable deviation by Poland from its own orthodox model.

In the present challenge to our survival, the Soviet commitment to expansionism, inherent in the Soviet doctrine, can be eroded only by pressure from a well-informed population which has to pay its costs.

United States policy can enhance this process in two areas: 1. Trade, credits, and export of technology; 2. Ideological competition.

In the past, economic concessions followed every settlement which the Soviets had no intention to respect. Credits from the West and expansion of trade helped Moscow to avoid economic reforms and changes in the distribution of the national income. In the longer run, credits, trade, and joint investment ventures may pose a serious threat to cohesion of the NATO alliance and may weaken resistance of its members to Soviet pressure. A denial or restriction of credits, export of goods and technology is bound to have a considerable impact on the Soviet economy and may eventually slow down the Soviet military buildup as consumer pressures impinge on available resources.

THE HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY

The recent shift in the balance of advantage in the ideological competition in favor of the West calls for a reconceptualization of Human Rights Policy, a dramatic expansion of such instruments as Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty, and the Voice of America, and the development of new capabilities for political action abroad.

Western democracies regained some initiative in the ideological competition at Helsinki. Carter's policy of human rights could have given it new impetus. Unfortunately, it was launched without any clear definition of objectives, means, or priorities.

Definition: Human Rights Policy should not mean preaching morality to others, even less imposing it by such negative leverage as denial of military and economic aid. Of necessity, such measures are restricted to U.S. right-wing allies and clients, leaving the chief violator of human rights outside its range. Selective defense of human rights geographically—and ideologically—oriented in only one direction leads to moral duplicity and loss of credibility. By helping to replace weak right-wing dictatorships by Communist totalitarian regimes supported by the Brezhnev Doctrine, the policy of human rights provides Moscow with more opportunities to further its interests.

The policy of human rights should be reconceptualized as a powerful weapon in the struggle for survival of the Western democracies. It should be defined as moral, political and economic assistance offered to individuals and groups abroad who share our democratic values and are ready to work and fight for them in their own countries by nonviolent means. Such a definition excludes any terrorist groups and Marxists who simply aim to replace one totalitarian regime by another. Only under such a defini-

nition can a policy of human rights by applied universally and consistently to people who, by the very nature of their aspirations for freedom and democracy, are supporters and allies of the United States.

Under a new human rights policy, emphasizing the growth of free institutions, help would be offered openly in a manner consistent with accepted standards of international conduct. Moral and financial support to dissidents, to nonviolent defenders of human rights, and, especially, to working journalists, teachers, civic leaders and other conscious and unconscious agents of constructive political change cannot be dependably supplied either through diplomatic channels nor covertly by the CIA. In particular, the policy of human rights should not interfere with diplomatic dialogue and negotiations with foreign governments.

The United States must develop the capability to work through unofficial as well as official channels. The Soviet organizations which promote the expansions of Soviet influence are not bound by policies of detente professed by official foreign spokesmen. Soviet organizations act on various levels, but pursue through different methods the same long-range objectives of the Soviet state and party. They are of course controlled and coordinated at the highest echelons at the center of power.

Logistical support of the forces of freedom (and defense of human rights) should be placed in the hands of a committee (commission, foundation, or institute), financed at least in part by the Congress and subject to Congressional review. It should be subject to oversight at a high level of the Administration. It should, however, enjoy the same measure of autonomy as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The proposed Congressionally-chartered organization would perform two basic functions: It should serve as a visible symbol of concern, support and encouragement from the American people for dissidents and democratic defenders of fundamental freedoms in the Soviet orbit and for profreedom elements elsewhere in the world. In particular, it would perform the following functions:

1. Provide help to victims of political persecution and their families.
2. Assist in generating publicity about persecuted human rights activists as the best protection against their oppressors.
3. Publish works of writers, scholars and artists suppressed by censorship and assist in distribution of such works within the framework of free flow of ideas and information.
4. Encourage awards and prizes to creative people doomed to oblivion in their native countries, and provide other incentives as well to individuals, groups and organizations who distinguish themselves in the defense of human rights and the promotion of fundamental freedoms both inside and outside the Soviet orbit.
5. Enhance cooperation and meetings of private and governmental organizations engaged in activities expanding freedom around the world.

THE ROLE OF WESTERN MEDIA

Without the Western radios in recent years, Soviet dissidents would have been deprived of one of their main communication lines with the broad masses of people. The solidarity of Polish workers was made possible by Western radio.

There is at least one other programmatic and budgetary implication of the recommended approach: USICA should be beefed

up by strengthening not only VOA but also the other media and exchange activities suitable for enhancing American capabilities for ideological competition inside and outside the Soviet sphere.

CONCLUSION

Soviet expansion cannot be effectively contained by nuclear deterrence, negotiated settlements or conventional diplomacy. The old policy of containment is no longer a viable option because the United States has lost the nuclear superiority on which it was based. Under conditions of parity, the Soviet Union's nuclear deterrent provides a shield for their expansionist adventures.

All of the activities reviewed in this paper should, by Presidential directive, be accorded a budgetary priority as high as any other national security enhancement project. This not only makes programmatic sense; it would go far, when suitably announced, to establish the seriousness of the Administration's commitment to the pursuit of traditional American ideals in world affairs.●

"GOLDEN LADY" AWARDS

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with greater pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievements of Agatha Spatola O'Connor and Benedetta Giannotto of my congressional district. Their extraordinary contributions to the Essex County community and to the State of New Jersey have earned them the "Golden Lady" award of the National Women of Achievement Organization.

Mrs. O'Connor, a community leader in Newark's North ward, was honored with the Humanitarian Award for her many civic, charitable, and community services. The founder and president of the St. Gerard Ladies Guild of Newark, Mrs. O'Connor also serves as a director of social services for Villa Victoria, a housing complex in Newark. Her statewide activities include membership in the New Jersey State Funeral Directors Association and the Italian-American Federation of New Jersey.

Mrs. Giannotto, recognized for her pharmacy work at Newark's St. James Hospital, served the State of New Jersey diligently as a member of the board of trustee of Rutgers University from 1974 to 1980. Her community services also include activities for the American and New Jersey Pharmaceutical Associations.

I am honored, Mr. Speaker, to join the National Women of Achievement Organization in recognizing the numerous contributions and accomplishments of these two dedicated women.●

THOMAS HARKNESS, M.D., RETIRES FROM PRESIDENCY OF CALIFORNIA SOCIETY OF ANESTHESIOLOGISTS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, early next month, Dr. Thomas Harkness, a personal friend from my home town, will step down as president of the California Society of Anesthesiologists. I do not want to let the opportunity pass to join his many friends in wishing him well on this occasion.

For the past 20 years or so, Tom has been referred to as "the man in Redlands who you would most like to have put you to sleep." More seriously, he is a highly respected member of the local medical community.

Tom came to Redlands in 1963, after service in the U.S. Air Force and a brief stint at the University of Missouri School of Medicine as an assistant professor of anesthesiology. Prior to that, he had attended the University of California at Berkeley as an undergraduate, obtained his medical training at Yale University and his advanced specialty from the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia.

He is a member of both the American Medical Association and the California Medical Association. Prior to assuming his duties as president of the California Society of Anesthesiologists, he held several other posts within that organization and is also the California delegate to the American Society of Anesthesiologists.

During the past 20 years, Tom has not let his busy medical practice interfere with his participation in a wide range of community service activities in our area and he is well-known for his contributions to the city of Redlands. I am delighted to join his friends and family in congratulating him on a job well done.●

REMEMBER ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY

GEORGE C. WORTLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, we marked the fourth anniversary of Anatoly Shcharansky's arrest and imprisonment in the Soviet Union. The continued imprisonment of Anatoly Shcharansky demonstrates the total lack of freedom and justice within the Soviet Union.

For 4 long years, he has been denied the right to emigrate to Israel and to be reunited with his wife, Avital. For 4

years he has been imprisoned for joining the Helsinki Watch Group which monitored Soviet compliance with the Helsinki accords. Because of his commitment to basic human rights, he has spent 4 long years in prison. For this commitment to simple human justice, the Soviet authorities have sentenced him to 13 years in prison.

I think that the world agrees that 4 years is too long, 1 day's imprisonment would be too much for a man who sought nothing more than to have his country live up to the international agreements it consented to abide by. Shcharansky's imprisonment underscores the Soviet Union's history of picking and choosing which of its international agreements it wishes to adhere to. This history of Soviet non-compliance should be remembered in all our dealings with that country.

In September 1980, Shcharansky's mother was allowed to visit her son for the first time in more than 1 year. Her visit, which is his only contact with the outside world, was limited to a scant 2 hours. There was a guard present at all times. She was not even permitted to give him anything, not even a Jewish calendar or food. His mother, in observing him on a previous visit, described him as "looking like an Auschwitz prisoner." This is Soviet justice.

The continued holding of Anatoly Shcharansky is a mockery of justice. When Shcharansky was tried the free world stood with him, but not as "defendants". The free world found the Soviet Union guilty of violating its own international obligations.

Our response to the passing of yet another anniversary spent in prison must be that we remember Shcharansky's plight and that we will never forget him. Shcharansky's last words to the Soviet court must be repeated by us today with a slight variation, "Next year in Jerusalem."●

COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY OVERSTEPS BOUNDS

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in western Wisconsin and many other parts of the country, there is increasing concern about the lobbying activities of community action agencies.

I share this concern, expressed to me by dozens of my constituents.

Recently in Wisconsin's Third District the West Central Wisconsin Community Action program—West CAP—overstepped its bounds, in the view of many.

Numerous citizens of our district have contacted me to register their discontent over the activities of West

CAP. West CAP has conducted a campaign that is clearly designed to bring pressure upon legislators to block parts of the President's economic recovery plan.

REAGAN SAYS "NO" TO HUMAN NEEDS

The West CAP campaign has included writing, publishing, and distributing a brochure titled, "Reagan Says 'No' To Human Needs."

Through public meetings in each of West CAP's seven counties, by means of its taxpayer financed toll-free number, and as a result of staff activities, this community action agency has waged an aggressive campaign among its constituents.

Because of these highly questionable activities by West CAP, I have asked the Community Services Agency to conduct an investigation of West CAP, to determine whether Federal law has been violated in its efforts to influence legislation proposed by the President.

At the present time, the CSA Acting General Counsel and the CSA Inspector General are conducting thorough investigations of West CAP.

Government funds intended to help the poor should be used for that purpose, not diverted to lobbying activities. While community action agencies by law may take an advocacy position on behalf of the poor and engage in educational activities to that end, this action goes beyond those bounds.

WEST CAP MAILING CALLED "DISGRACEFUL"

Mr. Speaker, several newspapers in my area have commented about the West CAP activities. For the review by my colleagues and as further background to substantiate the charges, I submit them for the RECORD:

[From the Colfax Messenger, Apr. 9, 1981]

WEST CAP'S RECENT MAILING IS DISGRACEFUL; INVESTIGATION IS TIMELY

Third Dist. Congressman Gunderson has charged that West CAP, based in Glenwood City, has overstepped its bounds by sending out a recent brochure "Reagan says 'No' to Human Needs."

He sees the brochure as an effort to influence legislation through direct action, labelled it as wrong and is seeking an immediate investigation. As a result, the federal Community Services Administration will investigate the matter.

We support Gunderson's position in this matter. West CAP, and the approximately 900 other community action agencies like it, are supposed to be the means through which Community Service Administration implements its programs to reduce poverty. They involve somewhere around 16 million people and that means a big chunk of tax money is needed to support them.

According to law, West CAP may take an advocacy position on behalf of the poor and engage in educational activities to that end.

However, we don't believe the brochure, admitted by West CAP spokesmen to be deliberately slanted, falls within the heading "educational activities."

West CAP personnel themselves were dubious of the propriety of the brochure. So questioning of it in fact that West CAP employees tossed money into a kitty to pay for the printing of the brochure, so public

funds wouldn't be used for such a questionable cause.

Then, by circular reasoning, West CAP decided mailing the brochures out was an informational endeavor, since the brochures told people about meetings where proposed budget cuts would be discussed. Therefore, public funds were used to pay the postage.

Since the brochures asked readers to attend the meetings to protest budget cuts; write to federal legislators, urging opposition to the budget cuts; and to call West CAP's toll-free number to register opposition, we view them as being blatantly a lobbying effort. And we view the mailing of them to be an integral part of that effort since brochures not distributed would have no impact.

We see the matter as one akin to public employees attempting to feather their nests. President Reagan's budget cuts would affect West CAP, probably causing staff reductions, in our estimation. Therefore, it was clearly in the best personal interest of the staff members to pay for the brochures in an attempt to rally public support to save their jobs.

We find that to be a disgraceful use of a government sponsored agency; attempting to use the people its supposed to serve in such a way as to serve the publically funded employees by attempting to protect their jobs; using public money to pay for the mailing of such a twisted effort.

Actions such as these tend to make the public employees the masters and the working taxpayers the help. That's the reverse of what should be.

[From the Redwing (Minn.) Republican Eagle, Apr. 8, 1981]

TAX-PAID "INFO" VERSUS REAGAN

A low-income citizens' meeting tonight at Pepin (7 p.m., high school) is part of what has moved new Cong. Steve Gunderson to righteous indignation—and a request for the Washington head office to investigate.

(New Cong. Vin Weber from south-western Minnesota has gone the same indignation-investigation route, and we'd be surprised if the same thing hasn't happened fairly commonly throughout the country.)

The 7-county federal anti-poverty arm known as West CAP, officed at Glenwood City, roused Gunderson's ire initially by mailing out last month 11,000 copies of a brochure entitled, "Reagan Says No to Human Needs, What Do You Say?"

We've received a four-page article from West CAP, and its thrust is what the title above implies: strong language against productivity tax cuts for business, against Defense increases like the F-18 fighter and MX missile system, against reductions in food stamps and other welfare programs—an across-the-board assault on the Reagan economic plan that places the author leftward of Teddy Kennedy.

It's not free-speech criticism to which Gunderson objects, but to a sustained anti-administration political campaign directed by federally paid employees.

We called West CAP to hear Public Info Director Doug Drake's defense. The brochure and tonight's meeting are within the guidelines, he said. Technically, West CAP is a non-profit private corporation, although most of its funds are federal. LBJ's basic Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 directed agencies like his to be "advocates for the poor."

But tax funds and tax-paid staff time are involved in the brochure and meetings,

Drake conceded. It does run close to the prohibition on "lobbying," he added.

No, there'll be nobody at tonight's meeting to counter the anti-Reagan "information" with the pro-Reagan arguments that overcoming inflation and spurring U.S. economic growth are the best things that could happen for America's poor, that national defense must take precedence.

Curious, and assuming that the answer would be "Jimmy Carter," we inquired whom Drake backed for President last November. "Barry Commoner," he replied.

Well, Gunderson is right. There's a good case study here of how hard it is to get red ink Big Government back under control.

On their own time, Drake and other West CAPers may do as they like. But Ronald Reagan won last Nov. 4, and he can rightly expect not to have tax-paid federal agents running around the countryside, on federal time, building backfires against his new administration. ●

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. AND CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1981—the 13th anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.—the Congressional Black Caucus, the King Center for Nonviolent Social Change, and 69 national religious, civil rights, labor, and public interest organizations sponsored seminars throughout the country on the relevance of Dr. King's ideas and politics to the present day. Forty-eight Members of Congress endorsed the purposes of the seminars.

One of the purposes of the King seminars, in rediscovering his ideals, ideas, and political methods, was to confront what is wrong with the politics of the present, the priorities that now exist within the Reagan administration, and America's foreign policies. Understanding what is wrong today, it was hoped, would lead to workable concepts for making changes and for discovering the means by which constructive changes could be accomplished.

In Washington, D.C., three separate seminars explored Dr. King's concepts of economic justice, civil and human rights, and his concept of the world community. The discussion was tape recorded, and I have begun the process of transcribing portions of the dialog. In printed form, the discussions held on April 4 will be circulated to all interested citizens around the Nation, and the dialog on Martin Luther King will thereby be continued.

I want to share with my colleagues at this point a portion of the discussion of Dr. King's concept of civil and human rights, that took place at the Howard University Law School. The seminar was convened by my distin-

guished colleague and good friend, Congressman MICKEY LELAND, of Houston, Tex. Congressman LELAND began the discussion by acknowledging the great influence that Martin Luther King had on his life and career. As he observed, "Had it not been for Dr. King, I would not have had the commitment to my community and to the political struggle that I have now."

Participating in the discussion were Dr. Herbert Reid, of Howard University Law School, Dr. Benjamin Quarles, of Morgan State University, and Dr. Evans Crawford, of Howard University. Herbert Reid is a former dean of the law school and is known, among his other pursuits, for his extraordinary legal work before the Supreme Court and other courts that gave legal and juridical meaning to the civil rights revolution. Dr. Benjamin Quarles, in addition to his distinguished teaching career at Morgan State and other universities, is the author of "The Negro in the Making of America" and "Black Abolitionists." Dr. Evans Crawford is dean of the chapel at Howard University and a professor of social ethics in its divinity school.

Portions of their discussion on Dr. King's theory and practice of civil and human rights follow:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY SEMINAR ON MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. AND CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Herbert Reid: "Dr. King made a great contribution to the theory and practice of non-violence and civil disobedience. He had a deep belief in the system and the people. He believed that if the conscience of America were informed, then Americans would react positively. Each of us has to reflect on whether or not Dr. King's belief has been vindicated. * * * He gave, of course, great impetus to the civil rights movement, and I will offer some thoughts on what is it and where it is. We have conceived of the civil rights struggle as a racial struggle. That to me gives credit to the system where credit is not due. What Americans have been dealing with in terms of Blacks and the peoples of Africa in a sense is whether or not we can or should become part of the body politic and whether or not we are human beings and should be treated as such. No other group has had that kind of treatment. Yet despite this we have made some progress over the years. * * * On the other hand, there are many ominous signs developing that we are moving backwards in terms of civil rights. The attack on civil rights now is in high gear, on all fronts. We are moving backwards at a fast rate in the courts. In *Balden v. Mobile* (1980) the Court set up a premise so that we can eliminate Members of Congress like Mickey Leland by requirements approving intentional discrimination in apportionment cases, or against complaints of racial discrimination, gerrymandering, and so forth. * * *

"In legislatures there have been anti-busing amendments and other amendments. Many affirmative action cases have been placed before legislative wills in a way that it appeared that what had been accomplished through legislative action and, for that matter, court action, could be taken

away by legislative action. * * * In the Executive arm of government we have turned the clock back. * * * I hope out of this will come the realization among black citizens and their allies, that we have come through hard times before, and will do so again. This is not a time for despair. It is a time for planning, for strategizing and for developing how we purport to move from the point we are at. I hope the Congressional Black Caucus will convene a meeting to discuss legal strategy. What we operate under now is bankrupt. * * *

Benjamin Quarles: "The early part of King's career was based on his seeking after citizen rights—the rights of citizenship in a particular nation. The latter part of his career was involved in seeking after human rights. Human rights is a far broader concept, that involves people all over the world beyond the boundaries of one country or one group. * * * King's career was launched in December, 1955 in the Montgomery Bus Boycott. His life ended on April 4, 1968 in Memphis where he was assisting in a bus drivers' and a garbage men's strike. In both he was engaged in civil and economic rights of Black citizens. * * * Because he was such a great leader he was able to say some frank, not-so-pleasant things to the Black community itself. He used to say, while oppression exists, of course, you can't blame everything on oppression. And he would say, there are things Blacks can do for themselves, and inner strengths can overcome external obstacles. * * * In his book, 'Stride Toward Freedom,' which he finished in 1958 and which examines the Montgomery Bus Boycott, he expresses the hope that the Negro can give new spiritual dynamic to the Western world and give the world greater spiritual power. Here he points to the larger concept of human rights. At a Lincoln University commencement in 1961 he says, all of us have to develop a world perspective if we are to survive. He also said, all of life is interrelated and we are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality tied to a single garment of destiny. * * * He traveled to India and then to Africa, and he acquired a world perspective, the highpoint of which was the Nobel Peace Prize that he received in Oslo in 1964. * * * We take strength in Martin Luther King's strength, courage in his courage, and faith from his faith. * * *

Dr. Evans Crawford: "We studied together at the same institution in Boston. * * * Martin belonged to that school that believes, you cannot reduce everything in reality to its behavioral manifestations, to sense perceptions or what appears to be the situation. If you do that, you lose an important dimension of what people are about. When we consider the present day, the technological society in which we all live, if we don't have persons like Martin who have probed beyond the limits of technology to the human reality, then we won't be able to deal with some of the disappointments that we feel when that technology fails, or when society fails, that inevitably happens. * * * It is important to revive Martin's thoughts and understand the important place that values had for him. He used to say, the law needs help. People would say to him, let's make a law to solve this or that problem. But to him, it was not enough to just make laws, or that making laws by itself would solve all problems. He believed that individuals had to do something about the problems around them, had to take some actions. Put your own body and your own trust on the line. And individuals had to be

willing to take the consequences of challenging the law. The highest respect for the law is being willing to take the consequences of challenging it. You don't get this kind of thought about law today. * * * King's sense of values ought to be revived because we simply cannot allow other people, who have hidden agendas, to capture this business of 'law and order.' King sparked and symbolized the highest respect for the law. I like to think that great Black constitutional thinkers like Thurgood Marshall made their contribution in large part because of Martin Luther King's respect for the law and his concern for values. * * *

MICHIGAN SENATE ON EL SALVADOR

HON. GEO. W. CROCKETT, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, recently the Michigan State Senate passed a resolution expressing its deep concern over the U.S. involvement in El Salvador and urging an internationally supported, negotiated peaceful settlement of the civil struggle now going on in that country.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include the text of that State senate resolution at this point in the RECORD:

SENATE RESOLUTION 86

Whereas, Among the thousands of victims of terrorism in El Salvador were three nuns and a Catholic lay worker, all from the United States, who were kidnapped, tortured, and raped before being executed and thrown into a common grave; and

Whereas, The demand by the United States government for a full investigation and explanation of these recent murders still has been met with indifference; and

Whereas, The assassination of Sister Ita was a result of her work with the ever-increasing refugees, which included distributing food, medicine, and clothing to thousands of hungry, diseased, and barefoot people; and

Whereas, The horror stories grow daily of beatings, killings, burnings, stealings, and the displacement of people from their families and homes in El Salvador; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the government of the United States be urged to join with international religious and relief organizations to negotiate a peaceful settlement in El Salvador in order to prevent the intellectual and political desolation that lies ahead if yet another country is plunged into the anguish of death that surrounds violent resolution of disputes; and be it further

Resolved, That America's ideological support for freedom around the world should not require the placement of American forces on foreign soil lending a perception of our ill-fated "Vietnam" posture in Latin America; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislative body shall recognize the ringing of church bells and other carillons on Good Friday, April 17, 1981, at 3:00 p.m. as an expression of hope and commitment to those who seek a non-violent settlement in El Salvador and an end to the human suffering; and be it further

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan Delegation to the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the Senate, April 8, 1981. ●

MINNESOTA'S THOUGHTFUL, WRY SENATOR

HON. ARLEN ERDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD a newspaper column written by Nick Thimmesch of the Los Angeles Times Syndicate. It is entitled, "Minnesota's Thoughtful, Wry Senator".

Now that title could refer to many Minnesotans, but in this case it's a story about Senator DAVID DURENBERGER. It is a story about a former Jesuit seminarian who came to the U.S. Senate from a State with a long history of progressive politics. It is a story about the incongruities of minority versus majority politics in the U.S. Senate. And it is more than that, but I will let Mr. Thimmesch explain:

[From the Los Angeles Times Syndicate, Mar. 18, 1981]

MINNESOTA'S THOUGHTFUL, WRY SENATOR
(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON—Minnesota's Dave Durenberger, once a Jesuit seminarian, is one of the more thoughtful Republicans in the Senate. He seems bemused about the new sensation of being part of a majority. And he's also concerned over what the resurgent GOP should stand for.

He came to the Senate two years ago, and soon learned that as a minority member "you can't effect change unless the Democrats agree with you. If you push a new idea, when it comes, it has a Democrat's name on it. I couldn't spend a lifetime as a minority member voting for Jesse Helms' amendments, those not going anywhere. The minority has no responsibility.

"It's much more comfortable to be in the majority and have the responsibility. It's also better not having Bob Byrd (former majority leader) keeping you here until the middle of the night. Since more than half the senators here are in their first term, they are not set in their ways and feel comfortable with responsibility.

"The old way of interpreting people as liberals, moderates or conservatives didn't have much to do with the reality of what went on here. I always voted against amendments which weren't going anywhere—cut food stamps, cut this, stop that. So I got labeled as being some kind of Teddy Kennedy, when I wasn't.

"Now we Republicans have the responsibility and are moderate as hell. We're talking about what should be done, not about what did Strom Thurmond or Jake Garn or Orrin Hatch say."

Durenberger, 46, laughs when he talks with such human propinquity. He was reared in the company of Benedictine monks at St. Johns University, where his father was athletic director. The wry humor the monks used to explain the incongruities of earthly life rubs off on people like

Eugene McCarthy, Dave Durenberger, and J. F. Powers, the writer.

Durenberger solidly supports President Reagan and his program. "The Reagan today is not the Reagan of speculation," he says. "He has shown that he relies on the best people he can find. He has one helluva sense of where the American people are today. He is able to communicate and has their trust. He doesn't abuse his power, and he is honest to his convictions. He can get emotional like Hubert (Humphrey) used to, with a catch in his throat.

"The spending cuts won't be a big problem in the Senate. Food stamps, dairy supports, veterans' benefits are controversial. But if we follow the plan to vote up and down on the bill as a package, it will be difficult to determine where we are on individual programs. We can get into trouble if we start switching things around, so that only farmers and poor people get screwed.

"We're trying to prove to people that we can stop our spending here so they will respond by stopping theirs. We'll take the medicine and get inflation under control. A year from now, we'll sort out the roles of federal and state government. Then, in future years, we can do things the right way here, piece by piece."

Durenberger's favorite study subject is redefining federalism. "It's not getting the feds out and letting the states do it," he says. "That's too simplistic. It's deciding what functions the feds should take and which belong to the states. Should the feds undertake the major obligations to people—income, security and health—and leave public works, housing and education to the cities and states?"

The intergovernmental system today costs \$83 billion, and while of good intent, often executes poorly. Durenberger cites the fuel assistance program for old people. Initially, these allocations were based on local fuel costs and severity of weather. Now, with two formulas, states are entitled to the greater of the two. So few assistance checks go to balmy Micronesia.

Categorical grants also go haywire. State and local government doesn't take part in deciding what they will be, only in accepting them and agreeing to match their funds. "By this mechanism," Durenberger says, "we disturb local priorities, burden local officials with reporting requirements, waste federal dollars and misallocate resources—and only sometimes achieve the goal."

Durenberger is the chief Republican sponsor of the Omnibus Small Business Capital Formation Act which: provides investment tax credit for new small businesses; reduces corporate tax rates, with small business getting the best break; cuts gift and estate taxes and eliminates taxes on estates valued at less than \$600,000 so farmers and small businessmen can will their property to their spouses or children; reforms accounting procedures so inventory costs reflect the cost of inflation.

Such concern for the bourgeoisie is what probably separates Durenberger from the run of Democrats and what, in a short time, has turned Minnesota from an overwhelmingly Democratic state into one where both senators, the governor and seven of the 10 congressmen are now Republicans.

Durenberger is sensitive to Minnesota's progressive political tradition, and tells GOP audiences that "while a landslide (1980) brings out the best in people," Republicans must work to enhance the notion that they are the party of hope and a better future, and not ride on negativism.

Durenberger says:
 "My hope is that we will reach out beyond those who find every governmental act a threat to private property; reach out to the many, especially the young and the elderly, who because of government neglect cannot afford a home of their own."

He applied the same dictum to health care costs and the challenge of strengthening families, reminding his fellow Republicans that it is not enough to carp about socialized medicine or the "permissive" society.

"It is time that the Republican Party stood for something more than a political platform from which desperate, unhappy citizens and single-interest groups select candidates for president and Congress," he says. "We must not turn our backs on the poor, the elderly, the infirm, the worker or the farmer. We must not forget our God-given mandate to create a nation of equality, of authority, or personal security."

That's pretty good stuff for a freshman senator who roars with laughter when explaining that while he has delayed announcing that he will be a candidate again, "there's nobody I meet who doubts that I'm going to run."●

FUNDING FOR PLAYHOUSE SQUARE AND CONTINUATION OF EDA

HON. DENNIS ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, the House Appropriations Committee restored \$3.5 million to the fiscal year 1981 budget for a project that possesses a tremendous economic potential to the people of Cleveland. The Playhouse Square redevelopment project is a planned program to reclaim and energize 60 acres of downtown Cleveland, known as Playhouse Square for its heavy concentration of theaters.

This restoration of moneys was a just and proper move by the Committee, because it represents both an economic boost to this section of our industrial heartland and provides proof of the feasibility of the Economic Development Administration.

The completion of Playhouse Square means jobs; jobs in an area that is currently suffering from an 8.2-percent unemployment rate. It is estimated that over 200 new full-time jobs will be created within the center itself and over 1,500 jobs will be generated in the district.

The wheels have been put in motion. The matching funds are in place and corporate and private donations have been committed. But we need the added assistance that this \$3.5 million will provide. We need this money that was committed to us once before. It is not fair to take back this money and rob Cleveland of this economic opportunity.

Neither is it fair or logical to reduce funding or eliminate an agency whose purpose is to economically revitalize

this nation's distressed areas. Since 1965, the EDA has created or saved over 1.4 million direct private sector jobs. During that same time, over \$9 billion in private investments has been leveraged by EDA projects. If the proposed fiscal year 1981 rescission and fiscal year 1982 budget appropriations are approved, it is estimated that over 200,000 jobs will be lost and over \$2 billion in private investments will not be leveraged. We cannot allow this to happen.

I urge my colleagues to support both the retention of EDA and its funding to the Cleveland Playhouse Square project.●

WHO SAID THERE ARE NOT ANY HEROES LEFT?

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues this inspiring and heart-lifting story about how a group of caring, courageous people saved a man's life. If this story has special meaning for me, beyond the sense of rejoicing it brings, it is because I know Mr. Casber's daughter who works for the House of Representatives. I think special mention should be made of Minneapolis Star Columnist Jim Klobuchar's sensitivity and insights in writing, "By Phone, She Saved His Life."

[From the Minneapolis Star, Apr. 8, 1981]

(By Jim Klobuchar)

BY PHONE, SHE SAVES HIS LIFE.

"Yes, I can get you the bus departure time for Grand Forks in a moment," the information agent told the young woman on the telephone. There was a pause. Muffled, uneven breathing followed. There were five seconds of silence. "Are you all right?" the woman was saying. His breathing became a gasp. Now another sound. Something or somebody settling to the floor? "Are you in trouble?" she asked again.

Now there was no sound.

In her apartment in south Minneapolis, Marcia Schuett, a University of Minnesota hospitals receptionist, fumbled with her mind for a moment. It might be a heart attack. In her nurses' training she had heard sounds similar to that. Who to call? The police, a hospital? A heart attack victim could die while help was enroute. She hung up, then picked up the phone again. The Yellow Pages were still open to the Greyhound Bus Terminal numbers. She dialed again, another number at Greyhound.

Dozens of times a year we are confronted with accounts of ordinary people who are either oblivious to another person's grief unfolding before them, or refuse to recognize it out of fear or futility. Sometimes a casual dispassion that shames them later deflects their eyes from the scene, or pulls their hand from the phone.

Non-involvement is safer and more convenient. It means not having to testify at a trial, getting mixed up with cops and insurance investigators. It means making it on

time to the movie. And sometimes it means a person will die.

But there are other ordinary people who understand a crisis when they see it, and even when they don't, and will not walk away from it.

The phone rang in the package express department of the Greyhound Bus Terminal at 6:45 a.m. an hour when the terminal is virtually deserted. Keith Holland was near the phone and took the call. The young woman on the line said she was afraid there was something wrong with the man in the information office. They were talking, and he began breathing strangely and then stopped talking.

Holland walked into the office and found Wally Casber, 59, lying motionless on the floor. He yelled to the loading dock for somebody to call the police.

John Sipe, a 35-year-old Greyhound employee and parttime police officer in Cottage Grove, ran into the office where Casber had collapsed. Holland was trying resuscitation, but he was not familiar with the method, and it wasn't working.

The blue tinge of cyanosis had already crept into Casber's lips. Sipe felt for pulse. Nothing. No heart beat.

Kneeling beside the lifeless man, Sipe asked quickly if anybody else knew anything about CPR.

"Yes," a young woman's voice said tentatively.

"You take the chest," Sipe said.

John Sipe put his lips to Wally Casber's mouth and began breathing. Bonnie Frederickson began pressing down on his chest in the slow rhythmic movements that simulate heartbeat. She had learned the method in a class at Columbia Heights high school but had never used it before.

Sipe was a cop and an onetime emergency medical technician. He had done it before and, in one bizarre flashback as he began breathing into Casber's mouth, he recalled the first. It was in St. Paul Park. The man's teeth were green and laced with snuff, and when he began breathing he vomited.

Wally gave him no such problem, mercifully. He breathed again, again. Only six times. And Wally was stirring, fighting to breathe. His heart had stopped and he was within a minute or so of dying, but within 45 seconds he was breathing. His eyes opened, spinning wildly. "Stay on the floor," Sipe said.

Wally grunted. He had to get up. He was so fierce about it that Sipe couldn't restrain him. He got up and sat at his desk, and he was there, tended by Sipe and Bonnie Frederickson and a few others, when the paramedics arrived and from the hospital. They administered oxygen and took Casber to Methodist Hospital, where he is recovering today from his heart attack.

"It is almost too much to believe," he said. "That woman could have done a half dozen other things, and nobody would ever have known. She could have hung up in a panic or said it wasn't any of her business. She could have told herself it was all her imagination and left it at that. She might have called a hospital but she did the only thing that could have saved my life. She not only cared about somebody in trouble, a total stranger, but she had the good sense to do exactly what she had to do. And then John Sipe and Bonnie didn't run around waiting for the ambulance. They stayed there and saved my life."

Are these ordinary people?

Perhaps.

Ordinary enough Marcia Schuett to receive a bouquet of flowers from Wally Casber's wife, and to call this small act of gratitude "one of the nicest things anybody has ever done for me."

WHITE HOUSE TO PROPOSE PLANE SALES TO SAUDI ARABIA

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, the White House has announced its intention to propose the sale of five planes incorporating Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) technology to Saudi Arabia later this year. I wish to take this opportunity to register my opposition to that proposal.

Israel is an important ally to the United States in the Middle East. The sale of the AWAC system to Saudi Arabia, a country that rejects the Camp David Accords, supports the PLO, and has called for a holy war against Israel, would not be in the best interest of the United States. The surveillance capability of the AWACS would eliminate the qualitative edge which Israel has depended on for its security. In another Mid-East war, the AWACS would be capable of directing hostile activities of Saudi, Syrian and Jordanian Air Forces against Israel. In order to preclude this eventuality, Israel would either have to purchase counter measures or depend on preemptive strikes. The Israeli budget has reached the saturation point on military spending, and, because of high interest rates, they would not be able to accept U.S. compensatory offers of additional military sales credits. The result of this would be further destabilization of the Middle East.

Another important consideration, is the security of this high technology AWACS equipment. Saudi Arabia would be the first non-NATO nation to own these sophisticated planes. The Saudis suffer from internal instability and hostile neighbors. To date, they have not been able to demonstrate competency in handling these contingencies. These factors, coupled with the need for U.S. military and civilian personnel to maintain and operate the AWACS equipment, could very well inspire instability in the monarchy and feelings of resentment toward the United States. Should this happen, the AWACS technology could fall victim to espionage or may even find itself in the hands of the Soviets or other governments. A historical postscript: AWACS had been approved for sale to the Shah of Iran in 1977. The fall of the Shah in advance of the delivery date early this year prevented the consummation of the deal.

Our Middle East policy should remain openminded and long range.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

However, arms sales should not be used as a placebo for diplomacy. Sophisticated weapons will not assure Saudi Arabia's stability, security, or friendship. Given their situation, I am very much opposed to providing Saudi Arabia with the AWACS.

HISTORIC MARYLAND

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 25, 1981, marked a historical event for the entire State of Maryland; 350 years ago, one of the first Episcopal Churches was founded on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay on Kent Island.

Maryland has undergone many changes in the last three and a half centuries, but the spirit of her original settlers still lives in the hearts and minds of their descendants and many others that have been captivated by the beauty of this land that is known as "God's Country".

Saturday's celebration and service of thanksgiving commemorating the 350th anniversary of Christ Episcopal Church was a reaffirmation of the people of Maryland's determination to carve out a life that embraces the ethics of hard work and christian spirit that has been the cornerstone of the American way of life.

In commemoration of this blessed event the Most Reverend and Right Honorable Robert A. K. Runcie, 102d Archbishop of Canterbury was gracious enough to participate in the thanksgiving service held on Kent Island. For all who attended this historic Christian event, the communion service marked a dedication to Christian principles and a unification of the people of Kent Island and Maryland. I would like to share the Archbishop's comments with my fellow members:

SERMON BY THE MOST REVEREND AND RIGHT HONORABLE ROBERT A. K. RUNCIE, 102D ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Knowing that I was to visit Kent Island, I made a search in the archives at Lambeth to see whether there was any record of a link between my predecessors and the Church here. Among other items, I uncovered a letter dated 1726 from the Vestry of Kent Island to the Bishop of London, complaining about your Rector, Thomas Phillips. Besides other misdemeanours, he was accused of always starting services on time—inconvenient, I suppose, in a scattered agricultural community with a shortage of clocks but

(a) I am glad it is a tradition you have maintained here in Kent Island from at least the eighteenth century to the present day

(b) that is why I deliberately arrived late from Christ Church at this service, to avoid a similar censure.

But there are more personal links: Captain William Clayborn, who established a

community here 350 years ago in 1631 was an Anglican from Kent, England who had studied at Cambridge and served in the Army. In the manner of St. Paul, I can say—So am I. I was delighted to be asked to take part in these celebrations and to thank God for the founding of the Clayborn settlement and the planting of the first church and Christian presence on Kent Island in 1631.

Very properly, you have chosen to celebrate this anniversary in a great act of worship which brings together Christian brothers from many different churches and representatives of every aspect of community life in this beautiful part of Maryland.

As a word and a concept, Worship has in recent times been largely confined to the ecclesiastical context. Worship is sometimes seen as the Sunday hobby of churchgoing people but it was not always so. In the old Marriage Service of the Anglican Church, one of the vows includes the phrase "with my body, I thee worship". Worship is not to be confined to hands together, eyes closed; the chanting of psalms or the use of ancient ecclesiastical rituals. I want to suggest that this kind of refined worship is just one expression of a universal aspect of human nature. Man is a worshipper. Everybody is engaged in worship every day, in the sense that human beings have so evolved that they constantly refer themselves and the things they do to someone or something which I think they regard as desirable or fearsome.

Whether we are aware of it or not, we are engaged in worship every day. Of course, the gods people worship vary very much. Most commonly, perhaps, the gods are abstract—success, security, power, wealth. These gods may be abstract but they exert a powerful influence on how we behave, how we choose our friends, who we invite to dinner, how we spend our money.

Sometimes, of course, the gods are other human beings. I once taught at a school at which some of the pupils were Americans. One of the girls worshipped a Puerto Rican wrestler called Bruno, who operated in Boston. We were both being driven rather dangerously through some country lanes and I remember her sitting on the back seat, shouting "I'll die for Bruno but I don't want to die for anyone else."

For Christians, of course, there should be no question. We worship the Father, as we see Him in Jesus Christ. As Our Lord says in that lesson from St John's Gospel we have just heard, "I have made thy name known to the men whom thou didst give me out of the world". The Father as we see him in Jesus Christ is our point of reference for all that we do and for all that we are becoming.

Granted that worship is inescapable, it makes sense for us to ask the question "What am I worshipping? What is my dominant point of reference?" This question becomes even more significant if you accept my second proposition about worship. First, everyone is engaged in it, whether they know it or not. Second, whatever you worship puts its mark on you. You can't help giving away, often unconsciously, to others the name of the god you worship because the dominant influence on your life is going to leave a mark on you. This is true, not only of our behavior but even of our very faces. After the age of about forty, we are largely responsible for our faces. We have all registered the serene beauty of the faces of those who have devoted themselves to worship the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. We have all noted the strained and avid faces of those who really worship

money or power, whatever their formal religious allegiance might be.

We are used to looking at history as being governed basically by economic factors or by political or military events but an equally valid way of reading history is as the search for something or someone worthy of worship. In default of a worthy vision, the faculty for worship which is in all of us will attach itself to an unworthy or even dangerous vision. Who could fail to see in the Nazi rallies at Nuremberg the faculty for worship tragically misdirected? If we are all engaged in worship and if the god we worship marks us profoundly then our search for a worthy vision to inspire our worship should be urgent and strenuous.

We do not search alone, however, and it would be dangerous to do so. Human nature being what it is, visions tend to be accommodated to our convenience, their demands ironed out to a comfortable blandness. We may use the right words—Our Father, or Lord, Lord—but these words can become drained of their potency if we become their possessors and insist on interpreting them only from our own provincial experience in space and time. At present, for example, there is a danger of reducing God to something of a pal and ignoring the harder demands of his Word, which we are told is sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow. Some Christian worship is so casual that this aspect of the God and Father of Jesus Christ would seem to have been obscured with shallow bonhomie. The awe and majesty of God, which draws from us reverence and wonder, cannot be ignored at a moment when man is beginning to chart the heavens. The neighborhood God, jogging with us through life's way, is not the whole truth about the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ—he is a fashionable puppet, who falls our imagination as we look into the vastness of space and ponder the mystery of creation. WH Auden, in his play "For the time being", devises a prayer for the worshippers of such a diminished, comfortable God—"O God, put away justice and truth for we cannot understand them and do not want them. Eternity would bore us dreadfully. Leave thy heavens and come down to our earth of waterclocks and hedges. Become our uncle. Look after Baby, amuse Grandfather, escort Madam to the opera, help Willie with his homework, introduce Muriel to a handsome Naval Officer. Be interesting and weak like us and we will love you as we love ourselves."

The temptation to worship a god made in the image of our own fantasies and desires is ever-present, which brings me back to our worship today and our anniversary celebrations.

In the Christian Church, we are not left to search alone, or just with our contemporaries in a particular place for the most worthy object of worship. We are fellow-pilgrims with all those who have worshipped God in past centuries and who now worship him with clearer vision beyond the grave. We are also fellow-pilgrims with the hundreds of millions of Christians alive in the world today who worship the Father on every continent and island. Our fellowship with the Christian centuries that are past and with the Church throughout the world is not optional or a luxury, it is part of a fully mature Christian life. The will to keep in step with our fellow-pilgrims saves us from turning our faith into self-indulgent fantasies, a mere endorsement of some na-

tional dream or the desire to preserve some particularly cherished style of life. We depend on the Church of all the ages and throughout all the world to save us from turning our worship away from the living God to some candyfloss idol.

This service expresses that dependence. We have looked lovingly at those who brought the faith of the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ to this place and at those who have cherished that faith over the centuries. In the ancient words of the liturgy, we have glimpsed the grandeur of the faith which inspired them and the majesty of the God we worship. This service also celebrates links with the Church throughout the world, particularly with the Church of England which now, in its turn, comes to America to learn about generosity in Christian practice and spontaneity in worship. Every age has its own contribution to make to the whole pattern and ours is no exception.

With these far horizons and a lively awareness of the communion of Christians throughout the centuries and across the oceans, we anchor ourselves in the worship of the God who is not a prisoner or the property of one time or place. In turbulent and fearful times, when the temptation is to retreat into narrowly-based, strident, even fanatical forms of worship which further divide us from one another and add fuel to the already dangerously combustible state of the world—now, more than ever before, we need to celebrate and cherish our links with the Church of all the ages and throughout all the world. The vision of that Church and its achievements gives us hope when present realities hem us in and the courage to act and work at a time when fear can immobilise us or, worse, make cynics of us. We praise thee, O God, we acknowledge thee to be the Lord. All the earth doth worship thee, the Father everlasting.

Mr. Speaker, an event of this kind can only take place through the commitment of people who care about preserving our traditional ways of life. I think it would be appropriate to name those people who played such an important role in making this occasion one which shall be entered into the annals of history:

SERVICE OF THANKSGIVING

Participants: The Most Reverend and Right Honorable Robert A. K. Runcie, 102d Archbishop of Canterbury; the Right Reverend John M. Allin, Presiding Bishop of the United States; the Right Reverend W. Moultrie Moore, Jr., Bishop, The Diocese of Easton; Bishop D. Frederick Wertz, The Washington Area, The United Methodist Church; the Most Reverend Thomas J. Mardaga, Bishop, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Wilmington; the Reverend Dr. Paul M. Orso, President, Maryland Synod, Lutheran Church in America; the Very Reverend C. Allen Spicer, Dean, Trinity Cathedral, Easton; the Reverend J. Edwin Pippin, Rector, Christ Church, Cambridge; masters of ceremony.

Diocesan Committee: The Very Reverend C. Allen Spicer; the Reverend J. Edwin Pippin; the Reverend Robert A. Gourlay, Rector, Christ Church, Kent Island; the Reverend Canon Edward N. West, O.B.E., S.T.D., Lt. D., Sub-Dean, The Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, consultant.

Committee of the Parish: William D. Moore, Chairman; the Reverend Robert A. Gourlay, Ex-Officio; Lt. Col. and Mrs. Thomas B. Baker; Mr. and Mrs. Winfield F. Corrison; James F. Ewing, Sr.; Mr. and Mrs.

John Eliot Kennedy; Miss Anne J. Kyle; Mrs. Arthur L. Nash; Mrs. William R. Russell, Jr.; Dr. Donald T. Walbert.●

RUBY LAKE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will help to bring some commonsense to the management of the Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Nevada. While it is admirable to protect waterfowl, and to provide for resting and nesting areas, it is not proper or right to preclude a large portion of the recreational motorboat public from using Ruby Lake for fishing and other recreational boating.

Undue restriction on boating activity has raised a continuing concern that the intent of Congress has not been carried out by the Secretary of the Interior in his management responsibilities at the Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge. This bill will clarify the intent of Congress by providing increased latitude under the Refuge Recreation Act for the Secretary of the Interior to ease the unreasonable restrictions presently being imposed on the public.

This bill would only specifically affect Ruby Lake National Wildlife Refuge, and would still provide a proper wildlife sanctuary. I urge my colleagues to give it careful consideration.●

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EL SALVADOR

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the Americans for Democratic Action recently completed an analysis of the applicability of section 502(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act to U.S. military aid to the Government of El Salvador.

This is an extremely well researched piece of work, and one which I believe ought to be examined by anyone interested in the current controversy surrounding U.S. policy toward Central America.

The text of the ADA study follows:

SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND EL SALVADOR: WHAT THE LAW SAYS

ADA believes that U.S. security assistance to the present regime in El Salvador violates Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Section 502B states:

"Except under circumstances specified in this section, no security assistance may be provided to any country the government of

which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights. . . .

"[The exception is triggered when] in the opinion of the Secretary of State. . . extraordinary circumstances exist which necessitate a continuation of security assistance for such country. . . and on all the facts it is in the national interest of the United States to provide such assistance. . .

THE COMPONENTS OF SECTION 502B

Security assistance is to be denied a foreign government under Section 502B, if the Administration makes two findings: first, that the government is a consistent and gross violator of human rights, as described above; second, that no national security concerns mitigate the first finding.

According to State Department officials, three criteria must be met if a government is to be shown to be a consistent and gross violator. The first criterion is the established fact of gross violations of human rights on the part of police, military, or other official forces. The second is a consistent pattern of such violations. The third is that the government itself—specifically, high and politically responsible officials—has been responsible for human-rights violations.

For purposes of the law, a government is involved in human-rights violations when high political officials "deliberately engage in or tolerate abuse." A government deliberately engages in human-rights violations when it specifically orders or plans or when one of its officials actually commits human-rights violations. A government tolerates abuses if it "willingly refrains from controlling" such abuses.

It is obvious that the law allows the Administration considerable latitude. Under the Carter Administration, Section 502B was interpreted to forbid military assistance to Guatemala. On the other hand, the "extraordinary circumstances" clause was interpreted to permit military assistance to Zaire, the Philippines, and Indonesia, despite the fact that their governments displayed a consistent pattern of gross human-rights violations.

Although or even because the Reagan Administration is unlikely to take Section 502B seriously, the law remains a useful basis for Congressional initiatives in foreign policy.

EL SALVADOR: A GROSS VIOLATOR

There is widespread agreement, among sources ranging from Amnesty International to the Legal Aid Office of the Archdiocese of El Salvador, that El Salvador's army and security forces have been guilty of substantial human-rights violations. Former Ambassador Robert White estimates that approximately 5,000 innocent people, mostly young men, were killed in 1980 on the mere suspicion that they were leftists.

The crucial issue for U.S. policy as embodied in Section 502B is whether or not the government of El Salvador bears any responsibility for these human-rights violations.

ADA has gathered evidence, also known to the State Department, that the government of El Salvador at the very least has refrained from controlling abuses of its security forces and death squads.

In the summer of 1980, National Guard Commander Vides Casanova gave names of National Guardsmen who were members of the UGB ("White Warriors' Union"—a right-wing death squad) to Minister of Defense Jose Garcia and Subminister Nicolas Carranza. In a subsequent meeting with the

Defense ministers, Vides Casanova reminded them of the list and asked why they had taken no action. They sat silent.

During the period of the first junta, established by the coup of October 1979, Ruben Zamora (Secretary to the Presidency) and other civilian members of the government met with Garcia to discuss the continuing violence. Garcia admitted that he and other military commanders knew the identities of right-wing death-squad members. He then refused to arrest them unless the civilian representatives on the junta would agree to the arrests of all the leaders of popular organizations. (These confederations of peasants' and workers' organizations became the vehicles for the politics of direct action for thousands of Salvadorans when the Molina and Romero governments crushed the traditional opposition parties between 1972 and 1979.) Since these popular leaders faced no criminal charges, the government would not authorize their arrest. Ultimately, not one member of the death squads was arrested.

While these are only two examples, ADA believes that they are sufficient to demonstrate government engagement. On at least two occasions, Colonel Garcia, the top Salvadoran official charged with military responsibilities, has shown that he is unwilling to use information in his possession to control the right-wing death squads. And his power is intact despite the reorganization of the government in December. Garcia, in fact, was the only Minister in both the January and December reorganizations (1980) not required to submit his resignation.

Moreover, the very structure and history of the Salvadoran army and security forces provide additional evidence of the government's role in human-rights violations. There is reason to believe that the security forces, the army, and the government function in an integrated fashion so that it would be virtually impossible for massive human-rights violations to occur without the knowledge and complicity of the military high command. High positions in the security forces, the army, and the government—including the presidency—traditionally have been filled from the same powerful cliques of officers. These cliques derive from relationships formed within tandas, or Salvadoran military school graduating classes. In their thirty years of military service following graduation, the officers seek contacts, form alliances, and otherwise work toward their goals of political power and its associated spoils.

Army commanders on local and regional levels, owing their offices to the favor of the reigning tandas, are responsible for the activities of the armed forces. Through the chain of command and the informal ties, an army commander knows which forces are doing what and which soldiers belong to formal or informal death squads. Most of the atrocities are committed in sweeps of the countryside by armed forces engaged in indiscriminate killings or by death squads under the formal direction or informal sanction of regional or local army commanders.

The significance of these powerful officers' cliques is that they constitute an important locus of power within the military and therefore the government. Given the subtly integrated command of the varied military and security forces (the services are distinguished by insignias on their uniforms and little else), abuses on the part of the security forces reflect also on the army, specifically on its high command, thus linking the army's representatives on the junta to the violence.

While the coup of October 1979 initially appeared to promise a change in the military system of government, it is clear now that the military institution has survived with its power unchallenged. As long as the military remains unstructured, most power will reside within the officers' network among the tandas, and the pattern of human-rights violations will persist.

EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES

The State Department under the Carter Administration insisted that extraordinary circumstances in El Salvador justified security assistance to its government despite human-rights violations, (satisfying the exception provided in Section 502B). The Carter Administration asserted that these extraordinary circumstances derived from the precarious position of a moderate and reformist government threatened by extremists of the right and left. The Reagan Administration continues to depict the Salvadoran situation in this way.

ADA agrees that the present government of El Salvador is reformist in one sense, genuinely committed to reform which will loosen the economic vise of the traditional oligarchy, and widen the government's base of support among workers and peasants.

But the government of El Salvador is not proved "moderate" or "centrist" merely because it is committed to reform. Economic reform serves the military, which is attempting to consolidate its political and economic control. The military has discovered that it need not rely on the oligarchy to bankroll its rule.

It is incontestable that the Salvadoran government has implemented economic reforms providing significant material benefits to the Salvadoran people. Banks and foreign trade were nationalized, improving access to credit and foreign markets for average Salvadorans. Phase one of Agrarian Reform, the expropriation of large plantations (of more than 1,235 acres), has been implemented. The "Land to the Tiller" decree, formally giving sharecroppers ownership of the land they work, was delayed for nearly a year, but has now been implemented in at least a few instances.

However, the Salvadoran government's commitment to reform does not extend so far as to include any willingness to share political power with the poor majority. Since late November 1979, following the October coup, the military has shown repeatedly that it does not tolerate and in fact aims to exterminate all political opposition. This is why the army wages a war of terror against the organized peasantry and suspected sympathizers. Even within the context of land reform, the army has used its role in the expropriation of estates as a pretext for violence against peasants in areas where the popular organizations are reputed to be strong.

The government's opposition to any meaningful political reform is further evidenced by developments within the government since the coup of 1979. After every confrontation or government reorganization, the most repressive elements of the military emerged in a stronger position;

Under pressure from the military, the junta released retired rightist Major Roberto D'Aubuisson, who led an abortive coup on May 2, 1980.

The Vice Minister of Defense, Colonel Carranza, went unpunished for his role in an attempted coup in February 1980.

Many Christian Democrats (Ruben Zamora and Hector Dada Hirez, among

others) resigned from the government and the party in March 1980, charging that the military high command was unwilling to punish right-wing violence.

Junta progressive Colonel Adolfo Majano was deprived of his powers through a series of military decisions, beginning with his replacement by hardliner Colonel Jamie Gutierrez as Army Commander in May, and ending with his ouster from the junta in December. Majano was arrested for having refused reassignment to a post in Madrid, and has left the country.

The current reorganized government, with Christian Democrat Jose Napoleon Duarte as President, remains dominated by the military right. After a year of silence on official violence, and explicit hostility to the popular organizations, Duarte has lost much of his popular constituency and depends for support on the armed forces.

Gutierrez remains Commander in Chief of the armed forces, Garcia remains Minister of Defense. The newly appointed Chief of Staff of the armed forces is Colonel Rafael Flores Lima, who was press secretary to former President Romero.

In summary, the present government's commitment to reform is only partial. It is discarding the oligarchy without changing the oligarchic structure, especially in the political arena. There is nothing extraordinary about its warrant provision of military aid.

NOT IN OUR INTEREST

The Reagan Administration, like the Carter Administration, defends its policy of security assistance to the government of El Salvador in terms of U.S. national interest. Specifically, the Administration makes three claims. First, the United States must respond to a "well coordinated covert effort" (by communist and allied powers) to bring about the overthrow of El Salvador's established government and to impose in its place a communist regime with no popular support. The Administration argues that this communist effort has been undertaken because of a perceived U.S. weakness. To restore credibility, the U.S. must act decisively to end this effort. This will tell the Soviet Union and Cuba what they can expect in the rest of the world.

The second argument made by Secretaries Alexander Haig and John Bushnell and President Reagan is that the issue is not only communist aggression in El Salvador, it is the threat to all of Central America and possibly Mexico. Haig has spoken about a Central America "hit list." State Department officials allege a three-stage Cuban scheme for subversion: (1) ideological support and training aid to guerrillas; (2) Cuban political leadership to unite different guerrilla factions and set up a political front to attract other groups; and (3) a final effort with Cuban military aid and perhaps advisers to overthrow the government. Bushnell claims this was the situation in Nicaragua, and that Cuba already has moved to stage three in El Salvador and is moving toward stage two in Guatemala.

Finally, the Administration dismisses the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) as a nice bunch of people who have no power and amount to a front group for the guerrillas.

On the first point, no one can deny the fact that other states, primarily communist states, did infiltrate weapons and other military supplies into El Salvador. However, the Administration admits that it has been successful in pressuring Nicaragua, the major conduit for aid from communist states, to

slow this aid to a trickle. (The Nicaraguan aid cut-off is therefore inexplicable unless Jesse Helms is the real Secretary of State.)

Furthermore, many independent authorities argue that both Cuba and Nicaragua now realize that they had dramatically overestimated the cohesion and popular support of the guerrillas in El Salvador. These authorities go on to argue that both probably would have drawn back without any U.S. effort. As some State Department documents make clear, the Nicaraguans always were reluctant to support the Salvadoran guerrillas.

Although ADA has no clear evidence, it might be said that the Nicaraguans, in allowing their territory to be used as a conduit, were trying to pay off the Salvadoran guerrillas for aid provided to the Sandinistas in their struggle. Reliable reports indicate that the Sandinistas received from \$10 to \$30 million in cash from the Salvadoran guerrillas. Now Nicaragua is returning to the policy, held by most of the Sandinista leadership, of providing revolutionary movements in other countries with moral support only.

In sum, ADA contends that the aid provided in December and January was extraordinary and that Cuba and Nicaragua have withdrawn direct support from the guerrillas. The Administration response—to press for an end to that aid—was justified. ADA does not believe, however, that present U.S. policy should be based on charges now outdated.

Secondly, the State Department is correct in what it has said about Cuban involvement in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Guatemala. What this Administration consistently ignores are the internal situations which give rise to the guerrilla movements which Cuba aids.

The factors which produce a revolution are not simply social conditions—poverty and desperation—but the structure of government as well. Poverty is just as great in Honduras as in Salvador and Guatemala; on a per-capita basis it is actually greater. Honduras, like El Salvador, is a very violent society. Cuba has provided some training to Honduran leftists. Nonetheless, there is no significant insurgency. Bitter political opponents are not on opposite sides of the barricades, but drink together at the American Embassy.

The primary differences are twofold. First, in Guatemala and El Salvador, the armed forces developed a close and cosy relationship with the very wealthy. And they have been willing to use terror to keep themselves in power. Secondly, the economic elite with the blessing of the armed forces grew richer and richer, with the gap between rich and poor ever widening. In Honduras, on the other hand, there are no great wealthy families to play a dominant role in politics. The army is equally corrupt, but it has never engaged in massive terror to repress those aspiring to participate politically. In the last two years, in fact, the military government has been moving the country in a democratic direction.

If Guatemala and El Salvador are on a "hit list," it is because the governments in those countries have created their own crises. The U.S. interest should be not simply to stop the Cubans, but to ameliorate the conditions which invite Cuban involvement. In the context of Central America, that means dealing with the nature of the government.

In ADA's judgment, the present Salvadoran government is not reformable. It is

therefore not in the interest of United States to strengthen the present government, especially its military components. But this is exactly what U.S. military aid does.

Finally, we must consider the consequences of a military victory. Such an outcome probably would increase the hardline sentiments in both the Honduran and Guatemalan armies. It probably would encourage all three militaries to look favorably on a military expedition to root out the "communist cancer" (sic) in Nicaragua. The Nicaraguans must certainly would erase all vestiges of pluralism and look to Cuba and the Soviet Union for protection. Such an intense regionalization of the conflict clearly is contrary to U.S. interests.

The alternative? The Reagan Administration ought to begin to take the FDR seriously. Even the most hardline Administration spokesperson admits that there are strong democratic elements in the FDR. The Administration argues, however, that the FDR is a front for the guerrillas. To some extent this is true. It is true primarily because the major tool in Salvadoran politics is now the gun. Substitute free organization and the ballot in place of violence and guns, and the guerrillas, like the army, will recede in political importance. This, and not military aid, is the only way to advance U.S. interests.

In conclusion, ADA finds that a close reading of Section 502B as it relates to El Salvador demands a termination of security assistance to the Salvadoran government. ●

FIRSTHAND LOOK AT NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. CLARENCE D. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 11, 1981, 89 young men and women from Dumbarton Junior High School in Baltimore, journeyed to Washington for a firsthand look at their Nation's Capital as part of their studies of American Government.

These students toured the Capitol Building, the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Supreme Court as part of their day's activities.

They were lead by the following teachers: Mr. Robert Flater and Mr. Ron Boone.

I am delighted these students have taken advantage of the opportunity to visit the Capital, and have taken an interest in our Nation's political process. Students who visited us yesterday are:

Greg Calleri, Brian Cremon, Steve Haynes, Robyn Bryan, Sandy Auty, Robin Norris, Joy Hartman, Lori Little, Leslie Owen, Megan Walsh, Terri Kernan, Keith Benfer, Pat Mahoney, Trish Bonner, Mike McCullough, Mike Clark, Steve Miller, Bob Stoltzfus, Lisa Billings, Julie Murn, Gary Houk, and Bart Sarver.

Kathy Gettle, Arielle Hacker, Meg Maffitt, Lise Reno, Elinor Sparks,

Tom Carson, Mike Curtis, Tony Pirera, Lisa Ackerman, Laurie Campbell, Clara Gardill, Sherry Jones, Judy Livingston, Laura Pitcock, Lauren Williams, Bobbie Bennett, Tom Corcoran, Steve Gerber, Laura Eger, Joe Peterson, George Cooper, and Chris Parks.

Steve Trageser, Carrie Carson, Becca Cline, Gavin Valle, Donna Deitsch, Suzanne Hill, Sandy Stoll, Keith D'Agostino, Kris Aldrich, Karen Hinson, Kathy Lynch, Julie Fisher, Kevin Kennedy, Debbie Pryor, Gus Morrison, Keith Isaacs, Barney Aburn, Kurt Spurrier, Carolyn Clarkson, Susan Gorney, Chris Rafferty, and Carol Wessner.

Scott Szeliga, Gale Dettor, Sally Smatt, Simon Noel, Chuck Schomann, Mary Caskey, Missy Gold, Cathy Pyle, Mike Cooke, Greg Zenger, Jill Eisman, Laurie Kreek, Megan Trumbore, Chris McDonald, Frank Reier, Daphne Rolfes, Joe Sprucebank, Sondra Kiser, Kevin Merriman, Amy Brune, Regine Esslinger, Kim Jones, and Julie Sameth.●

MIDEAST JOURNAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Roger Simon, columnist and feature writer of the Chicago Sun-Times, recently authored a series of penetrating articles on the situation that exists in the Middle East. His articles dealt with an Israeli village located on the Lebanon border. In view of the problems in that part of the world, I wish insert these very timely and pertinent articles which appeared in the May 10 and 11 editions of the Chicago Sun-Times:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 10, 1981]

MIDEAST JOURNAL: "THE DEAD AREN'T IN UNIFORM"

(By Roger Simon)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—The snow-topped mountains glowed silver in the moonlight and the shadow of the jet skipped across them, leaping up from the valleys and onto the peaks. In less than a second, the jet crossed the face of the dimpled moon itself and began its turn.

The ghostly exhaust trail followed behind it, writing across the sky like the finger of God. Beneath it in the harbor, the ships circled or lay at anchor, waiting for the warehouses to stop burning and hoping that the shelling would not resume.

For just a moment, there was the rarest of things in this city: silence. Then the Dixie Express shattered the sky.

The Dixie Express is an Israeli Phantom fighter-bomber, but one does not say "Israel" here. Israel is to the south, so it is called Dixie. And the jets of Dixie roam at will, cracking the sound barrier to say hello.

"It is like a calling card," Dan Pattir, counselor to the prime minister of Israel,

told me later. "It lets our friends know we are there."

And their enemies, too. Out near the airport, not far from where a Soviet T-34 tank was dug in up to its treads under camouflage netting, two Syrian soldiers got up from the fire where their tea had been brewing. They walked out from under the corrugated tin roof of their sandbagged, emplacement.

With weary resignation, they began tracking the plane across the sky with anti-aircraft fire, the twin barrels of the gun popping back and forth, throwing up puffs of smoke against the stars.

They did not really expect to hit it. But they had their duty. And they did accomplish one thing. From across the harbor and the city came the soft crump of the mortars, the sharp crack of artillery, the ragged tearing noise of heavy machinegun fire. The anti-aircraft guns had served as the opening baton in Beirut's nightly concert.

Once upon a time not long ago, wars like this were fought with aging Garand rifles and ancient Springfields, with Molotov cocktails and mortars made from the exhaust pipes of old cars.

Now, the boats and trucks unload tanks, howitzers, rocket launchers; bazookas, and boxload after boxload of automatic assault rifles still in their oiled wrappings and complete with instructions.

In the Mideast today, weapons are the one universally recognized symbol of friendship, whether it be AWACS for the Saudis or rocket-propelled grenades for the Lebanese Christians. And everyone wants to make friends and money: the Soviets, the French, the British, the Israelis, the United States.

Over here, nothin' says lovin' like a tank. "Lebanon is now the battleground for all the troubles of the Mideast," Alfred Mady, a spokesman for the Christian forces, said. "It is open land, open season, for everything. For narcotics, for weapons, for terrorism. There is no such word as legal in Lebanon. Anything goes."

It has been going badly. More than 500 people were killed here last month and the fighting continues. Not only fighting between the various Lebanese factions—some students of the conflict count no fewer than 39 separate militias—which is bad enough, but also fighting between the Syrians and Israelis.

The first thing that strikes one, though, is that the dead as almost never soldiers. This is a war planned by statesmen, directed by generals and fought by militiamen, but the casualties rarely wear uniforms. They wear business suits and carry briefcases. They wear dresses and carry shopping bags. They wear Moslem robes and carry farm tools. They offer wear diapers and carry nothing.

An unmarked but very real "Green Line" separates the Christian side from the Moslem side of Beirut. In normal times, thousands cross the line every day. But in these times, when they can cross at all, people plunge and scuttle across. Taxi drivers lean on their horns and speed across the no-man's-land drawing sniper fire.

On the day I arrived, only 30 or 40 shells had fallen so the fighting was reported as "light" or "sporadic" much as in another city the weather would be reported as "partly cloudy" or "drizzly." So to the rest of the world it was not big news, surely not as important as threats of Soviet intervention in Poland or injuries from rubber bullets in Belfast.

But this is not a village, it is a city of more than a million people, with houses and

apartment blocks and shopping areas and highrises. And the shells are not so much aimed as merely fired. The Moslems know all they have to do is turn their mortars east to hit a Christian. The Christians merely have to fire west to hit a Moslem. The targets are no more clearly defined than that.

It is not yet all-out war. The shell-pocked hulk of the Holiday Inn still looms silent and empty over the Beirut harbor, a monument to the civil war of 1975 and 1976, where Christians and Moslems blasted each other for 19 months, leaving 37,000 dead and property damage of about \$15 billion.

But even though it is not full-scale war, the shells still fall from the skies like the wrath of heaven. And after they have landed and the yellow-gray smoke has been carried away by the Mediterranean breezes, the people get up and walk about again. They buy fat red strawberries from street vendors. They sit outside their shops, slapping down the markers of their backgammon games. They buy tax-free and dirt-cheap cigarettes and go to American movies.

"Kramer vs. Kramer" is still packing them in on both sides of the Green Line. The restaurants along the sea are still open, though the owners complain that the new practice of fishing by hand grenade sometimes disturbs the customers.

Kamal Jrab meets me at the airport. He works for the Commodore Hotel, and it is his job to see that guests get from the airport to the hotel alive. The fee is very small, considering the service.

To Kamal, as to many Lebanese, the fighting is an unfortunate but not overwhelming fact of life, something that makes the traffic bad and the electricity sometimes fail.

"A beautiful country," he says, sweeping his hand over the mountains which cup the city. "The Switzerland of the Mideast." They really used to call it that, a reference to the mountains and banks, not to the peace and quiet.

The front seat of our cab is covered by a tapestry that depicts in unpleasantly real flesh tones the heads of John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King.

"For good luck," Kamal says, patting their faces. As we come to the first checkpoint and two soldiers with rifles fixed with grenade launchers come toward us, it occurs to me Kamal has picked three strange examples of good luck.

You cannot move more than a few blocks without going through a checkpoint, and they soon become a way of life. They are usually just sandbags, sometimes with a tin sheet on top and one or two bored soldiers inside. Few Westerners are bothered, although American diplomats must travel to and from the airport with bodyguards.

There are Syrian checkpoints, Palestine Liberation Organization checkpoints, Palestine Liberation Army checkpoints, Lebanese Army checkpoints, Christian checkpoints and, if one goes far enough, United Nation checkpoints, where one is stopped by red-raced Irishmen or blond-haired Swedes or black-skinned Nigerians or Fijians.

Slightly smaller than Connecticut, Lebanon is big enough for everyone to fight over.

The traffic grows heavy as we make our way toward the hotel. The traffic lights have not worked for years, and soon we are stopped in a massive traffic jam, with everyone blowing his horn furiously. Grid lock is not a dire prediction in this city, it is a way of life.

The problem is solved in the usual manner. A few soldiers wander over and start waving their rifles, forcing some cars to turn away onto other streets, letting others slip by. As soon as the soldiers appear, the horns grow silent.

The weakest element in Lebanon is the government of Lebanon. Many people don't bother paying taxes anymore. Law and order is provided by anyone who has a gun and enough armed friends to see that he keeps it. You can buy a hot Mercedes-Benz for \$500. And you can drive it until someone steals it again.

Garbage lies in empty lots. Sometimes it is collected; more often someone will grow tired of the smell, douse it with gasoline and try to get rid of it that way.

The harbor is controlled by Christian forces, who extract "taxes" from each cargo, but any trucks that unload the ships and cross into Moslem territory must pay again.

Some things do work. Phones, water and electricity are interrupted only sporadically. And there is wealth here, both from traditional sources and from war profiteering.

Lebanon is a country that runs by force of habit. But that has its limits.

"The car bombs go off because nobody checks for them," an Irish journalist told me. "Have you ever been in Belfast? My God, you can't leave your car for five minutes without the police or army checking it over. Here, nobody checks and nobody cares. You can blow somebody's head off or blow up a block of flats and nobody will arrest you for murder."

On my second day in Beirut, an artillery shell came whistling into the central business district about a block from where I stood. It landed with a tremendous crack and knocked down three people. I waited for police sirens to wail, but there were none. No ambulances rushed to the scene. No fire engines clanged their way up the crowded streets to battle the small blaze that had been set off. The injured were collected in private cars and taken away.

The most recent round of fighting erupted when Christian militia forces tried to gain control of the town of Zahle in the fertile Bekaa Valley. The town lies near the road to Damascus, and the Syrians declared it vital to their own security. So they began shelling the town.

"In examining the questions of the Middle East, however, you must never rule out sheer gangsterism," a Western diplomat told me. "The Bekaa Valley is one of the great hashish producing areas of the Middle East. We are talking about an industry that measures profits in the billions. Billions. Whatever army controls the Bekaa controls that traffic and that profit."

Whatever the reason behind the fighting, it is now getting beyond the control of all parties. Israel had an informal understanding with Syria: Syria would not operate too close to the South and would not deploy missiles. In return, Israel would limit its attacks to South Lebanon and the Dixie Express would buzz but not attack close to Syria.

But the Zahle fighting shattered the understanding. Fearing a massacre of the Christians, Israeli Phantom jets shot down two Syrian helicopters that had been firing on Christian positions. Now the Syrians have moved in surface-to-air missiles to knock out the Israeli planes.

Nobody seems willing to back down and, like it or not, the United States may become involved in the conflict.

"If the United States or Israel believes that it can undermine the steadfastness of

the PLO and Syria, it is mistaken," Farouk Kaddoumi, the political chief of the PLO, said in an interview. "This would lead to a much wider war than the United States imagines—a war that would cover all parts of the world."

"Regardless of the costs, American interests would not escape the hands of the Palestinians. If the United States exposes the PLO to danger, we will not hesitate to strike at American interests wherever they are."

There seem to be no small wars anymore, nor short ones. I talked to Karin Linstadis, a young Norwegian collector of handicrafts and antiques, whose apartment window had just been blasted by a car bomb, spraying her empty bed with razor-like shards of glass. She told me I must see the Syrian checkpoint near the American Embassy in West Beirut before I left.

"Go see the soldier there," she said with cold fury. "Then you'll see what the fighting in this country is all about."

"He stands there every day with his Kalashnikov rifle and his hand grenades. And he stops people or he waves them by. And do you know how old he is? Do you? He is 10. I asked him. He is 10."

"When you use the children," she asked, "what do you have left?"

On both sides of the Green Line they would tell her that she misses the point. Both sides would show her the pictures in their literature, the slick, glossy pictures of small children carrying big guns.

The point, they would tell her, is that no matter how great the losses to this generation, the struggle will be carried on by the next generation. And the next. And the next. And the next.

ORIGINS OF WAR ARE MANY

(By Roger Simon)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—The current war in Lebanon is not only a war between Christians and Moslems, but also a war between the left and the right, as well as Syria and Israel. In a certain sense it is also a war between the United States, which supplies weapons to Israel, and the Soviet Union, which supplies weapons to Syria.

The roots of the war are religious, but in the Mideast religion is more than a set of beliefs; it is a complete social and political structure. The religions live apart and rarely intermarry.

The Lebanese constitution of 1943 sought not to ignore religious differences, but to build them into law. Parliamentary seats as well as political and administrative jobs were allocated on religious lines.

The president was always to be a Maronite Christian, the prime minister a Sunni Moslem and the speaker of Parliament a Shiite Moslem.

Civil service jobs, judgeships and teaching positions were allocated in the same manner.

The idea was to safeguard the position of Christians in an Arab world and also to recognize the power of the Moslems. Each group is roughly half the 3 million population. Somewhat surprisingly, it seemed to work for many years. Lebanese citizens enjoyed a degree of personal liberty unknown elsewhere in the Arab world.

In foreign affairs, Lebanon adopted the formula of "strength through weakness." The Lebanese army did not seek to be a match for the powerful Israeli army to the south. Lebanon was careful to offer no security threat to Israel and after 1948 was left alone in the Arab-Israeli conflicts.

But tensions between the Moslems and Christians within Lebanon increased, and

the presence of 400,000 well-organized Palestinian refugees was too much for the delicate balance to bear.

With the expulsion of the Palestine Liberation Organization from Jordan in 1970, Lebanon became the only country where the PLO could train and operate openly. The Christians not only feared the Palestinians because they were Moslems, but the Christians also were afraid that PLO raids into Israel from Lebanese soil would invite Israeli counterattack.

In 1975, civil war broke out in Lebanon. The Syrians, who have never forgotten that Lebanon once was part of Syria, were asked by the Lebanese government to help establish order. This they did, but the 26,000 Syrian troops have never left.

Originally, the Syrians sided with the Christians. But the Syrians switched sides after Israel responded to PLO terror attacks by invading south Lebanon and the Christians sought Israeli aid. The Syrians found an Israeli-Christian alliance unacceptable and backed the Palestinians.

Who is currently fighting whom is even more complicated but there is basically a Leftist-Moslem-Syrian-Palestinian alliance vs. a Rightist-Christian-Israeli alliance.

When Israel withdrew from Lebanon it turned over control of border strip in the south to a maverick Lebanese Christian army officer who now calls it Free Lebanon. To the north of him are UN peace-keeping forces, and to the north of them PLO controlled territory. Syrian forces control West Beirut and the Bekaa Valley. Christian forces control East Beirut and northern Lebanon.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, May 11, 1981]

MIDEAST JOURNAL: "ISRAEL, ROCKET FIRE AND THE BOYS ON 109"

(By Roger Simon)

SECOND OF A SERIES

METULLA, ISRAEL.—They had been in the shelter for two days. Women and children mostly, they sat and listened to the rockets fall.

The doors to the shelter were huge steel slabs. They were painted gray and were ice cold to the touch. There were two of them, placed at right angles. One is always closed before the other is opened.

The doors had air filters in case of germ or gas attack and there was a shower between them to wash off contamination. On the inner door, in Hebrew letters, were the words "The Broken Heart Club." Beneath them was a drawing of a heart torn in two.

Inside, the people sat on bunk beds and folding chairs. On the surface, the electricity had been knocked out. But down here there was the steady clatter of a generator and pale, yellow light.

Children in sunsuits and floppy terry cloth hats bounced up and down on the beds and went running between the legs of the Ping-Pong table. On the concrete walls were posters of Starsky and Hutch, Charlie's Angels and Superman. Someone had also painted a few flowers.

High on the wall, there was an escape hatch in case the unthinkable happened and the two steel doors were breached by attackers.

Liaw Belsky, age 2, sat on his mother's lap, wetly gumming a matzo. His mother, Smadar, often wonders if her child really understands what is happening when he is picked up from his playthings in the front yard and is rushed into a shelter.

"Liaw," she asked, "do you know why we are here?"

"Boom," Liaw said.

"What kind of boom?" she asked.

"Kat-oo-sha!" he said with a burbling laugh. "Kat-oo-sha!"

The Katyusha rocket is a man-killer. Manufactured by the Soviet Union, it is fired from a single or multitube launching rack. It is a favorite weapon of Palestinian guerrillas.

The Katyusha is not very accurate but can be fired over long distances. It is made to be fired into urban settlements, where accuracy is not important. When it lands, it explodes in a whirring cloud of shrapnel.

Up above the shelter where Liaw and his mother sat, hung in the croch of a tree outside the Arazim Hotel, there is a partially exploded 3-foot-long Katyusha. It is such a familiar sight here that people don't even turn to look at it anymore.

Metulla is a resort town. It is Israel's northernmost settlement, founded by Jews nearly 90 years ago. It is a place where Israelis come for clean air and the cool breezes that blow off the mountains.

It is not large. There is one main, tree-shaded street with a few hotels. The street climbs upward toward the border with Lebanon. A longtime target of shellfire from across that border, Metulla has plenty of bomb shelters. And it is easy to forget, 33 years after independence, that some Israelis still spend the night in them.

Some refuse to, though. It is hard to stay. There is a helpless, claustrophobic feeling in the shelters. You not only hear the deep, booming bass of the shells, but you feel them through the earth and concrete.

A woman wearing sunglasses and carrying a beach bag walked along the main street in front of Israeli military headquarters.

"Incoming!" a soldier shouted at her. He meant that the blasts were Palestinian shells coming in, not Israeli shells going out.

"I grew up in Jerusalem," she shouted back, waving him off. "This is not so bad."

Reuven Weinberg, manager of the Sheleg-Halevenon Hotel, did not go down to the shelter. He expressed a common Israeli attitude. "In this country you can get killed in many places," he said with a shrug. "In the shelter, out of the shelter, there's a difference? Life is to live. So live it."

The Israeli response to such shelling is to shell back, both by artillery and gunboat. They also send planes and troops into Lebanon from time to time to attack guerrilla targets.

The Israelis know that the raids are not popular with other countries. They know that to a large part of the world, the Israelis are no longer viewed sympathetically as the scrappy survivors of the Holocaust. They

know that to many they are now viewed as the villains and not the victims.

They do not care. They would rather live than be liked.

"We became the good Boy Scouts of the Middle East," Brig. Gen. Yaakov Even, the chief Israeli military spokesman, said of an earlier era. "When you do not retaliate [and] you just suffer, the world loves you. You are the permanent underdog."

Now, Israel retaliates by land, sea and air. It strikes at military targets in Lebanon, but does not deny that civilians sometimes die.

"We have pursued a simple policy with our bordering countries," a government spokesman told me. "We told them it is impossible that our people should live in shelters, that our children should die, while their killers should live freely and painlessly in the sunlight. We ask them to stop the terrorists who live within their borders. If they don't, we will."

"We are on the offensive," Gen. Even said. "We are the aggressors. We are penetrating the so-called border of the so-called sovereign state of Lebanon, and we go after [the terrorists] wherever they hide."

Someone has to translate such policy into action. So meet the boys of Hill 109.

Hill 109 is on the Golan Heights, to the south and east of Metulla. Most of the world calls this place Israeli-Occupied Territory. The Israelis call it an Israeli-Administered Area. The Syrians call it Syria.

The Syrians lost it in the war of 1967 and failed to take it back in the war of 1973. There is much debate and argument whether the Israelis are here legally and whether they can afford to give it back.

The current Israeli government, however, tends to cut through such debates.

"We control the area," Moshe Arens, chairman of the powerful Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee of the Israeli parliament, told me. "That is a simple fact. We are not defensible from our old borders. That is another fact. I say we keep what we have."

Hill 109 is a "porcupine" stronghold. To create one you take a hill, any hill, and you hollow it out. You put steel corridors inside and booby-trap them every few yards, so you can bring down the roof if the bad guys get in.

On top you pour concrete and cover that with stone blocks to absorb direct bombardment. You put in a generator, air conditioner, heater (it snows here in winter) and water supply. You put land mines around it, an armored personnel carrier mounted with a .50-caliber machinegun in the backyard, some mortars and bazookas up top and barbed wire around the whole thing.

Then you bring in the boys.

Second Lt. Alon commands the 30 or so men of Hill 109. He is 20. He has been grow-

ing a beard for three months and it looks like first beards always do. If he lived in America, you could picture him at a college fraternity smoker, wearing a crested blazer and drinking beer out of a ZBT mug. Here, because the border with Syria has been quiet lately, he has been leading patrols into Lebanon.

"It breaks up the boredom," he says. "That and athletics. I've been here three months. I leave next week, thank God."

From down a corridor comes the giggling of about a dozen gum-chewing teen-age girls. They work in army recruiting centers and have come to learn about life on the front lines.

Do the girls help break up the monotony, I ask.

Alon makes a sour face. "They are on duty," he says. "They aren't any fun."

Are there any problems in the unit? Drinking? Drugs?

"No," he says. "We really can't afford to. Syria is very close. They have more soldiers than we do. We have to stay prepared. We have to be better than them, one on one. On Passover we had a glass of wine. One glass. That was it."

Do you expect action with Syria?

"I hope not," he says with genuine seriousness. "It is not like fighting in Lebanon. Action here means war."

How do your men like staying at Hill 109?

"If we don't stay here," he says, "I can't imagine who will."

Back in Metulla, Lt. Eli Messer, who serves on the Lebanese front, sat outside the hotel where the Katyusha hung in the tree. "If we have information that the terrorists are sitting there, planning an attack on Israel, then we move against them," he said. "They hit us with a Katyusha and we hit them with our air force. This is unfair? We must always be the victims? That would be more fair? People in America would like us more?"

"Without our strikes against the terrorists, do you know what would happen? All over the world, people would be watching TV and saying, 'Oh, the poor people. The poor Jews. My, my, too bad.' And what would happen? The Syrians or the terrorists would be sitting here in Metulla."

"And you think we haven't paid a price? You have heard what little Liaw said in the bomb shelter. How old is he? Two? How many words does he know? How many words does he know, but he knows the word Katyusha. He knows what a rocket is."

"When your children grow up like that, do not tell me you haven't paid a price." ●