

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AVIATION SAFETY AND NOISE  
REDUCTION ACT

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the White House for a clear signal that legislation rolling back the fleet noise rule would be vetoed. I have now received that response and I think it is something that all Members should be aware of.

This is a clear signal to those airlines which have been dragging their feet that they will have to bring their fleets into compliance, despite efforts in the Senate to the contrary. If the foot-dragging airlines fail to see the writing on the wall, they will have only themselves to blame as the compliance deadlines approach and they are not ready.

This is also a clear signal to the House-Senate conference on H.R. 2440 that they should report none of the Senate provisions which would roll back the fleet noise rule, and should instead move forward with the noncontroversial ADAP funding approved by the House.

Mr. Speaker, so that the record might be complete, I would like to include at this point Secretary Goldschmidt's letter of October 18 to you, the Secretary's letter of November 12 to Chairman Johnson, my letter of November 1 to the President, and the White House response of November 29 to me.

The letters follow:

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,

Washington, D.C., October 18, 1979.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,

Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to you regarding H.R. 3942, the "Aviation Safety and Noise Reduction Act", which is now pending before the Rules Committee. This bill, the so-called "noise bill", contains provisions which are unacceptable to the Administration for policy or budgetary reasons. In our view H.R. 3942 is an anti-environment bill which rewards some air carriers for delaying actions to meet environmental regulations, and which penalizes those carriers which have made efforts to be "good neighbors" to airports. Moreover, some of the major problems the bill addresses will be fully accommodated by legislation now being considered in the House to extend the Airport and Airway Development Act. More specifically, the Administration believes that H.R. 3942 is unnecessary and unacceptable for a number of reasons, including:

1. By redefining the Federal and local roles in reducing aircraft noise impacts, the bill implies a Federal responsibility for assuring land use compatibility with airport noise. This responsibility should continue to rest with local governments, which have the zoning and other authorities needed to insure land uses compatible with airport operations.

2. By exempting two and three engine aircraft from noise regulations issued in December 1976, it would delay relief from noise to

millions of people around major airports. It would also weaken the incentives for replacement of aircraft with new technology airplanes that could offer even more noise relief to the millions of Americans who are exposed daily to unacceptable levels of aircraft noise.

3. By authorizing some \$300 million in excess of the President's budget for FY 1980, an increase which is unwarranted, the bill would be inflationary. In any event, as you know, the House already acted to establish an obligations limit on the airport development program for 1980 at a level which is \$70 million over the President's budget. In addition we are concerned that the bill could be interpreted as exposing the Federal Government to increased money damages by way of increased Federal liability in inverse condemnation actions.

4. By prohibiting the Federal Aviation Administration from making changes through regulatory action to control navigable airspace, the bill would tie the Administrator's hands in responding to changes in the operating environment for aviation. With aviation activity growing at about 5 percent annually this prohibition could have potentially adverse effects on safety. In any event the regulatory proposal this provision was intended to forestall has been withdrawn by the Federal Aviation Administration.

I wish to stress that, more broadly, the Administration believes that the principal airport noise problems the bill addresses will be dealt with adequately by the legislation now pending to extend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. This legislation would extend the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and provide substantially increased authorizations for airport grants and for other FAA programs intended to promote safety. It would also broaden the use of airport grant funds to help mitigate noise impacts.

In summary, H.R. 3942, as reported, provides for more noise and less safety while at the same time being inflationary at a time when reducing inflation is a top priority for both the Administration and the Congress.

In recent testimony before both Houses the Administration expressed willingness to work with the Congress to find solutions to the aviation noise problem and to work toward an improved airport development program. H.R. 3942 is an unacceptable vehicle for accomplishing these important goals. Therefore, I will recommend to the President that he not sign this bill unless our concerns are resolved.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of H.R. 3942 would not be in accord with the program of the President.

I thank you in advance for your prompt and careful consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

NEIL GOLDSCHMIDT.

THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION,

Washington, D.C., November 12, 1979.

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON,

Chairman, Committee on Public Works and Transportation, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On October 18, I wrote to the Speaker and the Chairman of the Rules Committee expressing the Administration's strong opposition to H.R. 3942, the proposed "Aviation Safety and Noise Reduction Act", and my intent to recommend to the President that he not sign the bill if it is passed. I have enclosed a copy of my letter to the Speaker.

On October 22 the Senate passed H.R. 2440, striking the provisions of the House initiated bill and substituting for them the provisions of S. 413, the Senate "noise bill". I am advised the Senate has already appointed conferees in anticipation of a conference on H.R. 2440.

In expressing the Administration's opposition to H.R. 3942, I outlined a number of objectionable features of the bill. The provisions of H.R. 2440, as passed by the Senate, are comparable in many respects to those undesirable fiscal and environmental provisions of H.R. 3942 to which we are opposed; one example being a Senate proposed funding level for noise planning and airport development programs \$250 million above the President's budget for fiscal year 1980. Further, the Senate proposal is even more objectionable than H.R. 3942 on environmental grounds since, in addition to providing for mandatory waivers of the Department's noise regulations under certain circumstances, it would deem in compliance with our noise standards any airplane which exceeds those standards by as much as five decibels.

The effect of the five decibel exemption would be to permit all two and three engine narrowbody aircraft (i.e., 727s, 737s, and DC-9s) to continue operating in the United States for an indefinite period beyond the Department's 1983 compliance deadline without having to undergo retrofit or other noise reduction modification. This provision would drastically undercut the Department's efforts to reduce the adverse impact of noise on millions of Americans since it fails to account for the fact that 75 percent of this Nation's air carrier airports receive major airline service only by these two and three engine narrowbody aircraft. Thus, the people living around these, as well as other airports, would be denied the benefits of noise reduction which they have rightfully come to expect since the issuance of our retrofit/replacement rule in 1976.

Though the Administration continues to support the provisions of H.R. 2440 which would authorize the obligation of discretionary funds under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, the benefits to be attained from discretionary funding authority are far outweighed by the negative features of H.R. 2440 as amended by the Senate. Accordingly, I will recommend to the President that he not sign H.R. 2440 if it is enacted by the Congress with the objectionable provisions proposed by the Senate.

Further, the Office of Management and Budget advises that enactment of H.R. 2440, as passed by the Senate, would not be in accord with the program of the President.

In closing, I am deeply concerned that a conference on Senate passed H.R. 2440 will result in a retreat from the long-standing Federal commitment to reduce aircraft noise at the source. I urge you and the other Members of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation to vote against sending this bill to Conference. I thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

NEIL GOLDSCHMIDT.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., November 1, 1979.

President JIMMY CARTER,

The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to follow-up on our recent conversation at the White House.

As you know, in 1976 the Federal Aviation Administration, pursuant to its authority under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, promulgated a "fleet noise rule." That rule told the airlines that the portions of their fleets which did not comply with existing Federal noise emission standards would have to be either replaced or brought into compliance by 1983, in the case of 2- and 3-engine jets, or by 1985, in the case of 4-engine jets.

At the present time, approximately half a dozen airlines have made the contractual commitments necessary to bring their fleets into compliance. It is critical to our efforts to achieve compliance with the rule that the remaining airlines be making those commitments in the very near future. Unfortunately, however, at the very time these airlines should be taking action, they are receiving conflicting signals as to whether they will be required to comply. Specifically, two pieces of legislation (H.R. 3942 and S. 413) are under consideration which would virtually gut the fleet noise rule.

Many of us in the House have opposed this legislation, and it is by no means assured that any bill to roll-back existing noise regulations has sufficient support in Congress to be enacted. As an example, I enclose a recent letter opposing the House bill, signed by twelve of the Members of the committee which reported the bill.

Nevertheless, the mere possibility that such legislation might be enacted is threatening to prevent those actions by non-complying airlines which are necessary to achieve compliance within the mandated time frames. Your Administration has been most helpful by consistently supporting the fleet noise rule. The recent letters (enclosed) by Secretary Goldschmidt, further stating the case against the roll-back legislation and his intention to recommend a veto, have been most constructive.

However, non-complying airlines should know that, whatever may happen in Congress with H.R. 3942 and S. 413, such legislation will not become law. Only with such knowledge will some of the non-complying airlines make those commitments now which are necessary to meet the existing compliance deadlines. Without those commitments in the very near future, the chances for timely compliance with the noise rule will be seriously eroded, whether or not the legislation ultimately passes.

Only the clearest signal to the non-complying airlines will preserve the effective force of the fleet noise rule, and under the circumstances, that signal must come from the White House. A clear commitment from you that you definitely would veto legislation rolling back existing regulation of aircraft noise would create certainty where ambiguity now exists, and would make it possible for the remaining airlines to get on with their efforts to meet the compliance deadlines.

Thank you for your interest in this important issue, and if I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN Y. MINETA,  
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., November 29, 1979.

Hon. NORMAN Y. MINETA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. MINETA: The President has asked me to respond to your recent letter to him on the subject of aircraft noise legislation.

As you know, on October 22 the Senate passed H.R. 2440 after striking the provisions of the House passed bill and substituting for them the provisions of S. 413, the noise bill previously passed by the Senate. A conference on H.R. 2440 is expected to begin the week of November 26.

We are in total agreement with you that such legislation is unnecessary and unacceptable. Please be assured that Secretary of Transportation Goldschmidt has been speaking for the Administration in his letters to the Congress on this issue.

The Administration has several problems with H.R. 2440 as passed by the Senate (as well as S. 413 and H.R. 3942) including:

It exempts from the noise standards all aircraft which exceed the standards by up to 5 decibels. The effect of this provision is to permit all 2 and 3 engine narrowbody aircraft to continue operations for an indefinite period without undergoing retrofit. Seventy-five percent of the Nation's airports are served only by these aircraft. Passage of this bill would subject millions of residents to continued unacceptable noise levels.

It requires the mandatory waiver of noise regulations in certain other cases, thus again subjecting an airport's neighbors to unnecessary increased noise.

The bill may well disrupt plans of local airport authorities for noise reduction programs that were based on the reduced aircraft noise that could be assumed from the implementation of the Federal noise rules. As such, this may imply a shift to Federal responsibility for damages resulting from the continued noise.

H.R. 2440 authorizes \$250 million more than the President's 1980 budget for noise planning and airport development programs. Furthermore, the bill could be the basis for large federally funded land purchases, the least cost effective way to address the noise issue.

For these and other reasons presented earlier in testimony and reports from the Department of Transportation, the Administration finds this bill to be unacceptable. If such a bill is passed by the Congress, I believe that the bill should be disapproved.

I deeply appreciate your efforts to oppose passage of this bill. My staff and I stand ready to help you in any way possible.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. MCINTYRE, Jr.,  
Director.

#### NEW ITALIAN CHAPEL TO BE DEDICATED SUNDAY

#### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent observance of the 65th anniversary of Silver Lake Baptist Church in Belleville, N.J. May I also point out that Rev. Benedetto Pascale, pastor of the church, has been minister of Silver Lake Baptist since its dedication day in 1914. He has devoted his life to serving God and his fellow man, and certainly is to be commended for the great good he has accomplished through these many years.

Historical highlights of the founding of Silver Lake Baptist Church were reported in the November 20, 1914, edition of the Bloomfield, N.J. Independent Press. This highly interesting account was reprinted in the church's program of November 18, 1979, and I would like at this time to include it in the RECORD.

#### NEW ITALIAN CHAPEL TO BE DEDICATED SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 1914

"The Chapel which the First Baptist Church (of Bloomfield) has been erecting on the lower Franklin St. for the Italians

will be dedicated Sunday afternoon at four o'clock with a service entirely in the Italian language. The Italian Churches of Newark, Orange and Passaic will be present. The churches of Orange and Newark will sing. The dedication sermon will be preached by Professor Antonio Mangano, dean of the Italian Dept. of the Theological Seminary of Colgate University. Other parts of the program will be by Prof. Ghigo (of Bloomfield College and Seminary), Prof. Allegri, Revs. Corbo, Pagano, Galassi, B. Pascale and H. S. Potter. Next Monday evening (Nov. 23), there will be a service in the English language to which the public is cordially invited. Rev. Charles A. Brooks of New York will preach the dedication sermon, and there will be reports and brief addresses by several as well as special music by the First Baptist quartet and the Italian choirs of Newark and Orange.

"The building is of hollow tile and stucco, and cost, with the lot, \$11,000. There is pretty and commodious auditorium and Sunday School rooms opening into it . . . a Basement fitted up for a Gymnasium, and living rooms are attached to the rear . . .

"Rev. Benedetto Pascale is the Minister and Howard E. Wharton is the Sunday School Superintendent.

"In addition to the preaching and S. S., B.Y.P.U. there are cooking classes, language classes, boys' clubs, gymnastics, etc. . . The new building will help greatly as the rented building was not large enough to accommodate all who came. While the work is under the supervision of the First Baptist Church of our town, many others who are interested in the material, social, moral and spiritual welfare of our Italian neighbors are co-operating."

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FLIGHT OVER THE SOUTH POLE

#### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, this was to have been a happy day commemorating the historic flight of Richard E. Byrd over the South Pole just 50 years ago, on November 29, 1929. Instead, it has been marred by the tragic loss of an Air New Zealand DC-10, which crashed sometime Tuesday night just north of the U.S. base at McMurdo Sound, with no survivors among the 257 passengers and crew. Among those on board were twenty Americans who, with their fellow tourists, had taken an 11-hour, roundtrip, non-stop flight from New Zealand for a glimpse of the beautiful and awesome Antarctic continent. We grieve for the families of all those lost in the accident.

The National Science Foundation, which has responsibility for the U.S. program in the Antarctic, has made all of the resources of McMurdo Base available to assist in the search and rescue operation. Five planes and helicopters flown by the U.S. Navy Support Force stationed at McMurdo were sent up to search for the missing DC-10. It was sighted on the slopes of Mt. Erebus, some 30 miles from McMurdo, early Wednesday morning by one of the National Science Foundation's C-130 ski-equipped airplanes. The only air capability on the Antarctic continent is that operated out of McMurdo as logistic support for the NSF science pro-



gram. These ski-equipped planes make it possible for NSF to maintain and supply inland bases, including one at the South Pole itself, for scientific activities.

The base at McMurdo was readied for medical treatment in the event there were any survivors. In the meantime, the harsh weather conditions and terrain made it impossible for helicopters to land at the site of the crash. A team of mountaineers from New Zealand have now been flown in and airdropped at the site and have confirmed that there are no survivors, making this one of the worst disasters in aviation history.

At McMurdo right now are Senator HARRY BYRD and Congressman JOHN WYDLER, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, who had just arrived in a group led by National Science Board Chairman Dr. Norman Hackerman to inspect the U.S. program in the Antarctic and to retrace Admiral Byrd's historic flight to the pole. Incidentally, Senator BYRD is the nephew of Admiral Byrd. With them are Admiral Byrd's grandson, Mr. Robert Breyer; Dr. Lawrence Gold; and Mr. Norman Vaughan, leader and member of the advance party that gave Byrd weather information from a point 1,500 miles inland, which they reached by dog team. Ambassador Pickering and a senior official from the State Department, senior officials of the Navy Department, members of the National Science Board, and the National Science Foundation's manager of the U.S. Antarctic research program are also in the group.

We rejoice in the news that the NSF group is safe, although the gladness is tempered by the sad developments almost immediately following their arrival at McMurdo. We also are reminded once again of the extraordinary courage of Admiral Byrd in setting out on an 18½-hour trip in a trimotor plane with a cruising speed of 100 miles per hour over the most treacherous terrain on this planet.●

#### THE KURDS, ORPHANS OF THE UNIVERSE

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the present crisis in Iran, where American diplomats are being held hostage, I believe it is important to acknowledge that Ayatollah Khomeini's venomous anti-Americanism is not shared by all the peoples of that country. I refer specifically to the Kurdish minority in northwest Iran.

In fact, at this very minute the Kurds are in their own life and death struggle against Khomeini and his band of blood-thirsty fanatics. The Kurds in years past have been pro-American. Though their enthusiasm was dampened by the end of American assistance a few years ago in their fight for an autonomous Kurdistan, the Kurds remain a significant force in Iran.

This would seem the proper time to rectify our past injustices and open a new chapter with the Kurds in Iran.

The Kurds, a much maligned, unfortunate people, have been struggling for an autonomous Kurdistan for over 100 years. For centuries, these people have been subject to invasion and suppression, first at the hands of the Greeks, then the Mongols, Turks, and Britons.

The best account of the recent and gloomy history of the Kurds was an article published in the Washington Star on September 16, by Smith Hempstone, a Washington-based syndicated columnist who spent the summer of 1974 with Mulla Mustafa Barzani's guerrillas in Iraq. Coincidentally, Barzani died in Washington this past spring. Unfortunately, his leadership and pro-Western attitude will be sorely missed.

THE KURDS, ORPHANS OF THE UNIVERSE—  
KHOMEINI WAGES "FEAST OF BLOOD"

(By Smith Hempstone)

"Shedders of blood, raisers after strife, seekers after turmoil and uproar, robbers and brigands; a people all malignant, and evil-doers of depraved habits, ignorant of all mercy, devoid of all humanity, scorning the garment of wisdom; but a brave race and fearless, of a hospitality grateful to the soul, in truth and in honor unequalled, of pleasing countenance and fair cheek, boasting all the goods of beauty and grace."

Thus a 19th Century Western traveller described the Kurds, the warrior-poets now locked in combat with the 79-year-old Ayatollah Khomeini's Islamic regime in Iran. Since the days of Alexander the Great, the Kurds have gotten the short end of the stick from history. And this latest Iranian chapter in their saga is no exception.

The Kurds, a Sunni Moslem but non-Arab people—they are thought by some to be the descendants of the ancient Medes—have lived in their Central Asian mountain fastness since the beginnings of recorded time. They have fought with ravenous joy for their independence against Greeks, Persians, Mongols, Turks, Arabs, Crusaders (Saladin was a Kurd) and Britons. When there has been no outsider to wage war against, they have kept in practice by fighting each other.

But while the Kurds number more than 10 million, no atlas portrays a nation called Kurdistan; it exists only in the hearts of those—and they have been many—who willingly have given their lives for it.

In the aftermath of World War I, when Wilsonian self-determination was all the rage, the 1920 Treaty of Sevres promised the Kurds a homeland of their own. But the rise of Kemal Ataturk, and the greed of Britain and France, aborted the treaty. The Kurds were left worse off than they were before: formerly united in bondage under the Ottoman Turks, the Kurds found their heartland divided among three masters, Turkey, Iraq and Iran. Today, six million Kurds live in Turkey, four million in Iran and two million in Iraq (another 600,000 are divided between Syria and the Soviet Union).

Since this betrayal, unrest has been endemic among the Kurds, with each rebellion seemingly costing more lives than the last.

In 1919, Ataturk, who dealt equally harshly with Turkey's Greek and Armenian minorities, swore "to proceed in such a manner as to destroy the possibility of a separatist movement by the Kurds." His successors took him at his word, and it is Turkish policy to this day to deny even the existence of a people called the Kurds: they are, according to Ankara, simply mountain Turks who have forgotten their language and miraculously learned another.

Kurdish rebellions in 1925, 1930 and 1937

were put down with great severity, the leaders executed and some tribes exiled from their mountain homes. Today, the Kurdish areas of eastern Turkey are under martial law, the use of Kurdish as a written language is forbidden, and it may not be spoken on Turkish radio or television. To be elected to the national assembly, one must demonstrate a fluency in Turkish that most Kurds do not possess.

#### SUPPRESSION IN TURKEY

Although there are at least 16 underground Kurdish organizations in Turkey, the only political party openly to espouse the Kurdish cause, the Marxist Turkish Labor Party, was banned in 1971 and its leaders given long prison sentences. Perhaps because they come from a poor country's most depressed region, those detribalized Turkish Kurds who acquire an education tend to be attracted to militant leftist movements.

But because of Ankara's tough policies, internal tribal rivalries and linguistic differences, there has been no significant Kurdish insurrection in Turkey for more than four decades. The few Kurds within Syria and the Soviet Union also have been quiet.

The situation has been quite different in Iraq. There the Kurdish nationalist movement since 1927 has been dominated by the Barzani clan, whose charismatic leader, Mulla Mustafa Barzani, died in exile in Washington earlier this year (Mulla Mustafa's father was hanged by the Turks). But even in Iraq, the Barzanis have encountered opposition within the Kurds—from the Bardost and Zibaris, for tribal reasons, and from detribalized Kurds such as Jalal Talabani on ideological grounds (Talabani, a Marxist, today leads a small force of Kurdish leftist guerrillas operating in northern Iraq).

Iraq, whether ruled by monarchists or leftists such as the current Moscow-supported Baathist regime, has from time to time granted its two million Kurds a degree of cultural and political autonomy. But it has never been enough for the freedom-loving Kurds, and Mulla Mustafa Barzani four times between 1961 and 1974 launched full-scale rebellions against Baghdad.

#### BARZANI'S LAST HURRAH

The 1974 insurrection was Barzani's last hurrah, and came closest to succeeding. Barzani's Pesh Merga ("those who face death"), supported by the shah of Iran, armed by the Central Intelligence Agency and assisted to a degree by the Israelis—perhaps because they have a predilection for unorthodox Islamic sects, Iraqi Kurds always have got on well with both Christians and Jews—gained control over 43,000 square miles of northeastern Iraq.

But it was never the intent of the shah, fearful of the attraction it might provide for Iran's four million Kurds, to see the Kurdish rebellion succeed in Iraq. Barzani, totally dependent on the shah for food and military equipment, was kept on a short leash by the shah, who used him to weaken the Baathist regime, which was fomenting disorders among Iran's Baluchi tribesmen and giving refuge to anti-shah dissidents.

When that purpose had been served, and Baghdad proved willing to make other political concessions to Iran, the shah (and Henry Kissinger) in 1975 pulled the oriental carpet out from under Barzani, the revolt collapsed and many of Barzani's followers fled into Iran, where they were disarmed and interned. Many of those who stayed behind in Iraq were executed or deported to punishment camps in the south, leaving whole areas of Iraqi Kurdistan depopulated.

#### REPUBLIC CRUSHED

Kurdish rebellions in northwestern Iran in 1921, 1926 and 1930 were put down by Reza Shah, father of the now-exiled monarch

and founder of the short-lived Pahlavi dynasty. But while there were executions, the Iranian monarchy's Kurdish policies in some respects represented a compromise between Turkey's total denial of the very existence of the Kurds and the more permissive line of at least some Iraqi regimes.

In Iran, where Kurds account for about 10 percent of a population that is no more than 60 percent Persian, the tribes were disarmed, the use of Kurdish was not permitted in schools or government, and Kurds who showed either marked leadership qualities or inconvenient dissidence were either bought off or restricted in their activities. But books in Kurdish were published, and Kurdish programs were broadcast by the state-controlled radio.

Yet the monarchy never succeeded by this judicious use of the carrot and the stick in totally extinguishing the spark of Kurdish nationalism. In 1946, the Kurds, with Russian help, succeeded in establishing an independent Marxist republic at Mahabad. But when Harry Truman forced the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from northern Iran, the central government retook Mahabad, executed the republic's president, Qazi Mohammad, and forced Barzani, who had crossed the Iraqi border with several thousand fighting men to help the Iranian Kurds, into a Russian exile that was to last a dozen years.

#### NEW AUTONOMY EFFORT

With the collapse of the Pahlavi dynasty in February of this year, many of Iran's Kurds nourished hopes they would be allowed autonomy within the framework of the Ayatollah Khomeini's Islamic Republic. But as a precaution—for there is a saying that "the Kurds have no friends"—they took over most of the police posts and army barracks within Iranian Kurdistan, helping themselves to the arms stored there.

Because Khomeini is no friend of the First Amendment—in recent weeks, he has padlocked 26 Iranian publications and expelled more than a dozen foreign journalists—it is difficult to say who started the fighting in Iranian Kurdistan, what the objectives of the Kurdish leaders are and what outside forces, if any, are supporting the insurrection. It is at least possible that Khomeini called for a Shi'ite holy war against the Sunni Kurds to divert the attention of his restive countrymen from the inadequacies of his regime. Certainly he used the disorders in Kurdistan as a pretext to crush all opposition to his rule.

The first confrontation between Khomeini and the Kurds came late last February after the Kurds took over the Mahabad garrison, wounding its commander. Dispatched to Mahabad to find out what was going on, Labor Minister Dariush Forouhar was told by Sheikh Ezzedin Hosseini, the bearded, 58-year-old Kurdish religious leader, that the Kurds "are not separatists."

What Hosseini and Abdul Raham Qassemu, secretary-general of the banned Kurdish Democratic Party, said they wanted of Tehran was local autonomy within the framework of a federal, democratic Iran, joint control of military and police forces within Kurdistan and, paradoxically, a crackdown on the political and military activities of Barzani's two exiled sons, Idris and Massoud.

#### CRACKDOWN BEGINS

There was, insofar as is known, no formal reply to the Kurdish demands from either Khomeini or the government of Mehdi Barzagan.

Throughout the spring, Kurdish missions continued to travel between Mahabad and Tehran. More police posts and army barracks were peacefully occupied in Kurdistan, their demoralized garrisons disarmed and told to leave the area.

Late in July, Major General Nasser Fabrod resigned as Iranian army chief of staff, and

was replaced by Brigadier General Hossein Shaker a hardliner. On July 22, the first major armed clash occurred when Iranian army units relieved a police post besieged by the Kurds near the Turkish frontier. Another bloody incident took place on July 28, when revolutionary militiamen called Pasdars tried to reenter the Kurdish town of Marivan.

The fighting escalated in August when the army and the hated Pasdars retook the town of Paveh after a bombardment by tanks, artillery, helicopter gunships and American-made F-4 jets. More than 400 people lost their lives in the Paveh fighting, and the Kurds claimed to have downed three helicopters and an F-4.

Khomeini, enraged at the Kurdish resistance—and fearful their separatist virus might prove contagious for Iran's Arab, Baluchi and Turkomen minorities (Pasdar brutality in Khuzistan already had provoked serious rioting among Iran's Arab minority)—assumed personal command of the armed forces, threatened military leaders who did not achieve immediate results in Kurdistan with "revolutionary justice" (a euphemism for execution) and called for "a feast of blood" in Kurdistan. The KDP was banned, Hosseini and Qassemu were branded as "corrupt satanic agents" and the summary execution of captured Kurdish guerrillas began in Saqqez and other government-held Kurdish towns.

With the failure of a Kurdish peace mission to Tehran—Khomeini was quoted as saying the Kurds "deserved no mercy"—the Kurdish leaders abandoned Mahabad without a major battle and pulled their forces back deep into the mountains. Qassemu accused Khomeini of planning "a genocide of the Kurds," while he and Hosseini continued to insist they were not separatists, but wanted only the right to run their own affairs within the framework of Iran's independence, territorial integrity and national sovereignty.

By Labor Day, the situation seemed to have reached a stalemate, with Khomeini's forces in control of most Kurdish towns, but KDP guerrilla units still roaming the mountains with their captured weapons.

#### KEY FACTORS MISSING

It is clear the Kurds cannot hope to succeed, if success is defined as the creation of an autonomous Kurdistan independent in all but name of Tehran. History has demonstrated that a Kurdish nationalist movement can succeed only with the coincidence of three key factors: the emergence of a single, charismatic Kurdish leader, the existence of a weak central government and the active support of an adjacent major power.

While Hosseini and Qassemu are allies, the division of authority (and support) between them is unclear, and neither has the stature of a Mulla Mustafa Barzani. Massoud Barzani is gallant, but he is both an Iraqi and a tribal chief, and hence suspect to the radical faction of the KDP.

The regime in Tehran is weak, but, spurred on both by fear of their own executions and anti-Sunni prejudices, Iranian army commanders, with their far superior fire power, have shown themselves at least capable of holding the Kurdish towns and roads.

Finally, while Qassemu claims (and Khomeini charges) he has Moscow's support, there is no firm evidence of this. The Kremlin has no love for Khomeini, who has cracked down on Iran's Communists and incited Afghan rebels against Moscow's client regime in Kabul. But the Russians, while they have influenced the Kurdish nationalist movement over the years, never have been prepared to bet all their chips on its success.

#### MORE ORPHANS

Certainly the United States, which participated in the Shah's betrayal of the pro-Western Barzanis, has shown no disposi-

tion to embrace Qassemu, who spent years in exile in Czechoslovakia and has ties to many European Marxist groups. Nor is there any evidence of Israeli participation in this chapter of the Kurdish saga, although Jerusalem has an ax to grind with Khomeini, who cut off the principal source of Israel's oil and backs the Palestine Liberation Organization.

In the absence of fruitful negotiations between the Kurds and Khomeini—and the chances of this now seem slight—the prospect is for a prolonged guerrilla war in Kurdistan, which will bring great suffering to the women and children among Iran's four million Kurds.

Mulla Mustafa Barzani, in the last bitter days of his Washington exile, once remarked that "the Kurds are the orphans of the universe." With Jimmy Carter, who has spoken more than once of the need to inject an element of morality into the conduct of foreign policy, selling kerosene and military supplies to Khomeini's regime, that would appear to be an accurate appraisal.

Before Khomeini's appetite is sated from his "feast of blood," there will be thousands of new orphans in Iranian Kurdistan. ●

#### TELEVISION DIPLOMACY

#### HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the more disturbing aspects of the current situation in Iran is the relationship of the state-controlled mass media to the events at the U.S. Embassy and in the streets of Tehran.

Joseph Goebbels, Adolf Hitler's propaganda minister, perfected the methods which are now being used by the Ayatollah Khomeini and his revolutionary council. Through state-control of the media and the use of lies, distortions, and prevarications, Goebbels was able to whip up nationalistic drives and war hysteria among the German people, which contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War, and the systematic slaughter of millions of civilians. Goebbels' manipulation of the media successfully kept people's minds off Germany's real problems and managed to keep many people ignorant about the holocaust and other atrocities.

We are once again confronting that phenomenon today in Iran. In recent months, the hold of the Ayatollah Khomeini over Iran had begun to unmistakably slip. There was growing unrest among the ethnic minorities who were making demands for autonomy under the proposed Islamic constitution. The Arab minority in the southwest was threatening to sabotage Iranian oil production, and the Kurds were in open rebellion against the ayatollah, which neither the so-called revolutionary guards nor the remnants of the army were able to subdue. Leftists were growing more restive, and there was increasing opposition to the mock trials and subsequent executions by the ayatollah's agents. Public services were declining, and the ayatollah was faced by increasing opposition from the government of Prime Minister Barzagan.

Confronted by this growing unrest, the



Ayatollah Khomeini adopted the Goebbels approach. His pronouncements and appearances on television were calculated to achieve three goals. First, eliminate all references to the real problems facing Iran. Second, stir up frenzied and wild nationalism. Third, escalate the pattern in clear stages right up to the national vote on December 2 concerning the approval of the Islamic constitution, which would solidify the ayatollah's power over Iran.

In Nazi Germany, Goebbels used radio. In Iran, the ayatollah uses television. That is the sole distinction between the two.

As his hold slipped, the ayatollah increasingly took to television from his headquarters in Qom with more and more references to "foreign devils" and a "sick or demented Carter" as the source of all of Iran's problems. He coupled these statements with attacks on the Barzagan government. As the stridency of these attacks increased, the government became powerless in the face of anti-American nationalism demonstrated by the Tehran mob. Those demonstrations culminated in the takeover of the U.S. Embassy, which convinced the Barzagan government that it no longer could stay in power. Thereby, the ayatollah eliminated the sole remaining check over his power.

The illegal and immoral takeover of the embassy increased the ayatollah's reliance on television. He well realized that his power could diminish, unless he constantly fed the mob's hatred of President Carter, the Shah, the United States, and the embassy. His television ravings have become ever wilder, and his lies ever bigger. Daily references to the President and this country have become more and more vituperative, and moderate statements by others have been denounced. The appearances on television by the ayatollah have shown that dark and uncontrolled savagery that lurked at the heart of Nazi Germany.

These efforts intensified, as Iran entered the holy period of Moharram, which is traditionally a holy period for Iranians. By obvious design, the referendum comes on December 2, only 1 day after the height of Moharram, Ashura, the anniversary of the death of Husayn, the cousin and son-in-law of the prophet Muhammad.

Although the arrival of the shah in New York provided the ayatollah with a useful reason for his violent anti-Americanism, it is probable that he would have found some other excuse. Like Goebbels, the ayatollah has the uncanny ability to seize on a chance event and turn it to his advantage, as he demonstrated through his public lies about the tragic event in Mecca.

In essence, the ayatollah is conducting his internal and foreign policies by television. The Tehran mob receives its marching orders from him via his almost daily broadcasts; the United States and others are forced to conducting diplomacy by watching the ayatollah's television broadcasts. Moderate statements by the former acting Foreign Minister, Bani-Sadr, were systematically denounced by the ayatollah's statements

on television. That process culminated in the replacement of Bani-Sadr by Sadegh Ghotbzadeh, who is head of Iranian National Radio and Television. That personnel shift seems quite appropriate, in light of the ayatollah's use of television for diplomatic purposes.

All of this is somewhat bewildering for Americans. This country is accustomed to conducting diplomacy through normal channels on a government-to-government basis, and we are certainly not accustomed to examining the ravings of a fanatic to discern what another country's foreign policy is toward the United States. Because of our free and open press, this country might have some difficulty comprehending the media manipulation by the ayatollah. In order to help explain this phenomenon, I want to share an insightful article by Henry Brandon from the November 28th edition of the Washington Star with all of my colleagues.

Diplomacy by television is irrational, irresponsible, and counterproductive. It lies outside the normal and accepted rules of international diplomacy, but it must be remembered that it makes perfect and rational sense to the Ayatollah Khomeini because of his obvious goals.

The article follows:

#### TELEVISION'S DIPLOMATIC CHANNELS (By Henry Brandon)

Television, as we are all aware, has an effect on everything and everybody, but the realization that it can also have a far-reaching influence on diplomacy is new. The world got a first inkling of it when a television interview seemed to have played a role in facilitating President Anwar Sadat's spectacular visit to Jerusalem.

But we have learned since that television's influence in this case was not as creative as had been assumed, because a secret meeting in Morocco between Moshe Dayan, the Israeli foreign minister, and Hassan el-Tohamy, a confidant of President Sadat, preceded the interview. During the meeting, el-Tohamy imparted President Sadat's idea of a secret meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Begin.

But during the Iranian crisis, television from the start has played a part that made everybody, and above all the diplomats, aware of its influence on world diplomacy. The military learned during the war in Vietnam how difficult it is to fight a war, especially a misconceived one, if television brings its bloodiness daily into the living room. Now the diplomats are getting their taste of it.

In the Iranian crisis, television unified the United States after it was treated to the shameful sight of American diplomats being led, blindfolded and handcuffed, before the cameras by so-called Iranian students.

But it also led Americans, in their anger, to want quick action, quick results and, if necessary, the application of force to teach Ayatollah Khomeini that he could not trifle with the United States.

Thus while new and better ways of escalating pressures on the revolutionary government were sought, American diplomacy was up against the need to keep American public opinion calm as the nightly provocations transmitted live from Tehran escalated the frustrations among Americans and pressures on the U.S. government to do more.

But that is easier said than done. American diplomacy succeeded in isolating Iran at the United Nations. It deprived it of an oil embargo against the United States. It even rallied the Soviet Union and China on its side on the narrow issue of the violation of the international code governing diplomatic relations.

Still there is no sign that the hostages would be released. On the contrary, they were being threatened with a show trial for espionage. The State Department organized an emergency situation room. But whatever crumbs of information it garnered came mostly via television.

However much the United States tried to bring diplomacy within diplomatic channels, it couldn't prevent television from taking the lead.

The television correspondents asked the crucial questions and once, at least, John Hart of NBC created the impression of testing a compromise formula. MacNeil-Lehrer of Public Broadcasting, in a satellite interview with Foreign Minister Bani-Sadr, brought up all the relevant questions, but the answers only illustrated the hopelessness of public diplomacy on television.

It took the revolutionaries a little time to learn that presenting nothing but demonstrators with their clenched fists parading in front of the invaded American embassy only enraged the American public and that they would be better off presenting their case against the shah. They had no case when asked about breaking the code of diplomatic immunity.

With the use of force in reserve as a deterrent to protect the lives of the hostages, diplomacy remained limited to gaining time. But dragging out diplomacy makes it hard to preserve the public's patience. Television heightens the urgency daily, and television reporters, often with remarkable resourcefulness and courage, do their best to find a bridge to a solution.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the United States welcomed the initiative of U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim for an emergency session of the Security Council which would allow the Iranian government to vent its case and the United States to rally the council's support for release of the hostages.

It was one more maneuver to play for time until Moharram, a month of mourning which engenders self-imposed suffering, and the referendum for a new constitution, which would give Khomeini complete control over everything and everybody, have passed.

It is to be hoped that a more rational diplomatic approach will become possible. Assuming optimistically that the use of force can be avoided, it will be interesting to see whether the untying of the Gordian knot will be done via television or via traditional diplomatic channels. ●

#### A BILL TO RAISE THE MINIMUM DENOMINATION OF TREASURY BILLS

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a bill I have introduced today which amends the Second Liberty Bond Act to require the Department of the Treasury to raise the minimum denominations of Treasury bills to \$25,000. This measure would result in boosting the housing mortgage market and would, in turn, substantially brighten the housing industry in our country. The sudden shift of savings into Treasury bills has seriously depleted the amount of funds available for the housing mortgage market. This, of course, is due to the out-

flow of savings from savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks and other types of thrift institutions. By raising the minimum to 25,000, I am confident the effect will be an increase in savings into these institutions which will correspondingly provide the desired results within the housing industry. This, however is not the only determinant for an increase in minimum denominations. Several factors are involved:

First. Because of the dramatic increase in sales of Treasury bills, the Department of the Treasury resources which service these accounts has been severely strained. In a statement released on May 8, 1979, the Department stated that one of the major reasons for delays in mailing checks in payment of Treasury bills was due to the "unprecedented volume" and the "dramatic increase in participation by small investors." They went on to say the problem is compounded by the fact that over half of the accounts maintained by Treasury are rolled over at maturity into new issues and, in most cases, these investors do not submit reinvestment until the last minute. If this trend continues, it would most certainly mean an increase in staff.

Second. Analysis will show that, due to processing expenses, the direct cost to the Government of issuing small denominations is exceptionally high in relation to the volume of funds attracted.

Third. In 1970, the Treasury bill minimum was raised from \$1,000 to \$10,000, much for the same reasons as have been listed above. Today, it would require approximately \$19,200 to equal the purchasing power of \$10,000 in 1970. So, in reality, by raising the minimum to \$25,000, we are still providing access to U.S. Government Securities by the small investor. This is to say nothing of the large number of money market funds available.

Members of the House are aware of the difficulties this Nation is presently experiencing in the housing mortgage market and the dire straits in which many of our savings and loan institutions find themselves. Certainly, the \$10,000 Treasury bill is exacerbating an already severe problem. I am hopeful the Committee on Ways and Means will look closely at my proposal and I would welcome my colleagues support in cosponsoring what I believe is a most-needed piece of legislation.●

#### THE K-AWARD

### HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the disability compensation increase recently approved by the House and Senate was a long time coming and I am relieved that disabled veterans, dependents, and survivors of disabled veterans around the country will have a 9.9-percent cost of living increase applied to their December checks.

I was appalled, however, that the Senate, in an attempt to save \$4.5 million

over the next fiscal year, returned this bill to the House with a provision postponing the K-award increase until September 1, 1980. Surely, cost savings could have been achieved in some other area.

The K-award is an additional compensation awarded veterans who suffered the loss of a limb, eye, and so forth, due to service-connected causes. This award has only been increased three times in the past 28 years and was certainly due for another increase this year.

The Senate's action to postpone the effective date of increase for the K-award until 1980 is a callous and disturbing action that affects those veterans who are severely handicapped and disabled, surely the most disadvantaged members of our society.

If final approval of the disability compensation increase had not taken this long, I would have vehemently opposed this action.●

#### FREE BUS RIDES SIGNAL POSITIVE VIEW OF TRANSIT

### HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. LOWRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD the following article from the Washington Post, and reprinted in the Nation's Cities Weekly. This is a fine example of business working hand in hand with Government to address a serious problem. Seattle First National Bank is in my district and I am pleased to recognize their contribution to energy conservation. If all business and governmental concerns followed their lead we would be well on our way to easing a major energy crisis. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post]

#### FREE BUS RIDES SIGNAL POSITIVE VIEW OF TRANSIT

(By Neal R. Peirce)

SEATTLE.—American public transit may have turned an important corner last week as the nation's 27th largest bank, Seattle First National, started to offer its thousands of Washington state employees free yearly passes on their local bus systems.

It will be the first known instance in the United States that a major employer has made transit passes available as a permanent, completely cost-free fringe benefit of employment. Several other large Seattle firms are soon expected to follow suit.

And as Seattle goes, so may—in time—the nation. Whether an employer is a private business or government, it can claim credit—as Seattle First does now—for doing its part to conserve energy, reduce the number of private cars on the roads, ease center city congestion, cut down on air pollution and relieve parking problems. And the cost, compared to other employee fringe benefits, isn't high. The effective cost to Seattle First, for instance, will be \$9 or \$15 per pass per month, depending on the transit zone an employee lives in.

Moreover, providing transit passes relieves employers of the pressure to provide parking for their workers—often a very expensive outlay, especially in inner-city areas.

Seattleites were especially impressed that it was the very stolid Seattle First National, hitherto unknown for socially adventuresome

attitudes, that took the first step into the free pass era.

Seattle is not, of course, the first or only city to experiment with reduced-cost or occasional free transit.

But Seattle First National is the first major employer anywhere to offer free system-wide transit passes with virtually no strings or time limits attached. Employees must simply sign what bank officials call "an innocuous statement" that they'll use the pass for commuting. In fact, there will be no restraint on their using the free passes at other times for shopping, recreation or any other purpose. It's precisely the totally free, unrestricted nature of the Seattle pass program which makes it so potentially significant. With a free transit pass in his pocket, a worker loses his last shred of rationalization for using his private car when reasonably convenient public transit is at hand.

There, of course, comes the rub: how good, how accessible is bus (and subway or trolley) service in most cities and suburbs? The answer: a very mixed bag. And there's a second question: If thousands of employers adopted the Seattle First National policy, could U.S. transit systems accommodate the new passengers? Seattle's Metro system is one of America's best, expanding with modern equipment—a major reason the bank decided on its free pass program. But many cities—Los Angeles, for example—have seriously aged and inadequate bus fleets.

To an extent, it's a chicken and egg problem. Neglected during the highway boom of the last decades, mass transit systems atrophied. Now a major recovery is under way. But it takes the political pressure of expanding ridership to free the government dollars needed for dramatic bus fleet expansion and improvement.

President Carter, who didn't even mention public transportation in his 1975 "moral equivalent of war" energy speech, has come full circle. At APTA's recent convention in New York, Carter fervently endorsed mass transit in an era when foreign oil dependency threatens U.S. security.

The administration occasionally exaggerates its fresh dollar commitment to transit (even mentioning figures as high as \$50 billion). Still, \$13 billion, all from the proposed windfall profits tax, would flow to transit. A chief priority in spending it, says Lutz, must be to put U.S. production, now in the doldrums, on a fast track. As much as "strategic oil reserves," he believes, America needs "strategic bus reserves" to assure mobility in a world energy emergency.●

#### THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DRAFTING OF THE CONSTITUTION

### HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the towns of Braintree, Holbrook, Randolph and Quincy, Mass., just recently celebrated the 200th anniversary of the Massachusetts constitution. I would like to take this time to praise the Quincy Sun newspaper of Quincy, Mass., for its complete coverage of this historic anniversary. I was particularly pleased with the detailed coverage of the men and women behind this constitution.

The constitution, which was drafted in Quincy, Mass., by John Adams in 1789 is believed to be the legal and moral basis of our Federal Constitution. I have just recently introduced legislation which



would create a stamp commemorating this important event.

I hope my colleagues will take a minute to read excerpts from the Quincy Sun, which I am submitting for the RECORD. I found it historically, interesting and informative.

[From the Quincy Sun, Aug. 30, 1979]

**A CONSTITUTION IS BORN IN QUINCY**  
(By Dr. James R. Cameron)

The Constitution of Massachusetts was the culmination of more than a century and a half of political experience for the residents of this state but also marked an important milestone in the political history of the United States. This instrument reflected the experience of living under several forms of government and provided a model for the federal constitution.

Before the Pilgrims left the *Mayflower* in the fall of 1620 they drew up a written document which specified the responsibilities of the members of the new settlement that was to be established at Plymouth. Although this *Mayflower Compact* was not a constitution, according to Professor Robert E. Moody, it did contain the idea of self-government. Each of the 42 men who signed the agreement promised to obey the laws that should be made for their welfare. The *Mayflower Compact* did, in fact, serve as the basis of government until the colony charter of 1628, which was granted to "The Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay." The next constitution for Massachusetts was the Provincial Charter of 1691. Each of these forerunners of the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 were written documents, they spelled out the rights of the citizens and they provided for the participation of the citizens in the process of government.

The Colony of Massachusetts Bay had experienced separation of powers among the governor, who was appointed by the King of England; the House of Representatives, which was elected by tax-paying men; and the Council, which was chosen by the House subject to the approval of the governor. The governor received his appointment from the king but received his salary from the colonial legislature. It was when the British Government levied new taxes upon the colonists to make the governor independent of the colonial legislature that the inhabitants of Massachusetts experienced a unitary form of government and came to feel that they were being deprived of their liberties.

It was to secure such natural rights as life, liberty and property that the Declaration of Independence was written and adopted. There is a sense in which this document is a preamble to our Federal Constitution. John Adams was thinking of these rights when he drafted the first major section of the Massachusetts Constitution. Selections from this part of the Constitution are engraved on the monument in Quincy's Constitution Common. When the Constitution of the United States was first drafted it contained no bill of rights. Political leaders in Massachusetts insisted that provision be made to include in the Federal Constitution the same kind of safeguards that were already in the Constitution of this state before they would agree to ratify the proposed federal system.

John Adams recognized that in America government had moved from overcentralization before the War for Independence to too much decentralization. This was a natural reaction to the intense emotion raised during the war. In writing the Massachusetts Constitution, Adams restored the balance of political power among separate branches of government. Because of its balance, its reasonableness, and its guarantee of fair treatment, the Constitution of Massachusetts served as a model for our Federal Con-

stitution and remains an example of republican government for all peoples everywhere.

**DRAFTING THE CONSTITUTION**

In an address delivered on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of Massachusetts, Samuel Eliot Morison offered a comprehensive statement on the drafting and adoption of this instrument of government. In Morison's judgment, John Adams' greatest achievement was not his service as second president of the United States but his drafting of the Constitution of Massachusetts. In the midst of the turmoil of war, the Revolutionists succeeded in establishing a government under law. They had the conviction that it must be done and they knew how to do it. Government under law was an old tradition in Massachusetts and, even in the midst of war, the citizens of Massachusetts did not lose sight of what they were fighting for. By the end of the American Revolution, eleven of the 13 states had adopted new constitutions. Morison declared that the Constitution of Massachusetts "has been the most enduring because it was the best." The 25 years which have passed since Morison made this statement have only served to validate his judgment.

In his presidential address before the American Historical Association, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin emphasized the importance of the constitutional convention method of making the constitution rather than having it drafted by the legislature:

"If I were called upon to select a single fact or enterprise which more nearly than any other thing embraced the significance of the American Revolution, I should select—not Saratoga or the French Alliance, or even the Declaration of Independence—I should choose the formation of the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780; and I should do so because the constitution rested upon the fully developed convention, the greatest institution of government which America has produced, the institution which answered, in itself, the problem of how men could make governments of their own free will . . ."

In the fall of 1776 the towns of Middleborough, Concord and Acton opposed the suggestion that the legislature draft a constitution and requested that a constitutional convention be elected for that special purpose. The General Court ignored this suggestion and drafted a constitution which was rejected by the towns. After this rebuff, the General Court took up the suggestion of a constitutional convention and asked the citizens to vote on the proposal in their town meetings. The response was overwhelmingly favorable. The General Court then requested the towns to elect as many delegates to the Convention as they were entitled to send representatives to the legislature.

Delegates from 190 towns attended the first session of the Constitutional Convention which met in the First Church in Cambridge during the week of September 1-7, 1779. After electing James Bowdoin president and Samuel Barrett secretary, the Convention selected a committee of 30 to prepare a draft. This special committee selected from its members a subcommittee of three; James Bowdoin, Samuel Adams and John Adams. The subcommittee then delegated its functions to John Adams, who became the principal author, drafting the document in his law office in the John Quincy Adams Birthplace in what is now Quincy. An annotated copy of John Adams' draft is included in Volume IV of *The Works of John Adams*, edited by his grandson, Charles Francis Adams (1851). The Committee of Thirty submitted its report to the second session of the convention in Cambridge on Oct. 28, 1779. The report was read and printed copies distributed.

John Adams attended the second session

of the convention but left for France the day after it ended to join Benjamin Franklin in negotiating a treaty of peace. The efforts of the second session were devoted entirely to a discussion of the Declaration of Rights. A third session, which met in January, 1780, discussed the organization of the new government. Copies of the proposed constitution were sent to every town where special town meetings were to be called to discuss the document, paragraph by paragraph. A fourth session of the convention declared the constitution formally adopted on June 15, 1780.

**THEY CALLED HIM 'AN OLD FIELDER'**

Contemporaries said a lot of things about John Adams, most of them hurtful, many of them true, for he was an Adams, which meant that he was scholarly, introspective, austere, humorless, tactless to the point of being rude.

"The Adamsses have a genius for saying even a gracious thing in an ungracious way," complained James Russell Lowell, who knew several members of the family.

A Baltimore newspaper, probably an adversary for the middle colonies were suspicious of anything that smacked of the Massachusetts' Adamsses or the Lees of Virginia, once called him "an old fielder" and he accepted it as a compliment.

"An old fielder," John Adams defined to his wife, Abigail, "is a tough, hardy, laborious little horse that works very hard and lives upon very little."

Which was one of the things the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention had in mind when it chose him to draft that most important document; he was given the job and left alone to do the work.

John Adams was born Oct. 19, 1735 (Old Style) in Braintree into a family of no particular distinction. It was through his mother's line, the Boylston of Brookline, that he attained the social standing to graduate 15th in a class of 24 from Harvard in 1755.

He was a teacher for a while in Worcester but he found that he had small patience for the "little runtlings," as he called his class. He turned to the law, a fortunate choice for the American nation-to-be.

Another fortunate choice was Abigail Smith, the preacher's daughter from Weymouth. Her mother, a member of the prestigious Quincy family, didn't think very much of the match. Nevertheless, John and Abigail were married on Oct. 25, 1764, a union that lasted 54 years.

Alike yet different, they complimented each other nicely. She was witty, bright, "saucy," he called her, and extremely well-read in politics, literature and philosophy for a woman of her time. During the long years that he was away on his country's service, Abigail ran the farm at the foot of Penn's Hill and raised their four children who survived infancy.

There was little law to practice in colonial Braintree, aside from the writing of wills and the viewing of fences, so more and more John Adams was attracted to Boston, where the action was. There he fell in with his fiery cousin, Sam Adams, and the brilliant James Otis Jr.

The Stamp Act was the big issue of the day and it brought young Adams to prominence. It was he who drafted the Braintree Instructions to Ebenezer Thayer, the town's representative in the General Court, protesting the act as contrary to the English constitution and common law and therefore null and void.

He moved his growing family, Abigail 3, and John Quincy 1, to Boston in 1768 and he was elected to the General Court two years later. It is a mark of the esteem in which he was held that at the time of his election he was preparing a defense for the British

soldiers who were accused of murder in the Boston Massacre.

With the help of his friend, Josiah Quincy, he secured the acquittal of all but two soldiers, who were convicted of manslaughter, and a homicide in self-defense verdict against Capt. Thomas Preston.

The trial and the General Court left him weary. He moved back to Braintree in 1771 to enjoy "the air of my native spot . . . the fine breezes from the sea on one side and the rocky mountains of pine and savin on the other." Part of the time he spent taking the water at the mineral springs in Stafford, Conn. "Farewell, politics," he wrote in his diary.

But the situation in Boston was worsening and Adams found it difficult to stay away. He became involved in the growing controversy over Crown-granted salaries for governors and judges. He was elected to the Governor's Council in May, 1773, but the governor vetoed the choice. He was named a delegate to the first Continental Congress in Philadelphia in 1774.

For the next 26 years as revolutionary, legislator, diplomat and statesman, John Adams was a man "on call" by his state and country during their most critical formative years.

As a member of the Continental Congress, it was he who proposed the modest and virtuous, the amiable, generous and brave George Washington as commander-in-chief; and he helped to write the resolutions of May 10, 1776, that led up to the Declaration of Independence.

The Congress dispatched him to Paris in 1778 to help negotiate a commercial and military alliance with France and, 17 months later, he arrived back home in Braintree just in time to be chosen a delegate to the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention. He wound up writing the whole first draft of the Constitution himself.

Adams had barely finished that assigned task when Congress sent him abroad again in November, 1779. This time he was gone for nine years, negotiating loans from the Dutch that saved the credit of the United States, negotiating a treaty of peace with Mother Britain and the last four of those years as minister to London. Abigail joined him in 1784.

It followed that immediately upon his return to the United States in 1789, Adams was elected the first vice president, serving under George Washington. It was a post that he despised for its inactivity.

"My country," he wrote, "has in its wisdom contrived for me the most insignificant office that was the invention of man."

Washington, the all but unanimous choice, retired from the presidency in 1796 and Adams was elected to replace him, but not without a fight as the Federalist party of Adams and Alexander Hamilton split and the Democratic-Republicans of Thomas Jefferson surged to the fore. He barely edged Jefferson, 71-68, in electoral votes.

Adams' four-year term as President was marked by intra-party strife. Perhaps his highest achievement was keeping the peace with revolutionary and belligerent France, with whom a treaty was concluded in the last year of his administration. But it was not enough to save John Adams.

He lost the presidency to Jefferson in a rematch in 1800 by eight electoral votes, 73-65. This time he really was through with politics. He retired to write and farm on his estate, Peacefield, in Quincy, where he died July 4, 1826, the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

#### AN AGING FIREBRAND IS ASKED TO LIFT HIS PEN

Sam Adams was approaching his 57th birthday, an aging firebrand born to foment revolution whose time and place had long since passed, when he was tapped by his peers to help draft a constitution for Massachusetts.

"The world in his mind was not that of the true philosopher, filled with a variety of images, all well-rounded, symmetrical and beautiful," wrote one biographer. His figures were cut in bold relief, stiff, stark and austere.

"There was no place for shading there; everything was in sharp contrasts, in disconcerting black and white. Whatever he did see, he saw with intense clearness, but it was too often a caricature rather than the real image."

And the fall of 1779 was the time of the philosopher, the statesman; the day of the revolutionist, the man who saw people and events in caricature, was slipping into the past.

Samuel Adams was born in Boston on Sept. 16, 1722 (Old Style), the son of a well-to-do brewer, socially and politically prominent, who was forever exasperated by his son's ineptitude in business and finance.

Graduating from Harvard in 1740, he got a job in the counting house of Thomas Cushing. He may have been fired. His father gave him £1,000 to start his own business. It failed. He became a partner in his father's malthouse on Purchase St. The business languished.

He was elected provincial tax collector in 1756 and when he left office in 1765 his accounts were £8,000 in arrears. Royal Gov. Thomas Hutchinson charged him with defalcation, a polite term for embezzlement. The charge was probably not so. It was just that he was assigned to collect certain money and neglected to do it.

It was about this time, while his financial house was collapsing around him, that Sam Adams discovered his true calling: How easy it was to lift his pen and marshal the words that sent others to the barricades.

He had always been a rebel. His Harvard master's thesis defended the proposition: "Whether it be lawful to resist the Supreme Magistrate, if the Commonwealth cannot be otherwise preserved," delivered while Royal Gov. William Shirley glared from the same platform.

All these things had shaped the mind of Sam Adams by 1765 when parliament passed the hated Stamp Act, which required that all documents—legal papers, pamphlets, advertisements, newspapers—carry a revenue stamp. There were heavy fines for violations, levied without jury trial and payable in cash.

The pages of the Boston *Gazette* were filled with angry denunciations of the act, written by Sam Adams and his friends in the radical, semi-secret Caucus Club. Inflammatory? Inciting to riot? Indeed they were.

The ink was scarcely dry in the *Gazette* when Andrew Oliver, who distributed the stamps in the Massachusetts Bay colony, was hanged in effigy (he resigned the next day) and the palatial home of Lt. Gov. Hutchinson was demolished in the first appearance of a street mob in Revolutionary Boston.

Sam Adams was elected to the House of Representatives that same year (1765) and it gave him a larger stage from which to dispense his revolutionary doctrine. Emis-saries from the Caucus Club fanned out across the colony, preaching passive resistance to the Stamp Act and inveighing against the presence of British troops in Boston.

Again, it was his articles in the *Gazette* that stoked the fires for the Boston Massacre in which the British troops were provoked into firing into a crowd, killing five. Strangely, while Sam Adams helped to incite the incident, his young cousin, John Adams, the lawyer from Braintree, defended the British soldiers from a murder charge.

By 1772, Parliament had repealed most of the repressive measures and radicalism was on the wane in Boston. Sam Adams barely held his seat in the House in the election. As one observer put it, "there was not

enough British tyranny left to keep active opposition alive." If there were no issues then, of course, it was necessary to create some.

In May, 1773, Parliament placed a three penny duty on tea imported into the colonies, a rather innocuous measure. In November, three tea ships arrived in Boston Harbor. The radicals refused to let the tea be landed. Gov. Hutchinson refused to send it back. On the night of Dec. 16, at a signal from Adams, some 50 men disguised as Indians, seized the ships and threw 342 chests of tea into the harbor.

Six months later, as a man sent by the Royal governor, Gen. Thomas Gage, waited outside the locked door to dissolve the General Court, it was voted to send Sam Adams, cousin John James Bowdoin, Thomas Cushing and Robert Treat Paine, as delegates to the first Continental Congress. The door was locked because Sam had the key in his pocket.

The Congress, meeting in Philadelphia, was not really ready for Sam Adams and the radicals from the Massachusetts Bay. Nor were they prepared for Patrick Henry and the men of Virginia. One delegate from Maryland complained that "Adams with his crew, and the haughty sultans of the South, juggled the whole conclave of the delegates."

But the fire in Sam Adams was burning low. He withdrew from the Congress in 1781 and returned to Boston. But it was not the same. There were new leaders, new ideas, new issues. He broke with his old ally, John Hancock, and the latter's election as the first governor was a deep disappointment to him. The people, he wrote to his friend, James Warren, were deceived "with false appearance for the moment."

He ran for lieutenant governor in 1788 but the old magic wasn't there. He finished a poor third behind Benjamin Lincoln and Warren. He ran for Congress that same year and lost to the Young Turk, Fisher Ames of Dedham.

Finally, he was elected lieutenant governor under Hancock in 1789 and, when Hancock died in 1793, he succeeded him. By this time, the American political system was old enough to split up into parties, and he was elected governor in 1794 as a Democrat.

He declined to run again in 1797 and, on Oct. 2, 1803, Sam Adams died in quiet retirement in his native Boston.

#### JOHN ADAMS: HIS MOOD AND HIS TIMES (By Tom Henshaw)

"Voted, to send only one Delegate to represent them in the Convention appointed to be convened at Cambridge on the First day of September next for the purpose of Framing a New Constitution. Then the Honorable John Adams Esquire was chosen for that purpose.—Braintree Records, Aug. 9, 1779.

There is every reason to believe that the Honorable John Adams Esquire didn't really want to go.

He had arrived home only seven days before on the French frigate *La Sensible* after nearly 18 months in Paris helping to negotiate a commercial and military alliance with France. He was in such a rush to get home that he apparently landed the day before *La Sensible* reached Boston by rowing ashore from Nantasket Roads.

He missed his wife, Abigail, terribly, and she him.

"One was angry, another was full of Grief, and the third with Melancholy, so that I burnt them all," he wrote to her from Passy on Dec. 18, 1778, listing his complaints with her most recent letters. "If you write me in this style I shall leave off writing intirely, it kills me."

"Am I not wretched Enough, in this Banishment, without this? What Course shall I take to convince you that my Heart is warm? I beg you would never more write to me in



such a strain for it really makes me unhappy."

"How lonely are my days?" she wrote on a Sunday evening, Dec. 27. "How solitary are my Nights? How insupportable the Idea that 3000 leagues, and the vast ocean now divide us—but divide only our persons for the Heart of my Friend is in the Bosom of his partner."

Somewhere on the vast ocean the two letters passed each other.

Paris and the dissolute court of Louis XVI held small appeal to the Puritan in John Adams, even when his closest everyday companions were Dr. Benjamin Franklin, still with an eye for the ladies at age 73, and the swashbuckling Capt. John Paul Jones, half patriot, half pirate, who had just taken command of the leaky old East Indiaman he had renamed *Bon Homme Richard*.

The American colonies, newly reborn as the United States of America, were going through the most dismal period of the War for Independence. Inflation was rampant; butcher's meat, a dollar to eight shillings a pound; flour, fifty dollars a hundredweight. The news from the fighting front was of defeat, privation and horror.

Massachusetts was deep in the agony of the ill-fated Penobscot expedition.

Late in June, the British started building a base near modern day Castine in the province of Maine to protect Halifax. The Americans dispatched 1,000 Massachusetts militia under Gens. Solomon Lovell and Peleg Wadsworth and a 37 ship flotilla under Commodore Dudley Saltonstall to stop them.

But while Saltonstall dawdled and procrastinated, British reinforcements arrived from Sandy Hook and bottled up the American forces, who fled into the wilderness of the Penobscot River valley. All the ships and 474 men were lost. So was all the artillery, under Lt. Col. Paul Revere.

A month later, the Provincial Congress wrote to the Continental Congress asking to be excused from the continental tax of \$6 million until the expenses of the disastrous expedition were liquidated.

The failure of the expedition, the letter said, "hath involved this Government in extreme Difficulty. We not only have lost three State Vessels of Force but have insured all the others . . . The Calls upon us to make good our Contracts with the Owners of the private ships are pressing and must be fulfilled . . ."

"The 'extreme Difficulty' of the people themselves called for a convention in Concord early in July 'to take into Consideration the present distressed Situation of the People at large; and particularly the excessive high Prices of every Article of Consumption.'"

The convention fixed the price of beef at six shillings a pound until Sept. 1, five shillings after that; lamb and veal at four shillings a pound; milk at two shillings, six pence in Boston and directed that persons "who demand or take more for any of the above Articles . . . shall be held and deemed as Enemies to this Country and treated as such." In Boston, laborers' wages were set at 60 shillings a day; ship carpenters 78 shillings. The news from the front was almost uniformly bad.

Gen. George Washington's main Continental Army was inactive around Philadelphia; Sir Henry Clinton's small British force was moving all but unimpeded up the Hudson; Savannah had fallen; and a band of Loyalists under Col. William Tryon was laying waste the Connecticut countryside. Fairfield and Green's Farms were burned and Norwalk destroyed all in a three-day period. West Haven was under attack and the fiercely anti-British Independent Chronicle of Boston fumed:

"Although in this expedition it must be confessed to the credit of the Britons that they have not done ALL the mischief in their power; yet the burning of the stores

upon the wharf; the beating, stabbing, and insulting the Rev. Dr. Dagget after he was made a prisoner, the mortally wounding of Mr. Beers, senior, in his own door, and otherwise abusing him; the robbing and murdering the very aged and helpless Capt. English in his own house, and the beating and finally cutting out the tongue of a distracted man, are sufficient proofs that they were really Britons."

Raising men to soldier in the Continental Army was becoming a problem. The Provincial Congress resolved in June to raise 800 men 16 years and over to serve in Rhode Island, "exempting officers and students of Harvard, ministers, grammar schoolmasters, Indians, Negroes, mulattoes and those who pay a fine of £30 or procure a substitute." Suffolk County was asked for 95 men to serve as privates at £16 a month.

Once in the Army, soldiers were hard to hold, too, in the face of privations and uncertain terms of enlistment. Boston papers of September, 1779, advertised for Nathaniel Piper, 21, a deserter from Col. Jackson's battalion, Capt. Hastings' company, who was known to be about Boston, particularly at night; and Cpl. Samuel Berry 30, of Lynn, absent from Jackson's Corps.

Closer to home, there was the case of Elizabeth Etter, one of the Cleverly girls of Braintree, who was given permission by the Provincial Congress to take her 4-year-old child and join her husband, Franklin, the Tory, in Halifax where he was serving in the Loyal Nova Scotia Volunteers. Elizabeth was warned that she was "not to return to the state without leave from the government."

And, in Old Braintree, life went on.

The Town Meeting renewed the 30 shilling bounty on crows' heads and voted to prosecute anyone who obstructed the alewife in its annual passage upriver to the spawning ponds and named a committee "to use their influence with proper authority to suppress, any vexatious law suits that may be brought by Dr. Moses Baker against any of the Inhabitants of this Town," for what reason was not stated.

Like many Braintree wives whose husbands were away at war, Abigail Adams was forced into the unaccustomed role of head of the household, a function she filled with determination.

"I cannot avoid sometimes repining that the gifts of fortune were not bestowed upon us, that I might have enjoyed the happiness of spending my days with my partner," she wrote, "but as it is, I think it my duty to attend with frugality and economy to our own private affairs; and if I cannot add to our little substance, yet see to it that it is not diminished."

She abstained from drinking black market tea, allowing herself one tiny complaint: "I should like a little green (tea), but they say there is none to be had here. I only wish it for a medicine, as a relief to a nervous pain in my head to which I am sometimes subject."

John Adams attended the opening session of the Constitutional Convention in Cambridge on Wednesday, Sept. 1. On Saturday, he was named to a committee of 30 to prepare the declaration of rights and the constitution. On Monday, the committee delegated the task to a subcommittee of three, John and Samuel Adams; and James Bowdoin. The subcommittee, in turn, left it up to John.

"I was by the Convention put upon the Committee—by the Committee upon the subcommittee—and by the subcommittee appointed a sub subcommittee—so that I had the honor to be principal Engineer," he wrote to his friend, Edmund Jennings. Payroll records indicate that he was paid £90 for his work.

The so-called "Adams draft" of the Mas-

sachusetts Constitution was accepted by the Convention with a few alterations but by that time John Adams was long gone back to Europe, this time to help negotiate a treaty of peace with Britain and serve as America's first minister to London. He did not see the farm at the foot of Penn's Hill again for another eight years.

But he was immensely heartened by these words from the pen of his ever-loving Abigail, written on Oct. 15, 1780:

"Our Massachusetts Constitution is read with admiration in New York and pronounced by the Royal Governor as the best republican form he ever saw."

#### LITTLE RED FARMHOUSES WERE PROBABLY ONCE CREAM

The little red farmhouses at the foot of Penn's Hill where John and John Quincy Adams were born appear to be accurate reflections of their condition in Revolutionary times in structure only.

The U.S. National Parks Service, which took charge of the two cottages in April, 1979, is discovering new things about them daily as it strives to restore them to their appearance in 1807, the last year an Adams lived in them.

For one thing, they weren't painted red, probably a cream color, says Carole Perreault, architectural conservator from the North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center, a regional research arms of the USNPS.

Indeed, at least one of them was white at one time, as this passage from the memoirs of John Quincy Adams, dated Sept. 9, 1824, will attest:

"I took a ride of almost three miles with my father in his small carriage, called at Mr. Marston's and rode to the foot of Penn's Hill by the houses where my father and myself were born. That of his nativity has within the last year, at his request been painted white."

John Adams law office, in which most of the Massachusetts Constitution was drafted, probably looked different in 1779. For one thing, the ceiling, where the beams have been exposed since an earlier restoration in 1896, probably was plastered.

"There is no evidence that the beams were charred by smoke from the fireplace so they must have been covered," says Ms. Perreault. "Holes in the lathe lines in the beams were made by hand-wrought nails, which indicates the covering was there in pre-19th century."

The outside entry door at the corner of the law office probably was there in 1779, although it was not necessarily cut through the wall as an entrance to the office. It is there in a water color of the Birthplaces, done in 1822. But it is missing in photographs taken later in the 19th century.

"When the building was restored in the 1890's, they took the plaster out and found the door just as it is today," says Ms. Perreault.

Indications are that the fireplace was there in 1779, but it probably was larger and of a different shape. The lintel is probably the hand-hewn original but the hearth almost certainly has been rebuilt. The small bricks are not characteristic of the 18th century.

The John Quincy Adams Birthplace is the older of the two. There are indications that one Samuel Belcher was living there in 1663 in a one room structure with fireplace. It was expanded to its present size in 1716. During the 1896 restoration, a brick dated June 6, 1716, was discovered in the main part of the house.

The house was purchased by Deacon John Adams for £50 in 1744 and rented to Dr. Elisha Savil until 1761 when the Deacon's son John inherited it from his father and moved in. John Quincy Adams was born there Jan. 11, 1767.

John and his wife, Abigail, moved out and into the larger Mansion on Adams St.

in 1788, leaving the cottage and its farm to tenants. But John Quincy Adams moved back into his birthplace in 1803 and stayed until 1807, just before he was named U.S. Minister to Russia. He was the last Adams to live there.

The John Adams Birthplace originally was the home of Joseph Penniman but its age is not known. A brick inscribed with the date 1681 was found during restoration in the 1890's but dated bricks are not regarded as indisputable evidence of age by the National Park Service.

Deacon John Adams purchased the house and seven acres of land from James Penniman in 1720 and it was in the southeast bedroom next to the Coast Road that the future president of the United States was born on Oct. 19, 1735 (Old Style). The Deacon left it to his second son, Peter Boylston Adams, when he died in 1761.

Both houses were restored by the Adams Realty Trust, the John Quincy Adams Birthplace in 1896 at a cost of \$1,650, and the John Adams Birthplace a year later at an expense of \$515.49. They were presented to the city of Quincy in 1940 and supervised by the Quincy Historical Society until they were turned over to the USNPS in 1979. ●

## SALUTE TO GEORGE MEANY

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1979, the first president of the AFL-CIO, George Meany, retired. He leaves behind a remarkable record of achievement and a leadership base capable of carrying on the work of the AFL-CIO in his tradition.

I take special pride in saluting this legendary labor leader because he comes from my district in the Bronx, where he began his career at the age of 16 as an apprentice plumber. He moved on to become what one news article described as "a cigar chomping, finger-stabbing, table-pounding, tough-talking champion of labor."

He served as president of the New York State Federation of labor from 1934 to 1939, a fact that all New Yorkers are extremely proud and thankful. In 1940, New York was forced to share George Meany's extraordinary leadership abilities with the rest of the country when he was chosen as the secretary-treasurer of the AFL. He remained in that position until 1952, when he was elected to the national presidency of the union.

After 3 years of determined efforts, Mr. Meany was successful in uniting the American Federation of Labor with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and became the AFL-CIO's president.

During his 24 years of service, the AFL-CIO was instrumental, under the strong leadership of George Meany, in obtaining the passage of landmark legislation dealing with such issues as minimum wage, civil rights, improved health and safety standards in the workplace, and pension-benefit guarantees.

However, Mr. Meany did not restrict his efforts solely to labor issues. He was very active in fighting against totalitarianism in all forms and protecting the AFL-CIO from Communist penetration

and the influence of organized crime. He remained totally committed to democracy, and everything it stood for including the ballot box, the legislative process, and the freedom to assemble and bargain collectively, which he considered to be the cornerstone of a democratic society. Further, he has been influential in such areas as politics, foreign affairs and, in more recent years, he has focused his efforts on our Nation's energy problems.

While Meany's success over the years is part of our Nation's history, he has never taken time to look back. Rather, he has always focused his efforts toward goals still to be achieved. Mr. Meany expressed this philosophy in his recent farewell address:

To achieve our goals, the labor movement cannot be content with defending the status quo, or reliving past glories. We must constantly look to the future, develop new leadership, adapt policies to changing conditions and new technologies—but—always, always with unswerving loyalty to the mission of the trade union movement as the instrument for improving and enhancing the working and living conditions of those who work for wages.

He went on to cite several important goals that have yet to be fulfilled: National health insurance, full employment, equal rights for women, and labor law reform.

In the words of the newly elected president of the AFL-CIO, Lane Kirkland:

I cannot promise to match or even approximate the record of achievement of George Meany—but I am reassured by the certain knowledge that neither could anyone else in our time.

While I fully share Mr. Kirkland's sentiment, I would like to also express my wholehearted support for, and confidence in, the new leadership of the AFL-CIO, especially to Mr. Kirkland and the newly elected secretary-treasurer, Thomas R. Donahue, a fellow New Yorker.

Both of these men have much to offer, having gained invaluable experience while serving under the dynamic George Meany. Lane Kirkland served 9 years as Meany's executive assistant and 10 years as secretary-treasurer. Mr. Donahue, as part of his 30 years in the trade union movement, served as Meany's executive assistant since 1973.

Donahue's extensive labor experience also is closely tied to New York City, where he was a part-time organizer for the Retail Clerks in 1948, and then served as a business agent, contract director, publications editor and assistant to the president of Local 32B of the Service Employees. Donahue was later appointed Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Johnson administration with responsibility for the department's labor relations activities.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is extremely fortunate to have been blessed with a man of George Meany's caliber, and I am hopeful that his vast wisdom continues to be utilized even in retirement.

At this time I would like to insert an article describing the recent AFL-CIO farewell to George Meany at the AFL-CIO's 13th biennial convention. The ar-

ticle appeared in the November 24, 1979, issue of the AFL-CIO News.

The article follows:

DELEGATES GIVE GEORGE MEANY A LAST HURRAH

(By John M. Barry)

The convention belonged to George Meany. He held the hearts of the delegates from the first day, when he advised them officially that it was "the last time I will have the honor of opening a convention of the AFL-CIO," the federation of American workers that stands as his finest achievement.

And he remained in their hearts on the final day of the gathering, when the successor he had nominated, Lane Kirkland, rapped the gavel to adjourn the 13th biennial convention.

In between, the delegates let Meany know with repeated standing ovations of the high regard they held for him, for his leadership and courage in standing up front for working people whenever and wherever their rights were threatened or denied.

On his part, Meany had only gratitude—to the AFL-CIO staff for "a job well done," to the leaders of each federation affiliate and central body "who have carried out the programs and have made this federation a testament" to their forebears, to his fellow members of the Executive Council for their counsel and support and friendship, and to the delegates and the members they represent "for the highest honor that could be paid any human being, the honor of leading this great organization of workers who have built this nation."

Meany commissioned all of them to take the American trade union center he had helped to create and to carry it forward to new heights.

"It needs to continue to grow," he told them, "to consolidate its strength. And, I predict with certainty, it will."

Every speaker who took the convention podium had a special recollection of the achievements that marked Meany's career—government officials, Cabinet officers and President Carter himself; congressional leaders of both political parties; civil rights leaders and the victims of oppression; his fellow trade unionists from countries throughout the free world and from here in the United States.

On its second day, the convention paid its own tribute in the time-tested manner of conventions, through a resolution. It was read to the delegates by an old friend and colleague, Martin Ward, president of the Plumbers & Pipe Fitters, the union that had given Meany his start as an apprentice in New York. In the galleries, as Ward read the words, were members of the AFL-CIO headquarters staff who had been given the afternoon off by "the boss" so they could see what a federation convention is like. In the audience were his grandchildren and their parents, the close-knit family that occupies his private life.

"Whereas, George Meany—our friend, our leader, our brother . . ." the resolution began. It went on to point out his "vision" in bringing about the merger of the AFL and the CIO in 1955, "his faith in the labor movement" and "his commitment to its highest ideals," his "strong voice" raised on behalf of workers and "in pursuit of freedom, democracy and dignity for all people." And it conveyed the convention's "love and respect, and its sincerest best wishes for a long and happy life."

Finally, the resolution declared Meany to be president emeritus of the AFL-CIO, with annual compensation equal to that of the organization's president.

To keep from adding days to the proceedings, the convention permitted a half-dozen speakers to convey the sentiments of all 895 delegates.



There was Fred O'Neal of the Actors & Artists, who said Meany "has taken the stage and held it against the critics of our profession" and of the entire labor movement; who hailed Meany's efforts on behalf of black workers, and who exhorted the convention, in the words of Shakespeare, to "embrace and love this man with a true heart and brotherly love."

Ray Corbett, head of the New York State AFL-CIO, recalled Meany's own leadership of his home-state central body that became a springboard for his rise to national leadership. "We thought we were losing something," Corbett said. "But all of us in New York suddenly recognized . . . that all we did was to share the benefits of your progress with the entire nation and, yes, I guess, the world."

Jack Sheinkman of the Clothing & Textile Workers pointed to Meany's lifelong fight against totalitarianism in all forms and presented him with a copy of a new booklet prepared by the Jewish Labor Committee, which Sheinkman heads, for distribution in America's schools. Its title: "George Meany—the Making of a Freedom Fighter."

Jean Ingrao, secretary-treasurer of the Maritime Trades, remembered starting out 27 years ago in Meany's office with plans to work for only two years and thanked him warmly for instilling in her "a desire to learn, to achieve, to strive."

Sol Chaikin of the Ladies' Garment Workers spoke especially for members of his own union in thanking Meany for his support of their efforts to lift their low wages and poor conditions to acceptable levels and remarked with wonderment at how "this plumber from the Bronx was easily at home with the unemployed, with the desperate, with the deprived, with the exploited . . . and then with the captains and kings."

Howard McClennan, the chief Fire Fighter and head of the AFL-CIO Public Employee Dept., conveyed the gratitude of the workers in the public sector for helping the department get started.

Lane Kirkland, who had stood beside Meany for a quarter-century as aide and fellow officer, earlier had asserted the privilege of reviewing Meany's accomplishments so that they will be "inscribed in one place in the living history of this federation."

Kirkland began with the legislative gains Meany had helped win for New York workers as head of the State Federation of Labor, including the state's pioneering unemployment insurance system, and he cited Meany's leadership of a successful strike against the government to preserve wage standards for WPA workers.

He recalled Meany's service on the War Labor Board during World War II and his post-war involvement with the Free Trade Union Committee.

The 1955 merger unifying a divided American labor movement was Meany's most important accomplishment, Kirkland observed, yet it was "not a climax, but just a beginning."

The list went on to cite adoption of the AFL-CIO Internal Disputes Plan, the evolution of COPE into a major political force on behalf of workers, Meany's strong stand in support of the civil rights struggle and his insistence over the doubts of President Kennedy on inclusion of a fair employment practices section in the Civil Rights Act.

In 1969, Kirkland, noted, Meany founded the Labor Studies Center that now bears his name so that the federation would have a center for training its future leaders. In the '70s, Meany rallied labor to win bargaining rights for postal workers and enactment of a strong occupational safety and health law.

He led American labor in its continuing support for the State of Israel against its enemies, and he provided the first platform

in this country for the Soviet exile, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, to tell the story of Soviet tyranny and the Gulag Archipelago.

This year, Kirkland noted, Meany initiated and guided the discussion leading to the National Accord with the Carter Administration giving labor a strong voice in the nation's economic programs.

When the list was done, Kirkland told the delegates that even in retirement Meany would be on call for advice and counsel.

"This great mine of wisdom, character, experience and memory is far from exhausted of its product," he said. "The trade union movement that he has done so much to build and advance is still not yet so rich in genius and inspiration as to be able to afford the neglect of the vital resource embodied in the person of George Meany."

But after all the words were said in that special tribute, Meany had the last word. He reminisced a bit for the delegates and thanked them.

"I hope to be able to render some service in whatever way I can. I'm sure that my successor will not have to call on me," he said as he turned to Kirkland with a smile. "I'll be breathing down his neck." ●

#### AKRON "PROJECT DAWN" SPARKS COMMUNITY UNDERSTANDING OF THE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

### HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues about a unique pilot program—"Project Dawn"—which was undertaken in my district to enlist community support and understanding of mentally handicapped citizens. The project was sponsored by the Summit County Association for Retarded Citizens under Ray Thomas Jr., executive director, with a grant from the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and the Ohio Developmental Disabilities Planning Council, and was implemented by the Akron-based public relations firm, Meeker-Mayer.

"Project Dawn" was a public education effort to teach community residents about mentally handicapped individuals in institutions, and those returning to or living in the community. The purpose was to create a more open-minded attitude toward the developmentally disabled, to address the fears and anxieties of the public about the mentally handicapped, to educate the public about the different kinds of developmental disabilities, and to create a community climate where mentally handicapped individuals were encouraged to develop to their capacity.

The project incorporated personal experiences of 15 mentally handicapped individuals residing in the area who expressed their frustrations with their handicaps and their hopes for their lives. Although the project did not have the resources to measure the general community's attitudes before and after the project, which used both radio and television to reach the public, the general response to the broadcasts of "Project

Dawn" showed that the knowledge levels and attitudes of the public were positively affected by the project.

Mr. Speaker, because of the amount of space it would demand, I will not include the full report on "Project Dawn"—its objectives, research and implementation. However, I call my colleagues attention to "Project Dawn," a unique and sensitive effort to open the minds and hearts of a community to the mentally handicapped who need special understanding to be—in the words of "Project Dawn"—the most they can be. ●

#### THE AIR FORCE IN THE SPACE AGE

### HON. JACK HIGHTOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. HIGHTOWER. Mr. Speaker, in the November 5 edition of U.S. News & World Report, there is an exceptionally interesting article written by the associate editor, Orr Kelly, concerning what we may expect in the next decade with respect to our Air Force operations in the decades ahead.

Who would have believed back in the days of Wilbur and Orville Wright that within a matter of a few short years, planes would be flying higher and faster than man could ever have dreamed, and that men would be landing on the Moon through the miracle of our technology and research.

I believe it is important for all Members to have the opportunity to read this very interesting and exciting article concerning the Air Force in the space age.

The article follows:

#### A NEW AIR FORCE FOR THE SPACE AGE

The most dramatic changes in its 32-year history are transforming the U.S. Air Force.

Taking shape is a high-technology military arm that will send men and women to live and work routinely in space in the early 1980s. Its planes will carry supersmart weapons and laser "death rays" that can score a certain kill against any target a pilot can see. Its ability to "look" deep into hostile territory will be greatly enhanced.

And, if no hitches develop, it will build and operate a 33-billion-dollar mobile missile system that could radically shift the superpower strategic balance before the end of the '80s.

The revolution in technology is matched by a revolution in personnel policy. Gone are the days when the 560,000-strong Air Force was headed by a cigar-chomping bomber pilot and only 10 percent of its officers had finished college.

Now, 40 percent of the colonels have master degrees or better, and the chief of staff is a nuclear physicist who wrote his doctoral thesis on "Photo Disintegration of Deuterium by 95 Mev X-rays."

Such talents will be in even greater demand as development of a shuttle enables the Air Force to leap into space. Air Force Secretary Hans Mark, a nuclear physicist, stresses that the importance of sending ordinary service personnel—and not just astronauts—for duty in space can't be exaggerated.

#### HUMAN JUDGMENT

Of the 487 shuttle missions the U.S. now plans to fly in the next dozen years, 113 will involve a military purpose.

"Every single flight of the space shuttle," says Mark, "will be accompanied by man, with human judgment. That will make a major change in how we do business." He predicts that the first service personnel to remain in space for long spells will not be supersonic test pilots but telephone technicians who will repair and monitor the unmanned satellites that are increasingly important for communications, navigation and surveillance.

From the shuttle, Air Force technicians will be able to place satellites in orbit and retrieve and repair older satellites. They may even check out foreign satellites to see how they work.

Maj. Gen. Jasper A. Welch, Jr., assistant chief of staff for systems and analyses, says the ability to carry out repairs in orbit will make it possible to produce satellites much more cheaply and to send them quickly into space to perform specialized jobs. Currently, every satellite must be manufactured to operate flawlessly for its full lifetime and then tested over and over to make sure it will not break down. With a repairman in space, there will be no need for that level of perfection.

Most spy-in-the-sky operations will be handled by unmanned satellites. But Lt. Gen. Thomas P. Stafford, a former astronaut who now heads Air Force research and development, says there also will be men with binoculars—or more-sophisticated devices—watching to see what's going on down below. Stafford says he is still amazed at how much detail can be seen from space, even with the naked eye.

Repair and maintenance teams will be followed into space by the crew of an orbiting control center. This will replace the flying command post that is on constant airborne alert to enable top officers to control the U.S. nuclear arsenal in a crisis.

#### SOMETHING OF VALUE

Will the Air Force eventually fight outside the atmosphere? Secretary Mark has no doubt that armed conflict will follow man into space. "Where there are things of value, people will fight about them," he says. With the shuttle, carrying 10 times the payload of existing rockets, there will be a rapid increase in the number of things of value in space.

Stafford and Allen, the chief of staff, foresee a fleet of two-man spaceships capable of taking off from ordinary airports, zooming out of the atmosphere and then returning to land at their home bases after completion of their missions. They will probably be equipped with laser weapons to burn out the electronics of a hostile satellite or another spaceship. Stafford says that such a fleet could be operational before the end of the century.

As a first step toward achieving this, the F-15 fighter is being fitted with a missile that can be fired into space from high in the atmosphere to knock down an enemy's satellite.

While the move into space will revolutionize the role of the Air Force, other developments, almost as dramatic, are in the works. Experimentation with lasers has reached the point where it is considered a near certainty that they will be used as "death ray" weapons in the near future.

"The 1980s will be the decade of the laser," Stafford says. Already, a laser-equipped plane is flying at Wirtland Air Force Base, N.M. In experiments, small unmanned planes and missiles have been destroyed in flight.

The first use of lasers as weapons will be to defend large planes. A cruise-missile carrier, for example, might be so armed to protect itself as it circled over the ocean preparing to launch its missiles. Later, laser weapons will be made small enough to be carried by lightweight fighter planes to attack ground targets and enemy planes.

Development of a new MX missile that

can survive a Soviet surprise attack poses another staggering technological challenge. In one of the biggest engineering projects in history, the Air Force will build 200 "race track" courses for the new missile in the Western U.S., assuming that Congress authorizes the plan. Each track will consist of a 20-mile loop with 23 garagelike shelters to conceal a missile.

At the same time, work will be pushed ahead to perfect the missile itself, a monster capable of delivering 10 super-accurate warheads against targets in the Soviet heartland.

Other teams of engineers will design a 480,000-pound vehicle capable of "dashing" with the missile from one shelter on the race track to another at speeds up to 30 miles an hour.

The development and production of cruise missiles are another multibillion-dollar project that will bring revolutionary change to the Air Force. These are tiny, subsonic unmanned airplanes that will be launched from carrier planes hundreds of miles from their targets. Each missile, flying close to the ground, will be guided by a computerized brain following a terrain map.

A big new warplane is planned—although no decision has been reached on whether to build it or even what its ultimate mission ought to be.

During the coming year, the Pentagon will decide whether to design this aircraft to stand off and launch cruise missiles, penetrate to the heart of enemy defense or combine those two functions. The technological challenge of developing such a warplane—given improved Soviet air defenses—is considered immense.

While this "large warplane"—as Secretary Mark calls it—is on the agenda for the future, the Air Force is in the process of buying a whole new fleet of combat planes: F-15 and F-16 fighters, A-10 tank killers, E3A combat command posts.

In the next decade, as much as 12 billion dollars may be spent on electronic equipment—new radar, communications, guidance, fire-control and jamming devices—to improve the performance of these new planes. A major effort will be made to overcome a critical problem: The limited ability of American warplanes to attack ground targets at night and in bad weather.

Another critical problem is that the very-high-performance engines used in the F-15 and F-16 are wearing out much faster than expected.

In developing new aircraft, the emphasis is less on increasing altitude and speed and more on electronics that can tell a pilot where he is, help him find his target and enable him to communicate easily. New developments in electronics make it possible to put more and more computing capacity into small planes, enabling pilots to make split-second decisions.

How far the Air Force has progressed on this front was demonstrated recently when F-15 fighters supplied to Israel engaged a flight of Russian-made planes of the Syrian Air Force in a dogfight. Four Syrian planes were shot down in a battle that lasted only 1½ minutes.

#### FLYING COMMAND

To back up the increasingly sophisticated electronic equipment in small aircraft, four-engined flying command posts are coming into service to monitor everything that is happening in the battle area. Technicians in these planes not only guide the smaller planes but also use their computers to work out complex tactics in a matter of seconds.

Soon to come are superpowerful computers, packaged in tiny panels, that will increase the chances of a pilot to fight and live to fight another day. At present, a pilot must fly directly at his target at least for a few

moments—an exceedingly dangerous maneuver.

The new electronic fire-control devices will eliminate that danger, permitting a pilot to release his weapons while he is maneuvering violently—even if he is rolling upside down.

Technology is being developed to help pilots in other ways. New radar and lasers, now under test, will make American warplanes virtually immune to enemy jamming, a major problem. These devices are in what is known as a "constant jump mode"—that is, they move continuously and automatically from one frequency to another, defying enemy efforts to pinpoint them. Because of the Russian emphasis on disrupting enemy communications, this effort to jam-proof U.S. planes is a top Air Force priority.

#### ON THE GROUND

Other advances in technology promise dramatic improvements in the ground-support area. One example: New aircraft engines will have far fewer parts than those flying today. This not only will reduce the chances for failure but drastically cut the number of spare parts that must be bought and stored.

Another example: Streamlining of the Air Force Logistics Command. Gen. Bryce Poe II, who heads the command, claims that when Israel defeated Egypt and Syria in the brief but intense Yom Kippur War of 1973, it was logistics that made the decisive difference. He says: "It was a logistical conflict between us and the Soviets. We beat them hands down over a longer distance." His command is responsible for 800,000 items, from patrol dogs to nuclear weapons, with a budget of 16.4 billion a year. If it were a private business, it would rank 10th on a list of the top 500 corporations in the country.

Largely through the use of computers and automated equipment, the Logistics Command has reduced its depots from 21 in the mid-1950s to five today. At the same time, it has cut the number of people employed from 225,000 a quarter of a century ago to 91,000 today, and that number is scheduled to drop another 10 percent by the early 1980s. Despite these decreases, Poe says, the Logistics Command is doing essentially the same amount of work.

As the Air Force prepares for its new challenges, there are many in the service who worry that this elite corps is in serious danger of losing the very asset that has made possible its technological leadership: The high quality of its people.

#### THE EXODUS

One warning sign is that, for the first time since the introduction of the all-volunteer force seven years ago, the Air Force is not filling recruitment goals.

Even more worrisome is the fact that experienced men and women—both middle-level enlisted personnel and commissioned officers—are leaving the service in increasing numbers. The loss of pilots and engineers, critical to the future of the Air Force, is particularly acute.

A shortage of 2,000 pilots and 900 engineers is currently reported.

While there is concern in the Pentagon, in commands outside Washington the reaction is close to alarm. "We are in deep, serious trouble," declares Gen. Alton D. Slay, head of the Systems Command.

At Langley Air Force Base, Va., home of the Tactical Command, the situation appears particularly bleak. Gen. W. L. Creech, the tactical commander, described the steps he had taken to improve life in the service for his pilots. The result? "We've made so much progress they're leaving us now with smiles on their faces," he says. "Our pilot-retention rate is the best in the Air Force—and it's terrible." Not only is the loss of pilots reaching serious proportions, but there is also a less noticed loss of sergeants which, Creech says, "could reach a flood unless we address the issue."



For the long-range health of the service, the shortage of engineers may be even more serious than the loss of fliers. The Air Force counts on recruiting 800 to 1,000 engineers a year. It is now reaching only 40 percent of that goal, says Lt. Gen. Andrew P. Iosue, the service's manpower chief, and experienced engineers are leaving in record numbers.

"We are back-filling jobs that were held by captains and majors and lieutenant colonels with second lieutenants. A man with one year of experience replaces a man with 12. The experience exchange is disastrous," says Lt. Gen. Lawrence A. Skantze, commander of the Aeronautical Systems Division in Dayton.

Largely responsible for the manpower problem, say top Air Force officers, is the series of ceilings that have prevented military pay from keeping up with the cost of living and with raises received by union workers. Coupled with this is the price industry will pay men and women with certain critical skills. A pilot who takes an airline job can make two or three times the income he could achieve in the service. An engineer right out of college can go to work in industry for \$18,000 or more. The Air Force can offer \$12,000.

But beyond this difference in compensation is a growing bitterness, a feeling that service life is going to get steadily worse.

"Almost in every area, from the perspective of people in the service, there have not only been pay cuts but renegeing on the deal they made with the country," Creech says.

A young pilot complains: "Do you know how they're going to pay for the new MX missile? They're going to take it out of our parking fees."

Thus, twin challenges face the Air Force as it prepares to move into space in the 1980s:

It must maintain the momentum of its revolution in technology and at the same time attract and hold the men and women whose special talents are needed to manage that revolution.●

#### FIRESCOPE—A RESOURCE FOR EMERGENCIES

### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, when massive assistance is needed to combat a fire of major proportions there has been, in the past, attendant massive confusion as various units from outlying areas rush into the disaster area. This confusion arises because emergency agencies, fire, sheriff, highway patrol, police departments and others, each talk their own language, and second because of a lack of unified command.

FIRESCOPE, which is an acronym for firefighting resources of southern California organized for potential emergencies, is a program designed to increase effectiveness of fire agencies involved in fires and disasters that occur within a large area. The Operational Coordination Center (OCC) is located in Riverside, Calif., and is manned by the California Division of Forestry, State Office of Emergency Services and the U.S. Forest Service. There they track, daily, all the fire resources in southern California.

The recent Eagle Canyon fire in the

Santa Barbara area of my congressional district put FIRESCOPE to the test. The results were positive and merit being brought to your attention. Command was instantaneous and totally unified under the "Incident Commander," the title given to the chief in whose area the emergency exists. A uniform emergency structure was put into operation where all FIRESCOPE equipment and personnel worked interchangeably. In the words of Santa Barbara County Fire Chief William Patterson, "the nicest thing about FIRESCOPE is that it works." Without FIRESCOPE the Eagle Canyon fire might well have been a terrible disaster. FIRESCOPE enabled the positioning of fire units before the fire started.

The history of FIRESCOPE goes back to 1971, when Congressional action authorized the U.S. Forest Service to assist southern California fire agencies in developing a system that would increase coordination and effectiveness during major emergencies. It encompasses Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Orange, Riverside and San Diego Counties.

Because of the success to date of FIRESCOPE in saving lives and property, I ask the Members of the House to join with me in extending congratulations and continued support to the agencies involved.●

#### SENATOR CRANSTON'S SPEECH AT THE LASKER AWARDS CEREMONY, 1979

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, each year amid the beautiful surroundings of the St. Regis Hotel roof the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation, which has done so much for humanity through its programs for the stimulation of medical research and the application of medical knowledge, as well as the stimulation of the effort of public leaders in aid of such objectives. The Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation presents the Albert Lasker Medical Research Awards Luncheon. At this luncheon, the recommendation of the awards jury for medical research awards are presented and, on occasion, the awards jury also recommends a distinguished figure for his or her public service in advancing medical knowledge and service to humanity. On such occasions, there is always an outstanding speaker to make appropriate remarks pertaining to the expansion and the implementation of medical knowledge and providing greater and more meaningful health care to the people of our Nation, indeed, of the world.

This year at the luncheon on November 16, the speaker of the occasion was the Honorable ALLEN CRANSTON, U.S. Senator from California and majority whip of the Senate. Senator CRANSTON stimulated those present by his grasp of the problem of providing medical care for the people and for appreciation of one

of the phenomena of our time, the increasing age of the population of our people and all that attends that significant change. Senator CRANSTON presented a scholarly dissertation and did it in a very engaging manner so that his address was warmly received by the distinguished audience present.

I should like to share with my colleagues in the Congress and the people of our country this eloquent address of Senator CRANSTON's, and I include in the RECORD following these remarks.

SPEECH BY SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON, LASKER AWARDS CEREMONY 1979

The Old Testament speaks of the years of human life as three-score and ten. But when the scriptures were written, average life expectancy was only 18 years. Much later, at the peak of the Roman Empire, life expectancy was about 22. By Shakespeare's time the average had crept up to 35 years.

Obviously, everyone in those days did not die that young. At all times in history some people have survived to 80 or 90 or even longer. In each generation a handful of strong individuals have come close to living a full and natural life span.

Life expectancy is an average. In the past, a larger percentage of people than now died at birth. Deaths used to be more frequent in the young and middle years due to poor nutrition, inadequate sanitation, harsh living conditions and the spread of infectious disease.

This century began with an average life expectancy of 49 years in the United States. Almost overnight—in terms of history—we have added more than 20 years to life expectancy here, and elsewhere in the world's wealthier nations.

In just the last decade we have added nearly three years more to this average. New figures from the U.S. Public Health Service show deaths from heart disease are down 22 percent since 1969. Deaths from stroke are down 32 percent. These are tremendous achievements, in large measure due to our efforts to educate the public about hypertension and new methods for alleviating some of its effects. Deaths from atherosclerosis and diabetes also are down significantly.

But we still have not changed our inherent life span. Scientists in the relatively new field of gerontology now can estimate what our true life span is, however. Most of them agree that human beings have the biological capacity to live to 100 or more—as some few manage to do even now.

Most people don't live that long because the underlying mechanism of the aging process make us vulnerable to cancer, heart disease, stroke, senility, diabetes and other degenerative diseases. These afflictions occur much more frequently among the aged. They rob us of the comfort and quality of our advanced years. They render many aging men and women helpless for years. And they shorten our lives.

I am convinced, however, that we are on the verge of major advances in what we know about the biomedical mechanisms of aging.

To understand these mechanisms is to begin to control them. And control of the aging process promises two distinct benefits.

First, by forestalling age changes in the body, physicians will almost surely have a powerful new strategy for preventing disease. And secondly, we will probably learn to avoid the prolonged deterioration of mind and body which now devastates so many people far short of their full life span.

As a member of the Senate Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee, and as chairman of the Veteran's Affairs Committee, I follow closely our progress in biomedical research. Often I invite research scientists to

my office in the Capitol. They have an opportunity to discuss their work in an informal, crossdisciplinary forum. They share new findings with others working in parallel and complementary research.

What I have heard is astonishing to a layman. I suspect many scientists, too, would be surprised to learn how quickly we are assembling pieces to a very fundamental puzzle.

Researchers are probing basic mechanisms at the cellular and molecular level with tools that were unknown and unavailable just a few years ago. They are unravelling the secrets of how and why people age. Already some have successfully delayed and even reversed some aspects of the aging process in laboratory animals.

The field of gerontology for years was considered an unglamorous and unpromising field. To a degree, that attitude persists. But we also are seeing a stirring of great interest among scientists in the basic biology of aging.

The National Institute of Aging in Washington, D.C., reports a quadrupling of research applications over the last three fiscal years.

Researchers across the country are closing in on the disease of aging by pursuing strong leads in immunology, neural and endocrine mechanisms, genetics, protein synthesis and free radical pathology.

I believe that the question before us is not whether we will learn to intervene in the aging process or our benefit.

The question is: when?

For which generation?

Will my generation perhaps be the last to die prematurely, or the first to live to its full potential?

I expect that investigations now underway will pay our society a bonanza in a very few years. There are very real possibilities that we will learn to increase the robustness and vigor of older people, if we use our scientific and fiscal resources wisely.

By extending the potency of human immune systems—to cite just one example—we might be able to stretch the healthy middle years of life into the 70s and 80s and beyond.

This particular avenue of research might not pay its greatest reward in aging at all—but in prevention and treatment of cancer.

Many scientists believe that carcinogenesis and senescence share a common biologic origin. We know, for instance, that 50 percent of all newly diagnosed cancers and 60 percent of all deaths from cancer occur among people over 65.

Unfolding the mysteries of cellular and molecular changes which underlie the aging process almost certainly will yield valuable information, possibly leading to cures for a host of medical problems from cancer to senile dementia, renal failure and atherosclerosis, to name a few.

In America today, 11 percent of our population—some 23 million people—are over the age of 65. Their numbers grow by a half-million more each year. In the beginning of the next century—which really is not so far away—the baby boom generation will approach 65. The number and percentage of older Americans will swell dramatically.

Federal spending for Social Security, health care and pensions for the elderly already are in the multiple billions. We could be in serious trouble by the year 2000. We cannot afford to begin the 21st century with a mushrooming population of dependent old people who are no better off than many who are in nursing homes today.

Make no mistake: our longer-lived population is a triumph and an opportunity for our country.

We have won some important battles against killer diseases and crippling dis-

abilities. But we have some major challenges still ahead. We must surmount them if we are to succeed in enhancing, as well as prolonging, life.

We must plan ahead now for the kind of society we are becoming.

I think it is highly unlikely that in the next 30 or 40 years there will be no major technological breakthroughs that relate to human life span. Breakthroughs may come much sooner. But even if there are none soon, the number of people over 65 in our country will double in three to four decades.

With the commencement of control of the aging process we will have an even larger population of healthy, active older Americans.

What will our society then be like? What will the world be like when people live to 100 or more with the capacity to be vigorous and competitive until the very end?

Some will ask: why should we want to have more old people around? Especially when so many elderly today suffer from poverty, dependence, low social status and age prejudice?

What will be the burden of future health care capacity and tax-supported services? What about overpopulation? Jobs for everyone? Living space? Won't our culture stagnate if there are more and more old people and fewer younger citizens?

These are important questions. While it is impossible to project precise solutions into the future, we have some clues within our own century.

The present population of seniors was unanticipated when life expectancy was just 49 years. We have had problems with poverty, inadequate housing, health and nursing care for the elderly. But I agree with Dr. Bob Butler of the National Institute on Aging that these are temporary dislocations. They are the result, largely, of society's failure to anticipate and prepare for a major shift in human survival. We have no excuse to be unprepared in the future.

If people in their 80s and 90s someday enjoy the physical health and resilience associated with middle-aged people today, we need not worry about increased social costs of health care and dependency. Elderly Americans who work, produce for the economy and pay taxes will help us salvage much of the expense and wasted resources we now assume are inevitable with an aging population.

Certainly we will need to end forced retirement based on age alone in order to free the energies and productive capacities of a longer-lived, healthier population. Managing a larger work force and providing meaningful jobs for all who want to work are political problems, not scientific problems. They can be solved.

Ask yourselves this: has this century's dramatic increase in older Americans made ours a less flexible, intellectually sterile, or socially immobile society? Not by a long shot. Nor is stagnation the inevitable result of an older population.

I do not minimize problems of overpopulation and limited resources in our nation and in our world. We will have to find solutions to these problems. They will confront us whether or not we manage to intervene in the aging process.

I believe an older, wiser population will be an asset, and perhaps an absolute necessity if we are to cope with the future. It will help us grasp solutions that require years of technical training and the kind of learning that comes only through long and vast experience.

George Bernard Shaw wrote: "Men do not live long enough. They are, for all purposes of high civilization, mere children when they die."

In a technically complex society, such as

ours, talented young people spend an increasing proportion of their lives being trained to produce and contribute. But long before their years of experience have enabled them to realize their very fullest potential, their faculties fall to the processes of age.

This is a tragic loss in human terms and in terms of productivity. We need to find lifespan technologies that allow us to lengthen the middle years and to reduce to a minimum the period of eventual decline.

In this way we will develop a generation of people with the wisdom, insight and energy to lead us wisely forward to the future.

We need not fear biomedical advances that lead to greater human survival. Rather, we should be on guard against what Lewis Thomas calls halfway technologies.

Halfway technologies in medicine treat the manifestations of disease instead of its mechanisms. They aim to compensate for after-effects of illness rather than reaching for preventions.

The iron lung was an instance of halfway technology in the treatment of polio. Fortunately, we didn't stop there. We pursued the basic science that eventually yielded a vaccine.

I believe today's nursing homes someday will be seen in a similar light—as the equivalent of iron lungs for the dependent elderly. They will be regarded as an expensive relic of the days before we found more satisfactory answers to the challenges of human longevity.

We will not get to that happy day as quickly as we should, unless we marshal our intellectual and financial resources, and begin to do it now.

We will not get there rapidly unless we are willing to take some chances.

I am distressed when respected scientists tell me that many innovative and original research proposals are not given a chance to prove themselves.

These are times, in government especially, when research dollars are scarce. Inevitably there is a tendency to favor safe bets in research. Too often institutes, eager to show a return on research, fund projects that yield highly predictable—and minimal—results.

Predictable research will not speed us toward the answers we need if we are to meet the health challenges we face now and will face in the future. We need to have the flexibility and the good judgment to support occasional proposals that carry a high risk of failure—but that also holds the promise of a high payoff if they succeed.

It is difficult for government to justify risks. Yet I think it must. But the difficulty in moving the levers of government means that there is now a crucial need for the private sector to give competition to government—and to set a standard, too—in supporting potentially high benefit biomedical research.

I know many of you here today are making large contributions to science and to those working on its frontiers. I admire you greatly for the achievements and services you are making possible.

For the present, the new mass of knowledge in the field I've focused upon in these remarks is still formless, incomplete, lacking essential threads of connection. There are fascinating new concepts everywhere, irresistible experiments beyond numbering, countless new ways into the maze of problems and on to the heart that is their solution. Every next correct move is unpredictable, every outcome uncertain. But all hold the possibility of discovery.

I join with Lewis Thomas in assessing ours to be a puzzling time, but an exciting time, an exhilarating time, a very good time.

My thanks to many of you here for helping make it so. Thank you. ●



A TRIBUTE TO MR. AND MRS.  
JOSEPH MATASOVSKY

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

• Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, when the divorce rate in America is soaring to 50 percent of all marriages, when the traditional American family structure and values seem to be in decline, it is my distinct pleasure to bring to your attention the life and achievements of a noteworthy couple who most clearly exemplify those values we ought treasure most.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Matasovsky, lifelong residents of the south side of Pittsburgh observed their 70th wedding anniversary Sunday, June 3. They were married in St. Matthew's Church on the south side 70 years ago, and went to the same church to offer thanks for the blessings in their life.

The Matasovskys are the parents of four children: Mrs. Joseph Piroch (Mary) of Emlenton, Pa.; Mrs. Joseph Matuschak (Irene) of Uniontown, Pa.; Joseph M. Matasovsky of Plattsburgh, N.Y., deceased; Mrs. Susan Dvorak of McLean, Va., deceased.

They have five grandchildren: Dr. Joseph Piroch of Meadville, Pa.; Dr. George Matuschak of Rochester, N.Y.; Mark Matuschak, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.; Mrs. Leonard Egan, Burlington, Mass.; Joseph P. Matuschak Jr., of Uniontown, Pa. There are five great grandchildren: Debbie, Joseph, and Greg Piroch; Christopher and Hope Anne Egan.

The Matasovskys conducted business, at three locations on the south side over the years—Jane Street, Sidney Street, and Spring Street. After retirement from the retail business, Mr. Matasovsky was and still is involved in real estate. For a time, they operated a business in Europe.

The couple led a full life with activities in their community, fraternals, and politics, American and European.

During World War I, Mr. Matasovsky was active in the recruitment of volunteers for the Czecho-Slovak Legion in France which fought with the Allies against the oppressive Hapsburg Austro-Hungarian Empire. Bundles for soldiers abroad were prepared and sent from the Matasovsky Jane Street address where Mrs. Matasovsky organized a Red Cross unit. The then Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, wrote and thanked Mr. Matasovsky for his enthusiasm.

After the war, Mr. Matasovsky was a witness to the formal signing of the "Pittsburgh Pact" between Czech and Slovak leadership in the formation of Czecho-Slovakia.

During World War II, Mr. Matasovsky was with the civil defense and served in various areas including drilling of recruits.

As a young man, he was dedicated to physical fitness and was compared to

the legendary physical culture proponent Bernarr McFadden. Mr. and Mrs. Matasovsky had an opportunity to channel their enthusiasm for both physical fitness and love of their homeland, Slovakia, in fraternal organizations which were involved in the physical culture Sokol movement here in America.

Mr. Matasovsky served as an officer on the national, district, and local levels in two of the largest Slovak organizations in America. He was the national commander of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, and the First Catholic Slovak Union Sokol for years. He set up gymnastic and track and field programs to be used in meets nationally in his two organizations. He introduced the concepts of districts and groups and published the first terminology and drill books. Interwoven in his original choreography of rhythmic drills used for mass exhibitions was the culture of Slovakia itself. In 1912 for instance, his Sokols performed movements with "valasky" long handled axes typical of the era of the legendary Slovak hero Janosik, the Rob Roy of England. Songs of Slovakia, depicting life there were used as musical accompaniment.

His Sokol enthusiasm caught the imagination of his wife Anna, the first gymnast of the Sokol organization, and their children and grandchildren. He had the pleasure of seeing his two daughters, Mary Piroch and Irene Matuschak, and a granddaughter, Renee Egan serve on the national level as physical directresses of the Sokol organization. His son, now deceased, Joseph M. Matasovsky, was a gymnast competing in the Slovak Catholic Sokol, Jednota Sokol, Swiss Turners and Sokol USA. His youngest daughter, now deceased, was a gymnast in Slovak Catholic Sokol, Jednota Sokol and Swiss Turners also. His grandsons, Dr. Joseph Piroch, Dr. George Matuschak, Joseph Matuschak and Mark Matuschak, competed and served as group commanders.

Aside from fraternals, Mr. Matasovsky was involved with the Slovak League of America, the spokesman for Slovak organizations in America. He was chosen to represent the league on a diplomatic mission to Czecho-Slovakia, to observe a plebiscite in a dispute over boundary lines of the new Republic. He organized the National Committee for the Integration of Certain Territories into the Republic.

In American politics, Mr. Matasovsky has been active in promoting candidates on the local and national level by contributing articles, addressing meetings, and taping speeches used on bilingual radio broadcasts over wide areas in the country.

He sought to improve the image of the Slav through the arts and literature. He was active (treasurer) in the fund-raising committee to bring to America, delegates of the Literary Academy of Slovakia (Matica Slovenska) for the purpose of disseminating more information concerning Slovak authors, artists and composers.

Mr. Matasovsky organized choral groups as well as little theatre actors

whom he directed in Slovak plays, depicting life everywhere. He also served as an editor of a Slovak newspaper, Obrana, for a time.

While most of the companions of his life have passed on, he is still known to thousands who have trained in his gymnasiums, who have read his articles, who have heard him speak and sing, who have experienced his leadership, and who have followed in his footsteps.

Mrs. Matasovsky is known especially for her efforts for the Red Cross, the Slovak Catholic Sokol, but most of all for her gracious hospitality to the many Slovak leaders who were guests at their Jane Street home in years gone by.

True Slovak pioneers, their name will ever be a talisman of dedication, effort and sacrifice for others.

Today, villages in Slovakia evidently named after Mr. Matasovsky's ancestors, as for instance, Matiasovce and a genealogical research which produced a coat of arms of a bear carrying a club and used by the bishops and barons in the lineage may stand as witnesses to noble ancestors, but as far as Mr. Matasovsky is concerned, it is the nobility of character that is prized—especially to stand up for the truth. •

UKRAINIAN NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

• Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of the most respected and revered benefit societies in the world, the Ukrainian National Association celebrated in New York City its 85th anniversary. Since its inception the Ukrainian National Association has been deeply interested in the status of Ukraine and in the aspirations of its people for freedom and independence.

Founded February 22, 1894, in Shamokin, Pa., by a civic-minded group of Ukrainian pioneer immigrants, UNA has blossomed into a national organization of over 87,000 members with 460 branches in 27 States and 7 provinces of Canada.

This multifaceted organization promotes cultural, educational, social, athletic and community activities designed to benefit all Ukrainian Americans as well as their compatriots living in Canada and scores of other nations.

As the largest and most influential Ukrainian organization of the North American continent, UNA has rendered invaluable assistance to the Ukrainian people in their struggle against Communist oppression. Encouraged by the American defense of human rights, spearheaded by President Jimmy Carter, the association has aided and defended Ukrainian dissidents imprisoned for monitoring Moscow's infringement of the Helsinki agreements, as well as initiating such projects as the erection of the Taras Shevchenko Monument in Wash-

ington, D.C., honoring Ukraine's foremost poet and champion of freedom, and the establishment of the Ukrainian Studies Center at Harvard University, the only one of its kind in the country.

As part of its many services UNA is involved in the publication field. The association financed the publication of the first Ukrainian encyclopedia in the English language, as well as publishing the Ukrainian language daily *Svoboda*, the English language Ukrainian weekly and a children's illustrated monthly magazine, the *Rainbow*, in both languages.

The anniversary of UNA is an anniversary of faith, reason, and understanding. At a time when events around the world are constantly changing and shaping the lives of its members, UNA has shown and will continue to show its uncanny ability to meet those challenges head on, improving the lives of thousands everywhere.

On this joyous occasion I urge you and my colleagues to join in saluting UNA and its members throughout the world.●

**TOM BERKLEY, OAKLAND LEADER,  
OAKLAND OAK**

**HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Thomas L. Berkley is a man well known and respected in Oakland, Calif., and its environs. Some of my colleagues already know Tom Berkley. For those who do not, I wanted to place a few comments about him in our RECORD and in this way increase the number of people who are aware of Tom's many accomplishments.

Tom presently serves as the president of the board of commissioners of the Port of Oakland. He is the founder of the well-known law firm of Berkley & Rhodes. He is also the publisher of the Post Newspaper Group, a chain of six tri-weekly English-Spanish newspapers that serve the bay area.

The wood of the oak tree is well known to be tough, hard and durable. These adjectives describe Tom Berkley, too, but there are other adjectives that are just as apt—understanding, helpful, proud.

But it is always difficult to sum up a long, distinguished and continuing career in a few words. Rather than try to do that, let me list a few of Tom Berkley's accomplishments. They were recently commemorated at a testimonial dinner in Oakland and here is what the celebration was about: Tom Berkley as humanitarian, athlete, editor and publisher, lawyer, financier, educator, soldier, politician, civic leader, internationalist, public servant, mold of humans and civic activist.

This is not simply a list of things Tom Berkley has done and is doing. This is a list of things Tom Berkley has done well. He has been an inspiration to the young people he has worked with and helped. He is an inspiration to those who know him.●

**GEORGE MEANY—THE HANDS  
THAT BUILT AMERICA**

**HON. WILLIAM D. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 27, 1979

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in a special tribute to a unique American: Mr. George Meany, who for the past quarter century has been the leader, the spokesman, the driving force of the united labor movement in this country.

I would first like to commend my close friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMANS) for his foresight in arranging this special tribute now. Too often, we delay expressing our affection and esteem until the object of those sentiments has departed this Earth. I am delighted that George Meany is able to hear what we have to say. Given his insatiable interest in what we are doing in this legislative body, I am sure he is listening; given his innate sense of personal modesty, I am sure he will be embarrassed by the warmth of our regard.

But what we have to say is a tribute long overdue.

Throughout the long and distinguished history of the American trade union movement, only four men have presided over the united house of labor—Samuel Gompers, John McBride, William Green, and George Meany. Throughout my own lifetime, it has been George Meany who has loomed large on labor's horizon—as secretary-treasurer and then president of the former American Federation of Labor, and, since 1955, as president of the merged AFL-CIO.

George Meany's contribution to the trade union movement, itself, is something that can best be measured by his colleagues in organized labor. They are in the best position to render objective judgment on his day-to-day contribution in the fields of organizing and collective bargaining and on the bread-and-butter issues of wages, hours, and working conditions which represent the reason why trade unions came into existence. His colleagues in the trade union movement are best equipped, as well, to address his determination to rid labor's ranks successively of the Communists and the handful of racketeers who sought to prey off union members in the postwar period. I must say, however, that I have nothing but admiration for a man who was willing to preside over a smaller, but cleaner, house of labor.

His contributions to the trade union movement aside, George Meany was an activist on the political scene, and it is here that we, in the Congress, occupy a unique position to render our own judgment. On behalf of the millions of dedicated members of organized labor, George Meany made his voice heard on the broadest possible range of social issues; on behalf of all Americans, he helped us remember the constitutional injunction to "promote the general welfare."

His were not narrow, parochial views. He was concerned for the welfare of all working people, whether they belonged to trade unions or not; he was concerned with the quality of life, not only on the job but when the day's work was done. Scratch any domestic program you can think of—minimum wages for those, usually not union members, on the lowest rung of the economic ladder; dignity and economic security for people in their retirement years; better education for our kids and better housing for their families; better health care; equal opportunities for all as students, as workers, as voters, as human beings—scratch any one of these programs, or scores of others, and you will find the mark of George Meany.

He has spoken to the best that is in us—to our compassion, to our humanity, to our sense of purpose—and we have responded with a litany of social legislation that redounds as much to our own credit as to his.

And yet I have the feeling that, if George Meany were in this Chamber today, he would not be content with past accomplishments but would have his eye fixed firmly on the future; I have the feeling that he would echo that famous, one-word goal of the first of labor's giants, Samuel Gompers: "More." And we know what he would mean: More jobs at decent wages; more and better education; more and better health care at prices within reach of the family budget; more and better housing; and more attention to the needs of people as human beings in an increasingly depersonalized society. In the end, our finest tribute to this great man would be to continue on the road we have traveled together in the shared effort of improving and enlarging the human condition.

After a lifetime spent in the service of his fellow human beings, George Meany has retired. He leaves a legacy of great social achievement; he reminds us, by his accomplishments, that it has been the hands of people like him which have built America.●

**GUINNESS BOOK OF RECORDS,  
ATTENTION**

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, wire service stories tell us that Leonid Brezhnev has told the world the Soviet Union has produced a "devastatingly low" 179 million metric tons of grain this year.

It seems to me that by this time the Soviet Union must have set some kind of world record for free-style crop failure in a fertile land. Pre-Czarist Russia was the breadbasket of Europe. Over 60 years of socialist planning, improved technological means of agricultural production and efforts to create the new Soviet man through collectivization have resulted in crop failures that boggle the mind.



I have no doubt that the Soviet leaders will blame this recent crop failure on the Nazi invasion of World War II, the Chinese Communists, the CIA (would not it be wonderful if that were true?) and capitalism's ability to control the weather.

I suppose it can be said that American farmers benefit from this example of Socialist know-how. But would not it be interesting if we could find other markets for our crops, convince our Western allies to do the same, and then sit down and talk things over with the Kremlin. Perhaps we could convince them to convert all of the energy and money they now use to prepare for war into a search for better farming methods.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD a wire story published in the Chicago Sun Times, November 28, 1979:

#### GRAIN PROBLEMS IN U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Union produced a devastatingly low 179 million metric tons of grain this year, President Leonid I. Brezhnev announced Tuesday. In a speech to the plenary session of the Communist Party Central Committee, Brezhnev said 1979 "was a very difficult year." The figures were a sharp fall from last year's record crop of 237 million tons and underscored the country's roller-coaster production that has a sharp impact on the U.S. grain market. The Soviet Union has contracted to buy up to 25 million metric tons of grain from the United States and is expected to buy up to 32 million metric tons worldwide. A metric ton is about 2,205 pounds. ●

#### UNITED STATES TAKES IRAN TO WORLD COURT

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today President Carter wisely decided to sue the Government of Iran in the International Court of Justice at The Hague. He is asking the World Court to order Iran to release the American hostages immediately.

Last week in a letter to the President, I pointed out that Iran's seizure of our diplomats and property blatantly violates the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The text of my letter is included in my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 26, page 33536, which makes clear that both Iran and the United States signed that treaty and have agreed in writing that either party can take the other to the World Court to enforce its provisions. Today, President Carter filed a complaint with the justices of the World Court citing the Vienna Convention, the U.N. Charter, and two other treaties.

As a result, it will be the Iranian Government that goes on trial, not American diplomatic prisoners as Khomeini has proposed. Action by the International Court should help galvanize world opinion against Iran and hopefully move that country toward an early release of U.S. citizens. ●

MR. J. KENNETH SNYDER

#### HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the accomplishments of one of my constituents, Mr. J. Kenneth Snyder, who has served the York-Adams Scholastic Press Association for half a century. His fine efforts while working with this organization have made it one of the most admired student press associations in the Nation.

Mr. Snyder has assisted in planning every convention from the first on April 17, 1929.

Several hundred young journalists attend these sessions to listen to seasoned writers, to ask questions and to observe the world of journalism. I myself have attended and enjoyed the conventions in the past. Each convention since 1929 has been centered around the schooling of young journalists and every year more students attend. In part, this is due to the hard work and dedication of Ken Snyder.

Graduates of the association newspaper writing programs have gone on to distinguish themselves in the field of journalism. Bill Kling, now press secretary with U.S. Senator JOHN WARNER; the late Emanuel Freedman, foreign news editor of the New York Times; Jerry Strine, racing editor of the Washington Post; Dick Smyser, managing editor of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., paper; and Adam Smyser, editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, are all former students.

With the help and guidance of Ken Snyder many young writers have realized their dreams. And in helping them over his 50 years with the association, Ken has fulfilled a great dream of his own—to improve the quality of high school journalism.

I ask unanimous consent that the Harrisburg Patriot-News article of October 14, 1979, about Ken Snyder be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY—SCHOLASTIC PRESS CONFERENCE SET

YORK.—The York-Adams Scholastic Press Association will mark its Golden Anniversary October 23 at Spring Grove Area Junior-Senior High School, and a familiar face will be greeting conferees.

J. Kenneth Snyder, who assisted in planning for the initial convention on April 17, 1929, is handling arrangements for the celebration.

Snyder, retired headmaster of Country Day School of York and one-time faculty adviser for the now-defunct York Collegiate Institute Chronicle, has participated in every conference since the association's inception. The late Dean Hoffman, editor of the Harrisburg Patriot, was the main speaker at the first conference. At the second session, the late Lt. Gen. Albert Stackpole, general manager of the Harrisburg Telegraph, spoke.

The 50th anniversary program speaker will be Saul Kohler, executive editor of the Patriot-News Co. He will describe his experiences as a White House correspondent during the Johnson, Nixon and Ford administrations.

Several hundred young journalists will at-

tend the 50th anniversary conference, according to Snyder. Panel discussions, conducted by local newspapermen, will center on newswriting, sports, features and other topics.

"The first planning committee was composed of outstanding educators, who were interested in furthering journalism in the high schools of York County," Snyder said.

"A key leader of the committee was Dr. Millard Gladfelter, who was principal of West York High School and later became president of Temple University," Snyder said. "Miss Anna Mae Morris, a West York High teacher, was also a member of the committee."

Both Miss Morris and Dr. Gladfelter are being invited to attend the celebration.

The National School Press Association was started in 1921 in the midwest. In 1925 the Pennsylvania School Press Association was organized simultaneously with the Columbia University Scholastic Press Association, and both today are considered prestigious organizations.

PSPA organized 13 area scholastic press groups, including the York-Adams unit. Today, the local group also includes schools from Lancaster County.

Attitudes of many educators towards high school newspapers have shifted over the last decade, Snyder said.

"Principals are unaware of the true values of newspaper training," he said. "There are no illiterates graduating from high school newspapers."

High school newspaper faculty advisers receive little or no pay for working with student editors and reporters, Snyder said. "High school football and basketball coaches receive hundreds of dollars for their efforts," he said. "Most high school newspaper advisers receive a thank you from their superiors."

"I'm also disappointed in some students working with their school newspapers," Snyder said. "They lack the dedication of the young men and women of 30, 40 or 50 years ago."

Currently, 250,000 students work on 34,000 high school publications throughout the nation, he said. "The United States still puts in more effort to publish high school newspapers than any other country in the world."

Snyder, who has been a PSPA executive board member, has little patience with officials of high schools who claim their institutions are too small for newspapers. "Any school can publish a newspaper," he said.

In his half-century of working with YASPA, PSPA and CSPA, Snyder believes that he has devoted a full two years to the cause of high school journalism. "If you figure on a 40-hour week, I've put in two years since 1929," he said.

In 1975, Snyder received the Golden Crown certificate from CSPA for being one of the outstanding leaders of the U.S. school press. In the same year, he was awarded a similar citation by the PSPA in an awards ceremony headed by former Gov. Milton J. Shapp.

In 1953, Snyder and his wife, Elizabeth, founded Country Bay School of York. The school has become a part of York College of Pennsylvania. ●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. ALVIN BALDUS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. BALDUS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, November 27, I missed several important votes while I was attending the

National Milk Producers Federation annual conference in New Orleans. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 682: On agreeing to an amendment, as amended, that prohibits the FTC from enforcing the antitrust laws with respect to agricultural cooperatives and marketing orders. "Yes."

Rollcall No. 693: On final passage of H.R. 2313, the FTC authorization bill. "Yes." ●

#### ESCALATION IN THE DESERT

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 1979, the New York Times printed a letter to the editor from our outstanding colleague, STEVE SOLARZ. Entitled, "King Hassan Should Get No U.S. Arms for His Saharan War," Mr. SOLARZ' letter was, as always, an erudite exposition of his views. On November 20, the Washington Star published an editorial, to the contrary, "Escalation in the Desert." The Star recommended instead that Morocco receive the arms in question.

Both Mr. SOLARZ and the Washington Star agreed, as I do, I might add, that negotiation of the Western Saharan issue is the key. Mr. SOLARZ, however, seems to want to see King Hassan negotiate from a position of relative weakness; whereas, the Star prefers that he negotiate "from a position of reasonable strength." That appears to be the issue, and I might say that I agree with the point of view of the Star in this case.

I believe we should send the arms to Morocco, as the Star points out, "King Hassan is a friend of the West and his rivals are not known for this quality." I guess it all boils down to whether we want the Marxist-led Polisario guerrillas with Soviet-bloc weapons, supported by Algeria, Libya, and Cuba, to be relatively stronger in the negotiating stage, or our friend and ally, Morocco.

The Washington Star editorial is reprinted below:

#### ESCALATION IN THE DESERT

The struggle for control of the Western Sahara has taken an ominous turn in recent weeks. After four years of small-scale hit-and-run attacks by guerrillas against the troops of Morocco's King Hassan, the rebels have started operating with greater confidence, greater firepower and apparently a bolder infusion of foreign help.

The result, we learn from *Washington Star* reporter Walter Taylor, has been a series of pitched battles such as the desert has not seen since World War II. The 40,000-man Moroccan force, though unbeaten, is hard pressed to keep control of the vast, sparsely populated territory, formerly a Spanish colony.

Escalation of the conflict increases the urgency of Morocco's bid to purchase sorely needed counter-insurgency equipment in this country. The administration for the last month has backed the proposed sale of reconnaissance planes and helicopter gunships, stressing the king's status as a longtime U.S. ally and the expectation that, with his hand

strengthened, he could better negotiate a political settlement. But congressional approval of the arms sale is still awaited. A long delay on the Hill could be costly.

The situation is messy on several counts. King Hassan may have overreached in first claiming a part of the former Spanish Sahara and then adding Mauritania's share when that country withdrew from the anti-guerrilla war in August. He resisted international pleas for a plebiscite to determine the post-colonial fate of the area, and his annexations have gone largely unrecognized abroad. But no one can point to a democratic mandate in the disputed region—certainly not the guerrillas whose mandate is their guns.

Neighboring Algeria with its own ambitions toward the west and Africa's Atlantic coast has proved to be King Hassan's most important opponent in the venture, sponsoring and harboring the Marxist-led Polisario guerrillas. The guerrillas have sophisticated Soviet-bloc weapons. Radical Libya is believed to help finance the insurgency, and Cubans are reported to be providing some training.

Algeria may now be participating even more directly against its fellow Arabs. Captured guerrillas say they were led by Algerian officers, according to Mr. Taylor's dispatch. But Morocco enjoys support from other Arab nations—Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The latter has urged the merits of the U.S. arms sale.

While massive American involvement is not called for, there can be no question where the U.S. stands. King Hassan is a friend of the West, and his rivals are not known for this quality. If oil politics must be considered, Algeria's role as a supplier is more than offset by Saudi Arabia's.

King Hassan should have the opportunity to acquire what he needs to fight off the Polisario threat (which has included attacks inside Morocco's original border). He should be encouraged to negotiate an end of the desert war, from a position of reasonable strength. ●

#### TURKEY VOICES DISAPPROVAL OF AMERICAN EMBASSY TAKEOVER

### HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Iran not only seriously threatens international peace and security, but also affects the way in which diplomacy can be conducted by the community of nations. U.S. officials, the United Nations Secretary-General, the Presidents of the U.N. Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as other important foreign government spokesmen have stated their support for the sanctity of diplomatic premises and personnel throughout the world. Most recently the Turkish Prime Minister, Suleyman Demirel, has expressed strong disapproval of the Iranian takeover of the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and the seizure of American Embassy personnel as hostages. I commend my colleagues' attention to Mr. Demirel's November 23 statement:

Naturally, we cannot approve of the events taking place in Iran. Since the outset of human history, it is unheard of taking hostages of embassy personnel, whichever embassy it may be, on the pretext of considering them as spies. ●

#### NICARAGUA—PART II: SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Nicaragua has suffered during the decade of the 1970's as few other nations in the hemisphere. In December of 1972 a devastating earthquake shattered the capital city of Managua, claiming 5,000 lives and inflicting physical damage to the economy estimated at \$800 million. Reconstruction was nowhere near complete when the country was ravaged by a civil war far more destructive than blind nature. At least 35,000 people died as a result of hostilities which ended this summer, and physical damage to the economy has been placed at \$580 million. These figures are doubly grim when one considers Nicaragua's size and general economic condition: it is a nation about the size of Arkansas, with 2.5 million people whose per capita annual income fell to \$650 this year.

It is difficult to comprehend the full social and economic costs of the Nicaraguan civil war, but suffice it to say that those costs will be paid by virtually every Nicaraguan in every walk of life. The social costs are perhaps the more severe. Beyond the staggering toll in war-related deaths, 100,000 people were wounded and 40,000 children were orphaned. Just last month the Nicaraguan Embassy reported that 10 percent of the populace was homeless and 40 percent was malnourished. The economic costs are high as well. With one business in four destroyed and agriculture in a depression due to outright damage and lost plantings, the gross domestic product of Nicaragua dropped 25 percent during the belligerency. About \$515 million in capital fled the country in the same period. Upon assuming office in July, the Government of National Reconstruction faced accumulated debts of \$1.5 billion, debt service of \$660 million this year alone, and a public treasury stripped of all but \$3.5 million in assets. Given social and economic dislocation of this magnitude, that Nicaragua has not yet sunk into chaos is nothing short of miraculous. The miracle, of course, stems from the strength and tenacity of the Nicaraguan people.

If the recitation of these figures in briefings did not impress upon us Members of Congress the seriousness of the situation in Nicaragua, what we saw of the country and heard from the people was more than enough to impress. Blasted buildings and piles of wreckage, some from the earthquake and some from the fighting, dotted the landscape in Managua. The walls of homes in the neighborhoods bore scars of intense gunfire. Power outages were frequent. An amputee with crutches was a commonplace sight.

Our very first meeting with Nicaraguans only served to define the seriousness of the situation more sharply. Junta



member Alfonso Robelo, in answer to a question of mine concerning the problems and priorities of the Government of National Reconstruction, cited a combined 55 percent rate of unemployment and underemployment, shortages and maldistribution of food, and shortages of medicine as the principal problems. The creation of jobs, the planting of crops, and the management of a uniform health care delivery system were the top priorities of the government. I myself found it significant that the exigencies of national reconstruction dominated so many of our conversations with Nicaraguans, whether in offices of government or outside. The social and economic underpinnings of the nation are undergoing extreme strains, and relief from those strains is very much the order of the day.

In the past the United States has responded to Nicaragua's troubles with dispatch and generosity. We provided Nicaragua with some 11,400 tons of emergency food in the 4 months after the earthquake. Assistance directly related to reconstruction totaled \$65.3 million in loans and nearly \$4 million in grants through 1977. Our response to the depredations of civil war in Nicaragua has been equally speedy and ample. As of November 12, we had sent some 36,300 tons of emergency food valued at \$13.3 million and had provided loans and grants of \$13.9 million to government and private organizations. Another \$29.4 million makes up the current loan pipeline. President Carter's supplemental request of \$75 million for Nicaragua, which I have already described in brief, would round out the package and begin to make a difference in the ongoing effort to reconstruct a stricken nation.

The Nicaraguan people know of our assistance and are grateful for it. The day we arrived in Nicaragua, November 16, the independent newspaper *La Presna* carried a story entitled "U.S. Has Helped More Than During The Earthquake" (translation mine). The story gave the proper figures on our assistance and described how the assistance was being used. The day we departed from Nicaragua, November 18, I toured AID projects in the neighborhoods of Managua and saw a sign near one of them which read in part:

This Site [is] Financed With Funds Of The United States Government And The Government Of Nicaragua For The Benefit Of The Nicaraguan People (translation of embassy staff).

The Nicaraguans are a forthcoming people, and my honest impression is that they will continue to give credit where credit is due.

There are solid reasons to support the additional assistance that President Carter has requested for Nicaragua. Humanitarian concern, a quality which Americans have always manifested, is one, and another is the opportunity to begin a relationship with a new government by helping it solve its gravest problems. Also, we should bear in mind that the results of our actions will not be like dust in the wind. The Nicaraguan people will know and remember who helped them and who did not. ●

NICHOLAS LAMBIS

## HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last week, when most of us were enjoying our children and grandchildren, I was again reminded of the youngsters in this country who are not as fortunate as some of our own—those children who suffer from Cooley's anemia. These children were called to mind by the death of a 27-year-old man, Nicholas Lambis, at the National Institutes of Health last Tuesday, November 20.

For the past 14 years, Mr. Lambis made a substantial contribution to the efforts to combat the disease that eventually took his life. For those of my colleagues unfamiliar with Cooley's anemia, or Beta-thalassemia major, it is a crippling blood disease that strikes children of Mediterranean heritage. Some of us in Congress have worked for many years to secure funding for research of Cooley's anemia, but Nicholas Lambis' own blood was an important part of the research that has been carried on at NIH for the past several years.

I submit for the RECORD Mr. Lambis' obituary from the Washington Post, which details his contributions to Cooley's anemia research, and call on my colleagues for continuing support of funding for research and treatment of this dread disease:

NICHOLAS LAMBIS, PATIENT IN NIH ANEMIA RESEARCH

(By Richard Pearson)

Nicholas Lambis, 27, a part-time personnel clerk at the National Institutes of Health for the past six years, died at NIH Tuesday of Beta-thalassemia major, or Cooley's anemia.

As a patient at NIH for the last 14 years, Mr. Lambis "made a substantial contribution" to efforts aimed at controlling the disease that took his life, according to one of his physicians, Dr. French Anderson, a hematology program chief at NIH.

The disease is hereditary and manifests itself as an inability of the body to produce its own blood.

Until the drug Desferal was tried as a possible treatment for Cooley's anemia at NIH in 1973, the life span of a patient with the ailment was seldom more than 13 to 15 years.

The primary treatment had been blood transfusions and Dr. Anderson said that in most cases the body was unable to assimilate the iron that accompanied the transfusions. As a result, he said, most patients would suffer cardiac arrest.

With the development of Desferal, patients were able to continue transfusions without the side effects of excessive iron, Dr. Anderson said. He said the life expectancy of Cooley's anemia patients is now far longer than previously.

He added that Mr. Lambis had donated much of the blood required in experiments to advance treatment of the illness.

In 1965 Mr. Lambis' blood was used in experiments that showed that blood cells of patients with Cooley's anemia could not make a normal hemoglobin molecule. In 1977, his blood was used in experiments showing that an iron-binding drug could improve treatment of the disease.

"As a result of his contributions as a patient in early studies of new therapy for Cooley's anemia, Mr. Lambis is now a widely known person in medical circles," said Dr. Anderson.

Mr. Lambis was born in Washington. He was diagnosed as having Cooley's anemia when he was less than a year old. After undergoing treatment at Children's Hospital he became a patient of Dr. Anderson, and in recent years, of Dr. Arthur Nienhuis at NIH.

Despite his illness, Mr. Lambis graduated from Calvin Coolidge High School in 1971 and attended Montgomery College.

Survivors include his mother, Eugenia, and a sister, Judy, both of Washington; four other sisters, Jenny Fytras of Brooklyn, N.Y., and Phyllis Axarlis, Judy and Barbara, all of Silver Spring, and two brothers, Constantinos, of Falls Church, and James of Silver Spring.

The family suggests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to NIH Patients Emergency Fund. ●

## CHRYSLER UNION FALLS SHORT

## HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial from the Omaha World-Herald on the economic dilemma of the Chrysler Corp. The editorial focuses on the opinions of Mr. Alfred Kahn, adviser to the President on inflation, regarding the proposed contract concession offered to Chrysler by the United Auto Workers. It discusses the role the U.A.W. may have in finding a workable solution to the Chrysler problem.

Whether Congress should grant the Chrysler Corp. a loan guarantee is an issue, I believe, that must be given painstaking consideration. Our decision will have long and extensive effects on the automobile industry. I request that the Omaha World-Herald editorial be placed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

## CHRYSLER UNION FALLS SHORT

Are the United Auto Workers contributing their fair share to the Chrysler rescue mission?

Inflation fighter Alfred Kahn doesn't think so.

"All that we've heard so far from the union isn't sufficient," the chairman of the Council on Wage and Price Stability said.

Briefly, this was the plan:

The federal government would guarantee a \$1.5 billion loan to Chrysler.

The auto company would match this by raising or saving a similar sum.

Part of the savings would be provided by a wage concession from the UAW.

The union and company have tentatively agreed to a contract which would save Chrysler \$203 million in two years compared with the UAW's contracts with Ford and General Motors.

But Kahn said that Chrysler workers would be allowed to catch up with the other auto workers in the contract's third year and therefore there were no real savings.

Kahn also noted the anti-inflation pay guidelines call for three-year settlements of no more than 22.5 percent. The UAW con-

tract is for 33 percent. This would undermine the anti-inflation program, Kahn said last week. He termed the pact "outrageous."

He first said that the White House might oppose the loan guarantee, then changed his mind after talking with Stuart Eizenstat, the president's chief domestic adviser. But Kahn added: "That wage contract—if nothing else happens, that ain't enough."

Union president Douglas Fraser called Kahn's statements "absolutely shocking and incomprehensible, as well as reckless and insensitive."

More complications will probably emerge as Congressional hearings continue this week.

The Wall Street Journal suggests letting Chrysler go into bankruptcy.

"It's not as harsh a solution as it sounds," the Journal said. "While selling off some of its assets, the company would be able to continue many of its operations as it worked out a plan to pay off its debts. It's the best way to cut the company's losses quickly."

Columnist James F. Kilpatrick also talks of bankruptcy. Says he: "One has to sympathize, of course, with the prospective plight of the workers, but their pathetic scenario demands careful scrutiny. A reorganization under Chapter X of the Bankruptcy Act by no means requires the instantaneous shutdown of every Chrysler facility everywhere."

Reluctantly, we still think the \$1.5 billion loan guarantee is a better solution. This is not, as some mistakenly believe, an outright gift or loan of tax money. It is a promise by the government to make good any part of the loan that Chrysler is unable to repay. It continues a bad precedent, but under the circumstances, it appears to be a necessity.

Bankruptcy would be traumatic for many workers. We feel that their union should be required to make a greater effort to help. Taking Kahn's advice and making a real financial concession now increases chances for the loan and might save jobs later. ●

## ISRAEL AS A SECURITY ASSET FOR THE UNITED STATES

HON. JIM JEFFRIES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article regarding Israel's strategic importance to the Western World. The article appeared in the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs newsletter and I feel it is especially apropos considering the present situation in Iran.

The article follows:

### ISRAEL AS A SECURITY ASSET FOR THE UNITED STATES

(The growth of Soviet naval power in the Eastern Mediterranean, Indian Ocean and, through its basing facilities, the Persian Gulf gives the USSR the capability to bottle up Middle Eastern and Persian Gulf oil in a crisis situation. Moreover, the very capability the Soviets are developing creates conditions where the political leaders in the Middle East and Persian Gulf, as well as Northeast Africa, make efforts to be responsive to Soviet requests. All of this is harmful to Western interests. Given the growth in Soviet military capability and the incapacity for the US in the short term to do much directly about it, the following JINSA essay outlines the role Israel may well play in rendering to the US and the Western Alliance vital assistance.)

Israel is a small country that, over its brief existence as a modern state, has spent most of its time fighting for its survival. Under this circumstance, consideration of Israel as a security "asset" to the United States might appear as presumptuous.

However, a number of important developments in the Middle East and in the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union have altered the picture considerably and have projected Israel from a state dependent entirely on military assistance to a nation of considerable and growing importance to the United States and to the Western alliance.

These developments can be summarized as follows: the expansion and elaboration of Soviet conventional force and its spill-over into the Middle East; the shifting naval balance of power in the Mediterranean, enhancing Soviet prestige in the third world and placing her nuclear capability realistically within range of the Middle East and Persian Gulf.

Most clearly visible is the growth of Soviet conventional military capability and the transfer by the Russians of sophisticated military hardware to her client states in the Middle East. By 1973 the Soviets had moved to the area advanced aircraft of the fighter and bomber variety, including swing-wing MIG 23 and advanced Tupolev and Sukhoi designs; modern tanks equipped with laser aiming devices and night-fighting gear; modern missiles, including the SA-6, then the most advanced type of its kind, enabling the Russian-backed Arab armies to move forward into Israeli-held territory under a "missile umbrella;" extremely modern bridging equipment, radars and other types of communications and target designating equipment; and surface to surface missiles with strategic potential and moderately long range, possessing relatively good accuracies.

The appearance of massive quantities of Soviet equipment in the region, and the realization by Western experts that much of the military hardware was much more effective than theretofore believed, required Israel to acquire on a rapid basis the means to combat any further convergence of Russian arms into the region. This was done with U.S. backing and strenuous political and economic efforts by Israel, resulting in Israel today fielding one of the best equipped and battle tested military forces of its kind in the world.

Unfortunately, the pace Israel has had to keep up because of the potential of Soviet pressure—represented by recent heavy arms acquisitions by Syria, Iraq and Libya—has not been matched by parallel buildup of US forces in or near the Middle East. Quite the contrary, US power in the region has declined, partly with the loss of extensive facilities in Iran and an impressive list of front line military hardware, and partly with the lack of growth in US naval capability in the Mediterranean.

The centerpiece of American military power in the Middle East is the presence in the Mediterranean of the US Sixth Fleet. The Sixth Fleet is the anchor that secures the vital sea lanes of the Mediterranean, projects US power in southern Europe, safeguarding NATO's southern flank, and inhibits the Soviets from considering active military intervention in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. Recent signs of erosion of America's military capability—the more visible use by the Russians of surrogates such as the Cubans in the African Horn and in South Yemen (PDYR), the extensive Soviet program of base expansion in and around the area, and the stockpiling of large stores of modern Soviet weapons in countries like Libya, reveals a Russian perception of US vulnerability and weakness.

Authorities are generally agreed that Soviet boldness has been stimulated by the in-

vestment they have made over the past 15 years in their own naval presence in the Mediterranean. Lt. Commander Bruce Watson, writing in *Problems of Sea Power as We Approach the Twenty-First Century* says: "Since 1967, the shift in the Mediterranean balance of naval power has been in favor of the Soviet Union." In the decade, 1966 to 1976, the Soviets have indeed improved their naval position in the Mediterranean, as the chart below derived from the recently published Atlantic Council volume *Securing the Seas* illustrates:

### U.S./U.S.S.R. combat deployment in the Mediterranean

1966:		
United States.....		34
U.S.S.R. ....		6
1976:		
United States.....		33
U.S.S.R. ....		25

The chart reflects aircraft carriers, general purpose submarines, major surface combatants, minor surface combatants, amphibious ships and mine warfare ships. It does not account for the greater firepower of the smaller Soviet vessels compared to American vessels of equal tonnage, nor does it reflect the greater sea-carried air power of the US carrier fleet, or the land-based Soviet naval air force, used to protect the Soviet fleet.

JINSA has prepared a brief summary of Soviet naval activity in the Mediterranean which appears at the bottom of this page. The summary helps point out how growing Soviet naval power has been used to enhance the Soviet.

The expansion of Soviet naval capability in the Mediterranean, and its concentration in the Eastern Mediterranean, has not been matched by any enlargement of the US Sixth fleet, or even by a rapid modernization of the carrier task force. Frequent battles in the Congress on devising ways to combat the Soviet build-up has hindered US naval expansion on a timely basis. Moreover, the US has experienced serious problems in the NATO alliance making it difficult to deploy large numbers of US vessels on a regular basis, or to carry on effective NATO exercises in the Aegean and Mediterranean. This trouble, principally with Greece and Turkey is yet unresolved and neither country has yet reached a final military agreement with the US. Greece remains partly outside of the NATO alliance.

This leaves the southern flank of NATO partially unhinged and creates opportunities for the Russians to exploit Turkey and possibly Greece as well. Any conflict in the area in which US naval forces became embroiled with the Soviet flotilla could leave the two sides in an undecided battle—perhaps enhancing Soviet opportunities on the ground in southern Europe. The recent Atlantic Council study suggests that ultimately the balance of forces in the Mediterranean turns on air power. "The battle for the Mediterranean," the study says, "would probably be heavily influenced by the relative availability of airpower to each side. A substantial force of land based, long-range naval aircraft from Soviet bases would be pitted against the extensive carrier-based aircraft of the Sixth Fleet. The outcome could well hinge on the ability to supplement US naval carrier-based aircraft from various land bases on the Mediterranean littoral. Given US control of the air, it would then be reasonable to expect that control of the surface—and the sub-surface—would follow." (emphasis added)

Where would the extra airpower come from? The most sophisticated and battle tested air force in the Middle East area, effective and experienced in the Eastern Mediterranean, is the Israeli air force.

Indeed, the list of enhancements Israel can conveniently provide for the US Sixth fleet is extensive. JINSA has prepared the



following "Quick Reference" on Israel as a security asset to the United States:

**QUICK REFERENCE: ISRAEL AS A U.S. SECURITY ASSET**

1. Israel has a strong, secure location in the Eastern Mediterranean.
  2. Israel has a well developed military infra-structure, featuring a wide range of sophisticated communications, transport, and supply systems.
  3. Israeli forces are equipped to maintain, service and repair as needed U.S. origin military equipment including the most sophisticated electronic equipment and aircraft. Israel has a proven capacity for quick turnaround during conflict and the capacity to innovate rapidly in wartime.
  4. Israel has an excellent deep water port at Haifa bay, featuring communications and military infrastructure.
  5. Nearby Haifa, Israel has excellent air facilities of the most modern type and can service virtually any variety of jet engine or aircraft type.
  6. Israel is close to vital sea lanes in the Eastern Mediterranean, Red Sea and Persian Gulf. Her ability to effect a rescue at Entebbe, jam radars in Uganda, maintain in the air a command and control and medivac aircraft, indicate a clear ability to project power over long distances.
  7. Israel maintains a domestic air force larger than many fighter forces in Western Europe and possessing more up to date military hardware.
  8. Israel is a multilingual country with an in-depth capability to monitor Soviet and Eastern European broadcasts, and to maintain surveillance over hostile states in her immediate region. Most Israeli officers read, write and speak English and received training in the United States, Great Britain or France.
  9. Israel is experienced in combating Soviet tactics and is familiar with a wide range of Soviet military methods.
  10. Israel is well situated to provide substantial assistance to the US Sixth Fleet when operating in the Eastern Mediterranean. It keeps in its arsenal equipment common to the fleet, including naval models of the US Phantom F-4 aircraft, many types of missiles, and the E2-C early warning aircraft, used widely by the Sixth Fleet.
  11. In the case of wide-scale war in which the US may be tied down in southern Europe, Israel can provide essential military support to the US by combating flanking operations sponsored by the Soviets, by tying down local troublemakers, and by requiring the Soviets to commit forces to preventing an Israeli strike against her port facilities, air bases, and military stations in and around the Mediterranean. Israel can also provide emergency air cover for the Sixth Fleet if needed.
  12. Israel is a democratic country with tested anti-Soviet, pro-Western leanings, a high level of internal order and a strong orientation to support the NATO system.
- There is no doubt that Israel possesses the ability and the will to act as a vital back-up to the United States in the Mediterranean. The only outstanding issue is whether the US will take advantage of Israel's capability. This cannot be done passively. To make use of Israel's military power requires extensive, prior coordination between the two countries, detailed staff planning, and understanding of objectives between the commanders of the respective forces. While there has been some recent discussion of the potential of Israel, the critical issue for US national security, for NATO, and for Israel as well, is whether the US will take advantage of Israel's potential in a timely manner.
- JINSA SUMMARY: USSR MEDITERRANEAN NAVAL ACTIVITY**
- 1958—8 "Whiskey Class" Soviet Submarines with a submarine tender vessel operate in

the Mediterranean for the first time. Submarines are home based in Vlone, Albania.

1960—Soviet intelligence ships and submarines conduct exercises in the Aegean sea to demonstrate ability to attack US carrier task force.

1961—Soviets lose Albanian base, discontinue Mediterranean activity.

1964—15 vessels from the Soviet Black Sea fleet make a grand tour of the Mediterranean. Continued buildup from this time of Soviet naval capability in the Mediterranean until middle 1970's.

1967—Admiral Gorshkov arrives in Egypt to seek Soviet port facilities. Soviets get port facilities at Alexandria and Port Said. Soviets start building a facility in Yemen. Soviets enhance fleet presence with Six Day war and begin regular monthly calls in Algeria. Berbera, Somalia base started.

1968—Soviet squadron begins operating in Indian Ocean. Four Soviet "spy ships" anchored in Arab ports—Basra, Iraq; Tartus, Syria; Port Said, Egypt; Hudaida, Yemen Arab Republic. Soviet "N" Class submarines visit Egypt. In 1968 Soviets complete 14,000 "ship days" in area.

1969—Soviet fleet "employed" in exercise to give diplomatic support to overthrow of King Idris of Libya. Soviets set up a ship-based air shield, blocking British from flying pilots into Libya from Cyprus.

1970—Soviet missile ships equipped with surface to air missiles (SAMs) stationed in Egyptian ports to hinder Israeli air strikes during war of attrition.

1972—Soviets begin enlarging base at Berbera. Soviets also build new naval facilities in Syria at Latakia and Tartus. Soviets average 18,000 ship days in Mediterranean. TU-16 reconnaissance aircraft transferred from Egypt to Syria.

1973—Iraqi deep water port of Basra used by Russians to support warships on patrol in the Persian Gulf. Soviet Mediterranean squadron nearly doubled with war. Ships stationed close to war zone and shadow US sixth fleet with surface to surface missile boats positioned close to US aircraft carriers. Four Soviet guided missile submarines also put within range of US carriers. US hesitates to deploy fleet close to war zone in early part of conflict.

1974—Soviets expand port facilities in Syria. First Backfire supersonic bombers assigned to Soviet naval aviation, some based in range of Soviet Mediterranean fleet.

1975—Soviets gain some limited facilities in Yugoslavia.

1976—Kiev "aircraft carrier" enters Mediterranean. Soviets finally expelled from Egypt.

1977—Soviets electronically jam radio circuits used by Egyptian fighter pilots in the border conflict with Libya. Soviets lose Berbera, but gain new facilities (still incomplete) in Ethiopia.

1979—New titanium-hull Soviet attack submarines identified by US intelligence. ●

**CORRIGAN CIVIC CLUB**

**HON. RON PAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, twice in recent months, the people of the 22d District of Texas have suffered extensive flooding. In these tragic circumstances, I have been proud of the initiative and concern displayed by individuals and citizens' organizations. They have worked to resolve the flooding problems, and helped those whose homes and businesses have been damaged or destroyed.

One of the groups deserving special mention is the Corrigan Civic Club in Pearland, Tex. The club's work in monitoring flooding and drainage problems has provided extremely valuable information about the causes and potential solutions to these problems.

I would like to call the Corrigan Civic Club's achievements to my colleagues' attention, and congratulate the club on its magnificent efforts. ●

**ODD-EVEN GASOLINE PURCHASE SYSTEM SHOULD BE REINSTITUTED**

**HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, several times in recent weeks, I have called to my colleagues' attention my belief that odd-even gasoline purchase systems should be reinstituted immediately.

As the following Washington Star editorial points out, it is the nagging inconvenience of odd-even that serves as a reminder of our national need to conserve.

And the need to conserve is with us now. Today—right now. Not next month nor next year.

Weekly fuel consumption and production statistics show that as of November 23—for the first time since early spring—national gasoline inventories dropped below the Department of Energy's minimum acceptable level. If this trend continues we could have a serious shortfall at the gasoline pumps in 4 to 6 weeks.

However, if through a greater consciousness of the need to conserve—a consciousness I am convinced can be brought about through the odd-even gasoline allocations system—Americans will increase their conservation efforts and gas inventories will rise again.

Perhaps it is especially noteworthy that California—the first to feel the gas pinch and the first to solve with odd-even—is reinstituting odd-even again.

The editorial follows:

**ODD-EVEN AS SYMPTOM**

The governors of 39 states who met recently with President Carter apparently did not actually snore during a White House session in which he urged greater energy conservation now that the U.S. will import no oil from Iran. But there was a good deal of dozing among the congregation.

After the meeting, the governors' reactions amounted to a collective yawn. Texas Gov. Bill Clements described Mr. Carter's recommendations as "just warming over yesterday's scrambled eggs."

If Mr. Clements' flippant view is shared by his brethren, it suggests our complacency about energy consumption has hardly been touched by the fearful events in Iran this month and what they may portend.

The president's recommendations were modest and prudent—among them, further reduction in fuel use by state agencies and vehicle fleets, tougher enforcement of the 55-mph speed limit and revival of odd-even gasoline sales.

There was one exception to the gubernatorial ennui. Gov. Jerry Brown ordered a scaled-down version of the odd-even scheme (if a driver can show he is 100 miles or more from home, he gets gas, for instance) in California. Though the young governor and Democratic presidential candidate not infrequently seems to court the label of space cadet, in this instance his action was eminently reasonable. The logic of such a system is to diminish the tendency toward panic buying, which exacerbated last summer's gas shortages, and to instill habits of conservation.

As a yoke of social discipline, this one is made of feathers. At worst, odd-even involves a modicum of inconvenience.

If the governors feel it is an intolerable imposition on the citizenry, one must wonder what, if any, measures they would endorse. Indeed, considerably more than mild constraints may be required eventually.

We note that Treasury Secretary William Miller, now in Saudi Arabia for discussions with the Riyadh government, said the administration is studying tougher energy-conservation controls. "I think all of the options of mandatory curtailment or price curtailment have to be looked at," he said. "That could be rationing or some other program that would limit use of automobiles." The options could be before the president by mid-December, he said. It seems increasingly imperative that mandatory constraints be invoked, despite the restrained enthusiasm of a Congress that this summer gave the president a standby rationing authority that is more standby than authority.

The lack of urgency on the energy front was further illustrated in this area in the odd-even matter. Representatives of Maryland, Virginia, the District, Delaware and Pennsylvania did manage to get together to draw up what was called a coordinated plan for an odd-even sales procedure—but for use, we gather, only after a shortage is imminent or develops.

"None of us felt that there is any kind of a problem at hand" that requires immediate action, said one of the officials at the session. The reasoning—that because any supply pinch is expected to take 60 to 90 days to make itself felt by motorists—misses the point so stunningly that one can only admire it.

The point, or so it clearly seems to us, is that habits of conservation are equally essential and absent at a time when our energy vulnerability is increasing.

What you may be fairly certain of, when gas lines materialize again, is that there will be howling from the statehouses about an alleged lack of presidential leadership that did nothing to prevent them. ●

#### CITIZENS GROUP FORMS TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

#### HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, last night, citizens from the entire Washington metropolitan area, including residents of the Eighth Congressional District which I represent, met to form the coalition on airport problems (CAP), to deal with the intolerable situation at Washington National Airport.

This is an important step. The coalition will address the problems of Wash-

ington National from a regional viewpoint, representing the concerns of the entire Washington area. CAP will deal with airline noise, with health and safety problems, with environmental implications, and with the alternative transportation facilities, such as Dulles International Airport and Baltimore-Washington International, available to the Washington area.

I look forward to working with the coalition on airport problems, as we continue our quest for a quieter, safer airport facilities. ●

#### INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCERS

#### HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues in the Senate continue to consider legislation to impose an excise tax on the production of domestic oil, I was encouraged by the Senate's vote on November 27 to exempt independent oil producers from the so-called windfall profit tax. The Senate's decision to exempt the first, 1,000 barrels of oil a day produced by independent drillers is a step in the right direction. The important role independent oil producers play in the production and exploration of our future energy supplies is clearly illustrated by the article in the November 26, 1979, *Forbes* magazine by Howard Rudnitsky and Linda Gasparello. I am having it reprinted at the close of my remarks for any of my colleagues who may not have had an opportunity to read it.

Our aim is to increase our domestic energy production. I hope that we will remember, during the debate that is yet to come in the House on the conference report to this legislation, that any tax we impose on the price difference between controlled and noncontrolled prices will reduce the moneys available to the independent oil producers for additional exploration and drilling.

The article follows:

#### WHAT'S A WINDFALL?

In 1960 the U.S. had 20,000 independent oil operators. Today, there are about 12,000 as a result of relentless attrition in an industry that holds the key to a good deal of future domestic oil and gas production.

Independents (a broad classification covering any operation smaller than the 32 largest U.S. oil companies) accounted for one out of every five barrels of U.S. crude production last year and about 25 percent of its natural gas. But their role in the discovery of new reserves is far greater. Independents drill nearly half of all new U.S. producing oil wells and nearly three-quarters of all new gas wells. Last year they plowed over \$6 billion into exploration, development and production.

In a business where more than eight out of every ten new field exploratory wells are dry holes, megasuccesses like Marvin Davis' are the reason thousands of other wildcaters, who will never own a stately home or a jet, keep trying. The fact that 8,000 left the game in the past two decades indicates that even at that, the business odds as well as the

geologic odds—always slim—are turning against the wildcatter.

Among the independents, the true entrepreneurial wildcatter is a tiny minority. Giant Superior Oil, with several billion dollars in assets, or big companies like Louisiana Land & Exploration and Belridge Oil are classed as independents along with tiny one-man companies and drillers. But many of the biggest oil companies today were wildcaters 50 years ago—among them Getty, Superior, Kerr-McGee and Gulf.

True wildcaters will probably be the hardest hit by a windfall profits tax on oil companies. Exxon—and Davis Oil—have the financial resources to survive. But a good many smaller operators will overextend themselves by borrowing to drill those eight or nine dry holes should too much of the profits of the tenth be legally classed as "windfall." A good many others will get out of the game because those steep odds have become prohibitive instead of merely discouraging. Either way, U.S. oil and gas production will be the real loser. ●

#### MORE ON HIGH MEDICAL COSTS

#### HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recent debate on hospital cost containment brought the broader topic of health care before the Members of Congress. This debate will continue as we deal with the issues surrounding national health insurance. There are several aspects of this debate that I believe we have overlooked. The main point is that until individuals begin to take more responsibility for their own wellness, no amount of Government expenditure will produce a healthier society. This point was made in the following fashion in the August 1979 *Science* magazine:

As the debate over these multibillion dollar plans heat up, the nation risks losing sight of the fact that one of the cheapest and most effective ways to put a cap on spiraling health care costs is through greater self-care.

Another factor in the rising cost of health care, is an inherent defect in the health care system's current financial structure. At the financial base of our hospitals and other health care facilities is a payment system lacking in cost effectiveness. It is a recognized fact that the "cost reimbursement" system, under which most health insurance companies, and Medicare and Medicaid, function, imposes little or no internal restraint on the amount of money spent for services. Knowing that costs are covered, especially by such an affluent guarantor as the public treasury, provides no incentive to use efficient or effective procedures and technology. And, with our system of third party payment neither the individual nor the doctor has reason to economize or control costs.

I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to a recent *New York Times* editorial which aptly summarizes the problems of containing medical expenses and which offers excellent suggestions



for improving the effectiveness of our Nation's health care system.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 21, 1979]

#### STARTING OVER ON HIGH MEDICAL COSTS

Everyone agrees that something has to be done to control exploding medical costs. In two decades, they have gone from 6 cents of every consumer dollars to a dime and from 2 percent to 9 percent of Government spending. But there is little agreement on how costs should be controlled.

President Carter's program to control them by mandate has now been defeated in Congress. Hospital and medical associations fought the plans because they do not like Government controls any more than any other industry. They argue too that voluntary controls have reduced the rate of hospital-cost inflation from 19 percent last year to 13 percent this year. But 13 percent is still above the rate of inflation in every other industry except energy.

Congress's alternative to the Administration plan is weak: more voluntary local action and a national commission to study the problem. But as is evident in New York and other cities, it is no easier to control costs locally than nationally. And considering how many commissions have already studied the question, it's hard to imagine anything the new group can discover. So the country is back where it started.

Historically, bigger spending on health care has led to better health. Life expectancy in the 70's is improving four times as fast as in the previous 15 years. Differences in life expectancy between blacks and whites have been cut by a third; infant mortality is down a fifth. Yet high costs are not an inevitable part of good health. Much greater advances can be made at much less cost if people smoke less, eat more sensibly and exercise more. Indeed, in several other countries much less is spent but life expectancies are longer.

If medical costs take an ever larger fraction of all income, something else—defense, food, pensions, luxury goods—will have to yield.

To limit health-care spending, the United States is probably going to have to shift away from a system in which more than 90 percent of all hospital bills are paid by third parties—neither the patient nor those providing the service. In the existing system, no one has much incentive to control costs. The insured patient wants the best of everything. The doctor, knowing that insurance pays the bills, has little incentive to economize. Insurance agencies, whether public or private, know they can pass along higher costs to faceless customers in the form of higher premiums. Higher health spending should be no surprise.

Ultimately, a different financial structure, such as prepaid medical care, will have to be created to give doctors an incentive to control costs. They alone have the expertise to know what high-quality medical care requires. But they are not going to assume that job under the present system of incentives.●

AN ADDRESS OF HON. ALAN C. SUNDBERG

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is a public service to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD addresses of out-

CXXV—2149—Part 26

standing persons which are of particular significance to the American people. I was privileged to hear such an address from one of the new but outstanding justices of the Supreme Court of Florida, Hon. Alan C. Sundberg, when he spoke before a breakfast of Omicron Delta Kappa at a recent homecoming at Florida State University which, as a member of Omicron Delta Kappa, I was privileged to hear. Justice Sundberg has brought his scholarly observations to bear upon his college life in a way that is stimulating to those who have had their college days and enlightening to those whose college days are still ahead. Hence, I incorporate in the body of the RECORD this notable address by Justice Alan C. Sundberg and commend it to my colleagues and my fellow countrymen:

#### REMARKS OF JUSTICE ALAN C. SUNDBERG

Thank you. I am pleased and deeply honored to be before you this morning. However, to say otherwise than that I am pleased to be here would, of course, break the single bond that binds all platform speakers together. No matter who they are, what they have to say, or how long it takes them to say it, have you ever heard a speaker indicate anything other than: "I am pleased to be here?" Unfortunately, the same bond does not unite the audience. I have been one of you often enough to know that the pleasant emotion of "being here" is not equally shared by the speaker and his listeners. Sometimes that departure comes before the remarks begin, but most often it occurs at the point in the address when the speaker has really finished what he had to say, but did not realize it nearly as well as his listeners. The object, of course, is to see if I can make you as pleased to be here as I am.

I recognize that I have been invited here today because of the office I hold rather than because of any particular personal attraction which I exhibit. As a matter of fact, prior to my appointment to the Supreme Court, the only groups to which I had been invited to speak were my son's cub scout den and the north ward grammar school P.T.A. in St. Petersburg.

Now, however, I am asked to speak authoritatively on all sorts of subjects, which reminds me of a cartoon Sally Roney, Judge Paul Roney's wife, sent to my wife, Barbara, on the day of my investiture to the court. It depicts a guru with a long beard walking along clothed in a toga, carrying a staff. He is followed by a woman similarly dressed who says: "I just can't get over your being a sage, you didn't know beans when I married you!"

Be that as it may, since I am invited to speak, I would like to offer some personal thoughts on my college days and how they have related to my life and profession, and how the university experience in general relates to the development of our society.

First, my time here at F.S.U. upon entering Harvard Law School, we were told that Harvard would teach us how to think like a lawyer. Well, if Harvard taught me to think like a lawyer, Florida State University taught me how to think.

As a callow youth arriving here from a dis-accredited high school in Jacksonville in 1951, I was exposed in the next four years to the likes of (1) Rogers in English; (2) Robers in History; (3) Daisy Parker Flory in Florida Government; (4) Miriam Irish in Constitutional Law; (5) Claude Flory in Literature; (6) Vincent Thursby in Political Theory. These fine, dedicated academicians opened my eyes to a whole world of thought, ideas, and concepts of which I never before imagined. For me it was an extraordinary

and fulfilling experience that has not been duplicated in my life.

But, the four-year college has come under increasing and sometimes vitriolic attack from disparate segments of our society. College is expensive and elitist, they protest, and it esconces impressionable youths in ivory towers far removed from the painful realities of life. Not so, not so. College life, lived to its fullest, is and should be an all-encompassing, excruciating yet exhilarating leap into the infancy of maturity.

The intellectual challenge in college can be formidable. The scholastic force-feeding and rote process of high school education is replaced by a less certain, more independent system of learning. This freer-form process in turn engenders responsibility, discipline and persistence in the successful student. Academic competition pervades the system, sparking otherwise hesitant students to better work. The result, ideally, is a person who possesses the intellectual discipline and analytical acuity to perceive the problems of today and how they relate to the events of the past and the uncertainties of the future.

On the other hand, college is and should be social interaction as well as just plain fun. Few things are more enjoyable than a good hearty fraternity party, nor more agonizing than a bad first date. Yet these experiences, along with the myriad other social opportunities F.S.U. has to offer, are a vital part of life, and they, along with the spiritual and intellectual spheres, should be tasted and savored.

Thus I believe one's college career should be a comprehensive, balanced experience. A time when the fear and angst of adolescence can be tempered and transformed into maturity by the sweet successes and bitter defeats we all inevitably experience throughout life; a time when the energy of infantile curiosity can be harnessed into disciplined experimentation and reasoned analysis; a time when youthful perversity can flower into seasoned wisdom. My college days were the most exciting and invigorating, yet some of the most painful of my life. To my mind, it is this terrible, exhilarating contrast which transforms the halting freshman into the open-eyed and thoughtful graduate.

But to reap the harvest, you must first sow the field. Like anything else, college can be an empty wasteland if one retreats from its challenges. The student must seek involvement in both the academic and social areas of college life. This is equally important, if not more so, in later life. Basic to the democratic process is the free choice by the citizens, the governed who have given their consent, to become involved in the work of the society in meeting its needs. The small step of the individual in becoming involved is the beginning of the process.

One of the most damaging concepts today is that the "government" is some inanimate mechanism in which individual people are not involved. It is an outside force which does something to you, as an individual—or for you, as the case may be—but it is something for which most persons, as individual citizens, seem to feel no responsibility. We forget that every human endeavor is just a bunch of individual people, like you and me, working together. Sending a man to the moon and then getting him back is the finest example of a great achievement that was nothing more than a great many single persons working together, each having, and I sense really feeling, his own importance in the effort. And so it is with government.

Most of us who want to become involved are stopped by the really perplexing question: What can I, as an individual, do? Many people are defeated by the view that their vote does not really count or that their involvement in a cause or activity really will not make enough difference to warrant the effort. The problems are so big and so com-

plex that we feel that nothing we can do at our level can contribute to the solution.

It is up to people such as you to be sure that we not lose sight of the fact that it is "the government we" and not "the government they." We must guard against thinking of the government, whether it be in Washington or Tallahassee, as being "they" rather than "us." The sole justification for the existence of government is for it to serve the people, certainly not for the people to serve it. The only sure way to accomplish this objective is for each of us to "get involved," so that our government truly expresses and serves the goals of the people.

The university campus is a microcosm of the larger community of our state and nation. The involvement one displays on campus is, I suggest, a barometer of the involvement one will later display in those larger communities.

My time here at F.S.U. marked the genesis of a sense of involvement in community affairs which has resulted in the role which I play in the government of Florida today. I had the opportunity to serve as president of my fraternity and of the inter-fraternity council. As a result of that I was tapped for membership in gold key and omicron delta kappa, which led to even greater involvement. Each of these activities was instrumental in nurturing the sense of responsibility and commitment I feel today. This university has always offered a climate for participation in myriad worthwhile activities that can and do make a difference in the lives of those around us.

My point is simply this—personal involvement in our social institutions—whether that be omicron delta kappa, this university, the state of Florida, or this nation—does make a difference, and without the personal involvement and commitment by the individual, the institutions will betray us. But it takes that first step on the part of each of us. The day the constitution of the United States was adopted, Benjamin Franklin, then over eighty years old, was leaving the constitutional convention when an elderly lady stopped him and asked—"what is it to be Dr. Franklin, a monarchy or a republic?"—for even then the people did not know what form of government they would have. To which Franklin responded: "A republic madam, if you can keep it. Not if they can keep it. You and your efforts will save this republic—or no one will."

And so I leave you with this admonition. We owe it to ourselves and our society to imbue our lives with quality. We must not be content with passable work, when we have the potential for far better. We must not be satisfied with one friend, when we have the understanding and compassion for scores. We must not be content to sit idle, when our energies and imagination could help shape the world. And we must not be content to be good, when we could be great. Quality, that's what F.S.U. stands for.

You do me great honor today and I am truly touched by it. But the honor belongs not to me—it belongs to my alma mater F.S.U. Thank you.●

#### NOMINATION OF JOSE CABRANES

### HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the Federal judiciary is gaining the services of an extraordinarily capable individual, well schooled in the law and in government service and corporate administra-

tion. Mr. Jose Cabranes is a constituent of mine, residing in North Haven, Conn., and for the last 4 years he has been the legal counsel and director of government relations at Yale University. Mr. Cabranes has been nominated as U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut, and I am confident that he will be unanimously approved. To better appreciate the unique qualities of the individual and the value of this appointment to the Federal judicial system, I would like to recount some highlights of his distinguished career.

Mr. Cabranes was appointed to the Yale administration in 1975 and has served under three Yale presidents—Kingman Brewster, Jr., Hanna H. Gray, and A. Bartlett Giamatti.

A graduate of the Yale Law School in 1965, he was associate professor of law at Rutgers University from 1971 to 1973 and served as special counsel to the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from 1973 to 1975.

Mr. Cabranes received his A.B. degree from Columbia University in 1961. After receiving his law degree from Yale, he studied at Cambridge University, England, on a Kellett Research Fellowship awarded by Columbia College and received his M. Litt. degree in international law in 1967. At Cambridge he also received a scholarship awarded by the Cambridge University Faculty Board of Law.

He was with the firm of Casey Lane & Mittendorf in New York City from 1967 to 1971 and was engaged in practice before Federal administrative agencies and in general corporate practice. At Rutgers, he taught administrative law, international law, and conflicts of law.

Mr. Cabranes is a director of various not-for-profit institutions, including the International League for Human Rights, the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund (of which he is a founding member and chairman of the board of directors), and Yale-New Haven Hospital, Inc. He was appointed in 1977 by President Carter to serve on the President's Commission on Mental Health. He is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Earlier this year he was named by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the seven-member Civil Rights Reviewing Authority which conducts judicial reviews of appeals under Federal laws prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, sex or handicap.

The author of articles in several American and British law reviews, Mr. Cabranes is the author of a book "Citizenship and the American Empire: Notes on the Legislative History of United States Citizenship for Puerto Ricans," published by the Yale University Press (1979).

Mr. Cabranes was born December 22, 1940, in Mayaguez, P.R., and came with his family to New York in 1946. His father was director of a settlement house in the Bronx and later served as head of the Office of Puerto Rico in New York and as an official in the New York City administrations of Vincent R. Impellitteri and Robert F. Wagner.

He is married to Susan Beth Feibush of New York who is a graduate of Vassar and received a Master of Arts degree in history from Yale. They have two daughters and reside in North Haven, Conn.

As Congressman from the district which encompasses Yale University, it has been my privilege to work closely with Mr. Cabranes in his capacity as the legal counsel and director of governmental relations for the university. I am impressed with his thorough knowledge of the law, his broad range of teaching, administrative and legal experience at various levels of public service, and his calm, deliberative, rational approach to all problems.

I am confident that Mr. Cabranes has the requisite knowledge and the qualities of character and personal temperament to make an outstanding judge. Adding a man of his stature to the Federal bench is an act of public service of which we can all be proud.●

#### MONT PELERIN SOCIETY MEETING IN MADRID

### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in the November 23 issue of National Review, Mr. John Chamberlain reports on the Madrid meeting of the Mont Pelerin Society.

Mr. Chamberlain, one of our country's outstanding champions of the free market, writes—as always—in a most informative and interesting way. Few men have his economic wisdom or his eloquence.

I call his article to my colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

ALL EYES ON BRITAIN

(By John Chamberlain)

MADRID.—The word "liberal" in Spain retains its classic connotations. The modern Spanish liberal, even as his nineteenth century forebears did, believes in the free economy operating in a framework of law, with government limited to preserving the national security. He may be in a distinct minority in his own country, but he keeps his intellectual lines clear and refuses to surrender his nomenclature to interlopers. So it was hardly an anomaly when, in the midst of entertaining some three hundred members and guests of the Mont Pelerin Society at a dinner, the Liberal Club of Madrid invited Nobel Prize-winner Friedrich Hayek, the founder of Mont Pelerin, who for his own part won't be called a conservative, to become the Liberal Club's honorary president. It was like unto like. The title had previously been the exclusive property of the late Salvador de Madariaga, one of Spain's immortal liberal philosophers.

The honor paid to Hayek was an interlude in the September meeting of the Mont Pelerin Society, held in Madrid with a fascinating side excursion to the old university town of Salamanca. Hayek had no semantic difficulties communing with his hosts and



graciously accepting their tribute. It is something of a personal crusade with Hayek to recover the word "liberal" from the collectivists and interventionists who have filched it. The Spaniards who listened in on the Mont Pelerin deliberations could understand Hayek's passion; after all, in Spain, the word "liberal" was first applied to a wholly non-collectivist nineteenth century political grouping. And it came as no news to Spanish scholars that the subjective theory of value commonly associated with Carl Menger and Hayek's own Austrian school of economics had been rather elaborately formulated in the sixteenth century by Dominican and Jesuit professors at the University of Salamanca who believed that the "just price" of medieval ethical concern was nothing more or less than the market price in an uncoerced transaction.

The Mont Pelerin deliberations in Spain followed usual lines for the most part. There were sessions on money ("private good or public good?"), on the law and union power, on the record of state intervention in Europe, on natural law, on government versus private education, on workers' management, on the ethics of competition, and on the economic theory of democracy. The papers were invariably nourishing, but for me the high points of the meeting were the trip to Salamanca and the old walled town of Avila, which took up all of one day, and an impromptu session given over to a discussion of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's chances for rescuing England from the grip of the labor unions and letting the average Briton keep just a little more of the income that, for thirty years, he has not dared call his own.

At Salamanca we sat in an ancient hall and listened to a remarkable paper on "The School of Salamanca" by Marjorie Grice-Hutchinson. As everyone knows, the Industrial Revolution took place in England, bringing an end to mercantilism. Dr. Grice-Hutchinson told us, in effect, that it might have happened in Spain, but didn't. The prerequisites for the revolution were there. The seven-hundred-year effort involved in driving the Moors out of Spain had fostered the qualities of courage, endurance, resourcefulness, and organizing ability, which, as Dr. Grice-Hutchinson pointed out, are not virtues of a rigidly ordered society. The "winds of liberty" blew for a time in the valleys of the Douro and the Tagus; if those winds had been tamer it is unlikely the Spanish cavaliers would ever have overrun most of America.

With the New World conquests went a demand for the products of the mother country—foodstuffs, tools, soap, horses, textiles, wine, and seeds. It was a time for market optimism in all of Spain. The professors at Salamanca were ready with theory that predated Adam Smith by 250 years. As good Christians, the professors had to reckon with the concept of the "just price" and the Church's prohibition of usury, which was defined as the taking of any interest at all on a loan.

One of the Salamanca doctors, Diego de Covarrubias, found his way to the just price by noting, in language that would surely find favor with Murray Rothbard, that "the value of an article does not depend on its essential nature, but on the estimation of men—even if that estimation be foolish. Thus, in the Indies wheat is dearer than in Spain because men esteem it more highly, though the nature of the wheat is the same in both places." Another sixteenth century doctor, Luis Saravia de la Calle, wrote that "If we had to consider labor and risk in order to assess the just price, no merchant would ever suffer loss, nor would abundance or scarcity of goods and money enter into the question . . . the just price is found not

by counting the cost but by the common estimation." Carl Menger and Ludwig von Mises couldn't have said it better.

#### INTERESSE V. USURA

As for interest on loans—the "price of money"—the Spanish doctors arrived at the conclusion that a lender was entitled to be reimbursed for any loss that he had sustained through surrendering the use of his own money for a given time. The lender could legitimately accept compensatory "interesse," as contrasted with illicit "usura." The Church, in time, had to reckon with the Salamanca view.

Why didn't Salamanca theory sustain the growth of a liberal market system in Spain? Court and Church, of course, favored top-down controls, but it was slavery in the colonies more than authoritarian tradition at home that did Spain in. The gold and silver that flooded into Seville, the home port of the American trade, were produced by cheap Indian labor, causing an inflation that soon spread far beyond Andalusia. With gold and silver to spend in ever bigger quantities, it was easier for Spaniards to turn to northern Europe for goods than it was to develop their own industries and train their own apprentices. With less bullion, Spain would have been better off; it would have been forced to trade goods for goods, not for a just price in specie that came without effort.

#### A DEBT TO DRAKE

In a free moment between the Mont Pelerin sessions in Madrid, Ben Rogge showed one of the pictures that have been underwritten by the Liberty Fund of Indianapolis to illustrate good free-market principles. The subject was England as the incubator of the Industrial Revolution. But Rogge's picture missed an irony: it could be argued that England acquired at least a portion of her investment capital—a point that is important to an understanding of her economic development—thanks to the ability of her seamen, Francis Drake and the rest, to pirate the gold of Spain on the high seas.

Dr. Joaquin R. Reig, the Spanish Mont Pelerin member who was responsible for the Madrid meeting, is a businessman whose avocation is translating Ludwig von Mises into Spanish. His aim is to fill the void in Spain that was caused by the failure of the Salamanca school to perpetuate itself. Spain had obviously not done too badly in the last years of Franco the building boom, with its high-rise condominiums along the Costa del Sol and its workers' flats on the fringes of the big cities, had benefited the whole society. Spain is now prepared to enter the European Common Market. But the tradition of autarchy, a holdover from the earlier Franco years, does not die easily.

In one of the Mont Pelerin sessions spent on Spanish problems, Dr. Juergen B. Donges of the Institut für Weltwirtschaft in Kiel, West Germany, called for a "reconsideration" of the direct control of business which Spain's National Industry Institute (INI) exercises in the name of the "national interest." The INI not only presumes to ride herd, in Rexford Tugwell fashion, on new firms, it has taken over failing companies, playing a big part in steel, petroleum refining, and shipbuilding. INI-controlled companies get favorable treatment, which discourages investment in new private firms. Spain doesn't have as big a share of publicly run firms as Britain, but its record for interventionism is fully comparable to what goes on in France and Italy. Dr. Donges advises the Spanish National Industry Institute to divest itself of ownership in such enterprises as "do not require public support any longer for being commercially viable: food processing, textiles, automobiles, chemicals, and even electrical utilities. . . ." He also recommended

more autonomous operation of remaining government industries. "The Italian experience with decentralized decision-making in the public sector," he said, "has much relevance for Spain."

Spain, according to Joaquin Aelig, is ripe for divestiture. The Left, though it is still formidable if Communists and Socialists are lumped together, has lost some of its certainties. Santiago Carrillo, the Secretary of the Communist Party, has officially softened the Communist line by dropping Lenin's name from its programmatic literature. Good Eurocommunists, he says, can no longer maintain that "Leninism is the Marxism of our epoch." Of course, only the useful idiots accept Carrillo as a democrat—he gave himself away when, in response to the taunts of Catalan Reds, he asked a cynical question, "What would Lenin have done?" Lenin, of course, was always willing to indulge in a useful lie.

With the Communists donning sheep's clothing, the Spanish Socialists are split between believers in a distant revolution and those committed to ordinary West European social democracy. So, with the Left wobbling in its aims, the atmosphere could be right for an old-fashioned, classical liberal response to basic economic questions.

There was considerable clamor among the Spanish Mont Pelerin guests to hear more about Margaret Thatcher in England. It struck me, listening in at the session given over to the British chances for a return to a free economy, that the Spaniards had come to exactly the right place. Sitting in the room there happened to be the four people who—luckily for England—had molded Margaret Thatcher's thought: namely, Professor Hayek, Ralph—now Lord—Harris, Antony Fisher, and Arthur Seldon.

#### THATCHER AND THE IEA

Reconstructing the progress of the intellectual movement that has a chance of reviving a free Britain, one recalled that, in 1946, Antony Fisher, then a young man out of the Royal Air Force, had gone to Professor Hayek for advice about entering politics. Hayek, fresh from his success with *The Road to Serfdom*, told Fisher that if he really wanted to have an effect on the future he should turn to the promotion of ideas instead of running for office. Accordingly, when Fisher had accumulated some capital in the chicken business by exploiting loopholes in a controlled economy, he subsidized an organization called the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) which, for a long time, consisted of two dedicated and considerably overworked young men, Ralph Harris and Arthur Seldon. Together, Harris and Seldon slogged away with anti-intervention studies—the Hobart Papers—for some three decades. It was discouraging at times to throw unappreciated words into the Keynesian sea. But Margaret Thatcher read the IEA literature and was convinced.

She has now made Ralph Harris a lord and thanked him publicly for giving the Conservatives a real sense of purpose. Her program for Britain is an IEA program. She has promised to restore incentives by tax cuts and tax switches and by selling off bits and pieces of nationalized industries. The Spaniards at the Mont Pelerin meeting came away with a vivid object lesson in the percolation of ideas. Jeffrey Bell, speaking up for an immediate Jack Kemp tax-cutting program in Britain, twitted Lord Harris and Arthur Seldon on Mrs. Thatcher's failure to begin her regime with across-the-board tax cuts on both the consumption and supply sides of the economic picture. But the Britishers at the Madrid meeting offered a hope that deep sales-tax cuts would accompany income-tax cuts in due time, after the Conservatives had succeeded in returning a few expensive nationalized businesses to private ownership.

Spain, like Britain, has its union problems—the Communists and anarchosyndicalist traditions won't disappear overnight. The Spaniards will be watching Margaret Thatcher's efforts in dealing with what, after all, is Trotskyism in the British unions. The Mont Pelerin meeting in Spain won't affect the issue directly. But the percolation of ideas can't be stopped.

Who knows, it may be that Joaquin Reig, who, like Antony Fisher, has listened to Professor Hayek, will turn out to be the Spanish Lord Harris. In a world in which Marxists are trying to pose as pluralist democrats, anything is possible. ●

## A COMPASSIONATE LOOK AT A THAI REFUGEE CAMP

### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the following letter from a young American attorney living in Bangkok who, along with his wife, is a volunteer in the Thai refugee camp of Sa Kaew. The letter speaks of the Moon's experiences on their first trip to the Sa Kaew camp and gives a vivid picture of the terrible plight of the Cambodian refugees.

Through the words of Thomas Moon, we also see two caring and compassionate people of whom we, as Americans, can be very proud.

The letter follows:

"SA KAEW—ESCAPE FROM GENOCIDE"

Sa Kaew—the name of this Thai city sounds like many others that would appear in a tourist guide book and indeed Sa Kaew is unique. It is sought out by a multitude of travelling people only none of them are tourists; they are refugees. They have arrived by the tens of thousands in emaciated, starving, and diseased conditions fleeing from the attacks of the Khmer Rouge and from the persecution of the Vietnamese. They are trying to escape the cross-fire of the Khmer Serel army and still avoid being shot by the Thai border patrol or by the bandits. So they flee to a refugee camp which three weeks ago was a rice field. This story is about what my wife and I saw and experienced on our first trip to Sa Kaew as volunteers with the U.N. relief program (UNHCR).

Cambodia has historically been a peaceful nation of rice farmers. It was first brought into international focus by the events of the Vietnamese war. The North Vietnamese communists would escape into Cambodia and America's bombers would follow after. Cambodia's then ruling Prince Sihanouk was forced to walk a tightrope. He was overthrown by Lon Nol and he, in turn, by Pol Pot who has yet to be recognized as one of history's most capable butchers and practitioners of mass genocide on a par with Adolf Hitler. It is reported that Nazi Germany destroyed over eight million persons. Pol Pot comes close to equalling this atrocious record, as he has destroyed some four million Khmers (Cambodians). Pol Pot sought to alter the political make-up of Cambodia by eliminating any opposition, real or suspected, present and future. Entire villages were razed; their inhabitants shot or buried alive in mass graves. Any person thought able to read or write or otherwise classified as an 'intellectual' was simply killed.

These atrocities forced the Khmers to flee by the thousands. Less than a year ago,

the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia and they, in turn, under the puppet dictator Heng Samrin, sought to destroy Pol Pot, his army—the Khmer Rouge—and all those who supported him. Again the people of Cambodia suffered. Fleeing Khmer soldiers ransacked and murdered on their path of escape and the new "government" soldiers did likewise. Interspersed between these two elements are the anti-communist fighters—the Khmer Serel. It has all become too much for the native Cambodians who now are abandoning their country en masse. Many have fled by boat (the boat people) and others by land, many of whom eventually reached relief camps such as the one at Sa Kaew.

Sa Kaew is 40 miles from the Cambodian border near the town of Aranyaprathet. Sa Kaew is also the camp that Mrs. Rosalynn Carter visited last week and Senator James Sasser did a few weeks ago. It presently shelters (to one degree or another) some 32,000 inhabitants and another 250,000 are just on the other side of the border, hoping to also be one of the "lucky" ones. Cambodia less than five years ago had a population of about eight million people.

Officials now believe that the number has been reduced by half that. Some 4 million people have been quietly slaughtered in a modern day Dachau, an occurrence which has only recently gotten the attention of the modern world.

At Sa Kaew the mortality rate is about twenty-five people per day and close to 400 have perished since the camp opened. Of the present population, some 5,000 are "hospitalized" with about 1,000 seriously ill. Malaria, malnutrition, dysentery, anemia and pneumonia are the rule, not the exception.

Wanting to help in some way, my wife and I volunteered to assist a U.N. relief team that was aiding the Cambodians massed in a makeshift camp near Sa Kaew. We left Bangkok shortly after sun-up and headed for the Cambodian border. Anxious and eager to help, we rode by automobile for over three hours until we were within sight of the mountain range that separates Southeast Thailand from Cambodia. Less than five miles past a road intersection that is considered the city of Sa Kaew, we found the camp. It was an open field of several acres whose underbrush had been cleared away by bulldozer.

Surrounded by a barbed wire fence and guarded by M-16 carrying soldiers of the Thai army, it was an Asian version of the Nazi Auschwitz. Outside the camp were mounds of relief supplies that immediately signaled an overwhelming need and a channelled response.

The volunteer check-in station was outside the camp and, arriving at that point, we found our way to the U.N. volunteer coordinator. There we were "processed"—our identities and organization checked. We were issued green pieces of ribbon with the word "volunteer" inked in that were to serve as ID cards. This enabled us to freely pass through the guarded main gate throughout the day as we went about our work.

Our first assignment was to unload a large truck of supplies consisting of soap, clothing and medical supplies. After that was done, I was given a box labeled "children's clothing" and told to take it to the orphanage. I left the supply depot and entered the camp proper and into a world of horror. Once inside, the plight of the Khmers became all too real. Walking through the camp with my box of children's clothing, I saw the survivors aimlessly drifting about with that blank empty stare that only comes from starvation. There were not all ages represented in the camp, for during that entire day I only saw one gray-haired person. Dressed uniformly in black, ragged pajamas, they looked ravaged.

The first part of the camp was a "resi-

dence" section where the refugees lived. A typical shelter was formed by stretching string between two sticks and placing a piece of cloth, plastic or whatever they could find over the crown string. This was their "home." Some slept on a reed mat if they were lucky, most on the ground. Row upon row of these shelters covered section after section until an entire field of vision was covered. The effect was numbing, but the worse was yet in store.

Still seeking the orphanage, I made my way to the hospital section where the hospital "tents," medical facilities and orphanages were. There lay the true horror of the results of genocide. When one particularly large tent was pointed out as the main orphanage, I walked over to it and entered. What I saw inside that tent will never be forgotten. My ears heard a French lady telling me where to place the children's clothes, but I could not move or respond.

There were the children whose countless pictures I had seen for months in the newspapers and magazines throughout several countries. But here they were real; here I could hear the labored breathing and the strange hacking coughs. Here I saw the distended stomach flanked by rows of extending ribs.

The swollen bellies were all the more pronounced by the stick-like arms and legs long since void of possessing any muscles or energy. But worst of all were the eyes that simply did not respond. Their eyes told the story of their fatal condition.

I knelt by one child who was lying on a reed mat, his swollen belly flanked by his pencil-thin arms and legs and bent directly over him. He did not respond although my eyes were only a foot away from his. He just laid there gasping for breath with flies running in and out of his nostrils.

My soul shuddered as I realized the child had to be dying. Horrified, I raised up only to notice dozens of other babies on either side of this child in the same condition. As I turned around to leave, I saw rows of other children in the same condition. I left that tent only to see rows of similar tents that I knew only too well what tragedy lay within.

I don't know how long I stood there trying to regain my self when another volunteer came up and asked for help. Only too willingly did I respond. We went to the end of a row of tents where there was an empty space between the last tent and the barbed wire fence which marks the boundary of the camp. The refugees had been relieving themselves in that patch of open ground, as they were too weak to walk to the latrines. We were to cover this spot up with fresh dirt.

The first dump truck of gravel unloaded its contents over the barbed wire fence and I, two fellow Americans, an Englishman and a Frenchman began distributing the gravel. All too soon the stench of that field permeated my nose and feces clung to my shoes.

I realized in my own personal way what the refugees had known all along—there is no relief or escape from the horrors of their lives. Death is not only around them, it stalks them. It was said in the camp that when a person begins to act happy, it is because they are about to die.

This camp was the horror of horrors and I had come to help, which meant that I had to realize this and accept the inevitable. I could help in only a pitiful small way and would not achieve any meaningful change in this environment.

Accepting this realization gave me strength. Only then was I able to put down my shovel from time to time and see and accept the walking corpses and the suffering children.

After this assignment was finished I joined my wife, who was mixing dry soybean milk



with boiled water and giving cupful after cupful to the people. Here I was able to see the shattered Khmers one at a time.

These were the strongest, because they were able to walk and could take care of themselves. But many were afraid of accepting our rations. They lingered back and had to be coaxed to take a cup of milk. I could only visualize the horror of what they must have been through if they were afraid of an unarmed woman giving them milk.

A lady came up to me holding one of the all-too-familiar starving, emaciated, swollen babies. She was crying and talking at the same time. She handed me the baby—a girl—and started rubbing her breasts. I soon understood that her milk was gone and the baby was starving.

I found a plastic baby bottle and filled it with the soybean milk and gave it to the baby. She was unfamiliar with it and would not take it. The baby screaming with the pains of convulsions, I silently prayed that God would let me in this one instance be of some significance, that I could make a difference at least with this starving little girl.

Desperately I plunged my finger into the milk and then let the drops fall into the baby's mouth. I repeated this over and over again until it was apparent that between gasps the baby was getting the milk.

Finally, she accepted the bottle. I then began to rock the baby back and forth.

Having done the same many times with my own son and daughter, I instinctively began humming "Amazing Grace" while rocking her. The child fell asleep and I gave her back to the mother, who grunted in thanks and went about seeking her own food.

Next I was asked to help pitch a tent next to the last hospital tent. The hospital tent held scores of helpless people suffering in real agony. They were dying from many varied and strong malarias. I saw sights that only could be seen in a medical text book.

The hospital tent consisted of a bamboo framework covered by palm thatchings. People lay on reed mats on the ground and were so crowded that only leg room was between them. One man lay covered with a type of sores that I had never seen before. Although his eyeballs were rolled into his head, he wasn't dead, for you could see breathing from beneath his "blanket," of newspapers.

Another woman was in convulsions as volunteers tried to insert an IV. Many people were moaning and vomiting. On the other side of the hospital tent were the latrines, which consisted of a big ditch dug into the ground covered with alternately placed bamboo poles.

Palm nets were erected in front and back to provide privacy. The stench from the latrines and the hospital tent was formidable, but by now my nose had become impervious. Nonetheless, I and another American from Minnesota pitched the tent.

By the door of the erected tent was a stitched-on patch which portrayed two hands clasped in greeting and read "A Gift From The People Of The United States." I looked at that patch with agreement and pride, for Sa Kaew is a living example of American generosity and willingness to assist those that cannot fend for themselves.

History has shown that Americans have repeatedly given of themselves and their fortunes to assist whoever needed their help while asking for nothing in return.

One of the lady volunteers who had asked for the erection of the tent came by and expressed her thanks for our efforts. I asked for what purpose the tent was to be used. About the time her response hit any ears, my eyes saw another lady with a much more vivid answer to my question. She was carrying a dead baby.

The tent was to be used as a temporary shelter for dead babies. The sun had taken its toll on me and the camp had had its effect,

but the dead child was too much. There was no sense of fairness, or of right or wrong—only that which was. Various people had sought to eliminate the Cambodian race and this was the result of their efforts. I thought of my previous life in Nashville. I was ashamed of how excessive and opulently I and so many others had lived. This camp had become much more to me and my wife than pictures in a magazine or stories in a newspaper.

On the way home that evening, one of the volunteers in the car related the story of a nine-year-old girl they had found at the entrance gate that morning. How she had managed to cross the mountain range that marks the border was a mystery. She was brought to the processing tent where she was preliminarily diagnosed by the doctors as having tuberculosis and pneumonia. She was then sent to a holding tent to wait for space in the overcrowded hospital. Space is usually provided by the death of another patient. She did not have to wait long, our friend related. She had a space by noon and her space was again available by that evening.

We were a quiet bunch as we rode back to Bangkok that evening. I stared out of the car window and watched the Thai countryside pass by. Reflecting on all that had happened in what was the first of many visits to Sa Kaew, I realized that nobody could work in these camps and not be changed by the experience, Nashville and the person I used to be both seemed very distant as darkness came upon us that night.●

#### MASSACHUSETTS COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would create a stamp commemorating the 200th anniversary of the drafting of the Massachusetts constitution. Few people realize the importance of this event in the shaping of our Government and our history, and I would hope that this stamp could be used as a means to inform the people of this Nation. Such action is by no means exceptional, for it has been the practice of the Postal Service to issue stamps recognizing historic national events. I think this event is worthy of such recognition.

The constitution itself was written by John Adams in the city of Quincy, Mass., 200 years ago this month, making it the oldest surviving constitution in the world next to England's Magna Carta. From this document came the precepts upon which our Founding Fathers based the Constitution of the United States. In fact, many historians regard the formation of the Massachusetts constitution as the single most important aspect of the American Revolution.

John Adams recognized the problems of British imperial rule and also foresaw the troubles the new government would experience. These governments either had too much or too little central government, distorting the balance of political power between the various branches of government. Adams created, as a result, a document which restored the political balance of the government

while guaranteeing the people of Massachusetts reasonable and fair treatment.

These fundamentals lent themselves very well to the broader spectrum of the entire country so, in 1787, when the government failed under the Articles of Confederation, an alternative was needed. The men in Philadelphia looked to Adams constitution and used it as their model. Therefore, when we in Massachusetts celebrate the 200th anniversary of the drafting of this document, we are, in fact, celebrating the beginning of our country's moral and political commitment to democracy. Perhaps Adams himself summed it up best:

I made a constitution for Massachusetts which finally made the Constitution of the United States.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues to support the issuance of this stamp and to formally recognize one of America's greatest documents.

H.R. —

An act to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the 200th Anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of Massachusetts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General shall issue a special postage stamp in honor of the 200th Anniversary of the drafting of the Massachusetts Constitution which is the oldest written constitution still in force today. Such stamp shall be of such design and denomination, and shall be issued and sold for such period as the Postmaster General shall determine.●

MAYOR ALLAN R. MILLS

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a fine public servant, Allan R. Mills, who has been an outstanding mayor of Olmsted Falls, Ohio, which is in my district.

Mayor Mills is typical of the thousands of dedicated officials who have donated countless hours to a job which carried no promise of reward except the satisfaction of public service.

Allan R. Mills first ran for elective office in 1967. In this initial bid for the mayor's chair in the village of Westview, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, he was successful.

The first years of his administration were marked by improvement in service levels and a desire to merge his community with the village of Olmsted Falls and Olmsted Township. While township residents rejected such actions, a special election in May 1970 approved the merger of the two villages now known as the city of Olmsted Falls. In an unprecedented move Mayor Mills of Westview (the annexing community) stepped down and submitted himself to a special election to allow the now combined electorate to elect a mayor to head the new city. In a three-man race, he bested his

opponents by a 2-to-1 vote margin. He has been mayor since that time, continuing to improve services to his people, and seeing through a charter issue that gave home rule to his community.

A part-time mayor, he left the insurance business in 1975 to become the appointed executive secretary to the Cuyahoga County Mayors and City Managers Association representing the combined interest of 56 cities and villages in Cuyahoga County. In 1977 the Council of Governments that formed the Regional Income Tax Agency (RITA) elected him its treasurer. He holds both posts to this day.

After 12 years as mayor, he chose not to run again this past election.

During those years Mayor Mills sought to deeply involve himself in his home county and now serves on 20 boards and commissions that span a multitude of activities and interests encompassing all levels of government and human services.

He has honorably served his country twice in his lifetime, the last with the U.S. Army in the Korean war.

Olmsted Falls will surely miss Mayor Mills' leadership, but will reap the benefits of his administration for years to come. ●

#### BALANCE OF PAYMENTS IMPROVEMENT

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at a time when nearly all news seems to be bad, some good news about the U.S. economy has been largely overlooked. This is the tremendous improvement in our balance of trade, apart from oil, and a corresponding improvement in our balance of payments. The most meaningful measure of the balance of payments, the current account, will show only a very small deficit this year and is likely to be in surplus next year—despite an oil import bill that now exceeds \$60 billion a year. Not only has our nonoil trade balance improved dramatically, but also we are beginning to receive a major payoff in the "services" accounts from the earnings from all the overseas investments made by our corporations in the past several decades.

Judging from the nonoil trade figures, our competitiveness in the world may not be so bad after all. Our exports, farm and nonfarm, have been doing exceedingly well. Partly, of course, this reflects the lower exchange rate of the dollar that developed early in this decade, though in the past few years the dollar has been stable or rising against the currencies of the other industrial countries taken as a group.

A good summary of the recent improvement in the U.S. international accounts was contained in a speech delivered by C. Fred Bergsten, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, before the Boston World Affairs

Council on November 13. I am inserting the relevant portion of the address so that my colleagues may be aware of this heartening development.

The address follows:

Our current account deficit during the first half of this year was only \$1 billion. For the year as a whole, it is expected to run a few billion dollars at most. In 1980, we expect the United States to be in fairly substantial current account surplus, assuming oil prices rise no more than prices of other goods. Indeed, we expect the United States to have by far the largest current account surplus outside the OPEC group.

The improved U.S. performance derives from two key developments. First, the trade deficit in the first three quarters of 1979 is running at a \$6 billion annual rate below the \$34 billion deficit in 1978 despite the rise of \$16 billion in oil imports. Our non-oil trade balance has, in fact, improved by a whopping \$44 billion annual rate over the past six quarters.

In the year through September, the volume of non-agricultural exports is estimated to be more than 20 percent higher than the same period in 1978. At the same time, the volume of non-oil imports rose by only about 2 percent. Since the volume of world trade as a whole has been growing by 5-6 percent, it is apparent that both our exports and import-competing industries have made major gains in market share. The lagged effects of competitive gains from past exchange rate changes, and shifts in relative growth rates, have produced this substantial improvement in the competitive position of the United States. In 1980, these factors will produce continued improvement in our overall trade balance even though oil import costs will rise another \$10 billion or so, even on the basis of current prices.

Second, the United States surplus on services transactions is also growing rapidly. It is presently running about \$7 billion higher than the \$20 billion surplus achieved in 1978. Receipts from U.S. direct investment abroad have been especially strong, reflecting the improved profitability of foreign operations as growth overseas picked up and the translation effects of past exchange rate movements. In 1980, further gains in this area should result in an even larger services surplus.

It is worth noting that, at the present level of our services surplus, the United States can run a merchandise trade deficit of almost \$30 billion and still be in surplus on current account—the best single indicator of a country's international economic position. And our services surplus continues to rise rapidly each year. The structure of our current account is thus very different from that of Japan and Germany, each of which runs a sizable services deficit and thus must run a sizable surplus on merchandise trade to achieve overall current account balance. ●

#### COKE . . . ON THE ROCKS

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, America's coke industry, so vital to steel production, is on shaky ground despite the fact the United States sits atop vast reserves of coal. Steel industry experts see a growing dependence on foreign coke suppliers at a time when world demand for steel

will be on the rise. If that prediction holds true, the domestic steel industry is headed for a rocky road.

According to a study by Fordham University, the United States must, if it is to meet the challenge of the mid-1980's, increase its coke production by 5 million tons in the next 5 years. If it does not, it will be forced to buy imported coke and there is a serious question if foreign sources could be counted on to meet our needs in the face of a heavy demand for steel worldwide.

Furthermore, the failure to increase domestic coke production inevitably means a decline in domestic steel production. If the United States is unable to meet its steel needs it will have to open the doors for increased importation of steel products as well as coke, experts warn.

Viewed from an economic standpoint such a development is most alarming when it is realized increased coke imports mean fewer jobs for American coke workers and coal miners. For example, the 1978 slump in coke production, accompanied by a record 5.7 million tons of coke imports, was translated into the loss of 9,000 jobs.

Major obstacles standing in the way of increasing U.S. coke capacity—as well as increased steel production through the construction of new "green field" plants or the expansion of existing facilities—can be traced to a lack of capital and an abundance of Federal environmental regulation which, some experts contend, are too stringent and too expensive.

The Fordham study is being given close scrutiny by the Congressional Steel Caucus. The caucus is well aware the Nation cannot allow itself to become dependent on foreign suppliers of coke and steel as it has on oil. As chairman of the House Steel Caucus, I assure you developments involving coke production, domestic as well as worldwide, will be strictly monitored in the months to come. ●

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO COUNCIL 4361 OF THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

### HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor for me to come before the U.S. House of Representatives, but it is even a greater privilege to do so on this occasion. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an honor which has been bestowed upon one of Ohio's 18th Congressional District's most outstanding organizations, the Msgr. Joseph F. Dooley Council No. 4361 of the Knights of Columbus, located in Mingo Junction, Ohio.

This council was honored at this year's Knights of Columbus State convention for their outstanding accomplishments during the council year 1978-79. Council 4361 was the No. 1 council in division 4, which classifies the councils according to size. Each year this group donates



much of their time and efforts to helping those people in the community who are less fortunate than most. This year the theme for their endeavor was "Helping Hands." To accomplish the beneficial goals of their program, several activity committees were established. Those committees, and their chairman of each, are as follows:

Community activities, Thomas G. Sabatino; family life, John J. Bradley; church activities, Joseph Pulice; council activities, Robert Parmenter; fraternal activities, Lawrence Bell; youth activities, Frank Leeper; pro-life, Edward Karabaic; public relations, Daniel Marzeale; and membership director, Richard Harrick.

I would also like to point out that Daniel A. Sabatino and Stephen Gaydos were recognized for their outstanding participation in church, community, youth, and council activities. These men truly deserve our congratulations.

It is obvious that Council 4361 members are a group of dedicated individuals who believe in a cause and are rewarded by the help they provide to others. Along these lines, I would like to point out one other fact. During the 1978-1979 year, Council 4361 contributed over \$19,000 to schools and youth programs in the Mingo Junction area.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly remarkable, and each and every member of Msgr. Joseph F. Dooley Council No. 4361 deserves the warm thanks of many. On this occasion I would like to extend my sincere congratulations on a very successful year and best wishes for an equally successful year to come.●

**FAA'S PALMDALE, CALIF., FACILITY  
TO BE COMMENDED AND CONGRATULATED**

**HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join me in commending and congratulating the Federal Aviation Administration's Palmdale, Calif., facility for its outstanding accomplishments in the area of energy conservation. It is not often that one hears of a Federal Government agency actively involved in trying to cut its operating costs, but in this case I can compliment the FAA's Palmdale facility for saving both energy and money.

The Southern California Gas Co., the Nation's largest natural gas utility, has presented its Commercial Concern Award for good energy management to the FAA Palmdale facility. To qualify for the award, the Palmdale facility reduced its consumption of natural gas in 1978 by 35.4 percent, a savings of nearly 5 million cubic feet of gas—enough gas to serve over 645 average southern California homes for a month. The reduction amounts to a savings of more than \$12,300 on the facility's annual gas bill.

Figures for the first 9 months of 1979 indicate that this year's savings will be much greater than those achieved in 1978. Southern California is projecting that the Palmdale facility will be able to save nearly 6 million cubic feet of gas in 1979—a savings to the taxpayer of almost \$15,000.

These savings are the direct result of an aggressive energy management program developed by the Palmdale facility's environment support unit. The program includes improved operating procedures, adjustment of equipment to operating procedures, adjustment of equipment to operate at peak efficiency, lowering heating water temperatures to 150° F., setting cooling thermostats at 78° and lowering domestic hot water temperatures to 105°.

Special congratulations are in order for one of the members of the Environmental Support Unit. The most significant savings were achieved through ideas and methods developed by FAA environmental technician Jan Svalbe for setting temperature differentials on equipment and for comfort heating and cooling. Mr. Svalbe successfully readjusted automatic control mechanisms to accommodate significantly lower temperature ranges.

According to the FAA, further efforts will be made to reduce energy consumption. Palmdale facility employees have been asked to help find other ways to conserve energy and help the FAA lower its utility bills.

Again, I congratulate all the employees at the FAA's Palmdale facility on their very effective energy-savings program, and I urge others both within the Government and in private homes and businesses to follow this fine example.●

**THE SOVIETS GO DEEPER INTO  
AFGHANISTAN**

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago I placed in the RECORD various news articles dealing with the Soviet Union's growing dominance in Afghanistan. Some say that the Soviet troops in that country are going to lead the Soviet Union into its own "Vietnam" in which more and more troops get sucked into a war they cannot win against local insurgents. Others say that, gradually, the Soviet Union is moving to all but annex Afghanistan so that Soviet influence can penetrate closer and closer to the Persian Gulf area.

Now it is reported the Soviets have sent troops into action in Afghanistan. But with considerable shrewdness, the Soviet leaders have sent only Tajik and Uzbek troops to fight. This means that for the most part the troops will be roughly of the same ethnic and religious background as the Afghanists.

Perhaps Afghanistan will be a Soviet version of Vietnam. But I think we should not hope this will be the case. It

could well be that within months we will be faced with a Soviet threat poised on Iran's eastern border, waiting for the lunacy of the Ayatollah Khomeini to run its inevitable course into political and social chaos. Iran will be ripe for the plucking.

It might be argued that the Soviet Union already shares a border with Iran and has shown no signs of attacking across the Soviet/Iranian border. Yes, this is true. But why should the Soviets do that when, after Afghanistan is in their pocket, they can send "volunteers" of the new Afghanistan Government across the Afghanistan/Iran border in order to go "to the aid" of the "Iranian revolution." If Soviet Uzbek troops just happen to be among those volunteers and if Soviet officers direct the "fraternal aid" of the Afghanistan people, who will complain? The United States? The United Nation?

What are we doing to help the Afghan anti-Soviet rebels? Nothing, of course. To help them would be naughty.

At this time I wish to insert in the RECORD, a wire service story from the Chicago Sun Times, November 29, 1979.

Soviet combat troops have gone into action alongside Afghan forces in a major offensive against rebel-held territory in central Afghanistan, a report received in New Delhi from the landlocked Asian country said. Groups of Tajik and Uzbek soldiers, members of the Soviet army from the Central Asian Soviet republics just north of the Afghan border, were involved in the recently mounted government offensive, said the delayed report received Wednesday from the capital, Kabul. Moslem insurgents are waging a "holy war" against President Hafizullah Amin's pro-Soviet regime.●

**A WOMAN IN THE U.S. SUPREME  
COURT**

**HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR**  
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, I rose on the floor to urge my colleagues to join me in a letter to the President urging the appointment of a woman to the Supreme Court.

I have been pleased by the response. I am delighted to report that 46 House Members have joined me in that letter.

The appointment of a woman to the Court will strike a major blow for equality under the law. With a determined effort to secure that appointment, we will achieve our goal.

I would like to include in the RECORD the text of our letter and the names of those who signed with me.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have shown your commitment to increasing the number of women appointed to Federal office, including the Federal Judiciary. You have surpassed the record of your predecessors in the appointment of women.

A vacancy on the Supreme Court would offer you a tremendous opportunity to strike a dramatic blow for equality under the law. The appointment of a woman to the Court would enhance the Court and end the im-

pled and regrettable discrimination against women in Federal judicial appointments.

Appointments to the Supreme Court have never been made without reference to current political and social reality. The Court does not operate in a vacuum; appointments are not made in a vacuum. The appointments of Louis Brandeis and Thurgood Marshall are tremendous milestones in the history of the Court. In making those appointments, Presidents Wilson and Johnson did not have to compromise standards because there were few Jewish or black judges of prominence at the time. The same would be true of the appointment of a woman today. There are many qualified women Federal and State judges, practicing attorneys and law professors whose record of achievement would sustain the judicial caliber of the Court.

We in the House will not vote on any appointment you make; we can, however, offer our recommendations for those appointments. We can also assure you that the appointment of a woman to the Court would be hailed by our constituents as a major step for equality in this country.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

James L. Oberstar, M.C., Elizabeth Holtzman, M.C., Patricia Schroeder, M.C., Marilyn Bouquard, M.C., Millicent Fenwick, M.C., Anthony C. Bellensohn, M.C., Ted Weiss, M.C., Martin Olav Sabo, M.C., George Miller, M.C., John B. Anderson, M.C., Bob Carr, M.C., Don Edwards, M.C., James M. Jeffords, M.C., Dan Glickman, M.C., William H. Gray, III, M.C., Edward J. Markey, M.C., Richard Nolan, M.C., Robert A. Roe, M.C., Bennett M. Stewart, M.C., Bruce F. Vento, M.C., Jim Weaver, M.C., Berkley Bedell, M.C., Charles F. Dougherty, M.C., Frederick W. Richmond, M.C.

Barbara A. Mikulski, M.C., Mary Rose Oakar, M.C., Marjorie S. Holt, M.C., Margaret M. Heckler, M.C., Lindy Boggs, M.C., Frank J. Guarini, M.C., Vic Fazio, M.C., Alvin Baldus, M.C., Melvin H. Evans, M.C., George E. Brown, Jr., M.C., Thomas A. Daschle, M.C., Martin Frost, M.C., Ray Kogovsek, M.C., John J. LaFalce, M.C., Robert Garcia, M.C., Romano L. Mazzoli, M.C., Nick Joe Rahall II, M.C., James H. Scheuer, M.C., Morris K. Udall, M.C., Harold L. Volkmer, M.C., Howard Wolpe, M.C., Jonathan B. Bingham, M.C., Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., M.C.

## HOME HEATING FUEL CRISIS, PART X\*

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again take up an issue that has a bearing all across the Nation, namely, the energy crisis.

Some believe that since we have lifted the odd-even plan on the purchase of gasoline, and now that the major oil companies are providing the independent dealers with home heating fuel—that all

\*Part X is part of a series of reports on the home heating fuel crisis with Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 appearing in the Congressional Record on 9-17-79, 9-22, 9-29, 10-11, 10-19, 10-26, 11-9, and 11-16, respectively.

is well and that we can go ahead and drop our guard against any spot shortages or widespread emergencies. That is precisely what we did immediately after the last oil crisis in 1973.

Considering the sensitive leverage that foreign countries, such as Iran could and do use against us during times of conflict, and considering the wildly fluctuating market, we must adopt an attitude that we are not secure until such time when we have successfully ridden ourselves of the foreign oil yoke. To be able to do this is the greatest single challenge of the century to our Nation. It is a task that will require the cooperation of every American citizen and most certainly the united efforts of our industrial sector. While there are many American citizens who sense this challenge and are ready to rally behind a rational energy policy, including stringent conservation, unfortunately there are far too many businesses that still put self-interest above this crucial national concern. I have noted in prior statements in the Record, the degree with which oil companies are opposed to the windfall profit tax, price controls, and any other form of legislation that might interfere or regulate their domination and profits.

Now that we have stockpiled enough home heating fuel supplies to hopefully last us through this winter, and now that the independent dealers have been given relatively fair contracts and shipments, we must not stop our vigil against potential problems. I say this for various reasons: First, the refining capacity in this country has not been improved to the extent that it should be in order to accommodate the needs and distribution patterns of our industry and public sector. Not a single new refinery has been constructed in the United States since 1973. Second, we have not approved any legislation that will impose price controls on a product that could shoot up with the first sign of a shortage. Third, we have not negotiated any additional foreign oil supplies with countries that are on friendlier terms with the United States. As a result of these considerations—which by no means encompass all the problems on the energy issue, but do pose a daily threat—we would be foolhardy not to anticipate future spot shortages, price hikes, and oil blackmail. Our present situation should underscore that we are in an oil crisis.

I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this momentary flow of oil supply—at a time when we are not as critically threatened as we were a few months ago—to reflect on these points in order to try to put the problem into its proper context, and mindful that it demands constant vigil and forethought.

And I urge my colleagues to take advantage of this lull before the storm to move expeditiously in adopting the critical energy measures still lingering before Congress: The proposed Energy Mobilization Board, refinery incentives program, synfuels, and the windfall profit tax—All crucial issues that demand immediate attention if we are to come up with a comprehensive energy policy.●

## PRESIDENT CARTER PROCLAIMS DECEMBER 1979 "NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH"

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a proclamation signed by President Carter last week which proclaimed December 1979 "National Child Abuse Prevention Month." This proclamation has its origins in a resolution which I introduced on October 23, 1979, with the full and enthusiastic support of Speaker O'Neill. This resolution, House Joint Resolution 428, which I introduced reminds us that today, child abuse and neglect remains a very serious problem in this society. As the sponsor of one of the original child abuse prevention bills when I first came to Congress, I have maintained my commitment to working to alleviate this problem.

Today, more than 1 million children a year are victims of child abuse and neglect. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1975 has yet to fulfill its intent as the cornerstone of a Federal policy to combat this menacing problem. In this last month of the International Year of the Child, it is most appropriate that we realize that we must all bear the responsibility to insure that the Nation's most precious natural resource, our children, have the opportunity to grow up in loving and healthy surroundings.

I wish to insert for the RECORD a copy of my resolution and proclamation 4704 of the President which designates National Child Abuse Prevention Month.

H.J. RES. 428

Whereas each year in the United States one million children are victims of child abuse and neglect, including three thousand who die; and

Whereas the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1975 has yet to fulfill its mandate of being the cornerstone of a United States policy for child abuse prevention and treatment; and

Whereas a dedicated core of organizations and individuals (including the National Alliance for the Prevention of Child Abuse; the New York Foundling Hospital and its director, Dr. Vincent Fontana; Children's Village; and the National Center for the Prevention of Child Abuse and its Director, C. Henry Kempe, doctor of medicine) are leaders in the effort to focus greater attention on and resources into the movement to combat child abuse and neglect; and

Whereas the month of December 1979 is the final month in the observance of the International Year of the Child: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That December 1979 is designated as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

## A PROCLAMATION

America's children are our most precious resource, and in this final month of the In-



ternational Year of the Child I urge all Americans to consider what they can do to prevent child abuse and neglect.

The needs of children are best met in families where provisions can be made for the special needs and limitations of all family members. Even loving parents sometimes fail to provide adequate supervision, or find themselves in situations where needs are not met or emotions are difficult to control.

I urge communities and helping organizations to work with families to alleviate conditions that result in the abuse and neglect of children. I especially urge all those who feel unable to cope with problems to seek out help.

Our Nation's children are our Nation's future. We all share in the responsibility for making sure they grow up in a healthful environment. I appeal to public agencies, private organizations and the business community to support needed social, educational and health services in their communities to strengthen families during the critical child-rearing years.

Working together, with sensitivity and concern, we can reduce the incidence and lifelong damage of child abuse.

Now, therefore, I, Jimmy Carter, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of December, 1979, as National Child Abuse Prevention Month.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-sixth day of November, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fourth.

JIMMY CARTER.●

#### TURKEY DAY

**HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to my colleagues' attention the editorial entitled "Turkey Day? For the Birds" which appeared in the Thursday, November 22, Record Searchlight, Redding, Calif. The observations and comments which appear in this editorial are ones we all should give serious consideration:

#### TURKEY DAY? FOR THE BIRDS

The sign in the gas station proclaimed the hours that fuel was available.

Added in crayon below was the following: "Closed Thursday—Turkey Day!!"

Tuesday's mail brought a letter from a representative of a news syndicate, who closed with this wish: "Hope you have a happy Turkey Day!!" On Wednesday, a caller wished us, "Happy Turkey Day."

Turkey Day: It ranks right up there with National Pickle Week. If it really is Turkey Day, what's its purpose? To honor turkeys? Chances are the birds would just as soon forego the tribute.

In truth, "Turkey Day" is just one more example of a growing carelessness with words. Today is no more Turkey Day than Christmas is Xmas.

Today is Thanksgiving Day—a national observance unique to the world, which has its roots in an event that occurred more than three centuries ago in New England.

The story of the Pilgrims is a familiar and important one—the Buchwald version appearing at the top of this page notwithstanding.

And there are two things about that first day of thanksgiving that especially need to

be remembered. The first has to do with the very nature of the thanks that were given so long ago.

Thanks were given not so much for the abundance of a harvest, or for a gentle land of milk and honey, but for survival itself. Thanks were not given because all the celebrants had much more than they could ever hope to use, but because—for the first time since these Puritan refugees had fled Europe—there were sufficient food and supplies to sustain and nurture lives.

So far as we know, the celebration wasn't held so the settlers could congratulate each other. Thanks weren't given for the diligence of those who had planted the seeds, the culinary skills of those who prepared the meal, for the luck of those in good health, or to the dirt or the sun.

Thanks were given to God—for reasons that were obvious at least to those who gathered at the feast table.

The second thing to remember has to do with the feast itself.

For the feast wasn't simply a way of saying thanks, or an excuse to stuff oneself to the earlobes; it was just as much an experience of sharing.

And that sharing was not merely in the abundance of the land, but in the very life experience itself. Perhaps that's why Thanksgiving has been a time for the gathering of family and friends—not simply to indulge in a meal, but to share in each other and to share with each other our abundance.

Turkey Day? Perhaps some other day, but not today. Today is a day to give thanks—and to give thanks to God. It is also a day to remember that, even as we have far more than we can ever hope to use, untold millions have far less than they need—simply to survive.

And it's a day to remember that even as it's our pleasure to share our blessings with those who have been similarly blessed, it is also our charge to share those blessings with those for whom the simple act of survival is a struggle against odds that seem utterly overwhelming.●

#### EXCALIBUR AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

**HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, as a lifelong resident of the Capital area where the Federal Establishment is headquartered, and where the largest concentration of Federal Government civilian and military employees live and work, I have always been sensitive to the mood of the country with respect to the Government service and personnel. Thus, I have observed with concern the unfavorable trend in public confidence in governmental institutions and the progressive lowering of the esteem in which public servants are held. This trend, in my opinion, is largely due to the mass of unwarranted criticism emanating from an ill-informed but vociferous minority. This minority paints the entire Government with a broad brush and depicts the bureaucracy as a group of lazy, inefficient individuals. And yet, during the short time that I have served in Congress, my travels and contacts have confirmed and even strengthened my con-

viction that most of this criticism is baseless, and that the overwhelming majority of Federal employees are dedicated, hard-working, and intelligent public servants. They make every effort to do their share in solving pressing national problems, advancing the quality of Government services to the public, and improving the cost-effectiveness of governmental programs.

I think it is time that the public be made aware of these and other positive aspects of Government service and learn of the many examples of outstanding performance, unique achievements, and efforts beyond the call of duty by Federal personnel. As a Congressman representing a district in the Capital area in which thousands of Federal employees live, I feel a special obligation to make an effort in this direction.

It has occurred to me that one way of doing this would be to offer, periodically, an award to a Federal Government employee who exemplifies some of the most desirable qualities of a public servant or outstanding achievement in service to the public. The citation which I am initiating is to be known as the Excalibur Award. All Federal civilian and military employees are eligible for the award. Nominations are invited on a continuing basis from heads and other officials of Federal departments and agencies, from other organizations and from the general public. From such nominations, final selections are made by an independent panel of seven distinguished citizens, some of them from the private sector and none connected with the executive branch of the Government. The current chairman of this committee is Mr. Harry McPherson, attorney and former White House Counsel to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Since May, when the idea for this award was introduced to Federal agencies, I have received some 150 nominations. My staff has carefully reviewed each proposal, secured additional information where needed, and consulted with knowledgeable individuals, inside and outside the Government, to obtain supplementary independent evaluations.

From these submissions, the above-mentioned selection committee has now chosen, as the recipient of the first Excalibur Award, Mr. Frank J. Nola, a 49-year-old aerospace engineer at NASA's George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala. Following graduation from the University of Miami, employment in high technology industry and the U.S. Army Ballistic Missile Agency (Redstone Arsenal), Mr. Nola joined NASA at the Marshall Space Flight Center in 1962.

He has specialized in the development of electronic control systems for the guidance and stabilization of spacecraft. He holds nine patents on electronic control systems of motors and tachometers. In the course of this work with NASA, Mr. Nola invented and perfected the device which has qualified him for the Excalibur Award. It is a relatively simple and inexpensive power control mechanism, designed to reduce greatly the amount of power consumed by electric motors in industrial and domestic use.

Experts are satisfied that the machine has tremendous potential and could save upward of 30 percent of the power used by an electric motor. The viability and current practicability of the model are attested by the fact that NASA has already licensed over 30 companies to manufacture it, and is processing many additional applications. Several licensees are already producing and marketing this device. They are enthusiastic about the effectiveness and market potential of the Nola design and regard it as, by far, the best and least expensive of the many devices which have been designed for the purpose of power economy in electric motors.

With the problem of the present scarcity of energy and the gloomy outlook on all our minds, this unique method of effective energy-saving strikes me as a particularly significant and timely development. Hence, I heartily agree with the choice of my selection committee for this first Excalibur Award.●

#### GENERICIDE

### HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice, of which I am the ranking minority member, recently held 2 days of hearings on the issue of involuntary cancellation of registered trademarks on the ground that such trademarks have become commonly used names for a variety of articles or substances. This ground for invalidating trademarks is commonly referred to as "genericide" and has been the subject of substantial concern recently because of actions by the Federal Trade Commission to expand its activities in this area.

One of the most informative statements made on this subject during the course of our hearings was that of my good friend and colleague, ANDY MAGUIRE. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to take this opportunity to insert a summary of Congressman MAGUIRE's testimony in the RECORD at this time:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ANDREW MAGUIRE ON H.R. 3685 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COURTS, CIVIL LIBERTIES AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Thank you Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee for both holding hearings on H.R. 3685 and for inviting me to testify on behalf of my legislation this morning. As some of you may know, my principal area of expertise is in the health field. But I think all of us are under a special obligation, during this session of what has been dubbed "the Oversight Congress," to participate in another look at every aspect of our regulatory structure. Where we can dispense with an unnecessary layer of legal bureaucracy for the benefit of citizens as taxpayers, without working to the detriment of those same citizens as consumers, we should do so.

I became interested in this issue after

reading two letters from constituents in my district which complained about a generic trademark action launched by the Federal Trade Commission. Using its authority under Section 14(c) of the Lanham Act of 1946, the Commission petitioned the Commissioner of Patents to remove FORMICA from the register of trademarks on the sole ground that it had become generic. The corporation had been accused of no wrongdoing. No competitor had challenged the trademark nor had any complained that the FORMICA trademark represented an unfair exploitation of a generic term. No monopolistic practices had been alleged, nor had any customers complained of any confusion in the marketplace. Nevertheless, the Commission maintained that it was per se in the public interest to revoke the trademark on the basis that it had degenerated into common usage.

Moreover, the Commission made it clear that it intended to use generic trademark actions on an ongoing basis and that the FORMICA episode was an experiment that would be repeated. Since May, 1978, when the Commission started its famous action against FORMICA, the case has been described in several forums as a reusable, "innovative remedy." This is how it was described in the Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for 1978. Chairman Pertschuk in a January, 1979, interview in the Village Voice Newspaper, stated that he was going to rely on innovative remedies—like the action against FORMICA—because the scenario of Court Action, Consent Decree, and further monopolization, ad infinitum, is unproductive with respect to his agency fulfilling its role as the procompetitive arm of the Federal government.

While I have the most profound respect for Chairman Pertschuk, I find the Commission's intention to use its cancellation powers in this manner troubling. I believe that the record shows that the market is quite capable of promoting generic trademark actions without undue government interference. I believe that the record shows, in the Commission's first usage of this power, that the Commission is using inexact tools for gauging when a generic trademark action is appropriate, and that it is using the wrong legal tool, the Lanham Act, to promote a restructuring of the laminate market. I believe, in the absence of any indications of anti-competitive behavior in the market, that the government should refrain from playing the role of advocate and return to the role of arbiter, judging cases brought by competitors against registrants. Finally, I believe that the role of the government can be limited without degrading the common law distinction between the terms generic and trademark, and this is the intent of my legislation. . . .

Trademark law has always provided a mechanism for competitors who, at their own risk, expended the resources and hired the lawyers to confront a registrant. The casebooks are filled with examples. Notable are the entry of words like aspirin, cellophane, zipper, thermos, linoleum, mimeograph, yo-yo, safari, shredded wheat, lanolin, celluloid, and dry ice into the realm of everyday use. Time after time, when a trademark becomes generic, legitimate private actions weeded from the register names which identified classes of products and returned what was in effect common property to all competitors from the businesses which appropriated it. . . .

My bill, if enacted, would restore to the private sector the sole authority to petition the United States Patent Office to cancel a registered trademark exclusively on the ground that it has become generic, a power that we have seen works quite well. My bill would continue to permit the Commission to revoke a trademark where it sees the mark

functioning in concert with practices which restrict competition. If, for example, a registrant attempts to prevent a retailer from selling his trademarked goods at a price other than that established by the registrant, the trademark will still be susceptible to cancellation. And, competitors will still be permitted to use the readily available descriptive name, i.e., NEWMICA kitchen surfaces, MICARTA countertops, or whatever. If enacted, my bill would relieve the legitimate concerns of the trademark community that the FTC is going to continue to rely on a shortcut procedure (The Lanham Act) to deal with cases where it may believe there is anti-competitive behavior, but where it does not want to sustain the burden of that argument directly.

As I mentioned in the opening of my statement, there is a serious need for us to re-examine the powers of government and to trim away excess layers of bureaucracy. The Lanham Act provides a good mechanism for the market to police the register of famous trademarks. If the trademark becomes a tool to circumvent free enterprise and unbridled competition, public policy dictates that the rights enjoyed by ownership be kept within bounds. Similarly, the powers of government, like the right to hold a registered trademark, should endure as long as their continued existence benefits the public. The Federal Trade Commission's first execution of its authority to cancel generic trademarks demonstrates that this particular power is not likely to be used beneficially. I offer my legislation as the medium for retracting this and only this authority which was uncertainly granted in the first place and which unnecessarily detracts now from the important anti-trust activities which the FTC ought under the Federal Trade Commission Act to pursue on the behalf of the public.●

#### ANTI-COMMUNIST CAMBODIANS

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, how many Americans are aware that, at the present moment, there are almost one-half million Cambodian refugees located in areas controlled by non-Communist, anti-Vietnamese Cambodians? How many Americans know that these Cambodians, known as the "Free Khmer" have at least 6,000, and perhaps as much as 10,000 able-bodied, armed soldiers, ready to fight both Pol Pot's forces and the puppet Communist regime set up in Cambodia by the Vietnamese?

I would guess that most Americans are not aware of these facts. They do not make the front pages of most newspapers or the evening television news. But the Christian Science Monitor reports that the leaders of these groups want help from the United States. They ask for help from our CIA. We know, of course, that our CIA has been so crippled by domestic critics in Congress and the media that it is absurd for anyone to ask for its help. But, in any event, the people of this country deserve to know about the Free Khmer.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Anti-Communist Khmers Call for Arms and CIA Help" and "Who's



Who in Cambodian War" from the Christian Science Monitor, November 28, 1979.

ANTI-COMMUNIST KHMERS CALL FOR ARMS  
AND CIA HELP

(By Frederic A. Moritz)

There he sat—in a field headquarters roofed with thatch.

Bearded, in military fatigues, with a colorful sash wrapped elegantly around his waist, this animated, emotional man explained to visitors: "We need arms and food and the support of the outside world."

The man is "Prince" Norodom Soriavong. He leads a Free Khmer anti-communist refugee camp holding between 100,000 to 200,000 Cambodians. "Help me contact your CIA. We need their help," he appealed to me, explaining the need to continue the fight against Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia.

A few miles to the north at a similar camp named Ban Nong Samet, chief of staff in Sakan makes a similar plea. In stylish fatigues and colorful sash, his high cheekbones and elegant face give an aura of dash to the hot, crowded shelter surrounded by the huts of thousands of destitute refugees.

To many experienced observers of Cambodia, military leaders like Norodom Soriavong and in Sakan seem all too familiar. Skeptical "old-timers" say such men swathe themselves in khakis, sashes, and rhetoric—and lead their bands of followers in hopeless quixotic quests.

But some analysts take the forces these men lead more seriously.

"The existence of these groups is a symbolic threat to Vietnam," notes one. "For they stand for what most Cambodians probably want—a noncommunist, non-Vietnamese-dominated Cambodia. The Vietnamese know that under some circumstances these groups could quickly grow."

Although the refugees in these Free Khmer camps straddling the Thai-Cambodian border total some 450,000. Just how many are able-bodied, armed military "men" (often soldiers in these camps are school age) is unknown. Norodom Soriavong claims to command 6,000. In Sakan claims 2,800.

The question to be answered in the weeks ahead is just how much the military potential of these groups is weakened by civilian groups accepting the Thai offer to relocate at Khao I Dang. This camp has just been set up to house about 200,000 refugees.

Leaders like Norodom Soriavong and in Sakan are clearly concerned that if they lose their "civilian" populations, their "case" for international food aid will be weakened.

Vietnamese troops are believed to be only 10 miles from the perimeters of Ban Nong Mak Mun. A visitor occasionally hears the thump of a distant howitzer. Khaki-clad lads carrying automatic rifles and grenade launchers straggle in and out of camp.

Indeed, some analysts believe a serious Vietnamese attack could begin against these camps at any time—even though Vietnam may consider the Communist China-backed Khmer Rouge further to the south a more potent military force.

Other observers see these Free Khmer camps as a relatively low-priority Vietnamese target. The Thai interest in relocating these refugees stems less from concern over Vietnamese actions—and more from concern over having independent Cambodian warlords on the Thai border.

If the Vietnamese do strike, there seems little chance the bands of young men carrying weapons larger than themselves could hold their own.

WHO'S WHO IN CAMBODIAN WAR

The swirling guerrilla war in Cambodia has several major players. Among the most important:

Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge: The former ruler of Cambodia and his communist forces have been reduced to a guerrilla movement in isolated pockets—mostly in the western part of the nation. Under their rule, hundreds of thousands of Cambodians were killed or died of hunger. Current strength, 25,000 to 50,000 guerrillas and "camp followers."

Heng Samrin: Successor to Pol Pot, he rules most of Cambodia thanks to support from Vietnam's army.

The Free Khmer: Strongly anti-communist, the Free Khmers are waging a small resistance movement in western Cambodia. Non-communists might rally to their side if Vietnam's effort in Cambodia faltered. The Free Khmer and other, smaller, non-communist factions are believed to control about 5,000 to 10,000 fighters.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk: Exiled from his country, the Prince might someday return as head of a coalition government.

Vietnam: With up to 200,000 troops in Cambodia, Vietnam wields the greatest military force. Vietnam's long-range aims there are uncertain. Guerrilla resistance has apparently been stronger than Vietnam expected.

China: The Chinese are worried about the growing power of Vietnam, a Soviet ally, on their southern flank. Complete control of Cambodia by Vietnam would add to China's concerns. China furnishes some aid to Cambodian guerrillas.●

BEN COLE—INDIANA SOCIETY'S  
MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, traditionally it has been the role of the news media to report to the people the activities of public officials. It is my privilege to turn the tables and bring to the attention of my colleagues the achievement of a member of the fourth estate.

Ben Cole, Washington correspondent of the Indianapolis Star was honored this week as the "Man of the Year" by the Indiana Society of Washington. For 30 years, Ben has kept Hoosiers advised of events in our Nation's Capital through his honest and objective news stories, as well as his informative and entertaining "Washington Ripples" weekly column.

It has sometimes been said Government and the media have an adversary relationship. But I would suggest that, in the case of Ben Cole, there has always been friendship and mutual respect. He is dedicated to fairness and objectivity and he has never forgotten his roots. In fact, despite 30 years in Washington, it has been said that Ben Cole is still so much a Hoosier that he has the mildest case of Potomac Fever ever diagnosed in the Nation's Capital.

It is a pleasure for me to know a professional like Ben Cole. Indeed, it is an honor to call him my friend.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD an article from the Indianapolis Star of Wednesday, November 28, 1979, which pays tribute to Ben Cole as the Indiana Society's Man of the Year.

BEN COLE CAUSES A RIPPLE IN WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Ben Cole, Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis Star, was honored Tuesday night as Man of the Year by the Indiana Society of Washington.

Cole, who has covered the nation's capital for The Star the last 30 years, received the surprise award in ceremonies at the National Press Club.

The Indiana Society is an organization of more than 2,000 Hoosiers who live in the Washington area. According to Cole's own published account, it was founded in the 1920s as a way of registering Indiana residents for absentee voting, but it now is an important vehicle for bringing "uprooted" Hoosiers together, helping them to maintain their ties to home.

Perhaps no one feels those roots stronger than Benjamin R. Cole. Born in Indianapolis 63 years ago and graduated from Arsenal Technical High School, he has returned often to his native soil and from time to time he'll work a word or two about home into his weekly "Washington Ripples" column.

Even newsmaking events in Washington couldn't keep him away from a 50-year reunion at his beloved School 57 last May.

Cole attended Butler University (where he met his bride, the former Alice Louise Porteous), Indiana State Teachers College and the American Press Institute at Columbia University.

After six years as a reporter for the Terre Haute Tribune and Star, he came to The Indianapolis Star in 1944 and rose quickly to statehouse reporter, assistant city editor and city editor. He was named Washington correspondent July 15, 1949.

Throughout his career, his solid, objective reporting has won him many admirers. A good storyteller as well, he is said to have captivated the Congressional press gallery on more than one occasion with his accounts of his early days as a cub reporter.

He is a member of the prestigious Gridiron Club of top reporters in Washington, National Press Club and Sigma Delta Chi Society of Professional Journalists, and is member and past president of the Indianapolis Press Club as well.

He and his wife live at McLean, Va. Their two sons and one daughter are grown.●

CUMULATIVE DEATHS ON A  
NATIONAL SCALE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in the back pages of newspapers throughout this country one can find accounts of workers who have either been killed or injured while on the job. But generally people remain unaware of what a pervasive phenomenon this is. While this unawareness may be attributed to many factors, one important factor is that events such as these are treated as isolated events by local news services rather than being viewed as cumulative deaths on a national scale. However, when total national fatalities are analyzed over time, the extensive loss of life and the large number of disabling injuries become all too apparent.

For example, according to National Safety Council statistics, workplace fatalities accounted for 13 percent of all accidental deaths in this country during

1978. In terms of overall costs to our society, these fatalities become even more significant. The National Safety Council, which has computed costs to include wage loss, medical expense, insurance costs, et cetera, found that in 1978, work accidents in the United States cost \$23 billion. In 1977, over \$8.5 billion in compensation was paid to eligible workers in the Nation under workers' compensation laws, according to the Social Security Administration. This was more than four times the amount paid in 1966. Needless to say, these costs do not include the immeasurable human suffering resulting from these tragic deaths and disabling injuries.

At this point, I would like to provide for my colleagues information on some recent workplace fatalities. In the workplace many lives are lost as the result of falls from ladders, beams, scaffolds, et cetera, due to improper safety precautions. The following list represents only a few such accidents which have claimed the lives of workers throughout this country:

On September 11, 1979, a 26-year-old employee was killed in a fall at a nuclear plant construction site in Jackson County, Ala. The victim was assisting in the placement of 1½-ton steel plates on the top of the containment building, when one of the metal plates he was installing shifted, causing him to fall. Work in that section of the plant was suspended pending an investigation into the accident.

On September 16, 1979, a 35-year-old employee was killed in a fall at a plant located in Birmingham, Ala. The victim died of head injuries sustained in a 25-foot fall.

On October 1, 1979, a 40-year-old oil company employee drowned when he fell from a ladder and dropped into the St. Johns River. The victim fell between the dock and a barge that he and others were unloading near Jacksonville, Fla. An improperly secured ladder has been tentatively blamed for the accident.

On October 2, 1979, a 23-year-old employee of a plant located in Clarion, Pa., was killed when he fell into an acid filled tank.

On November 14, 1979, a 51-year-old employee of a steel plant located in McKeesport, Pa., which is in my district, was killed when he fell from a ladder. Two other workers had previously been killed at this plant when on November 2, 1979, they were crushed to death by a collapsing stack of steel slabs. OSHA is currently investigating all three fatalities.

On conclusion, although between 1912 and 1978 accidental work deaths per 100,000 population were reduced by 71 percent, the fact still remains that approximately 13,000 workers per year are losing their lives in work related deaths, not to mention the countless injuries. Furthermore, the effects of health hazards in the workplace are not generally felt for many years. Finally, the activities of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, such as: Im-

proved standards, targeted inspections, training, education, and consultation, should assist employers and employees in reducing the tragic loss of human life and the economic drain on our economy.●

#### THE USE OF OUR FOOD SUPPLY AGAINST TERRORIST NATIONS

**HON. E. THOMAS COLEMAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 29, 1979

● **Mr. COLEMAN.** Mr. Speaker, it is approaching a month now that Americans have been held hostage in our Embassy in Iran. Because of the crisis there, and related events elsewhere, I think we are forced to consider changing a long-time tradition of this country. We should begin to discuss ways to use our abundant food supply against terrorist nations. A pragmatic approach to foreign policy demands our Nation use every tool available. Food is one of those tools.

The student takeover of the American Embassy in Tehran is not an isolated case. Three of our ambassadors have been murdered. U.S. businessmen and Government officials have been abducted and sometimes killed. Embassies have been overrun, and their personnel held hostage. It is clearly time for the United States to reassess its relationship with other nations.

Obviously, some of our enemies receive our foreign aid. Some nations who receive our technology are using that technology against us and our allies. Some nations who depend on U.S. food allow—even encourage—terrorists to kidnap and murder our citizens and destroy our Embassies.

Last year, we exported \$452 million worth of food to Iran. In fiscal year 1980, estimates are that we will export nearly \$500 million worth of food. This represents about a fourth of all Iranian food imports, or about 7 to 8 percent of its total food consumption.

Iran needs our soybean meal, rice, wheat, and feedgrains, all of which we now export to that country. According to the Library of Congress, if our country were to withhold rice and feedgrains, Iranian cities would be hurt economically. The Iranian poultry industry, already suffering losses this year, would be crippled. These two commodities—rice and feedgrains—are vital to Iran. That country has no apparent alternative sources of soybean meal, and present shortages around the world would make it very difficult for Iran to supply the food its people depend on—rice.

In addition to our food embargo, we should call on other major food producing nations to join us in showing how food can be used to keep peace in the world. Our boycott of Iranian oil will not severely hurt Iran unless other nations boycott their oil, too. Likewise, a food embargo will not be as effective unless others join us in our fight against inter-

national terrorism. A total food embargo to Iran would create a short-fall in that country's food needs by nearly one-third.

Using food as a weapon is not a pleasant choice. But terrorist attacks on United States citizens and other nations are not pleasant either. Iran, and other terrorist nations, see us as a vulnerable country. They are taking advantage of our energy needs, and they don't think we have the will power to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

I think they are wrong. The American people are willing to cut consumption of energy. We are willing to make a strong statement to the world we will no longer allow oil to control us. We will control it.

It is time we refocus our attention. We have something these nations need more than we need their oil. Except in times of war, we have never used food as a weapon. But, we are threatened by acts of terrorism around the world. World peace is threatened. It is time to serve notice our Nation will use all its resources—military, economic, agricultural—to protect itself, its citizens, and its allies.●

#### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION ACT

**HON. DAN MICA**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 4, 1979

● **Mr. MICA.** Mr. Chairman, today the House voted on the Markey amendment which would have placed a 6-month moratorium on construction permits for new nuclear powerplants. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to explain why I did not support the Markey amendment.

When the Three Mile Island accident occurred earlier this year it raised some very fundamental questions over the safety and viability of nuclear power. I share many of the concerns regarding the future of nuclear power and would not want our Nation to seize upon an unsafe energy source in our search for energy independence.

The accident at Three Mile Island focused our attention on nuclear power and spurred a national debate which will continue for some time. During the past few months I have been contacted by many of my constituents on this issue, and I will continue to listen to and examine all their concerns. We must proceed very cautiously and closely evaluate all information on the use of nuclear power prior to making any final judgments.

I have personally spoken with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on this matter and was assured that no new construction permits will be issued for the next 6 months. In light of this as-



insurance and the possibility that a congressional moratorium could be construed as an antinuclear message, I did not feel that it was proper at this point in time to establish a moratorium. Should there be an attempt to issue a permit

within this 6-month period, I will join with Congressman MARKEY in leading the opposition to its approval.

This does not mean that I am unconcerned over the effects and safety of nuclear power. I am very concerned and

urge the Interior Committee, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the entire Congress to continue examining and reexamining this complex issue in order to determine our national policy. ●

## SENATE—Friday, November 30, 1979

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 29, 1979)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

O God, "our refuge and our strength, a very present help in trouble," we would be still and know that Thou art God. Quiet our restlessness. Fill our hearts with Thy love. Give us teachable minds and a devout obedience to Thy will. When we cannot see the distant scene, help us to do what can be done now, and to be open and responsive to all the light Thou dost impart for the future.

As the bells toll, may our hearts beat in unison with those in bondage. Shield them from harm and, by some miracle of divine grace, restore them to freedom.

To those who bear the burdens of government give Thy grace and that wisdom which comes from above. In this time of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail. May Thy righteousness prevail over man's sinfulness until peace and justice become the way of all men and all nations.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., November 30, 1979.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEVIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader is recognized.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

### TSONGAS AND LUGAR: GREAT JOB ON CHRYSLER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate Banking Committee reported the Chrysler loan guarantee legislation.

I voted against it because I oppose bailing out failing firms. But the bill from the committee does provide a far better chance for Chrysler to survive. It does require much greater sacrifice on the part of the interested parties that would gain from a Chrysler rescue. It provides a precedent that may be somewhat more discouraging in dissuading other failing firms from lining up for a Federal bailout when they get into trouble. It requires a somewhat lesser contribution from the taxpayer and considerably more protection for the taxpayer in the event of a Chrysler collapse.

For all these improvements, Senator RICHARD LUGAR and Senator PAUL TSONGAS deserve very great credit. They have put together a coalition that supports aid for this Nation's 10th biggest firm, employing over 100,000 people, and aid that, absent their efforts, in my judgment, would not be forthcoming at all.

Putting this kind of constructive package together is one of the most difficult but perhaps the most creative kinds of legislative work that we as Members of Congress can do. Senator LUGAR, who did the same kind of remarkable work in putting together the New York City package, and Senator TSONGAS, who demonstrated a really brilliant understanding of the complexities of this tough issue, deserve great thanks not only from the Chrysler family of dealers, suppliers, workers, creditors, and stockholders, but from the country as a whole.

This legislation is far from home free. It could fail in the House or Senate. Even if enacted, it could still not save a corporation that is in extremely grave condition. But it is a noble effort, and Senators LUGAR and TSONGAS deserve our gratitude.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that a New York Times editorial of yesterday, entitled: "A Shrewd Compromise for Chrysler," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### A SREWD COMPROMISE FOR CHRYSLER

As outlined by the White House, the Federal loan guarantee program for Chrysler is a cheap ride. Neither Chrysler's stockholders nor its employees would be asked to make major sacrifices. But two members of the Senate Banking Committee—Richard Lugar, a conservative Republican from Indiana, and Paul Tsongas, a liberal Democrat from Massachusetts—have a better idea. They suggest a bail-out program that would require those who stand to lose the most from Chrysler's demise to bear most of the burden of the rescue. That is the least the public should demand as the price of taxpayer support.

President Carter's plan calls for \$1.5 billion in loan guarantees to be matched by an equal amount from private sources. But little of that matching private money would come from Chrysler's unionized employees, who are determined to hold on to their recently negotiated wage increases. They won a \$1.3 billion package that would increase Chrysler's labor costs to about \$20 an hour by 1982. Chrysler's stockholders would be sheltered, too; the company plans to borrow most of the private money it needs from banks, dealers, suppliers and communities with Chrysler plants.

The Lugar-Tsongas plan would redirect the risks. The Senators want to offer Chrysler \$1.25 billion in Federal loan guarantees. But in return, every Chrysler employee would have to accept a wage freeze. And the company would have to raise a total of \$2.5 billion from private sources, including the sale of stock. If, through such shared sacrifice, Chrysler prospered, everyone would win. Chrysler stock, though diluted by more stock sales, would still be worth more than now. The workers would keep their high-paying jobs and, by a provision in the Lugar-Tsongas proposal, receive \$250 million in preferred stock as deferred compensation.

This bill is one with which everyone should be able to live. It would give Chrysler a good chance to survive. Yet it would ask for enough sacrifice to discourage other failing firms from rushing to apply for Federal rescue. It is a compromise between a giant Federal giveaway and a decidedly cold shoulder. We hope Congress sees the wisdom of this combination.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today's New York Times contains an editorial supportive of the new proposal offered by Senator LUGAR to resolve the Chrysler financing problem.

The distinguished junior Senator from Indiana has displayed an uncanny ability to effect compromises in areas of

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