

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOVIETS RECORD SINCE  
HELSINKI: POLAND ABYSMALHON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, at Madrid the oversight conference has resumed as part of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. The time has come to re-evaluate the performance of the Soviet Union since the signing of the 1975 act. The chief of the U.S. Delegation to the Madrid Conference recently gave an interview in the U.S. News & World Report of February 9, 1981, that I would like to share with my colleagues concerning the behavior of the Soviet Union under the Helsinki agreements:

RUSSIA'S RECORD SINCE HELSINKI: 5 YEARS  
OF CHEATING\*

Moscow is on trial at a Madrid meeting policing the 1975 Helsinki Accords on human rights and territorial integrity. The verdict, says the leader of the U.S. team: Guilty on almost all counts.

Q. Mr. Kampelman, what's the point of meeting the Soviets in Madrid to talk about compliance with the Helsinki Final Act guaranteeing human rights and sovereignty of all nations? Haven't the Russians made a mockery of this agreement by their invasion of Afghanistan, their threats to Poland and their repression of dissidents?

A. As one who had serious questions about our signing the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, let me say that we have taken that vehicle and turned it against the Soviet Union at Madrid in a very effective manner. We have used the vehicle to our advantage. I've always believed that if you have a vehicle that you can use to your advantage, you use it and don't throw it away.

The overwhelming feeling in the European press is that the Soviets have been taking it on the chin at Madrid and that they're on the defensive—indeed, they're isolated. Now, that's a political advantage to us.

Q. How are the Soviets reacting to this?

A. They clearly have been surprised. They did not anticipate the overwhelming attack against the Soviet Union for Afghanistan and for violation of human rights. It has never happened before. We are not in a position to judge how effective it is, because we don't know what Moscow is thinking or talking about.

I have very little doubt in my mind that the Soviets have been surprised by the intense allied unity that exists at Madrid—a unity that is strengthened by the addition of Spain, which is now clearly and unmistakably a Western country.

The neutrals and the nonaligned also have expressed themselves in unmistakable terms on human rights and Afghanistan. I

don't think the Soviets expected that. Nor did they expect the constancy of the attack, the stubbornness.

We have reason to believe that they expected we would go through the forms and not be effective at all.

Q. Do these verbal attacks really matter very much in practical terms?

A. I am firmly convinced—and I speak as one who has spent many years studying the Soviet system—that the worst thing in the world one can do in dealing with the Soviets is to pretend that they do not make mistakes. They do. I don't think the Soviets are self-sufficient in this world. They also seek respectability.

Their objective, after all, is world influence, and not just internal economic or political stability. All of this is adversely affected by the criticism.

If we hope to reach an accommodation with the Soviets, we must clearly state our requirements and the prerequisites for that accommodation. If we put blinders on ourselves, there is no chance of an accommodation. We will have the kind of relationship that we've had in recent years. We've kidded ourselves into believing we have a peaceful relationship with them, and they have not kidded themselves into believing that they should not build up their strength. It's a relationship that has worked to our disadvantage.

Q. What are the Russians getting out of the Madrid meeting?

A. They've gotten nothing out of it so far. They still have an opportunity to gain something with their proposal for military détente and disarmament, which will be considered in February.

What they hope to gain is a propaganda advantage by being in favor of a conference that would emphasize military détente and disarmament. They hope to put themselves in a position where they're a peace-loving people in the eyes of the Europeans and the eyes of the world. We will counter that.

Q. Will they get backing for their conference on military détente and disarmament?

A. No. They're not going to get the conference. The West is overwhelmingly opposed to it. I don't think the Russians expect to get their conference. They expect to get a propaganda advantage out of favoring the conference.

Q. You've painted a picture of a very tough confrontation at Madrid between the West and the Russians. Does that mean that détente as we've known it over the past decade is dead?

A. What I have said at Madrid is that the United States hopes to achieve détente with the East. It's an objective to be realized. It's not an objective now existing. I have stated explicitly that you cannot have détente while you have the Soviet Union, in effect, acting in complete violation of its human-rights commitments under the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, and becoming increasingly repressive in the area of human rights.

Secondly, we have said that we do not see détente while the Soviet Union is using its troops in Afghanistan in complete violation of the Helsinki Final Act. And we have said that in both of these areas—human rights and Afghanistan—the United States re-

quires specific movement by the Soviet Union before we would be prepared to say that détente can be achieved.

Q. Aren't the Russians getting many of the benefits of détente in the way of trade and credits without paying the price in terms of human rights and refraining from aggression?

A. I want to point out to you that some of these credit arrangements existed during the so-called cold war as well. I see very little difference—other than a difference in words—between what happened in our relationship during the cold war and what's been happening in recent years under the so-called period of détente. That is why I don't like to use the word as a description of the relationship that exists. Indeed, I think it fair to say that it's even a little worse today, because today you've got a hot war being waged by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, which is a lot worse than the cold war.

Q. What do we want from the Soviets as the price for détente?

A. We want a commitment from the Soviets not to use military force and an honoring of that commitment. And we want a commitment to the human-rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, which they signed.

At least, we want to see movement in the right direction on human rights. We recognize that theirs is a different society from ours. But, as I have said to the Soviet delegates in Madrid, I, for one, fail to see why the Soviet Union has got to keep 200 or 400 or whatever number of dissidents in jail. For the Soviets to behave more humanely and to live up to their responsibilities is not going to undermine their society. I do not think that by asking them to live up to their commitments that we're threatening them.

Q. Does this continued violation of their commitments on human rights mean that we are powerless to influence the Soviets on this score?

A. We've had very little influence up until now. If we can be constant about it, we may very well have an effect on them, because I think they need us. But up until now, they have ignored their commitment, and they have felt they can get away with it.

Q. Will the Reagan administration be any more effective in getting Russia to honor its commitments on human rights?

A. I would hope we could be more effective under the Reagan administration than we've been. I speak not as a partisan on this question, because I am a Democrat. I do remember very vividly that the whole business of détente began as a President Nixon phenomenon. And I think it turned out to be misleading.

We shouldn't be misleading about détente. You cannot expect the American society or the peoples of any Western society to make sacrifices in the form of heavier defense spending if they feel it's unnecessary. And if you tell them that we are in a relaxed period—a period of détente—why should they want to spend the money on defense? I certainly hope that under Reagan we will have constancy and a firmness of view.

Q. If you look at the overall implementation of the Helsinki Accords over the past

\*Interview with Max M. Kampelman, Chief of the U.S. Delegation to the Madrid Conference.

five years, just what are the results? Have there been any real gains?

A. You have to make a distinction between the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. With respect to Eastern Europe, there have been many advances. There have been significant improvements, for one thing, in the trade area for American business. Even in the human-rights field, we've made significant progress on such issues as family reunification. Most of this has been done bilaterally.

For example, the first week I was in Madrid I talked to the ambassador of one Eastern European country about a list of some 1,800 people who were having trouble obtaining exit visas to join their families. He came back and told me that about 600 of these people would soon be granted exit permits. When I asked about the other 1,200, he said that it would take time. But at least we got 600 immediately.

I gave the ambassador of another Eastern European country at Madrid a shorter list—a handful of names—and exit visas were approved in a matter of weeks for every single one on that list. The ambassador came back to me and said, "Done, done, done."

For a number of Eastern European countries, I don't have any names to provide. All have been taken care of.

Q. You still have numerous names of people in the Soviet Union who are unable to get out to rejoin families—

A. Yes. That's why I make the distinction between Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Q. How do the Russians at Madrid respond to all the attacks? Aren't the Soviets counterattacking by criticizing America's human-rights record?

A. As a matter of fact, there's been very little of that. The Russians talk about injustice to the American Indians—not much, but they refer to it.

We've had meetings on this issue. We explain what we in the United States are doing to try to deal with the problem of the American Indian. For example, we talk about the recent Supreme Court decision involving a government payment of more than a hundred million dollars to one tribe. We recognize the problem. We don't deny the fact that there is a problem there.

The Russians may still talk about other issues—for example, Puerto Rico. I've been expecting it, but so far they haven't talked about Puerto Rico, which surprises me.

They've talked once in general terms—in a broad, rambling discussion—about crime in the streets in the United States, about the danger of walking in the streets, about the case of someone who was killed for a dollar in Central Park, about that kind of thing. And they've talked about unemployment, alleging that it is a very gross violation of human rights.

#### KEY PROVISIONS OF HELSINKI ACCORDS

The Final Act of the 1975 Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, held in Helsinki, calls on the 35 signatory nations to:

Respect the inviolability of existing borders.

Refrain from the threat or use of force against any state.

Refrain from any intervention, direct or indirect, in the internal or external affairs of other states.

Respect human rights and individual freedoms.

Grant exit visas to permit the reunification of families.

Support confidence-building measures such as advance notification of military ma-

neuvers and exchange of observers for maneuvers.

Facilitate freer exchange of people, publications and information.●

#### JOHN CREIGHTON AND THOMAS FLECKENSTEIN OF THE KNIGHTS SOCCER CLUB

#### HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, young people in Northeast Philadelphia have an outstanding soccer program due to the dedicated and tireless efforts of two fathers in my district, John Creighton and Thomas Fleckenstein. Their efforts began more than 12 years ago, and, although their own children are now grown and no longer involved in the soccer program, these two men continue to work with young men and women who enjoy the game of soccer.

When the Northeast YMCA opened its field to the children in the neighborhood who wanted to play soccer over 12 years ago, Mr. Creighton and Mr. Fleckenstein helped their own sons and other young boys form a team. Because the "Y" was a young branch and had no money to sponsor a soccer program, the two men joined with other fathers to form the Fathers' Soccer Club to raise money to buy uniforms and soccer balls for the boys who played at the "Y" field.

In 1970 the Fathers' Soccer Club expanded into the Mothers' and Fathers' Soccer Club of the Northeast YMCA. Two more boys' teams were added and Tom Fleckenstein became a coach. During the 4-month soccer league season, a coach spends at least 2 hours a night, 2 nights a week, in practice with his team in addition to the weekend league game. However, the coaches actually begin their work with the teams at the beginning of August, a month before the regular season begins, and bad weather and the championship games usually extend the season into February or March.

The club prospered and became the Knights Soccer Club, an independent self-sustaining organization that operates and maintains a soccer program for boys and girls ages 7 to 17 who are members of the Northeast YMCA.

In 1972 girls' teams were added to the soccer club and Jack Creighton became the junior girl coach. He is still coaching the junior girls 9 years later.

Not only have these two fathers served as coaches, but they have also been active in other activities of the soccer club such as fundraisers and other events. Mr. Fleckenstein has worked in various maintenance programs and has coached the mothers'

soccer team, a group of mothers who joined together to have fun and occasionally play soccer. Mr. Creighton has been on the family picnic committee for over 8 years and currently serves as chairman of the grievance committee of the Independent Girls Soccer League, a league of more than 1,000 active girl soccer players. Both men have officiated at many exhibition games as referees or sideline attendants.

Although their own children have grown up and no longer play soccer, Tom Fleckenstein and Jack Creighton still give of their time and talents with no pay of any kind to insure that young men and women in Northeast Philadelphia have the opportunity to enjoy the game.

Mr. Speaker, we extend to Tom Fleckenstein and Jack Creighton our gratitude for the many hours they have devoted to the soccer program in Northeast Philadelphia and for the invaluable contribution they have made to the lives of our young people.●

#### UNITED STATES NEEDS TO LOOK AT POPULATION CHANGES

#### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, I introduced H.R. 907, a bill which requires all Government departments and agencies to address the effects of population change on their policies and programs, establishes a White House Office of Population Policy to coordinate and oversee these requirements and declares a national policy of eventual population stabilization.

The bill would improve the Federal Government's capability to prepare timely, accurate, and consistent forecasts of short-term and long-term trends in population, resources, and the environment, both nationally and globally. This will enable Federal, State, and local authorities to make timely and effective adjustments in their policies and programs in light of these projections.

The bill addresses the need to plan for the sweeping demographic trends which are changing the face of the Nation. While our birth rate has dropped, the American population continues to grow by more than 2 million annually. Although women are having fewer children, the sheer numbers of the baby boom generation insure an ongoing natural increase. Immigration, both legal and illegal, is an almost as large source of growth.

Demographic changes may be as important as sheer growth. Millions of Americans are leaving metropolitan



areas to resettle in rural communities. The population will no doubt continue to shift to the South and West. The influx of immigrants taxes the capacities of host communities. The steady aging of the population forces changes in the character and distribution of many services.

Changes in the Nation's population—whether they be in fertility, mortality, immigration, or distribution—affect all of us. They have a profound impact on every sector of society: Health care, education, housing, transportation, employment, retirement programs, environmental protection, and business. In spite of this, the Federal Government simply does not have the capacity to plan ahead for these changes and no systematic focus on them is presently required. This is the aim of H.R. 907.

The purpose of this legislation is not new. In 1938, Congress first recognized the value of a national population policy of stabilization. The National Resources Subcommittee on Population Problems recommended in its report to President Roosevelt that appropriate legislative and administrative actions be taken to shape broad national policies regarding our population problems and that transition from an increasing to a stationary or decreasing population may on the whole be a benefit to the life of the Nation. That was almost 50 years ago.

In 1972, the National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future recommended that organizational changes be undertaken to improve the Federal Government's capacity to develop and implement population-related programs, and to evaluate the interaction between public policies, programs, and population trends.

In 1974, the United Nations declared World Population Year, and the United States joined with other countries in endorsing the World Population Plan of Action, a formal agreement calling for each nation to construct its own population policy. The United States still has not honored this commitment, despite the fact that we urge population stabilization on underdeveloped countries and help pay for implementation with taxpayers' dollars. For American diplomacy to succeed in these troubled times, it must acquire credibility by showing that the United States is prepared to tackle at home those problems we ask others to tackle abroad.

More recently, the House Select Committee on Population did a fine job of bringing out the importance of population considerations to our national policy in all of its ramifications. The committee recommended that Congress consider alternative mechanisms for improving the ability of the Federal Government to develop alternative policies and programs for plan-

ning for future population change and assess the short-term and long-term costs and benefits of each.

Although the substance of my proposal may be familiar, the urgency for taking action is unprecedented.

The President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the U.S. Department of State last summer released the "Global 2000 Report." This report was the result of a 3-year inter-agency study of U.S. Government projections in the areas of population, resources, and environment. It concluded that a continuation of present trends would lead to a world in the year 2000 that would be "more crowded, more polluted, less stable ecologically, and more vulnerable to disruption than the world we live in now."

The followup report, "Global Future: Time to Act," released on January 14, proposed a series of concerted actions to meet the problems described in the earlier report. To improve the U.S. capability to respond to global resource, environmental, and population issues, the report recommended that the responsibility for developing and coordinating U.S. policy on these issues be centralized in one agency, preferably in the Executive Office of the President. The report further states:

Coordinated development of policy is absolutely essential. All the pieces must be evaluated and brought together in a coherent whole—a job attempted in this report for the first round, but one that must be continued, expanded, and made a permanent, high priority part of government operations.

H.R. 907 responds to these recommendations.

On January 24, more than 60 national organizations meeting under the auspices of the National Audubon Society, passed a resolution asking Congress to endorse the goal of population stabilization and establish a population policy office to coordinate national and international efforts. H.R. 907 carries out that declaration.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents have long recognized the impact of continued national population growth on the Nation, particularly as it affects energy supplies, natural resources, food and agriculture, the environment, governmental expenditures, and diplomatic relations. According to a 1976 Gallup poll, 87 percent of the public favor an end to U.S. population growth.

Ignoring population growth and changes would not stop them from reshaping our lives and our children's futures. Only conscious efforts at every level of government to understand them and plan ahead will make a difference. To persist in overlooking the many ways in which demographic changes affect the allocation of goods and services is to risk their waste and ineffectual distribution in times of mounting scarcity. For example, it is

nonsensical to use taxpayers' money to finance new school construction for communities which attention to demographics could have foretold would have excess facilities, as the Government did in the last decade to the tune of millions of wasted dollars. That is why I believe Congress must act now to improve our ability to forecast and respond to these changes.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill and calling for hearings at the soonest possible time. ●

## TERMINATE THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to terminate the Department of Education. My bill provides that the Department will terminate on December 31, 1982, and requires that the President submit a plan to transfer the necessary functions of the Department to other agencies. It states that the President may not submit a plan which would create a new Cabinet-level Department.

I believe that this is the proper approach, rather than simply putting the Department as presently constituted into the Department of Health and Human Services and renaming it HEW. My colleagues will recall that when the Department of Education was created, programs were transferred not only from HEW but from the Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is very possible that these programs should, and would, be restored to the various agencies from which they were taken.

If the present spending rate continues, the Department will have spent approximately \$15 billion in fiscal 1981; however, if the proposed supplements and rescissions are added in, the figure will be about \$15.6 billion. The tentative request for fiscal year 1982 is \$16 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we have seen \$15 billion worth of achievement from this Department. It was created with the noble goal of reinforcing Federal interest in education, but it has succeeded only in strengthening Federal interference. The ill-conceived, and fortunately now withdrawn, proposal to mandate bilingual education is a case in point.

Mr. Speaker, as one who spent 18 years in the field of education before coming to the Congress, I can assure you of my own strong support for a viable system of education in this

country. At the same time, I recall the destructive meddling that took place in my own district a few years ago that would have done grave damage to the curriculums of two fine State universities in Norfolk, Old Dominion and Norfolk State, and I feel very keenly that it is essential to return the responsibilities for education to experienced, professional educators at the State and local levels. I recognize that many education associations favor the Department still, but I think that we are doing them a grave disservice if we allow the present trend of growing Federal control to continue.

I think that terminating the Department of Education will make it clear that we have a commitment not only to permitting local educators to teach instead of doing increasing amounts of paperwork but also to reducing Government interference in all aspects of our lives, and I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

#### PAYING FOR THE FUTURE

### HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, as we await President Reagan's revisions to President Carter's budget proposal for fiscal year 1982 many of us are hopeful that the revisions will not be penny wise and pound foolish. A few days ago the Washington Star's lead editorial clearly explained the importance of maintaining our Nation's technological base as represented in the aerospace programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Of course we have economic problems now, but it makes no sense to try to solve these problems by cutting the strongest sectors of our economy. And a recovery will be made more difficult if not impossible if the technological sources of innovation and productivity improvement are discouraged. One simply cannot put scientists and engineers in a deep freeze. When a technology development team is dispersed, one has to start from scratch to reassemble it. Let us not mortgage our future.

Let me give one specific example. Right now there is a shortage of trained engineers, and there is an attempt to meet this shortage by bringing more students into engineering schools. How can we hope to encourage students to enter a rigorous course of study while at the same time we contemplate cutting the exciting, high-technology programs that are going to give them the real incentive to become engineers?

Mr. Speaker, I commend to all Members the following editorial which appeared on February 2, 1981:

#### PAYING FOR THE FUTURE

Although Reagan administration officials are not ready to list specific budgetary priorities, there are hints of things to come. For example, David A. Stockman, director of the Office of Management and Budget, said the other day that the administration's plan "will involve an unprecedented effort to change the spending code of the federal government," i.e. the "whole accumulation of entitlements and permanent authority that automatically drive outlays and spending whether any policy decision is made by the administration or the Congress in the interim."

At about the same time, however, Mr. Stockman said something suggesting that the administration is also aware of the harm that may be done if cuts hurt some science and technology programs, with which a nation's future is closely linked.

Responding to a question about the future of the space shuttle, Mr. Stockman called the larger U.S. space effort "a very constructive and very important investment for the country to make, not only because of its technological spin-off, but simply because of the boost that that gives to our economy and our aspirations . . ."

The sentiment may seem self-evident, but it bears emphasis because in fact it hasn't been evident as a matter of policy. Attacks of historical amnesia seem especially severe when they concern the space program.

By the time Apollo 15 was launched, public reaction to the lunar landings bordered on ennui; the encounter with Saturn by Voyager 1, which filled so many with wonderment as recently as last fall, already seems more a series of bright pictures than part of an ongoing program launched nearly four years ago. Voyager 1 was so successful that NASA recently approved a trajectory for its sister ship, Voyager 2, that would take it to Uranus in 1986 after flying by Saturn this August.

Yet as Mr. Stockman suggests, the value of the program is—and the word is used precisely—incalculable. It simply cannot be known what the rewards will be in scientific, military, industrial and technological terms. But if the past is guide, they will be great indeed. And Mr. Stockman seems wise enough to value a society's imagination, too.

The recent past, however, has been most uncertain since President Nixon proclaimed the landing of Apollo 11 on the moon to be the greatest event in history. In the early '70s, NASA cancelled three lunar landings, a "grand tour" of the outer planets, a once-in-a-lifetime chance to probe Halley's comet and, finally, plans for a completely reusable space shuttle. In 1967 dollars, the NASA civilian space budget has declined dramatically.

Former President Carter's 1982 budget suggests the ambiguities of the U.S. commitment. It noted 1978 presidential directives, encouraging space activities "to increase scientific knowledge, develop useful commercial and government applications of space technology and maintain U.S. leadership in space." But it also "recognized" that "funding demands of the space shuttle and the necessity of fiscal restraint would inhibit, in the near term, our ability to pursue major new engineering challenges in the development of space technology." Is that the way to approach a program requiring, above all, long-range planning and commitment?

We are perhaps reading too much into Mr. Stockman's words about the space program. But the issue he addressed is not small or exotic. Professor Walter McDougall recent-

ly put it this way: "A thumbnail definition of a great power between the two world wars might have been: 'A nation that builds its own airplanes.' The updated version would be: 'A nation that launches its own spacecraft.'"

#### MARRIAGE TAX

### HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman from New Jersey in calling for an end to the notorious marriage tax and in cosponsoring legislation for this purpose.

If any one item stands out in the minds of the American public as an example of the inequity in our present tax system, it is this absurd provision. As it now stands, the law penalizes millions of couples who choose to marry and provides a significant financial reward for those who live together without being married.

We still hear of couples who obtain divorces at the end of each year in an attempt to avoid this penalty. Of course, most Americans are not willing to go to such lengths to get around the law. They simply shake their heads in amazement that this provision is allowed to remain on the books.

Our present tax system was designed for another era when two-income marriages were rare and a wife's salary was considered a luxury. In the average family of today, both spouses must work just to meet everyday expenses, and they are being clobbered with taxes. Aren't these the very people we should be helping with some form of immediate tax relief?

It is time for us as a Congress to show that we are responsive to the overwhelming will of the people on this issue; 1981 should be the year when we bring an end to this discriminatory and ridiculous policy.●

#### INDIVIDUAL SAVINGS INCENTIVE ACT OF 1981

### HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I believe would substantially improve the dismal economic picture which confronts both individuals and businesses. It has become increasingly evident that our Government's fiscal policies have encouraged consumption and debt and discouraged savings, and hence have impeded capital formation and economic growth. It is past time to rectify this imbalance. While the



Congress took a first step in this direction last year in enacting a tax exemption on the first \$200 of interest income, it is necessary to expand on that base to further encourage a higher savings rate than the 4.5 percent which we now show.

Most discussion of this subject has revolved around the appropriate level of exemption of interest income, and the effect that different levels would have on the savings rate and on general revenues. My bill takes a somewhat different approach, in that it provides a tax exemption only for the increase in interest income from one year to the next for individuals under age 65. For those 65 and over, there would be no increase test to qualify for the exemption. In a true sense, this approach encourages new savings by exempting from taxation that interest income which reflects an increase in savings from the previous year. The Individual Savings Incentive Act of 1981 allows interest earned from savings accounts in excess of the previous year's earnings to be tax free up to a total of \$500 for an individual or \$1,000 for a joint return. In the case of individuals 65 and over, the first \$500 of interest income earned on savings would be excluded from taxable income.

This somewhat different approach has two significant advantages over a flat exemption.

First, it results in a lower revenue loss to the Treasury than a dollar for dollar flat exclusion.

Second, because the revenue loss factor is smaller, it is possible to increase the rate of the exemption, thus providing a greater incentive to increase savings.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that the total revenue impact of this proposal for the years 1981-90 would be \$23.5 billion. This compares with the estimated revenue loss during the same period from a flat \$250 exclusion of \$30.4 billion. Thus, the total revenue impact of the \$500 exclusion in my bill is actually less than that of a \$250 flat exclusion, yet it provides twice the benefit to the taxpayer who increases his savings. Thus, this bill puts the emphasis where it belongs—on increasing the present rate of savings.

If our objective is to provide an incentive for individuals to save more, the approach in the Individual Savings Incentive Act is clearly designed to meet that objective in the most cost-effective manner.

An additional feature of this bill is that it would help protect the savings of the elderly and retired from taxation and the ravages of inflation by exempting the first \$500 of interest income earned on savings held by those 65 and over from taxation. This recognizes the special situation of those who would be most likely to be

affected by an increase test and who would be least likely to be increasing their savings. Those over 55 account for over two-thirds of all savings and loan deposits, and interest income represents nearly 25 percent of the total income of persons 65 years and older. My bill then takes account of the fact that these individuals have contributed to savings over the years to provide for their retirement, and are far more likely to be drawing down on those savings than to be increasing them as they reach retirement age. Those savings should be protected, and the elderly and retired should not be penalized for their inability to increase their savings at the time in their life when they must rely on those savings, and when in fact they see serious erosion of those savings by double-digit inflation.

The subject of how to further increase our national savings rate will undoubtedly be addressed again this year in the context of tax reduction legislation, and I urge my colleagues to carefully examine the approach contained in this bill, which has the advantages of providing a genuine incentive to increase savings, providing more stimulative effect than the flat exemption approach with a lower revenue loss, and protecting the savings of the elderly. ●

#### NINE-DIGIT ZIP CODE PLAN

**HON. DANIEL B. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● **Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.** Mr. Speaker, the nine-digit ZIP code plan, which the Postal Service had planned to implement in February, has been delayed until June.

I have opposed this scheme from the beginning, and see no reason to change my mind. As you know, 122 Members of this body petitioned the Postmaster General to delay this plan until the citizenry could speak out. I was happy to be one of those petitioners.

If there is one thing we do not need from Government, it is more numbers.

Under the current five-digit ZIP code, the country is separated into small regions, each with its own code. The proposed nine-digit ZIP would divide the country into still smaller units; in fact, each block has its very own ZIP code.

What next? Well, perhaps the Postal Service will come up with a plan for even greater efficiency. After all, if assigning a ZIP code to each block will produce savings, just think how much we could save by giving each individual residence its own number.

Presto—the Government will have reinvented the street address.

The October 30, 1980 issue of the Sullivan (Illinois) Progress addresses this matter in a timely fashion. The editorial follows:

#### THROW OUT THE JUNK MAIL

How is it that all the national candidates have missed one of the best possible issues in this campaign? Think how many votes could have been drawn from dissatisfied postal patrons if someone had promised: "If elected, I promise you that there will be a definite improvement in the postal service". Of course, he or she might have had some trouble in keeping that promise, if elected, but it certainly would have drawn a lot of supporters.

What's wrong with this formerly dependable, once bargain priced service? Everyone seems to have an answer, but none of them seem to work. Back a number of years ago, the post office department came up with a cure-all that they labeled the "Zip Code". We were practically guaranteed faster, much improved service if everyone put a string of numbers on each piece of mail sent. The result: The mails slowed down more than ever and prices of mailing soared ever higher.

Complaints get nowhere, but now the department has come up with another cure-all: A bigger yet zip code, which means that all us doubtless will have to start memorizing even more numbers.

There is no way around the fact that the mail service has gone steadily downhill ever since the job of carrying the mails was taken away from the railroads. Furthermore, when the job of sorting the mails depended largely on hand work, the service was still more efficient, even though out of date. Somewhere in recent years, the department seems to have decided that its financial future depended in handling more junk mail, and that caused nothing but an increased volume of stuff and slower than ever service. In view of all that has been tried, the only solution seems to be to return to delivering the letters, newspapers and the magazines, and throwing out the junk mail. ●

#### NOW IS THE TIME TO END THE MARRIAGE PENALTY

**HON. JACK FIELDS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● **Mr. FIELDS.** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with our colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Mrs. FENWICK, in today proposing legislation to eliminate the so-called marriage penalty.

It is my firm belief that this legislation is long overdue and that the Federal Government has a responsibility to eliminate this inherent inequity in our Tax Code which is currently adversely affecting as many as 38 million Americans.

At this moment, our Federal tax structure is set up so that a husband and wife who both work may pay as much as 63 percent more in Federal taxes than they would if they were single. For a couple with income of

\$30,000 per year, there is a marriage bonus of \$1,929 when one spouse receives all the income and a marriage penalty of \$903 when the income is split equally.

Besides being a basic inequity in our Tax Code, the marriage penalty has placed the Federal Government in the awkward position of providing a disincentive to marriage, an incentive to divorce, and a disincentive for wives to seek paid employment.

Additionally, in this age of persistent double-digit inflation and ever-increasing consumer prices, the marriage tax has placed its heaviest burden on those couples whose double income is a necessity, rather than a choice.

Clearly, the existence of the marriage penalty is entirely inadvertent, logically indefensible, extraordinarily poor social policy, and perhaps even unconstitutional.

I therefore sincerely hope that both the Reagan administration and this Congress will include this proposal within any tax relief legislation and will allow all married couples the option of filing their taxes as if they were single.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this bill will eliminate the injustice of the marriage penalty tax without imposing additional taxes on any segment of the taxpaying public.

I urge its immediate adoption.

#### AMERICAN SHOE INDUSTRY

**HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the American shoe industry is in a precarious position. It is one of the most import-impacted industries in our Nation today, with imported shoes accounting for 48.5 percent of the domestic market. This is substantially higher than the much publicized steel industry with 16 percent import penetration and the automobile industry with 27 percent import penetration.

In 1977, the shoe industry was granted a 4-year import control program consisting of orderly marketing agreements between the United States and Taiwan and also the United States and Korea. In addition, the agreement extended the authority to take action against "surge" countries.

While this import relief has had a positive effect in reducing imports from Taiwan and Korea, no action was ever formally approved against surge countries which have cut dramatically into the domestic market bringing about an additional loss of 13,000 jobs since the implementation of the OMA's.

I feel that this extension of the relief program is essential if the do-

mestic industry is going to have sufficient time to realize benefits from revitalization efforts currently underway. The footwear industry and the affected unions have filed for an extension of the import relief program as provided for in the Trade Act of 1974. The International Trade Commission is currently conducting an investigation into the effect that the extension, reduction or termination would have on the American economy. The ITC will present its recommendations to the President, after the investigation, who has the final authority to extend, reduce or terminate the OMA's.

The House concurrent resolution I have filed today, urges the President to grant the extension of the OMA's, allowing the industry the opportunity to become more competitive in the United States and world markets. Since the imposition of the OMA's, the industry has undertaken a number of initiatives to enhance its competitiveness and adjust to import penetration. An ambitious export program, management training programs, and the establishment of the American Shoe Center to foster technological improvements in the industry demonstrate the industry's efforts to improve productivity and competitiveness.

The House of Representatives has a responsibility to see that the American shoe industry is allowed this opportunity to become more competitive. Over 250,000 Americans depend on shoe manufacturing for their jobs.

We, in Congress, should recognize the need to protect those jobs. We must do whatever we can to convince the International Trade Commission and the Reagan administration that it is in the best interest of our Nation to protect those jobs. I urge you to join with me in sending this message of support on behalf of our ailing shoe industry.●

#### REPEAL REQUIREMENT FOR MULTILINGUAL BALLOTS

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, I have endeavored to get the Congress to take a close look at what I believe was another unnecessary extension of Federal power. Specifically, I am referring to the bilingual provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended in 1970 and 1975. Though created with the best of intentions, I have seen nothing to indicate that the charges made in 1975 have had any effect other than to increase the costs which States and local communities must bear in supervising the electoral process. The bill I intro-

duce today will remedy the problem by repealing the bilingual provisions.

Section 203 of the act requires that a State or political subdivision must conduct its elections in languages other than English if, prior to August 6, 1985, the Director of the Bureau of the Census determines: First, that more than 5 percent of the citizens of voting age within such State or political subdivision are members of a single-language minority, and second, that the illiteracy rate of such persons as a group is higher than the national illiteracy rate. It should be noted that, for purposes of this act, illiteracy means the failure of a voting-age person to complete the fifth primary grade. Though the definition of language minority in section 203(e) of the act is described as meaning persons who are "American Indian, Asian American, Alaskan Natives or of Spanish heritage," there are documented instances where States and localities have been required to issue ballots and election information printed in Chinese, Japanese, and Tagalog, as well as various other lesser known languages.

The original purpose of the 1965 Voting Rights Act was to insure that black Americans would receive the essential right to participate in our electoral system and that States or localities which had a history of establishing tests or prohibitive devices for the purpose of denying that right would be forced to have future statutes relating to the electoral system cleared by either the U.S. Attorney General or the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia.

In 1975, Congress extended this principle for a 7-year period, but committed a gross error by identifying the voting difficulties of language minority groups with those of black Americans. In my judgment, this action was not warranted; the difficulty which single-language minorities face in participating in the electoral process is not necessarily due to any State action intended for that purpose. The costly results of our folly must be eliminated. There does not appear to be any evidence, in rebuttal, that the bilingual provisions of the Voting Rights Act have had any significant positive effect on the involvement of single-language minorities in the American electoral process.

In the final analysis, it is the English language which citizens in this country must learn if they are to enter into the mainstream of American culture. This is not to say that ethnic minorities should discard their own heritage and the language which represents that heritage. On the contrary, America has always encouraged diversity. For example, I am Irish and proud of it, but I do not believe that my State of Illinois has any responsibility to provide ballots in Gaelic. I be-



lieve that many immigrants to this country would never have been able to make their important and distinctive contributions to American life had they not learned English. I am afraid that recent efforts to extend bilingualism to the public school system as well as in the voting booth only serves, in the long run, to separate and polarize us.

Where there is no clear need for the Federal Government to involve itself in State matters, the better policy is for it to abstain. In my judgment, this is particularly true in the case of minority language voting rights, and for that reason, my bill will delete the minority language provisions altogether. I hope it will achieve rapid consideration and that the Congress will see fit to act before 1982.●

#### RELIEF FOR ATOMIC VETERANS

**HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the bill I am introducing today that would provide relief for the thousands of veterans who are suffering the effects of exposure to nuclear testing.

This legislation seeks to create a presumption of causality between a veteran's service at an atomic or nuclear test site and any disability or disease attributable to exposure to radiation. Under current law and Veterans' Administration regulation, in order for a veteran to claim compensation for a disability, the disability or disease must manifest itself within 1 year from the date of separation of service.

The nature of the effects of exposure to low-level ionizing radiation are only now being fully evaluated. Evidence indicates, however, that this exposure of the sort thousands of veterans experienced during the atomic and nuclear testing after World War II and ending in 1962, can precipitate leukemia and other types of cancers. A statistical study by the Center for Disease Control found that veterans present at the SMOKY test had a significantly higher proportion of instances of leukemia than present in the general population.

The bill would cover all veterans present at the Nevada test site, Bikini Atoll, Eniwetok Atoll, the Johnston Island area, the Christmas Island area, the general Pacific Ocean area in which testing occurred, and as an additional safeguard to cover any others that may have been overlooked, it would consider the time period in which the tests took place. Compensation would be paid for periods of time occurring after the effective date of the bill which is October 1, 1981. The

number of veterans and civilians present at these tests is unknown, but estimates place the figure as high as 400,000. The dollar amount of compensation would vary according to standard VA accounting measures based on the degree of disability, term of service, and highest rank held.

Mr. Speaker, these men responded quickly and honorably when they were called upon by their country for assistance. It is now our country's turn to respond in a similar manner to their pleas for help. The text of my bill is printed here for my colleagues to review.

H.R. —

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain veterans entitled to wartime disability compensation for disabilities and diseases caused by or attributable to exposure to atomic or nuclear radiation during their period of active service

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 312 of title 38 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) For the purposes of section 310 of this title, and subject to the provisions of section 313 of this title, in the case of any veteran who, as determined by the Administrator, served in the active military, naval, or air service at the Nevada Test Site located in the State of Nevada or at the Bikini Atoll, the Eniwetok Atoll, the Johnston Island area, the Christmas Island area, or the area around the point located at latitude 29 degrees north and longitude 126 degrees west, located in the Pacific Ocean, at any time during the period beginning on June 30, 1945, and ending on December 12, 1962, and such veteran suffers from any disability or disease caused by or attributable to exposure to atomic or nuclear radiation during such service, such disability or disease shall be considered to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service, notwithstanding that there is no record of such disability or disease during the period of service and that such disability or disease did not become manifest within one year from the date of separation of such veteran from such service."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1981, and shall only be effective with respect to compensation paid for periods of time occurring after such date.●

#### DECONTROL OF OIL

**HON. DON YOUNG**

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the decision made by President Reagan to decontrol oil and refined petroleum products. This decision is the first step toward a rational, cogent, and workable energy policy based upon facts not fantasy; a policy whose premise is based upon production not procrastination. Decontrolling the price of oil will make both produc-

ers and consumers of energy more aware and responsive to the true value of energy.

The United States is a storehouse of energy ranging from oil and natural gas to hydroelectric and geothermal power. Decontrolling the price of oil will provide the necessary incentives private industry needs to invest in exploration and development in the United States instead of foreign countries. Such action will allow industry to go forward in producing additional energy from conventional as well as unconventional sources of energy. In years past, many U.S. based companies have chosen to go abroad and search for oil because energy in foreign lands could be produced more cheaply than oil produced domestically. As a result, the United States suffered from a lack of drilling activity and production and an accompanying decline in domestic reserves. The action taken by President Reagan will serve to stimulate activity by private industry in developing U.S. energy resources.

I am excited by the prospect of the United States becoming energy self-sufficient again. I believe that a more realistic approach toward identifying our Nation's natural resources will greatly benefit the national economy. For example, we need to take a close look at our public lands. An accurate inventory or the fuel and nonfuel resources should be taken so that Americans will have a more accurate idea of the treasures stored within American boundaries. We are an energy-rich Nation: Steps should be taken to obtain knowledge about our precious resources so that responsible decisions regarding land policy may be made.

Belief and support of private industry, large and small, is demonstrated by the acceleration of decontrol of oil. Decontrol may set the stage whereby Alaska may be allowed to contribute even more to the domestic oil and natural gas reserves of the United States. It is possible for the United States to enjoy the wealth of Alaska's resources as rational decisions are made by the administration with respect to areas in Alaska with high resource potential. A transportation corridor known as the Trans-Alaska Pipeline (TAPS) is already in place to take 1.5 million barrels of oil per day to the tanker terminal at Valdez, Alaska. Other onshore areas in Alaska such as the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPRA) and the Arctic Wildlife Range (AWR) could provide Americans with literally billions of barrels of oil in the coming years. This will result only if proper and prudent land-use decisions are made.

I am excited by the prospect of accelerated decontrol; it will be good for the Nation. The solution to the energy problem is related to a host of variables; political, economic, geographi-

cal, and attitudinal. We must use our resources wisely and efficiently. Allowing the true cost of energy to be exhibited will reflect the true value of energy. I look forward to assisting the President in developing his policy of producing energy for the United States.

The Washington Post's editorial commenting on the decision of President Reagan accurately assesses the impact of decontrol. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post]  
DECONTROL, AT LAST

President Reagan was absolutely right to decontrol oil and gasoline prices, quickly and without qualification. It is an essential step toward a rational energy policy. You can dismiss all of those tendentious claims about the added cost to the consumer. The added cost to the consumer will probably be in the range of zero. More than five-sixths of the country's crude oil supply is decontrolled. Home heating oil was decontrolled five years ago. As for gasoline, competition is holding actual retail prices well below the legal ceilings. For the country as a whole, these controls have brought nothing but harm, and the end of them will bring nothing but benefit.

The controls were wrong in theory when President Nixon imposed them in 1971. They were demonstrably wrong, as much costly experience already showed, when Congress insisted on perpetuating them in 1975. President Carter wisely began the process of decontrol last spring. The schedule was a gradual one running into next fall, when the law will expire altogether. Mr. Reagan has now sped up that final process by eight months.

Why were controls wrong? Because they disguised the dangerously high cost of oil to the American economy. The control system required refiners with cheap, price-controlled domestic oil to subsidize other refiners' imports. That held the price to American consumers far below the cost of the imports. Americans used a lot and kept the flow of imported oil high. That seriously damaged the country's balance of payments and eroded the value of the American dollar.

The high level of American imports helped create the very tight market that enabled the exporting nations to double their prices in 1979. By now, the price to the American consumer is undoubtedly higher than it would have been in the absence of any price controls at all. As an attempt to protect the American economy from higher oil costs, the controls have been an unmitigated failure.

Prices have been rising, inevitably, even under the controls. They aren't going to rise any faster in the absence of controls, unless another world shortage develops. Decontrol may even slow the rise a little. The control system contained a number of hidden subsidies—including the usual fat subsidy for the independent refiners—that will now lapse, saving the public a little money.

At worst, in another international shortage and panic like the one in 1979 following the Iranian revolution, prices will indeed rise. How much? It depends on the scale of the shortage. There could be a squeeze on the supply line as early as this spring, if the war continues between Iran and Iraq. But in return for higher prices at the gasoline pump, you will get insurance against a

return of the gasoline lines. Those lines were created by the price ceilings, and the cumbersome allocation rules that they required. Having been through two memorable episodes of gasoline lines, most Americans would surely prefer the next time around to pay in money rather than time, anger and anxiety. ●

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, while still in the early days of the 97th Congress and a new administration, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter from my constituent, Mr. William Elton Lile, Auto Autowash, Inc., Hopkinsville, Ky., directed to the Department of Energy's southwest regional center regarding the ridiculous delay in the processing of his application for exception. I certainly share my constituent's sentiments and trust that my colleagues will follow the lead of the new administration in scrutinizing the efforts of the Department of Energy. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

I thank you for your phone call explaining that you were going to try and help me with my case. I appreciate all of the information that you gave me and telling me the information and the forms that you needed.

After considering everything involved, I have concluded that it is useless for me to continue my appeal. If the DOE has been unable to act on all the information that I have supplied in the past year, I don't believe they would act on the same information today. I am unable to continue in business under the circumstances so I will have to close and do something else that doesn't require so much bureaucracy. I am convinced that the DOE is for big oil and not for the small operator. As you told me that no matter what your ruling was that the Petroleum Company wouldn't have to comply, they would just appeal so I can't wait any longer. I suppose this was the ultimate aim of the DOE.

I can only hope at this point that my file on this case will help the incoming administration to see the complete inefficiency of the DOE and will abolish same and make it possible for small business such as mine to survive.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM ELTON LILE,  
Auto Autowash, Inc. ●

## THE IMPEACHMENT OF FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE NAUMAN SCOTT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, today it is my undesirable but necessary duty to introduce a resolution impeaching Nauman Scott, judge of the

U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana. It is never a pleasing matter to have to call into such complete question the actions of a civil officer, but no choice is left in this case.

Judge Scott has violated the 10th amendment of the Constitution. He has used the 1964 civil rights law as a mere device to illegally expand Federal authority over domestic law, an area of clear State authority.

There has been an overly broad exercise of judicial power violating due process. The judge has usurped the normal procedure of a State court in the exercise of its judicial functions in administering the domestic law of the State.

Judge Scott has committed the foregoing violations and abuses of authority by—

Ordering the principal of the Buckeye School and the school board to expunge school attendance records of the three children who were lawfully attending the Buckeye School, and by coercing them to be bused to the Jones Street School by ordering the Buckeye School to withhold credits that the children earned;

By denying the parents' legitimate request that the contempt hearing in the case be postponed for a few days in order that they could be represented by their attorney, and thereafter carrying out the hearing affecting the children and their parents without the help of counsel to advise them of their rights; and

By setting up a secret panel that decides which children will be bused to which schools, called the biracial committee, the composition of which is a secret and the proceedings of which are kept secret, thereby violating the due process rights of parents and children in the area affected.

To put it succinctly he has acted in a manner unbefitting his office and should be impeached.

Judge Scott argues that segregation is the primary issue, that busing is its sole remedy and that his conduct has been lawful in the pursuit of this end. There can be no question the conduct of Judge Scott has been far from legal or professional. As to the central issue and policy question of domestic law, alleged segregation and Federal intervention, however, some questions need to be asked to put it in perspective. Is the pursuit of a remedy for so-called segregation to be an all pervasive priority where all rights of travel and association are suspended? For instance, what if a single parent needs to have his or her child live with a grandparent in another school district because of an economic hardship and an inability to care for that child. Is he or she to be wholly prohibited from such action clearly in the child's best interest? And what of the rights of custody



of separated parents who now live outside the school district in question? Are their rights to custody of the children living in the school district under the desegregation order to be held completely void? Are we in fact to have the Federal court now routinely supervising all domestic law questions in the districts under a desegregation order to root out and make certain there is not lurking under each domestic dispute the question of segregation which has apparently even surpassed original sin on the scale of importance in human errors? Certainly no rationally minded and sound-thinking person can say "Yes" to these questions.

What we see being clearly and finally established, therefore, is the unfounded nature of busing. The answer is that another solution must be sought by the courts if they intend to pursue their original end, but this social program has unquestionably run its course. Society has been convulsed by busing, the judicial system has violated its constitutional soul in trying to implement it, and neither white nor black families have been the better for it.

Judge Scott has in fact played the trump card in the hand of constitutionalists. He has gone beyond all reason pursuing with unbalanced vengeance his decree. By so doing he has demonstrated to the country with the highest profile possible that the courts have been standing in thin air in pursuit of this unfounded, impractical mechanism. Having done so in violation of the 10th amendment, States rights, and due process, in a highhanded and outrageous fashion unbecoming the bench and the legal system of this country, Judge Scott should be impeached posthaste in accordance with the laws of this land. It is time to finally lay this matter and its tyrants to rest.

Thank you.●

# GOVERNMENT REPORT SAYS COAL INDUSTRY TOO REGULATED

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, for many years some of us have maintained that the rules and regulations regarding the coal industry are more of a hindrance than a help toward solving our energy crisis. Many of the environmentalists have accused those of us who took this position as being tied into the coal industry. In my case, nothing could be further from the truth. As a U.S. citizen, my sole goal on the energy front is to make us energy independent.

With that in mind, I was both encouraged and upset to find that the January 11, 1981 edition of the Washington Star contained an article entitled "Report Calls Coal Industry Too Regulated." I was upset because I wondered why it took so long for this to be acknowledged. I was encouraged because the reality of the situation finally had come out.

The article relates how a draft report of a year long Government study of coal regulations has concluded that the coal industry is justified in its complaints about unnecessary Government regulation and needless paperwork. I note in particular that the news story comments on the situation regarding mine safety in Illinois and how two different sets of rules, in conflict with one another, are enforced.

In the Illinois case, the amount of potentially explosive dust allowed in a mine is regulated by both the Federal and the State governments. In Illinois, the amount of rock dust is supposed to be controlled by watering down the walls. But the Federal inspector requires that the amount be controlled by spraying rock dust on the walls. Thus, the operator of one mine complained that when the Federal inspector came he had to spray the walls white with rock dust, but when the Illinois inspector came, he had to wash down the walls and therefore wash away the rock dust. I only wonder what would happen if both the Federal and the State inspector arrived at the same time.

It is significant to me that the report on the coal situation came forth during the final days of President Carter's administration. The point of the report, that the coal industry is overregulated, is one conservatives have been making for a long time. I am glad to see the Carter administration finally came to understand this reality.

I would like to bring the January 11, 1981 Washington Star article, "Report Calls Coal Industry Too Regulated" by Lance Gay to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

## REPORT CALLS COAL INDUSTRY TOO REGULATED

(By Lance Gay)

A government study of regulations affecting the coal industry has concluded that coal operators are justified in their complaints about government over-regulation and paperwork.

A draft report of a year-long study of coal regulations, released yesterday, found instances where state and federal regulators gave different interpretations for enforcing the same regulations, duplicate regulations or delays in obtaining permits.

"There are a lot of reasons for the coal operators to be damn mad," said Peter Petkas, director of the U.S. Regulatory Council, which embarked on the coal project as a study for the Carter administration of the effect of regulations.

The coal industry is one of the most regulated of American industries, with several federal and state agencies claiming jurisdiction over various aspects of coal extraction. Among the federal agencies dealing with mining are the Department of Interior's Bureau of Mines, the Department of Labor's Mine Safety Enforcement Administration, Interior's Office of Surface Mining, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Each of the states has a similar agency with parallel jurisdiction.

The study found some interagency conflicts in enforcing these differing rules. For example, both federal mine safety rules and state rules regulate the amount of potentially explosive dust that is allowed in a mine to avoid explosions. In Illinois, one federal inspector insisted that the dust be controlled by spraying rock dust on the walls of the mine, while the inspector for the state of Illinois required watering the walls down. The operator of the mine complained that he had to spray the walls white with rock dust when the federal inspector came, then wash the walls down—and thus wash away the rock dust—when the inspector from Illinois visited.

Petkas said the study found the basic problems were not in the basic laws, nor in the regulations themselves, but rather in interpretation given the regulations.

"Most of the problems are coming at the federal-state level and are resulting not from the written regulations themselves, but rather the complexity of the system," he said. "In a strangely elegant way, all things are fitting together and most regulations put out by the federal agencies and the state agencies are consistent. That's not the problem. The problem is application. There is a good deal of disagreement over implementing these regulations, and there is a lot of unnecessary confusion laid on top of that."

Petkas cited the case of strip mining regulations that are being implemented as a result of complex 1977 strip mining legislation and said he agreed with James G. Watt, Ronald Reagan's nominee to be Secretary of Interior, who told the Senate Energy Committee last week that the problem is not the basic law itself but management of the program.

One problem identified by the Council study was that strip mining inspectors do not have the latitude not to write up a violation notice when they uncover a violation of the regulations, no matter how small.

He said that this contrasts to the approach taken by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's food inspectors, who have developed "a symbiotic relationship" with the industry and have been given a large amount of discretion in trying to head off or correct violations of the law.

By taking such a stringent adversary approach to enforcement of mining regulations, Petkas said that the federal government is risking a backlash from operators.

"They are at risk of losing the whole system because operators are angry, and justifiably in some cases," he said.

Joan Davenport, assistant Interior Secretary, said she had several concerns with the Regulatory Council's finding. "The report appears to lack balance inasmuch as the Regulatory Council solicited comments from coal operators but not from citizen and environmental groups concerned that surface mining be conducted so as to protect the environment and restore the land."

Petkas said the study did not attempt to address major policy issues, but rather ex-

amine the impact of the entire regulatory process on a particular industry. Similar studies are being conducted of auto and steel industries by the council.●

MARGARET C. McNAMARA

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago our Nation lost one of its most conscientious, dedicated, and spirited Americans when Margaret C. McNamara, a woman whose contributions in numerous civic areas the people of this country will long be grateful for, passed away. I am sure I speak for all of us present today when I say this remarkable individual's accomplishments in the fields of education and social services will never be equaled.

Margaret's contribution in the field of education in this country, particularly her goal of assisting young people to experience the joys of reading, was undoubtedly her greatest achievement. She understood all too well, that many children from underprivileged families did not have adequate reading materials in the home, and that they would be better motivated to read if it was possible to own their own books. Out of this desire to motivate young people to read, Margaret founded the nationwide reading-is-fundamental program, which today has grown to involve more than 3 million children in all 50 States. Her dedication to leading children to choose and own books inspired her to lead a program that by 1980 had been responsible for distributing the astonishing amount of 37 million books, and it is no wonder that former President Carter awarded her the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Medal of Freedom, just a short time ago. Few Americans were ever more deserving of such an honor.

This energetic woman, with a seemingly endless supply of energy, also was involved in a number of other activities which benefited others who were less fortunate than herself. In 1959 she was named regional director for the White House Conference on Children and Youth, and from 1964 to 1968 was an active member of the National Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity, as well as giving much of her time to the League of Women Voters. In addition to all that, she also managed to find the time to serve as a volunteer with the Head Start program and the widening horizons program of the Urban Service Corps in Washington.

Margaret McNamara was a woman to be admired for her love of people and this country. She was a woman who gave so much for so many, a woman who fought with all her might

until the end. To her husband, and the rest of the McNamara family I offer my heartfelt condolences on their loss, a loss shared by a nation which appreciates all that she did for it. In this time of sadness they surely must be sustained by the memory of her lifetime and numerous achievements, as well as by the respect in which her memory is held by those fortunate enough to have known her.●

RETIREMENT OF DOYLE F. BOEN

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, the Eastern Municipal Water District will host a special retirement dinner to honor Doyle F. Boen, a man who had been both general manager and chief engineer of the district since it was first formed in 1951. I want to take this opportunity to join with his many friends in expressing my appreciation to Doyle for his many contributions over the past 30 years.

Doyle was one of the first of my constituents to stop by after I took office a little more than 2 years ago. Then, and in our continuing dialog, he has generously shared his expertise, garnered in working almost 50 years with water management problems, with me. I have always found his counsel both helpful and incisive in considering the special and unique water resource questions facing southern California.

Following his graduation from the University of Southern California, Doyle joined the Metropolitan Water District in 1934. Subsequently, he served as city manager and chief engineer of the city of Corona, Calif., for 5 years. During that period, he was primarily responsible for a major expansion of the city's sewer system and the reconstruction of its sewage treatment plant.

When the Eastern Municipal Water District was formed in 1951, Doyle was selected as the general manager and chief engineer, a post he held until his retirement in late December. During those 30 years, the district expanded from 86 square miles to cover more than 533 square miles. Similarly, the population expanded from less than 20,000 to almost 140,000 today. Mr. Speaker, some of my eastern colleagues may not be totally aware of the full impact of water management activities in our area. This is our most scarce and most precious resource. Doyle deserves the highest praise for his activities over the years to serve his constituency.

During those years, Doyle became involved in water and sanitation matters not only at the local level but also

at the county, State, and national levels. He was deeply involved in the drafting and subsequent enactment of the Federal Small Reclamation Projects Act, a law which has made much of the growth of the Eastern Municipal Waters District possible.

As part of those activities, Doyle has been recognized repeatedly by his colleagues for his contributions. To mention just a few, in 1974 he received the Outstanding Engineer's Merit Award from the Institute for Advancement of Engineering. The next year, the Bureau of Reclamation presented him with its Citizen Award for "initiative, leadership, and skilled direction in coordinating varied interests resulting in the adoption of the Small Reclamation Projects Act." In 1979, the National Water Resources Association presented him with its President's Award for "continued dedication to water resources development." Finally, only last year, the Riverside-San Bernardino chapter of the American Society of Civil Engineers recognized him as Engineer of the Year.

Doyle has been, and I understand intends to remain, active in a number of water-oriented organizations such as the American Society of Civil Engineers, the Riverside County Water Association, the California Water Resources Association, the National Water Resources Association, and the Southern California Water Conference. I am certain that these organizations and the people of the Eastern Municipal Water District will continue to reap tremendous benefits from Doyle's dedication and his great fund of knowledge. I know I will always welcome his counsel on these matters.●

CITIZEN'S COALITION TO SAVE OUR STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. HANSEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to share with you the contents of a letter I received from the Citizen's Coalition To Save Our Steel Industry. This comes from a group of concerned citizens who are a great example of what can happen from the grassroots level when people care enough to get involved and be heard:

Our friend, U.S. Steel Corporation's Geneva Works in Central Utah, has fed and clothed and provided a good living for over 5,000 families since World War II. Today our plant is in jeopardy. We don't know who the enemy is, maybe it's the foreign steel which has taken forty percent of our market or perhaps the government for not enforcing fair trade laws. Whatever the real cause, we knew our plant would not be able to stay in business and satisfy the demands of the EPA. The EPA (perhaps bound by



the Clean Air Act) wants U.S. Steel to spend millions the company doesn't have.

When our Geneva plant was being pushed, we formed a Coalition of concerned citizens and began to push back.

The Coalition took off like spontaneous combustion. Suddenly people with varying talents came together to work on the same issue from different angles and with different points of view. There were housewives who took their kids with them to shopping malls to get signatures on petitions, pass out balloons and badges, and ask people to write letters. There were people who liked public speaking and people who liked to write speeches. People who knew newspaper people who placed copy in the press. We had big campaign contributors crawling all over elected representatives. We also had money-raiser types and bookkeepers.

Everyone was a specialist and no one can claim full credit for getting the job done.

When we let it be known that twenty-five thousand people had signed our petitions and another six thousand had written personal letters, we began to be noticed. All of a sudden doors started opening. We had respect. Congressmen, ranking Corporate officials, union leaders and national trade association executives traveled to Utah to talk. Network television went wherever we went.

Not only was our effort successful, but it was just plain fun—a group of friends getting things done together—a social gathering.

No one ever did anything alone.

Each town had its own chairwoman who organized ladies groups. These groups distributed posters, leaflets, petitions, called to get people to attend hearings or to get signatures for letters.

As our membership increased the money poured in. Five dollars was the entry fee. Card tables were set-up in the malls and at the plant gates during shift changes to sign up new members. Unions, customers, and suppliers of the plant, Chambers of Commerce, and people and businesses from thirteen states have all joined our ranks.

The ultimate outcome of our effort is yet to be seen. However, one thing is certain: the work must go on. We know that thousands of citizens across the nation share our concerns. Over twenty-five thousand steelworkers are now on layoff. These are dependable, self-respecting people who earnestly want to earn their own way. But they are being denied the chance. For still other thousands there will be no callbacks. Their plants are closed once and for all.

We must unite and make our voices heard. Let's all stand together to revitalize this vital industry. We hereby invite all citizens to join us.●

#### BUDGET CUTTING

### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, this Congress will be faced with many major decisions concerning how to trim the Federal budget. There will be many suggestions, including the elimination of fraud, waste, and abuse; more efficient management; reductions in travel and procurement expenses; the elimination of low-priority

programs; and reform of entitlement programs.

Before these important decisions are made, however, it is necessary to understand how the growth in Federal spending has occurred and how much of it came to be called uncontrollable.

The growth of the Federal budget has come primarily from two sources. First, there have been increased expenditures for national security. Second, and more important in budgetary terms, there have been increases in income maintenance programs, such as social security, which are indexed to inflation.

Just 30 years ago, benefits for social security and railroad retirement made up less than 3 percent of Federal expenditures. Today, they are more than 20 percent. The proportion of Federal spending tied to the Consumer Price Index is expected to be about 30 percent next year. Ten years ago, only 3 percent was indexed. Thus inflation has had a devastating effect on the budget, particularly in those programs known as entitlements. These are programs in which any eligible person can participate. The more eligible persons there are, the more expensive the program. Unemployment compensation, for example, increases dramatically in times of recession. For this reason, such programs are often referred to as uncontrollable.

Other programs, such as payments to State and local governments, have also increased in recent years. The simple message, however, which comes through after a close look at Federal spending is that the budget is hemorrhaging.

Unfortunately, although everyone can agree that excessive spending must be eliminated, almost every line item in the budget is championed by its own constituency. One person's low-priority program is another's vital concern.

There is also a misconception that the budget can be balanced just by riding it of fraud, waste, and abuse. It would be easy to eliminate if there were such a line item in the budget with that label. The fact is that while some savings can and should be made by eliminating wasteful spending, most cuts will involve genuine sacrifice.

There is no magic solution that will suddenly balance the budget, and it is important that the public's expectations become more realistic. The attitude reflected in the letters I receive from constituents is "cut the budget, but leave my program alone."

All segments of our society, some with very special and perhaps vital interests will have to cut back. Some cuts will hurt, but nothing hurts as much as runaway inflation that threatens to destroy the very fabric of our social, economic, and political structure.

The Federal deficit may not be the primary cause of inflation, but for fiscal, social, and psychological reasons we will not reduce inflation unless we first reduce Federal spending.

As these reductions are made, we must do what we can to protect those who are most vulnerable. The sick, the aged, and the children in our society must be assured that they will not suffer from reductions in programs which provide a safety net for those who have no other means of support.

The new administration and we in Congress must work together to bring about a just and realistic budget. It can be done. It will be done, but only if we can all work together.●

#### ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

### HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have taken a keen interest in the proposed Alaska natural gas transportation system (ANGTS). In view of the world energy situation and the impact that it has had upon the economy of this Nation. I think it is commendable that such importance has been placed on the completion of the ANGTS. I would like to take this opportunity to give a brief introduction of the project for the benefit of the new Members.

The Alaska natural gas transportation system is the largest private construction project of its kind in history. Authorization for the construction of this project is contained within the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976.

The route for the ANGTS was approved by the President's decision in 1977, Executive Order No. 12142. The route consists of four segments: Alaskan, Canadian, U.S. eastern leg, and U.S. western leg. These segments will operate jointly to bring over 26 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to U.S. markets over the next 25 to 30 years. This will be approximately 5 percent of the U.S. natural gas demand given current levels of consumption. Experts estimate, however, that there are significant reserves of natural gas in addition to the reserves that have been identified at Prudhoe Bay. At the present time, oil is extracted from the Prudhoe Bay field at a rate of 1.5 million barrels of oil per day. The gas extracted with the oil is being reinjected into the gas cap at Prudhoe Bay in order to preserve this valuable energy resource until it is brought to market via the ANGTS.

The areas adjacent to the Prudhoe Bay field, such as the National Petro-

leum Reserve-Alaska (NPRA), the Beaufort Sea, and the Arctic Wildlife Range (AWR) have high probabilities of natural gas reserves. Reserves tapped from these areas will be close in proximity to the ANGTS corridor.

The route for the ANGTS will begin at Prudhoe Bay in Alaska and follow the existing trans-Alaska pipeline route for 548 miles to Delta Junction, Alaska. From this point the ANGTS will follow the Alaska Highway to the Canadian border. The length of the total system including all four legs will be some 4,800 miles. Initial delivery of the total system will be approximately 2 billion cubic feet per day—which will offset the import of foreign oil equivalent to 450,000 barrels of oil per day—however, this delivery can be increased with additional compression to 3.2 billion cubic feet per day.

The final design engineering and cost estimates are in the process of being finalized for the Alaskan segment. The major obstacle thus far is the compilation of a financial package, however, the project sponsors are working hard to resolve this issue. Construction has begun on the Canadian portion or so-called prebuild section of the ANGTS. The eastern and western legs of the system are scheduled to begin construction this year. Completion of the total system is expected sometime in 1985.

The regulatory procedures associated with construction of the ANGTS are being coordinated by the Office of the Federal Inspector of the Alaska natural gas transportation system. The OFI is a unique Federal mechanism designed to provide a "one-window" approach in coordinating and expediting activities and interests of Federal, State, and local concern.

The ANGTS will contribute significantly to the energy supply of the United States. It is not only symbolic of the determination to break our dependence upon foreign oil, it is a message to the world that Americans are willing to take the steps that are necessary in order to reduce our national vulnerability. The ANGTS is also symbolic of this Nation's ability to work with our neighbors, the Canadians, in an effort to construct this critical energy project. The year 1981 will be a year marked by progress toward energy independence, marked by the Alaska natural gas transportation system. ●

**FREEDOM IS A GOAL WHICH WE  
ALL PURSUE**

**HON. DANIEL B. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, freedom is a goal which we all

pursue. However, one of the major threats to freedom is the spread of international communism. An annual commemoration of World Freedom Day is held each year in Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China, in support of freedom for those nations enslaved under the bondage of communism.

An outstanding leader and key spokesman for freedom in the Republic of China is Ku Cheng-kang, LL.D., who has earned worldwide recognition for his strong stand against godless communism. I wish to direct the attention of the Members to an address delivered by Dr. Ku before the World Freedom Day Rally on January 23 in Taipei.

His address follows:

STRIDE AHEAD INTO THE ERA OF VICTORY FOR  
FREEDOM

(By Dr. Ku Cheng-kang)

NEW DECADE OF JOINT ENDEAVOR

Premier Sun, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are on the threshold of a new age in the course of history's development. Both the decade of the 1980s for the whole world and that of the 70s of the Republic of China have started. All the Chinese and others who stand for freedom and democracy have hand in hand stepped into an era of joint endeavor. This World Freedom Day Meeting here today represents the great new unity of such people in the new age, determined to fight on against Red totalitarians.

The 1980s shall see further rise of forces for freedom and democracy. It will be the decade of Communist fall. The ROC's 70s shall see China's reunification in freedom and democracy. The "World Freedom Day" Movement is the major driving force of this new situation.

PRESENT RISE OF FREE DEMOCRATIC FORCES

The present rise of international forces for freedom and democracy is moving in these four major directions:

As regards the bipolar confrontation by freedom and democracy against Communist autocracy, Russia's invasion of Afghanistan and continuous advances into the Mediterranean as well as the Indian Ocean and the Western Pacific have been accompanied by all-out Red Chinese infiltration to create rifts and armed rebellions in free countries, but these moves have made free democratic nations rise speedily with positive military readiness against Red aggression and expansion and better countermeasures against subversion. Unity and cooperation will be further enhanced among free nations. The whole free camp is being consolidated for collective steps to safeguard freedom and democracy.

In the race involving the two camps, the free world progress, prosperity, freedom and well-being are in growingly sharper contrast with the backwardness, poverty, autocracy and suffering under Communism. Greater than ever impacts will be created in the 1980s. More and more people in the free world will discard Communism, and more people behind the Iron Curtain will rise against Red tyranny. Identical thinking will bring unity of purpose and spur joint steps. In the face of a greater awakening of humanity and confronted by the determined surge of people everywhere for well-being, Communism will tread its path to downfall.

Changes within the Red bloc will further expose the failure of Communist rule, widen

the rift between revisionists and doctrinaires, and bring sharper clashes for power and hegemony. The struggle waged by Teng Hsiao-ping and other Red Chinese power-holders against the Gang of Four and its followers is widening the crack that will make the Red rule fall apart. The widespread strikes by Polish workers are bringing similar results. Communist regimes will come to their end amidst theoretical bankruptcy and opposition of gallant Iron Curtain masses.

Developments of the free world have been such that people have learned enough from the mistaken policies of appeasement and compromise in the 1970s. Those policies succeeded only in bringing rampant Red expansion, but the exposed Red aggressiveness made the free world wide awake and spurred the rise of righteous forces for anti-Communist campaigns. A surge is shaping up for the destruction of Red tyranny in the 1980s.

CHINA'S UNIFICATION IN FREEDOM AND  
DEMOCRACY

The rising free democratic forces are the mainstream of the 1980s. Unification of China in freedom and democracy will be the guiding force of history in the decade ahead.

The 900 million people on the Chinese mainland have been plunged in despair by Red rulers and no longer pin any hope to Communism. Even before getting under way, the so-called "four modernizations" started producing four bitter fruits: production suspension, economic withering, currency inflation and social confusion. The trial of the Lin Piao and Chiang Ching cliques came recently as an attempt to heap blames on a few past leaders. By condemning these scapegoats, the regime wants to fool the people under it and divert the attention of the world outside. But the trial, aside from foreboding even fiercer power struggle, has exposed the wickedness of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai, testified to the crimes of Teng Hsiao-ping and others now in power, and proven that the days are numbered for Marxism, Leninism and Communism. The opposition of the mainland masses to the regime will intensify.

In Taiwan, the Republic of China has implemented democratic constitutional rule, brought about great progress through policies of well-being for all, and succeeded in glorifying China's great cultural heritage. Our society has been built as one that is free, democratic, open and prosperous. A bright vista has thus been created for all China. Tremendous attraction and influence are being exerted. The 900 million people on the mainland are receiving encouragement for their anti-Communist struggles to win freedom, democracy and human rights. Their calls for emulation of the Taiwan economy example are evolving into demands for learning from the ROC in politics and for return to the Three Principles of the People. This is enhancing the march to China's unification in freedom and democracy in the 1980s.

The Republic of China will never compromise with the Chinese Reds or contact the Soviets. The firm ROC stand of never departing from the democratic camp has positively contributed to the building of peace and freedom in Asia and the world. The nation continues as a vanguard in man's struggle to safeguard freedom and democracy. Unification of China in freedom and democracy will add 900 million people to the free democratic camp and put all the op-



pressed masses behind the Iron Curtain on their feet for action to terminate Communist rule.

#### WHAT FREEDOM FORCES MUST NOW DO

Ladies and Gentlemen: The 1980s will usher in victories for freedom and democracy. This highly advantageous turning point of history must be fully grasped so that struggles for freedom, democracy and human rights will triumph before long. To meet this demand, I hereby on this glorious World Freedom Day advance the following calls:

We maintain that the newly-established Reagan Administration resolutely ends the humiliating U.S. policy of detente and compromise with Red forces. The awakened Americans support President Reagan's effort for national renewal. The United States is powerfully demonstrating that she will, with strength, safeguard freedom and peace and, with justice and righteousness, lead the free world.

President Reagan said clearly in his inaugural address that the U.S. would strengthen her ties with free nations and assure them of America's support and firm commitment, matching loyalty with loyalty. The Republic of China has had long-standing cordial historic ties with the U.S. She used to be regarded as an American ally. She is one of America's Asian-Pacific neighbors. She always has been a loyal friend, and the United States used to have commitment in her. We have reasons to request the new U.S. Government to take concrete steps to promote normalization with the ROC and abandon the dangerous mistaken tactics of "allying with the Chinese Reds for the checking of the Soviets" so that America "will again be the exemplar of freedom and a beacon of hope for those who do not now have freedom." The 900 million people on the Chinese mainland are in misery without freedom. America absolutely should not join hands with those Red rulers who have deprived the Chinese mainland people of their freedom.

Strategic interests are such that any U.S. attempt to pit the Chinese Reds against the Soviets will spur the latter's expansion on many fronts. Furthermore, the U.S. inevitably will be dragged into wars regardless of whether the two Red regimes engage in open clashes or become reconciled.

We heartily agree that, as President Reagan said, the will and moral courage of free men and women is a weapon the adversaries of free nations do not have. America's mission today is to bring free nations together and safeguard freedom with this weapon.

We maintain that free nations come to the unequivocal understanding that because of their failure to unite and cooperate as one, the Communists have become so rampant. Free nations therefore should speedily develop common defense cooperation and, with collective strength, check Red expansion and assure regional security.

We maintain that free nations take forceful steps to support the heroic Afghan war against Soviet aggressors, help the Polish workers and other East Europeans cope with Moscow's threat to their campaigns for freedom, aid the Indochinese, the Cubans and the north Koreans who are struggling to be free, and give strength to the Africans for successful fights against subversion, aggression and communization.

We maintain that free nations together encourage the 900 million Chinese mainland people's anti-Communist struggles to regain freedom, democracy and things Chinese.

Support should be given the people on both sides of the Taiwan Straits who are striving for China's unification under the Three Principles of the People.

We maintain that our 900 million compatriots on the Chinese mainland fully grasp the regime's current conflict and confusion and rise for a wide-spread anti-Communist revolution to overthrow the Red tyranny.

Ladies and Gentlemen: The history of man's struggle for freedom is written in blood and tears. The road to freedom has to be opened and leveled with firm steps of multitude. We will in the decade ahead break through the Communist mist and build a broad avenue of freedom for all mankind.●

#### BIAGGI INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO REMEDY SERIOUS PROBLEM IN ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging and chairman of its Subcommittee on Human Services I have reintroduced legislation aimed at remedying a serious flaw in the section 16(b)(2) program under the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

This program provides funds for nonprofit groups and organizations to purchase certain vehicles for use by the elderly and handicapped. The program as it is constructed today, merely provides the dollars to purchase the vehicle—it does not provide authority or dollars for operating expenses. Consequently, there are areas in this Nation where vehicles are sitting idle because there are no funds for operating expenses such as drivers. This constitutes a tremendous waste of Federal dollars not to mention the fact that it deprives seniors and disabled persons from essential transportation services which can keep them in the mainstream of society.

The bill I have sponsored would permit up to 20 percent of all section 16(b)(2) funds to be used for operating expenses associated with a vehicle purchased with said funds. A priority would be given to those applicants who have already received funds for purchasing vehicles.

I offer this legislation in the spirit of commonsense. Our Aging Committee has studied the transportation problems of the elderly in some great length and one chronic problem is coordination. The 16(b)(2) program in its present construction is a well intentioned but a poorly executed program. My legislation is one step in the right direction.●

#### REMOVING AN INEQUITY IN THE ESTATE TAX LAWS

#### HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to ease the burden of Federal estate taxes on certain older surviving spouses.

Under my proposal, there would be an unlimited marital deduction if, at the time the first spouse died, both spouses were over age 72 and had been married for 20 years or more. Decedents meeting these criteria could leave an unlimited amount of their property to their spouses without any Federal estate tax.

This change in estate tax law would allow the surviving spouse to live out his or her remaining years without having to undergo a drastic change in financial status or the need to sell off property to pay the death taxes. Of course, the same assets would be subject to taxation eventually on the death of the second spouse.

Currently, the marital deduction is limited to the greater of \$250,000 or, for estates larger than \$500,000, 50 percent of the estate. The 50-percent limit for larger estates was chosen in an attempt to equalize the estate tax burden on surviving spouses in community property and common law States. Before the marital deduction was enacted in 1948, surviving spouses in community property States only inherited half of their decedent spouses' property—since they already owned half the community property before their spouses' death—while in common law States they inherited, and thus were taxed on, 100 percent of their decedent spouses' property.

Congress was clearly right in attempting to equalize the treatment of surviving spouses in common law States. However, the change created a new inequity for some surviving spouses in community property States. This occurs when the surviving spouse originally acquired most of the community property. In a common law State, there would be no tax since the survivor would already own the property and thus inherit nothing. In a community property State, the survivor would inherit half the community property and thus owe estate taxes on it. For large estates the extra tax burden is considerable.

This bill would entirely remove the distinction between community, property and common law States, where the spouses are over 72 and have been married at least 20 years. These limitations reduce the burden on the Federal Treasury and prevent deathbed marriages merely to take advantage of the deduction.

I think older Americans ought to be able to live out their lives without the added burden of sizable taxes when their spouses die. The property will still be taxed on the death of the second spouse. I hope this proposal will receive serious consideration by the Congress. ●

## RURAL TELEPHONE BANK

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to extend the authorizations for the Federal contribution to the Rural Telephone Bank. This bill would allow the annual \$30 million Federal purchase of class A stock to continue for another 10 years, and repayment by the Bank of the Federal capital seed money would be delayed until after September 30, 1995.

The Rural Telephone Bank has proven to be a vital source of loan funds for developing and upgrading telephone service in rural America. The Nation's rural telephone companies borrow money from the Bank at intermediate interest rate levels and repay over 30 to 40 years. Eventually, the borrowers of the Bank will repurchase the federally owned stock resulting in a lending institution owned by the borrowers.

Without the appropriations authorized by this legislation, the Rural Telephone Bank would have to increase substantially its effective interest rate, thus disqualifying many telephone company borrowers of this loan program. Studies have shown that the result would be a higher net cost to the Federal Treasury. By extending this authorization, the Bank could continue to make loans to improve rural telecommunications facilities and thus improve the overall quality of life of rural Americans.

For more background and information on the Rural Telephone Bank, I am inserting into the RECORD the Comptroller General's report to Congress:

EXAMINATION OF THE RURAL TELEPHONE BANK'S FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1979, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### DIGEST

The Rural Telephone Bank, an agency of the United States, was established in 1971 by an amendment to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901), to provide for financing or refinancing the construction, improvement, expansion, acquisition, and operation of telephone lines, facilities, or systems in rural areas.

In fiscal year 1979 the Rural Telephone Bank loaned \$130 million to rural telephone systems. It has loaned \$1.2 billion since its inception. Amounts borrowed from the U.S.

Treasury, interest and principal collected on loans, and proceeds from the sale of stock are the Rural Telephone Bank's primary sources of funds.

GAO is required by the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) to examine the financial transactions of the Bank. GAO's last report was issued in May 1977 and discussed financial transactions through September 30, 1976.

### OPINION ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

In GAO's opinion, the Bank's financial statements present fairly its financial position as of September 30, 1979, and the results of its operations and changes in financial position for the period then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

### CHAPTER 1

#### Introduction

Public Law 92-12 dated May 7, 1971, established the Rural Telephone Bank (RTB) to make loans for the construction, improvement, expansion, acquisition, and operation of telephone lines, facilities, or systems in rural areas. The law amended the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901) which, since 1949, has authorized the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA), Department of Agriculture, to make loans for essentially the same purposes as the REA telephone program, that is, furnishing and improving telephone service in rural areas. To the extent practicable, RTB is to obtain funds from non-Federal sources and to conduct its operations on a self-sustaining basis.

In fiscal year 1979 RTB loaned \$130 million to rural telephone systems. It has loaned \$1.2 billion since its inception. The amounts borrowed from the U.S. Treasury, interest earned on loans, and proceeds from the sale of stock are RTB's primary sources of funds.

#### Management and administration

RTB, an agency of the Federal Government, is subject to the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, who is also the Governor of RTB, is RTB's chief executive officer.

RTB has a 13-member board of directors which is responsible for its management. The Administrator of REA, the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, five Presidential appointees, and six people elected by RTB's stockholders serve on the board. RTB has no employees; however, the RTB operations are performed by REA employees who also have similar responsibilities for REA operations.

#### Capitalization

RTB issues three classes of capital stock: (1) class A to the Government, (2) class B to RTB borrowers, and (3) class C to RTB borrowers, organizations eligible to borrow, and organizations controlled by borrowers or eligible borrowers.

#### Class A stock

Class A stock has a par value of \$1 a share and is issued, at par, only to the Administrator of REA on behalf of the United States. The United States provides money for the purchase of class A stock by REA. Public Law 92-12 authorizes the Congress to appropriate up to \$30 million annually for the purchase of class A stock until RTB has issued \$300 million of class A stock. As of September 30, 1979, RTB had \$247,500,000 of class A stock outstanding.

Public Law 92-12 also authorizes RTB to pay the United States a 2-percent annual

return on the class A stock outstanding. This return is cumulative and must be paid from RTB's income. In fiscal year 1979 RTB paid \$4.9 million to the U.S. Treasury.

RTB must retire its class A stock as soon as practicable after September 30, 1985, as long as its Board of Directors determines that such retirement will not impair RTB's operations.

#### Class B stock

Class B stock has a par value of \$1 a share. Borrowers must purchase, at par, class B stock equaling 5 percent of the amount borrowed excluding the amounts borrowed to purchase such stock. As of September 30, 1979, RTB had \$56 million of class B stock outstanding. Although class B stockholders do not receive dividends, they receive annual patronage refunds in the form of additional shares of class B stock. RTB's Board of Directors determines the amount of the patronage refund, which is made from net income after deducting the return on class A stock, cash dividends on class C stock, and any addition to the reserve for contingencies. In fiscal year 1979 RTB issued \$3.7 million of class B stock as a patronage refund.

#### Class C stock

Class C stock has a par value of \$1000 a share and is issued at par only to borrowers; to corporations and public bodies eligible to borrow; or to organizations controlled by such borrowers, corporations, and public bodies. As of September 30, 1979, RTB had \$548,000 of class C stock outstanding.

Class C stockholders may be paid dividends from RTB's income if the Board of Directors declares such dividends. The Board can only declare dividends on class C stock when income exceeds the 2-percent return on class A stock. Until all class A stock is retired, the dividend on class C stock cannot exceed the average rate of interest RTB pays to borrow money. In fiscal year 1979 RTB paid \$32,820 in dividends on class C stock.

#### Conversion of ownership, operation, and control of the bank

When 51 percent of the maximum amount of class A stock issued and outstanding at any time after September 30, 1985, has been retired:

The powers and authority of the Administrator of REA will be vested in RTB's Board of Directors, and the Board will select a new Government for RTB.

The five Board members appointed by the President will no longer be members of the Board.

RTB will no longer be a U.S. agency.

RTB will continue as an instrumentality of the United States and a banking corporation.

When all class A stock has been retired, RTB loans will not be subject to restrictions imposed by Public Law 92-12; however, after that time, the Congress can continue to review RTB's operations.

### CHAPTER 2

#### Operations

#### Borrowing power

Public Law 92-12 authorizes RTB to obtain funds by selling its bonds, debentures, notes, and other evidences of indebtedness (collectively called telephone debentures). RTB's Board of Directors determines when telephone debentures may be issued, their interest rate, and other terms and conditions. The amount of outstanding tele-



phone debentures may not exceed 20 times RTB's paid-in capital and retained earnings.

On June 30, 1972, Public Law 92-324 gave the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to purchase RTB's telephone debentures. The Secretary of the Treasury determines the rate of return that must be realized on any telephone debentures purchased. The current average yield on outstanding marketable U.S. securities with comparable maturity must be considered.

At September 30, 1979, cumulative debenture borrowings from the Secretary of the Treasury amounted to \$394,868,000 at various interest rates, as shown below.

#### BORROWINGS FROM TREASURY

Interest rate	From inception through Sept. 30, 1979
7.250.....	\$5,071,000
7.375.....	7,667,000
7.500.....	10,017,000
7.625.....	10,451,000
7.750.....	24,451,000
7.875.....	29,603,000
8.000.....	11,092,000
8.125.....	60,571,000
8.250.....	48,290,000
8.375.....	53,989,000
8.500.....	37,376,000
8.625.....	9,037,000
8.750.....	11,647,000
8.875.....	6,103,000
9.000.....	52,995,000
9.125.....	12,097,000
9.250.....	4,401,000
Cumulative total.....	394,868,000

RTB can repay amounts borrowed from the Treasury through the sale of telephone debentures at any time. Repayments will be applied to the oldest amounts outstanding. No amounts borrowed from the Treasury had been repaid as of September 30, 1979.

The Secretary of the Treasury can sell acquired telephone debentures at any price considered appropriate. All purchases and sales of telephone debentures by the Secretary are treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

#### Lending power

RTB can make loans, in conformity with policies approved by the Board of Directors, to corporations and public bodies which have received an REA loan or loan commitment or have been certified by the Administrator of REA to be eligible for a loan or loan commitment. RTB's loans may be made: for the same purposes as REA loans made under section 201; to finance or refinance the construction, improvement, expansion, acquisition and operation of telephone lines, facilities, or systems in rural areas to improve efficiency, effectiveness or financial stability of borrowers; or to finance the purchase of class B stock.

The Rural Electrification Act requires that RTB, rather than REA, loan funds if the borrower is eligible for an RTB loan and RTB has funds available. However, all loans for telephone system facilities which, on the average, will have three or fewer subscribers for each mile of telephone line are to be made by REA unless the borrower elects to take an RTB loan instead.

RTB loans can only be made when, in the judgment of the Governor of RTB, (1) the loan has adequate security and will be repaid within the time agreed and (2) the borrower is able to earn net income before interest which is at least 150 percent of the interest requirements on all of its outstanding and proposed loans or, if this is not true, this requirement should be waived because it prevents emergency restoration of the

borrower's system or otherwise results in severe hardship to the borrower.

The Governor of RTB determines the terms and conditions of RTB loans that are not specified by law. The Rural Electrification Act, as amended, requires that the interest rate on an RTB loan be equal to RTB's average cost of money; however, the interest rate cannot be less than 5 percent per annum. The act also requires that RTB loans be repaid within 50 years.

RTB borrowers may not sell or dispose of property, rights, or franchises acquired under the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act, as amended, without the approval of RTB's chief executive officer until any loans obtained from RTB, including all interest and charges, have been repaid.

#### Cost of operations

The interest cost of money borrowed from the Treasury through the sale of telephone debentures in fiscal year 1979 ranged from 8.875 to 9.25 percent a year. The total interest cost for fiscal year 1979 was \$27,930,503.

The Rural Electrification Act authorizes RTB to partially or jointly use the facilities and services of REA or any other agency of the Department of Agriculture without cost, and thus are not shown as expenses on the RTB statement. Costs incurred by REA as it provides facilities and services to RTB are generally for salaries and related benefits, employee travel, and automatic data processing.●

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS

#### HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to require the National Institute of Arthritis to conduct clinical trials of the drug dimethyl sulfoxide, or DMSO. As many will recall, this bill was introduced in the last Congress and enjoyed widespread support. More than 110 Members cosponsored the legislation and, in fact, it was adopted by the full House of Representatives in the form of a floor amendment to the Health Research Act, a bill which reauthorized our National Institutes of Health.

Unfortunately, during the final days of the Congress, a substitute bill was adopted and the amendment dropped. And so, despite hearings held in both the House and Senate, despite the support of many of my colleagues, we are no closer to knowing the truth about this potential ray of hope for those who suffer chronic pain than we were 17 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, 31 million Americans of all ages suffer from the crippling disease known as arthritis. One in every seven Americans is a victim. Someone new is added to this list every 33 seconds. There is no known cure for arthritis, and there are innumerable quacks and charlatans offering fake cures for arthritis sufferers.

There is, however, an inexpensive chemical compound which appears to

offer significant relief from the nagging aches and pains accompanying this disease. My bill simply directs the National Institute of Arthritis to conduct a clinical survey of this promising remedy, known as dimethyl sulfoxide or DMSO. The purpose of the study is to determine the safety and effectiveness of DMSO in helping relieve some of the pain and suffering experienced by these 31 million Americans every day.

DMSO is not a new drug. It is not a rare drug. And it is not an expensive drug. DMSO costs about \$4 a quart to produce and it is the byproduct of the manufacture of paper. The medicinal properties of DMSO first came to light in the United States in the early 1960's when it was discovered that DMSO is rapidly absorbed into the skin. Since that time it has been approved for human use in a dozen other countries. But in the United States DMSO is approved for only one rather rare bladder disease in humans, and also for veterinary use.

Doctors have testified before the House Select Committee on Aging that DMSO significantly reduces pain, inflammation, and swelling, and helps promote healing in soft tissue injuries. Professional athletes have indicated that use of DMSO is widespread among their ranks. Yet for the average American suffering from arthritis, the drug is officially off limits. Why? Because the Food and Drug Administration is adamant in its refusal to approve DMSO and persistent in its attempts to discredit DMSO proponents.

Nor are the future prospects very bright that DMSO will ever be available except in bootleg form. Again, DMSO is not rare and it is not expensive. But few firms are willing to devote their private resources to the testing and development of a substance commonly found in nature, cheap to produce, and in all probability not patentable. The income potential is simply not there to meet their investment criteria. Thus, there are no tests currently being conducted to determine the value of DMSO for use by patients with arthritis.

The situation at present is that thousands of Americans are going abroad, primarily to Mexico, to obtain DMSO treatments at outrageous prices. Thousands more are treating themselves at home with DMSO they obtain from their veterinarians in a concentration designed for horses, not humans; or with DMSO they obtain from their hardware store, where it is sold as an industrial solvent; or with DMSO they obtain through smoke shops, drycleaners, and other outfits in a few States where DMSO is legal. Continued national media attention serves only to increase the unauthorized use of DMSO by individuals who

use it at their own risk and without medical supervision.

Efforts on the part of the administration to discourage the use of DMSO by the public must, in my opinion, be combined with vigorous efforts to pursue research into its safety and effectiveness. Public demand and scientific doubts where DMSO is concerned will only be put to rest through efforts to establish the truth.

It is time for an objective, unbiased study to determine once and for all whether or not DMSO is the ray of hope 31 million Americans are praying for. It is time to put to rest the false claims and false hope. For these reasons, I am reintroducing my bill to require that the National Institute of Arthritis conduct clinical tests of DMSO. I welcome the support of my colleagues who have already joined in sponsoring this bill, and am hopeful that other Members will also support our efforts.●

#### WOMEN'S RIGHTS DAY

#### HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today is Women's Rights Day. Over 1,000 representatives from various women's organizations have converged on Washington to talk to lawmakers about issues ranging from equal employment protection to curtailment of sexual harassment in the working environment.

This will be an exciting, progressive decade for women. An analysis of the November elections indicates a greater percentage of women than ever before have entered the political process and won election to public office.

This growing coalition of female officeholders is significant in several respects. Not only are more lawmakers becoming more attuned to women's issues, but it is clear the American electorate no longer considers gender to be a decisive factor at the ballot box. An attitudinal change of this magnitude augurs well for the future progression of women's rights in America.

As the struggle for passage of the equal rights amendment continues, today is an appropriate time to reaffirm why we need such an amendment:

For every \$1 a man earns, a woman earns only 59 cents;

A title-by-title review of the United States Code, reveals over 800 sex-biased laws;

Nondiscriminatory laws of one State cannot carry over to other States;

Without an ERA, nondiscriminatory legislation in any political jurisdiction can be reversed, modified, or eliminated by statute.

While the prospects for successful approval of the ERA in three more State legislatures before the 1982 deadline look bleak today, some solace can be taken from the fact that the fight itself has caused a searching analysis of the issue of rights and opportunities as they apply to women in an international as well as American context.

Hopefully, as the issue matures over the decades ahead, a fuller appreciation for the societal problems facing women will cause forthright legislative responses.

Welcome to all the representatives from the various women's organizations on Capitol Hill today.●

#### TRIBUTE TO THE IRANIAN RESCUE MISSION VOLUNTEERS

#### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on Inauguration night, I joined with the rest of the country in following the news of the release of the 52 brave Americans who had spent 14 difficult months in Tehran. I was joyful, but a poignant note of sadness permeated the happiness nonetheless, when a television commentator relayed an emotional message from the family of one of the Americans who had been in Iran.

Unexpectedly, the grief was not that of a relative of one of the former hostages. Rather, it was from the family of one of the eight men who had died in the Iranian desert last April 25. She asked that her loved one be remembered; and may I assure her that he is.

The names are now symbols of the courage that is inherent in the American character—Richard L. Bakke, Lynn Davis McIntosh, Dewey L. Johnson, Charles T. McMillan II, George N. Holmes, Jr., John Davis Harvey, Harold L. Lewis, and Joel C. Mayo. May we always remember them.

Let us remember not simply their names, but also their gallantry. All volunteers, they placed their lives on the line for those they hardly knew in a remarkable act of selflessness. Let us be mindful that they acted to help their Nation maximize its prestige abroad, in an act that far transcends the everyday duties of patriotism.

If we are in a period of national celebration for the release of the hostages, let us also enter a period of national pride that America produces men of valor such as these. They understood, to recall the words of Woodrow Wilson, that "it is a fearful thing to lead this great and peaceful people into war" but they, like the American people who supported the rescue mission, understood that there are times

when bold actions are called for. Let us be gratified that when that time arrives, despite our best efforts to reconcile the dictates of justice with the desire for peace—our Nation can draw on men like these.●

#### CARE WEEK

#### HON. ROBERT (BOB) WHITTAKER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. WHITTAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this concurrent resolution today in the House which designates the week of May 10 as "CARE Week" and recognizing 35 years of outstanding service by the Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc.—better known by most of us as CARE.

CARE was conceived back in 1945 by 22 major American organizations made up of Cooperatives, relief agencies, religious organizations, and labor in order to aid the needs of millions of men, women, and children left destitute in Europe after World War II. CARE was a cooperative venture, conceived by cooperatives in this Nation. Today, CARE carries that cooperative spirit through all nations in which they help the sick and hungry.

Since 1945, CARE has grown with assistance from the passage of Public Law 480, providing major supplies of food from the United States. In 1962, CARE branched out into the medical services with the beginning of MEDICO.

Today CARE is more than just feeding hungry people—CARE also provides instruments for self-help and development to farmers and teachers in their communities and villages, education of modern medical techniques and child care, and the implementation of long-range 5-year plans in agriculture in providing loan funds and food-for-work projects.

Partnership programs are now carried out by CARE in nutrition, development, and health care. Throughout all programs and relief efforts, the aim of CARE—to help the impoverished help themselves—is clearly seen since these efforts undergird the assistance, rather than completely support a project.

CARE is the second largest nonprofit, nonpolitical, nonsectarian, nongovernmental agency and with over 46 million contributions received over the years CARE has continued to grow. The organization of CARE's staff and operations in utilizing contributions is truly outstanding—the CARE organization delivers in excess of \$5 worth of aid for each \$1 contributed.

Whether feeding hungry children in a Third World nation, or setting up temporary homes after natural disas-



ters, as they did in Italy late last year, the Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), I believe, can be held as a symbol of pride for this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this resolution and to pass it quickly to the President for his signature so the week of May 10 can be designated as "CARE Week" for 1981.●

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE OLIN TEAGUE

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to Olin "Tiger" Teague, distinguished Congressman from the State of Texas, who passed away on January 23, 1981.

"Tiger" was an American hero who served his country in war and peace. He was the most decorated soldier to serve in Congress, and was a natural choice to speak for the interests of American veterans. He will be best remembered for his decisive leadership role as chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, as well as for his ardent support for the advancement of the space program. He launched many of the programs which brought our Nation to a position of world leadership in space exploration.

On a more personal basis, it was my privilege to work closely with "Tiger" Teague on both of his committees—for 8 years on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and for 12 years on the Science and Technology Committee. I have never met a person who was more scrupulously fairminded in his treatment of his colleagues, and somewhat to my surprise, I found remarkably few issues on which we disagreed as to what best served the national interest in our work on these committees.

"Tiger's" sagacity and insights earned him the respect of his colleagues and friends. He will perhaps be best remembered as a man of conscience, a man who loved his country, and a man who cared about people. We will miss him.●

#### LOVE AFFAIR WITH THE AUTOMOBILE

**HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, if ever the American love affair with the automobile is embodied in one person, it has to be Lauren Skinner.

He remembers seeing his first car, in 1904, at the age of 7. He and his family were living on a farm south of Linden, in Marengo County. A chauffeur-driven car with three Sweetwater women stalled on the road in front of their farm.

A neighbor put the three Sweetwater women in his surrey and took them on to Linden, while the chauffeur stayed behind to fix the car. Finally he got the car fixed, and chugged off toward Linden, while a 7-year-old boy watched him go.

"You could smell that gasoline behind it," said Lauren, with a faraway look in his eyes. That gasoline smelled good."

From that first look, he was hooked. He wound up a young man in Birmingham in 1919, working on cars for Cruse-Crawford Motors. Then he got word that some men in Thomaston would build him a garage if he would come there.

His garage turned out to be a shed on the side of the county mule barn, and he began fixing cars there.

He sold some Model T Fords for a Selma agency, and remembers going to York to assemble them.

They would come seven Model T's in a boxcar, and the dealer would take 14 men over there with him to assemble them. Two men working together could put together two cars in about four or five hours. Then you'd put the fenders in the back seat and drive it back to Thomaston or Selma.

Even today, he said, "I could put one together right now. I knew where every piece went, where every bolt went."

Then, in 1926, Nash asked him to be a dealer in Thomaston, and he sold Nash cars, and Ramblers, until he retired a few years ago. When he retired, he had the oldest American Motors dealership in the world.

Besides his 1902 Rambler, he has four other cars—a 1948 Nash Ambassador, a 1970 Checker limousine, a 1974 Cadillac, and a 1979 Lincoln Continental.

He likes to travel by car, and puts some 40,000 miles a year on the Cadillac. He has driven to Alaska eight times, and makes a trip each fall to Vermont.

When asked why he loves cars so, Lauren responds:

Well, cars have always been my hobby and I tried to pick up enough money from 'em to make a living. They always fascinated me. I loved to work on 'em, I loved to fool with 'em, I loved to ride in 'em, and you don't have to hitch up a horse and buggy.

Lauren Skinner and his wife, Marguerite, are truly colorful people of Thomaston, Ala., and I wanted to share this delightful, refreshing story with my colleagues in the House.●

#### BARRIER FREE HOME BILL

**HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced the barrier free home bill. This legislation will provide incentives for homeowners, with handicapped family members, to make home improvements designed to allow handicapped individuals to remain in the residence. Under present statutes, many family members are actually discouraged from providing home care for handicapped family members. By not extending a helping hand to these families, households are faced with relinquishing prime responsibility for these individuals to various public and private institutions requiring increasing outlays of Federal money.

The barrier free home bill will allow a 50-percent tax credit, up to \$1,000 per year, with a ceiling of \$5,000 to install facilities needed to maintain as normal life as possible to severely handicapped family members. The Treasury Department has estimated that this proposal will lead to a revenue loss of \$140 million during fiscal year 1982. Although, I believe that this is a substantial amount, I also feel that the millions of dollars saved by removing individuals from State and federally financed institutions will more than offset this amount.

Congress previously has instructed that both public and private buildings must remove architectural barriers. Now we should assist the families of handicapped citizens to make the same commitment in their own home. Furthermore, I believe that if we can free handicapped individuals from many of the obstacles which they encounter and prevent these people from spending their lives in institutions, we may save money but most important, we will be helping people who need and deserve this assistance.●

#### U.S. SUSPENSION OF ARMS TO ROYAL ULSTER CONSTABULARY TO CONTINUE

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I have been deeply involved in the issue of human rights for Ireland. In this spirit, in July of 1979, I sponsored an amendment which was offered during consideration of the State Department appropriation bill for fiscal

year 1980. The amendment sought to bar the sale, shipment, or export of any U.S. arms to Great Britain for use in Northern Ireland to protest a January 1979 sale, approved by the State Department, of 3,500 rifles to the Royal Ulster Constabulary, the main police force in Northern Ireland.

The amendment was withdrawn following a commitment of a full investigation by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which in fact was conducted just 2 weeks later. As a result of this investigation, the Department of State announced on August 31, 1979, that it was suspending all future sales and exports of U.S. arms to the Royal Ulster Constabulary, pending a full review of U.S. policy.

My motivation for sponsoring the amendment was the conflict between our sale of weapons to the RUC and section 502(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act. This provision prohibits the sale of U.S. weapons to any nation or organization which practices a pattern of violating human rights. The Royal Ulster Constabulary has been cited on numerous occasions, by such reputable international organizations as Amnesty International and the European Commission and Court of Human Rights and the British Government-appointed Bennett Commission, for various violations of human rights in their treatment of prisoners and suspected criminals.

On January 5, 1981, I wrote a letter to Chairman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to get an updated status on the suspension issue. I received a response from the chairman today which I wish to place in the RECORD immediately after my letter to him.

I maintain my opposition to any sale of arms to the RUC while they engage in practices which violate human rights. The terrorism which exists in Northern Ireland is deplorable and must be ended if there is to be peace. However, if terrorism is to end—all culprits must agree to do so—and this includes not only the civilian paramilitary groups but also the forces of official violence such as the RUC.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 5, 1981.

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Chairman of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I am writing to obtain an updated status report on the suspension of United States arms sales to the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) of Northern Ireland.

The suspension, which took effect in August 1979, was to remain in effect pending a full review of United States policy on Northern Ireland. The specific questions I pose are:

(1) How is the review progressing? What areas of policy have been discussed besides prior arms sales?

(2) Is there any projection on how long the suspension might remain in effect?

(3) Have there been any discussions with the incoming Reagan Administration on this topic?

I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as it is possible.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

MARIO BIAGGI.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1980.

HON. MARIO BIAGGI,  
Chairman, Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARIO: Thank you for your letter in which you have requested an updated status on the suspension of U.S. arms sales to the Royal Ulster Constabulary of Northern Ireland.

According to the Department of State, their review of the issuance of licenses for guns to the RUC remains in progress. At this time they cannot give a projected date when the internal review will be completed. As I understand, the Reagan administration has not had the opportunity to adequately review the issue of arms to the RUC, or to formulate U.S. policy with respect to Northern Ireland. Thus, the status quo remains in effect.

Please be assured of my continued interest in this matter and I will advise you at the earliest possible date of any information which I receive from the Department of State.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely yours,

CLEM, Chairman.●

#### AMERICAN FORAGE AND GRASSLAND COUNCIL

HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention, and that of my colleagues, a meeting which will be taking place in Lexington, Ky., from June 15 to 24, 1981.

The American Forage and Grassland Council, in conjunction with the University of Kentucky, is hosting the XIV International Grassland Congress on the University of Kentucky campus.

The significance of grasslands to American agriculture is growing all the time, and I feel this meeting will focus on the most important issues facing American farmers. With the increasing need to expand food production for our growing world population, the pressing problem of reducing both environmental pollution and relative energy use, the scientists and technicians from all pasture, forage, and range-related disciplines of the world will have an excellent opportunity to actively participate in the exchange of research findings and ideas on grassland improvement, production, and utilization.

As you might imagine, I am very pleased that such a conference is being organized in my hometown of

Lexington, and want to commend both the American Forage and Grassland Council and the University of Kentucky for undertaking such a project. If I can provide information about the meeting, I hope those interested parties will contact my office. Thank you very much.●

#### INEQUITIES IN SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will eliminate two of the inequities in our supplemental security income program. Under the present law, if a SSI applicant or recipient is living in the household of another, it is assumed that he is receiving in-kind assistance which is equal to one-third of the benefit standard. Therefore, the amount of SSI assistance he receives is reduced by one-third. Most often, it is the low-income elderly and handicapped individual who lives with another person because he needs some personal assistance and has no financial resources to purchase such assistance. Many times these elderly and handicapped SSI recipients would be forced to move to an institution—at an even greater expense to the taxpayers—if they were not receiving support and in-kind assistance from their families and friends with whom they live.

The second part of my bill would allow SSI payments to be continued for 3 months for recipients who are placed in a nursing home or other institution. Under the present law, if a SSI recipient enters a medical institution in which a major part of his bill is paid by the Medicaid program, his monthly SSI payments are reduced to \$25 beginning with the first month of his institutionalization. Very often these recipients are elderly or handicapped individuals who are institutionalized for a temporary period of rehabilitation and fully desire and intend to return to their previous living arrangement. These recipients continue to pay rent, utilities, and other household expenses which must be paid even while the person is in the institution. Because of this reduction in benefits, many SSI recipients are forced to give up their households even though they might eventually be able to leave the institution. Consequently, they are also forced to give up their hope of returning to their previous level of independent living, and they often spend the remainder of their days in the institution.

It is my hope that this bill will correct the inequities of our SSI system which now penalizes low-income elder-



ly and handicapped individuals who depend on families or friends for in-kind assistance or who remain in an institution for more than 1 month.

The following is a summary of the bill.

#### H.R. —

A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to eliminate the one-third benefit reduction for those Supplemental Security Income recipients who live in another household, and to continue Supplemental Security Income payments for three months when a recipient is institutionalized.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE IN ANOTHER PERSON'S HOUSEHOLD

SECTION 1. (a) Clause (i) of section 1612(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(i) in the case of any individual (and his eligible spouse, if any) living in another person's household, support and maintenance received in kind from such person shall not be included."

(b) Clause (iii) of section 1612(a)(2)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "and the provisions of clause (i) shall not be applicable".

#### ELIGIBILITY OF INDIVIDUALS IN CERTAIN MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1611(e)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "subparagraph (B) and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)".

(b) Section 1611(e)(1) of such Act is further amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) and subparagraph (D), and by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) Except as provided in subparagraph (C), in any case where an eligible individual or eligible spouse is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility, such individual's benefit for the period ending with the third consecutive month throughout which he is in such hospital, home, or facility shall be determined as though he were continuing to reside outside the institution under the same conditions as before he entered the institution.

"(C) In any case where an eligible individual or eligible spouse, throughout any month, is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility, receiving payments (with respect to such individual or spouse) under a State plan approved under title XIX, and such month is either—

"(i) the first month in any period of eligibility under this title based on an application filed in or before such month, or a month in a continuous period of months beginning with such first month, throughout which such individual or spouse is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility (whether or not receiving payments with respect to such individual or spouse for each month in such period), or

"(ii) the fourth consecutive month throughout which, or a month in a continuous period beginning with such fourth consecutive month throughout which, such individual or spouse is in a hospital, extended care facility, nursing home, or intermediate care facility (whether or not receiving pay-

ments with respect to such individual or spouse for each month in such period),

the benefit for such individual for such month shall be payable—

"(iii) in the case of an individual who does not have an eligible spouse, at a rate not in excess of \$300 per year (reduced by the amount of any income of such individual which is not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b));

"(iv) in the case of an individual who has an eligible spouse, if only one of them is in such a hospital, home, or facility throughout such month, at a rate not in excess of the sum of—

"(I) the rate of \$300 per year (reduced by the amount of any income, not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b), of the one who is in such hospital, home, or facility), and

"(II) the applicable rate specified in subsection (b)(1) (reduced by the amount of any income, not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b), of the other); and

"(v) in the case of an individual who has an eligible spouse, if both of them are in such a hospital, home, or facility throughout such month, at a rate not in excess of \$600 per year (reduced by the amount of any income of either spouse which is not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b));

except that for purposes of any provision of law other than this subparagraph, any benefit determined under clause (iv) shall be deemed to be payable at a rate equal to the sum of the rate of \$300 per year and the applicable rate specified in subsection (b)(1), reduced by any income of either spouse which is not excluded pursuant to section 1612(b)." •

#### THE 63D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1981

• Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, last week our entire Nation, indeed the whole world, witnessed in the honors paid to the returning 52 how precious we hold our liberty.

In the face of Soviet aggression both within and outside of the borders of the U.S.S.R. and in the midst of the ever-expanding threat from terrorist groups in troubled spots around the world, it is important that we keep our pledge to support those who refuse to let their own dreams of freedom die.

Today in the Halls of Congress, as we commemorate Ukrainian Independence Day, we pay special tribute to the spirit of freedom which lives on in the hearts and minds of all Ukrainians.

For a quarter of a century, Members in every Congress have observed the independence of Ukraine. This is its 63d anniversary. Upon the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire, the Ukrainian National Republic was established on January 22, 1918, highlighting another phase of independence for the Ukrainian Nation. By 1920 it was destroyed in the first wave of Soviet Russian imperialism that in a succession of waves has reached in

our day into Afghanistan and which many think is being challenged by the workers' movement in Poland.

But the 40 million Ukrainians under Soviet domination and their 2 million brothers and sisters of Ukrainian descent in the United States have consistently opposed the repressive policies of the Kremlin and have earnestly sought to keep alive their independent, national spirit. As a result, Ukrainian intellectuals are being arrested and sentenced to long terms of internment in prisons, concentration camps, and psychiatric institutions.

In addition, the U.S.S.R. has imposed severe restraints on Ukrainian language and literature. In the name of "russification," the young people of Ukraine are being forced to attend Russian-language schools. This attempt to crush the spirit of the Ukrainian people by striking at their cultural and religious roots masquerades as official Soviet policy. The annihilation of the Ukrainian language would deprive these brave and proud people of the spark which fans the flame of their indomitable spirit—their history and their heritage.

We take this occasion to applaud those who willingly engage themselves in this struggle and who refuse to let their dream of freedom die. •

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 52 AND INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM: THE LESSONS OF TEHRAN

#### HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

• Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced House Concurrent Resolution 52, a resolution to establish an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the United Nations Secretariat. The purpose of this office would be to monitor compliance of signator nations with international agreements which guarantee the protection of diplomatic missions and their personnel.

The return of the American ex-hostages from our Tehran Embassy underlines the need to protect and safeguard diplomatic missions and their personnel. Public attention has been fixed on this problem for almost 15 months. The Government has recently focused its attention on the problem of international terrorism. But when the yellow ribbons fade, what important lessons will we as a nation have learned from this unfortunate experience? What would we do next time if a similar situation occurred? In an excellent article in Newsweek on February 9, 1981, Brian Jenkins carefully describes the lessons of Tehran and the

need to develop diplomatic measures to respond to future acts of international terrorism. I have included a copy of Mr. Jenkins' article entitled "When the Yellow Ribbons Fade" for the benefit of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The article follows:

#### WHEN THE YELLOW RIBBONS FADE

When the yellow ribbons fade, what meaning will the hostage episode have for Iran, for the United States and for the future?

Seen as an act of terrorism, which clearly it was, the seizure of the American Embassy in Teheran capped a decade of growing international terrorism. In the '70s, taking over embassies became a common form of protest and coercion. The seizure of the American Embassy in Iran was in fact the 35th time in ten years that armed extremists, on behalf of one cause or another, had taken over an embassy or a consulate. This does not include the numerous times when mobs sacked embassies or unarmed protesters occupied them without taking hostages. However, as an act of terrorism the episode in Iran was unique because of the Iranian Government's complicity in it.

To be sure, governments before had been the accomplices of terrorists, providing them with financial support, training camps, asylum, weapons smuggled in diplomatic pouches. Idi Amin's soldiers in Uganda openly assisted the team of Palestinian and German terrorists who hijacked a French airliner to Entebbe in 1976. But the episode in Iran was the first time that a government openly embraced an act of terrorism committed within its borders, made the terrorists' demands its own and ultimately took charge of the negotiations.

Turmoil: Holding the hostages brought nearly universal condemnation to Iran, but that did not seem to trouble the Iranians or cause them great hardship. If terrorism brought them no reward, the world imposed no great cost either, nor could it. Iran destroyed its own economy. The political turmoil was its own creation. As we discovered, it's hard to coerce a country that appears intent upon national suicide.

On the balance sheet for Iran, consider these questions: Is the Iranian revolution more firmly rooted now than it was on Nov. 4, 1979? Is the Iranian Government more stable? Are Iran's frontiers more secure? Are the Iranian people more united? Are they prouder? Iran would seem to have gained little.

Looking at it from the American side, the affair influenced an election, raised disturbing questions about our military competence and ended an era.

The seizure of our embassy in Iran confronted us with a form of terrorism new to our experience. Prior to the event, neither the American Government nor the American people fully appreciated the extent to which a single terrorist incident could mesmerize a nation and thoroughly distract its government. After the election, Hamilton Jordan said that frustration over the hostage crisis was the principal factor in Carter's defeat.

The post-Vietnam era came to its unofficial end during the Iranian crisis, when the Administration, many of whose members had vigorously opposed the war in Vietnam, indeed any military intervention abroad,

suddenly found itself in a situation in which they considered the use of military force to be appropriate and useful. President Carter thus joined every President in this century in ordering soldiers into action overseas.

The seizure of the American Embassy also altered one of the widespread attitudes of the post-Vietnam era. Since the Vietnam War, the American people have carried a heavy cargo of guilt, as if our great wealth and power had made us a principal source, if not the sole source, of evil in this world.

In the Iranian crisis, this attitude dissolved. Not since the early 1950s, perhaps not since World War II, have the American people been so united in their outrage and anger, so agreed on its source. True, some might argue, and did, that we brought this trouble on ourselves through our intimate relationship with the Shah. But the public mood was reflected in the cruel caricatures of the ayatollah, the graffiti scrawled on walls and the defiant bumper stickers—not in the columns of foreign-policy analysis. The folks didn't need to be told who the villains were.

Although American unity was a positive result of the incident, the prospects for global unity against terrorism seem more remote than ever. Government-backed kidnappings and assassinations are being carried out more frequently, with bolder disregard for the fragile international regime that governs relations between nations. No longer does a handful of nations make and enforce the rules; a growing number of nations no longer abide by them.

Security: This raises a critical policy question: can a world so unevenly respectful of sovereignty, so economically interdependent, impose constraints on terrorist governments? The hand-wringing and finger-wagging seen in international forums do not suffice. World opinion carries little weight with nations so self-righteous as to be immune to it. Economic sanctions appear unenforceable, particularly when those imposing the sanctions depend on the target for some vital resource. Military intervention is risky.

Terrorists have seized embassies on eight occasions since the American Embassy in Iran was taken over. Doubtless, it will happen again despite the increased security measures that are turning embassies into fortresses. Diplomats now routinely receive hostage training—and so they should, for terrorism will not go away.

What will we do next time. That question must be answered next time. There are no formulas; each episode is unique. However, we can prepare for the next time. Right now the government's attention is focused on terrorism. That will not last. When we are not under the gun, the problem of terrorism is considered no more than a nuisance. That itself is part of the problem. Terrorism attracts everyone's attention for a brief moment, then it is virtually ignored. Now is the time to develop a permanent arsenal of response measures, both military and diplomatic. The incident in Iran aroused the world's wrath and compassion. Now is the time to translate that into concrete agreements among those nations that still place a premium on human life.●

MAYOR OF EUTAW, ALA.,  
RESIGNS

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Mr. William Tuck, who has just recently resigned after serving as mayor of Eutaw, Ala., for 32 years. I believe that congratulations are certainly in order for this loyal public servant and his outstanding record.

William served 4 years on the town council before entering the race for mayor in 1948. He has been successful in his bid for reelection eight times. He was reelected to his ninth term last August, but resigned on January 1, because of his appointment to the Greene County Racing Commission. "Other people hold government jobs and jobs like this, but I do not want to cause any problems for the town or anyone else so I decided to resign," William said.

As can be expected, Eutaw has undergone many changes during the 32 years of William's leadership, but it is not the change or accomplishments of goals that sticks in the mayor's mind.

According to William:

We have managed to do a lot of things for the people of Eutaw during the past 32 years but I think my greatest personal satisfaction has been the honor of representing the finest people in the world. You know that is what I think about all the people in Eutaw and Greene County—they are just the finest you can find anywhere and to have been able to serve them has been my greatest pleasure.

William points out:

I went a lot of places on behalf of the town over the years—Montgomery, Washington, wherever I needed to go to get help for the town. The town paid my travel expenses but nothing more. I was fortunate that my brother and I were in business together and we both felt strongly about serving the public.

With his help I was able to take off when I needed to make trips or work with the council or public on some problem or another. I got to meet a lot of people doing the work for the city. I met people from the President on down and I enjoyed that but it was the reason I got to meet them that is important. I was trying to do something for the people of the town.

During the 32 years he was in office, Mayor Tuck saw and implemented many changes in Eutaw. He also had a few honors to come his way which indicated the respect others had for him. One of the honors was being elected president of the Alabama League of Municipalities—not a bad accomplishment for the mayor of a small town.

In addition to the job of mayor, he has served as chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Alabama



League of Municipalities and chairman of the Aeronautics Committee. He has also served on the board of directors of the Greene-Hale Counties Gas District since its organization in 1958. He is a past president of West Alabama Congress of Mayors and is presently on the Industrial Committee of WARDEC, representing Greene County. For the past 12 years, William has held the position of president of the local Salvation Army Service unit.

William Tuck is truly an outstanding individual. His devotion and service to the people of Eutaw, Greene County, and the State of Alabama, are outstanding in the public service arena.

I am honored to be able to share this exceptional story with my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and certainly wish William Tuck well in his future endeavors.●

#### LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT MASTER UTILITY METERING

**HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation I sponsored last year to prohibit the use of master meters for gas and electricity supplied to new buildings which have more than one unit. Passage of this bill would cut back on the considerable amount of energy currently wasted in apartments and commercial buildings with master metering.

As we all realize, the need for our Nation to save energy is absolutely essential. Our reliance on imported oil makes us politically and militarily vulnerable and causes severe economic problems that contribute to unemployment, inflation, the deflated value of the dollar, and our balance-of-payments deficit.

In our efforts to cut back on our use of imported oil, we have greatly neglected one abundant source of energy—conservation. Conservation is our cheapest, cleanest, and most readily available energy alternative. And, conservation does not have to mean undue sacrifice—recent studies show that the United States can use 30-40 percent less energy than it now does with no reduction in our standard of living. Conservation is thus the equivalent of an alternative energy source: It is far cheaper and easier to save a barrel of oil than to produce or import one.

At the present time the gas and electricity usage of the majority of tenants in the United States is metered at a single point for an entire building. When such master metering—rather than individual metering—is used, tenants utility expenses are included in their total rent charges; as a result, in-

dividual tenants are not directly aware of the amount of their gas and electricity consumption and thus have no economic incentive to cut back on usage. Not surprisingly, a tenant has a tendency to use less energy when he has to pay directly for it—as is the case when he receives a monthly utility bill that reflects his own individual consumption of energy.

The wasteful habits of tenants who receive their utility service by means of master metering have long been recognized by both utility company personnel and apartment owners and managers.

This considerable and unnecessary waste of energy was confirmed in a 1975 report prepared for the former Federal Energy Administration. After an extensive study of master metering of electrical service in apartment houses in 10 major cities, the conclusion was reached that residential customers whose electrical service was provided through master meters consumed about 35 percent more electricity than those in similar apartments who received service through individual meters and who thus paid directly for the energy used. Had the customers with master meters used the same reduced amount of energy as the individually metered customers, they would have saved 7 billion kW hours in a year—the equivalent of 13 million barrels of oil. This bill calls for individual metering of gas, as well as electricity, so the savings would be even greater.

The evidence provided in the FEA study is supported by officials at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, who state that a 35-percent reduction in electricity use occurred in public housing projects when the projects were converted from master metering to individual metering. In 1976, HUD issued regulations which required the conversion of all public housing projects to individual metering, where the conversion would be cost effective, by November 1978.

Laws which restrict the use of master meters in multifamily dwellings have been enacted in seven States: California, Florida, Maryland, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas. None of the utility commissions in those seven States report any major problems with the implementation of such laws.

The feasibility of totally eliminating master metering from residential service has also been proven in Chicago, Ill., where a Commonwealth Edison Co., policy of refusing to serve new residential customers through master meters has been in effect for 25 years. That policy has been successfully defended in the Illinois courts, and the company has established workable practices for the maintenance and servicing of their distribution systems in large buildings.

In most cases, conserving energy by installing individual metering would not cause undue sacrifice for tenants or cramp their lifestyles. A large proportion of the excess energy used in buildings with master metering occurs when air-conditioning and heating units are left to operate at high levels while tenants are away from their apartments during the day or on vacations.

Since 40 percent of the total housing, stock that will be available in the United States by the year 2000 will be built in the next 20 years, truly significant energy savings could be made through more energy-efficient building design requirements, including individual utility metering. We must use every reasonable means possible to reduce energy use starting immediately, and I believe that this legislation will contribute significantly to an effective energy conservation effort.●

#### TRIBUTE TO OLIN "TIGER" TEAGUE

**HON. LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

● Mr. DeNARDIS. Mr. Speaker, I was not a colleague of the late Olin E. Teague of Texas, who served in the House from 1946 to 1978, 32 years of most impressive service. Reading the tributes offered by those who knew Chairman Teague gives the newly arrived Member the vision of a legislative giant, a man of great personal courage, a teacher and mentor, and a figure with true public policy vision and the tenacity and skill to achieve it. Olin Teague left indelible marks on this Nation's policy toward its veterans and its policy on the exploration of space.

I cannot help but feel that 32 years of yeoman's service to constituents in Texas, to veterans throughout the Nation, to the critically important scientific and technological community, to the Democratic Party, and to the House of Representative as a political institution should be marked in a very special way. Drawing old fashioned inspiration from a truly remarkable legislative career ought still to be the order of the day.

Olin Teague's remains rest at Arlington National Cemetery, a hero among thousands of heroes. Texas A. & M. University graduated hundreds of men who made substantial leadership contributions to the U.S. effort in World War II. Lieutenant Colonel Teague led the 1st Battalion, 314th Infantry, of the 79th Division, the Cross of Lorraine, into France 4 days after the Normandy landings. The battalion fought in numerous engagements across France during which its com-

mander earned three Silver Stars, three Bronze Stars, and three Purple Hearts. Colonel Teague was severely wounded in December of 1944 while reconnoitering the Siegfried line. He recovered from those wounds and was elected to the House in 1946 from the hospital in Temple, Tex., which now bears his name.

Chairman Teague's wounds continued to cause him discomfort and pain throughout his 32 years in the House. As I said earlier, it was in that time that Olin Teague left his personal mark on veterans' programs and the space program. From the readings of the tributes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I gather that the chairman was loved by Republicans and Democrats, by the older veterans of the House and the newer Members, by those who approached him for needed counsel or favors and were never turned away, and by junior members of his committees who materially benefited from his solicitude, his generosity, and his friendliness. He was a legislator who believed in accommodation, compromise, and consensus, but who at the same time was fierce in the defense or the promotion of his public policy objectives.

I regret that I did not have the opportunity to meet Olin Teague and to serve with him, and I look to those who did have the privilege of serving with him to find the appropriate way of marking his life and achievements so that generations of legislators and citizens to come will have a true mark against which to measure public service in the House of Representatives.●

**A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR  
ALBERT S. RODDA**

**HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, as a result of last November's election, the California Legislature has lost one of its finest members, Senator Albert S. Rodda of Sacramento.

Al Rodda served in the State senate for 22 years, from 1958 to 1980, compiling a progressive record highlighted by his many contributions in the areas of finance, education, and protection of our natural environment.

I am pleased to join his many other friends in recognizing the accomplishments of this distinguished legislator, who has served in the traditions of Franklin Roosevelt and Adlai Stevenson. I know that other members of the California delegation will join me in expressing a congressional tribute to a man who has helped improve the quality of life in our State.

Al Rodda departed the State legislature as the chairman of the senate fi-

nance committee, where he helped our State struggle with the impact of proposition 13. Prior to his leadership of the finance committee, he headed the senate education committee, serving as chief architect for many of the improvements and innovations in California's public school system. Holding a doctoral degree from Stanford University, Senator Rodda was a respected educator, teaching history and economics at Sacramento City College for 20 years.

His Senate career has also included chairmanship of the select committee on innovation in school finance and character education and membership on the Senate natural resources and wildlife committee, the select committee on the maritime industry, the joint legislative budget committee, the joint legislative audit committee and the joint legislative committee on fairs, allocations, and classifications. In addition, he served on the local allocation board.

In a legislative career that spanned the administrations of three two-term Governors, Al Rodda authored 565 bills, constitutional amendments, and resolutions. His record includes sponsorship of bills in the areas of conservation and environmental protection; tax relief and tax reform; school finance, construction, and curriculum reform; collective bargaining in education; and four Senate versions of the State budget.

He also authored legislation to enact a master plan for the special education of developmentally disabled youth; to prohibit experimentation on live animals in public schools; to provide State financing of light-rail facilities; and to reorganize the governance of the University of California.

He was especially proud of his achievements directly affecting Sacramento and Sacramento County, including bills to preserve the old Governor's mansion; to create the California Fair and Exposition; to establish the Sacramento Regional Transit District; to help finance the Sacramento Medical Center; to finance local school construction; and to plan and develop the California Railroad Museum in Old Sacramento.

Sharing in over two decades of public service has been Al's wife, the former Clarice Horgan. Mrs. Rodda has been active in many Sacramento community organizations, including the Ladies' Aid to Retarded Children, the Crocker Art Gallery Service Group, the Altar Society of the Immaculate Conception Church, the Sacramento Association for the Retarded, the Cenacle Retreat League, and the Sacramento County Democratic Women's Club.

Senator and Mrs. Rodda are the parents of three children, Mary Elizabeth, a teacher, and Steven, and Margaret Ann, both attorneys.

At the age of 68, Al Rodda could have retired from public life after a long and distinguished career. But he is going to continue to use his expertise in State government finance to benefit the people of California as executive director of the commission on State finance.

On behalf of the California delegation, I want to wish Al Rodda all the best as he undertakes this new service to our State.

We are grateful for the years of dedicated, creative effort Albert S. Rodda has given to make California a better place to live.●

**IT IS TIME TO END THE GRAIN  
EMBARGO**

**HON. DAN COATS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, there is some indication from the President that he may cancel a campaign promise and continue the grain embargo to the Soviet Union.

This is a very serious matter to the farmers of my district. Export markets which took over 10 years to cultivate and establish were terminated overnight, leaving grain farmers with heavy debt loads to finance while suffering losses of up to \$1 a bushel in the price of grain.

No one disputes the reality that some action against the Soviet Union was made necessary by their reprehensible invasion of Afghanistan and other crimes against international peace and stability. The farmers in my district are the first to recognize this. But their question, and mine, remains: Why were they singled out to bear the brunt of U.S. foreign policy decisions regarding the Soviets?

The grain embargo has surely cost the Soviets money and inconvenience. Whether it has achieved its goals beyond that is highly doubtful. American farmers have been caused nearly as much inconvenience and expense; yet the troops are still in Afghanistan, anti-American agitation continued in Iran even during the final hours when the hostages' freedom was secured, and the U.S.S.R. seems totally unwilling to modify its foreign policy and behave in a more acceptable manner.

The embargo has been far from successful in changing Soviet actions, which was intended as its main goal. It has cost the American farmer, and will cost the American taxpayer even more in terms of direct outlays and tax losses. The export markets lost to our competitors during the embargo may never be recovered. If we are to be firm and effective in our dealings with the Soviet Union, then let us institute an embargo of all items—especially



the high technology on which the U.S.S.R. depends. Let all of us share the burden of foreign policy equally. But let us stop demanding that the farmers alone shoulder the expense and the disruption of their businesses.●

VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1981

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under a special order from my distinguished colleague from New York, I rise today to protest the Soviet mistreatment of Viktor Brailovsky and other Soviet refuseniks, and to put the Soviet Union on notice that the Congress is deeply concerned with their continued violations of the human rights and fundamental freedoms section of the Helsinki accord.

Viktor Brailovsky, his wife, and two children have been trying to emigrate to Israel since 1972. He was dismissed from his position as a computer scientist at the Institute of Electronic Control Machines because of his emigration request. He has been harassed continuously and has been jailed numerous times. His home has been searched and invaluable scientific papers and Jewish cultural materials have been confiscated.

On the eve of the Madrid Conference, Brailovsky was arrested on grounds of slandering the Soviet state because he led a group of 230 refuseniks on an appeal to President Leonid Brezhnev for free emigration of Soviet Jews.

Since his arrest, Brailovsky's health has deteriorated. He has not been provided with adequate medical care for the treatment of a liver ailment and permission for his wife to visit him has been denied.

Unfortunately, the case of Dr. Brailovsky is not an isolated one. Vladimir Kislik, Vladimir Tufeld, Abe Stolar, Josif Mendelevich, Yuli Kosharovskiy, Ilya Essas, Aba Taratuta, Arkady Yampolsky, Grigori Hess, Arkadii Mai, Leonid Volvovsky, Lev Shapiro, Dimitry Shchiglik, Natalia Chechik, Itzak Kogan, and thousands of others have also been denied basic human rights. It is time for the Soviets to end the continued inhuman treatment and persecution of Soviet refuseniks. The Congress has the responsibility to bring before the world the torture that Jews have experienced at the hands of the Soviet Government and bring to bear every possible effort to release them from its tyranny.●

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE DEATH OF MATTHEW SEXTON

HON. RICHARD C. SHELBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, Choctaw County, in Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, suffered a great loss recently with the death of Matthew Sexton, 73, of Butler.

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

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

In the fall of 1933, Matthew took the job as assistant county agent of Choctaw County. He was promoted to Choctaw County Extension Chairman in 1947 and remained in active, faithful service in that position until his retirement on September 30, 1976.

His knowledge of local history, his skill as a raconteur, his ready sense of humor, and his magnetic personality gave him a charm that endeared him to many. Matthew's simple philosophy of life was "the only way to have a friend is to first be one yourself."

Surviving are his wife, Lois Weaver Sexton; one daughter, Mrs. Sandra Sexton Kirkland of Butler; one brother, Mr. Paul Sexton of Prattville; three sisters: Mrs. Gertrude Freeman of Prattville, Mrs. Rae S. Kellner of Las Vegas, Nev., and Mrs. Carrie Mae Whatley of Baltimore, Md.; and two grandchildren.

Matthew Sexton's life should serve as a memorial to him for all time in Choctaw County, for he truly devoted it to serving the people that he loved and cared for.

He left many fond memories and I am sure that this fine gentleman will never be forgotten.●

THE DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 3, 1981

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to former Representative Emanuel Celler, who died January 15, 1981, at age 92.

It was not my privilege to know Mr. Celler personally. However, I remember him well from the years I spent as a staff member for a Senate commit-

tee. His name was legend. He had been here forever. His unswerving dedication to this country and to the integrity and fairness of our legal system was well known to all.

I would like to join with my colleagues now in sending my deepest sympathy to his family and friends.●

FISH URGES MEDALS, PAY FOR RETURNEES

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the response to the return of the American hostages from Iran has been overwhelming. From the touchdown at Stewart Air Force Base to the public receptions in Washington and New York to the small hometown celebrations, the American people have demonstrated their joy at the safe return of our citizens and their outrage at the treatment accorded the hostages while in captivity. I would like to share with my colleagues the reaction of one American, the only living honorary commander of the American Legion, my father, Hamilton Fish, Sr. The article is from the Newburgh Evening News, Sunday, January 25, 1981:

FISH URGES MEDALS, PAY FOR RETURNEES

NEWBURGH.—We welcome home all of the gallant American public servants who have added honor and glory to the American Flag, former congressman Hamilton Fish Sr. said Saturday night.

"The people of Orange County are proud that our heroic hostages will arrive first at the Stewart Airport and be stationed at the Thayer Hotel in West Point," continued the venerable Balmville patriot.

"The Iranian militants defied all principles of international law, resorted to tactics of terrorism and barbarism, but not one U.S. hostage caved in against the brutal kidnapers. The Congress should either give them the Congressional Medal of Honor or similar gold medal and double their pay from the time of imprisonment. It should be done within a month and not delayed," said the past national commander of the American Legion.●

FOOD STAMP REFORM ACT

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would substantially reduce the costs of the food stamp program by targeting assistance to those most truly in need and removing other recipients from the rolls.

No Federal program is in more need of fundamental reform and cost reductions than the food stamp program.

Countless working Americans have witnessed the abuses firsthand in grocery stores across this country. They have observed fellow citizens—many of whom are not much, if any, financially worse off than they—obtaining free groceries with food stamps supplied by the Federal Government.

Of course, food stamps are not free. Taxpaying Americans spent \$9.2 billion for this program in fiscal year 1980. Costs are now predicted to be at least \$11.1 billion, perhaps more, during fiscal year 1981 unless meaningful efforts are made to restrict benefits to only the truly needy and deserving.

The need for cost-saving reforms is further underlined by the latest projections that the fiscal year 1981 budget—once portrayed as balanced—will now likely result in a deficit of \$50 billion or more.

The growth in the food stamp program has been astronomical. What started out in 1965 at a level of \$34 million serving 435,000 recipients has skyrocketed to \$9.7 billion, and in September of 1980 served 22 million, or 1 out of every 10 Americans. The Congressional Budget Office's projected cost for fiscal year 1982 is now \$12.5 billion and the Carter administration's request for fiscal year 1982 is \$12,882,000.

The following chart denotes the exponential growth in the appropriations for the food stamp program in recent years:

Fiscal year:	Budget authority
1961.....	\$3,725
1962.....	\$48,900
1963.....	\$50,000
1964.....	\$45,000
1965.....	\$60,000
1966.....	\$100,000
1967.....	\$139,525
1968.....	\$185,000
1969.....	280,000
1970.....	610,000
1971.....	1,679,000
1972.....	2,289,214
1973.....	2,500,000
1974.....	3,000,000
1975.....	4,874,600
1976.....	5,203,000
1977.....	5,514,400
1978.....	5,627,000
1979.....	6,579,200
1980.....	9,182,000
1981.....	9,729,000

\*Pilot program with section 32 funding.

\*\$35,000,000 of section 32 funds; \$25,000,000 by direct appropriation.

\*Includes \$2,000,000 reappropriation.

\*Includes \$29,549,000 reappropriation.

\*Includes \$23,200,000 reappropriation.

Source: House Committee on Appropriations.

The growth of the program has continued unabated. Participation levels have escalated in the past 2 years:

October 1978.....	15.3
November 1978.....	15.4

#### RECENT MONTHLY FOOD STAMP PARTICIPATION—Continued

(Number of persons participating, in millions)	
December 1978.....	15.9
January 1979.....	17.4
February 1979.....	18.0
March 1979.....	18.5
April 1979.....	18.6
May 1979.....	18.4
June 1979.....	18.3
July 1979.....	18.4
August 1979.....	19.0
September 1979.....	19.3
October 1979.....	19.4
November 1979.....	19.6
December 1979.....	20.2
January 1980.....	21.7
February 1980.....	21.8
March 1980.....	21.7
April 1980.....	21.7
May 1980.....	21.9
June 1980.....	22.1
July 1980.....	22.0
August 1980.....	
September 1980.....	

Source: Food and Nutrition Service.

During the past 4 years, the Carter administration and the Democratic leadership in the Congress have been totally unresponsive to the need for reform in this program.

I am today introducing legislation which I hope can serve as a focal point for meaningful and long-overdue reform as reauthorization is considered in 1981. This list is not comprehensive, but does present a number of proposals which deserve serious consideration by those truly interested in making the food stamp program more responsive to recipients and taxpayers alike. The CBO estimates that the changes made by the bill would save \$3.7 billion from an otherwise estimated cost of \$12.5 billion in fiscal year 1982.

#### PURCHASE REQUIREMENT

A great part of the growth in program costs of the food stamp program is attributable to the decision by the Congress in 1977 to eliminate the purchase requirement as a prerequisite for participation.

Under the purchase requirement, participants with income were expected to contribute a small percentage of their incomes in exchange for food stamps representing larger denominations in value. Households with little or no income were not required to pay anything. Higher income households were required to pay up to 30 percent of their net income for food stamps.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that many low and lower middle income families have chosen to reallocate their limited incomes so as to select those commodities which are subsidized, thereby continuing to maintain their real purchasing power in nonsubsidized goods.

The CBO noted in an April 22, 1980, memorandum that since the elimination of the purchase requirement, the food stamp program has become more of a direct income transfer program, directly substitutable for nonfood purchases. Hence, the propensity to participate in the program increases with relatively high rates of inflation in nonfood, but still basic items.

In other words, low and lower middle income families are responding to inflation by enrolling in the food stamp program in order to spend what money they have on other necessities—and sometimes unessential items—which are not subsidized by the Federal Government.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the full restoration of the purchase requirement, at the same level as when terminated in 1977, would reduce food stamp costs by \$774 million at fiscal year 1981 spending levels.

Surely, the Congress should not be so blind to the post-1977 escalation of participation but to admit that the total elimination of the purchase requirement was a mistake, and that it should be reinstituted.

Its restoration would recognize the simple fact that when citizens have to put forth some money in order to participate in a matching Federal program, they are less apt to do so if they are marginally needy than if they must contribute nothing at all.

Since those marginally eligible are the ones who drop off—while those most in need remain—restoring the purchase requirement would serve to refocus benefits to those at the lower income level while tending to discourage marginal families from participation. It would also give those making the contribution for the higher value allotment a sense of contributing to their own needs.

The proposal incorporated within this legislation would not mandate a restoration of the full purchase requirement for all families, but rather would exempt the elderly, blind, and disabled—categories already recognized as deserving of special consideration. These groups would continue to be provided with food stamps without regard to the purchase requirement if they otherwise meet the income and assets test criteria of existing law.

Elderly, blind, and disabled households constitute at least one quarter of the food stamp caseload.

The exemption for these groups would insure that the food stamp program is tailored to assist those least able to help themselves.

The other most deserving category, the truly poor, would be exempt in practice from the restoration of the purchase requirement which even before 1977 exempted households at the lowest income levels.

Our colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK) first conceived of exempting these categories in an amendment she offered to S. 1309 on May 8, 1980. I believe that as Members reflect further on this concept, they will see the wisdom of restoring the purchase requirement principle.



## GROSS INCOME LIMIT

Another element essential to food stamp reform is that income eligibility be established at the gross, rather than net income level.

For instance, in December 1980, each household was entitled to an \$80 per month standard deduction as well as deductions of up to \$110 per month for child care expenses and/or excess shelter costs.

Such deductions permit families with incomes substantially above the poverty line to participate in the program.

The following figures, verified by the Congressional Budget Office, indicate the effective gross income limits which were in effect in December, assuming the maximum exemptions, in comparison with actual poverty standard as defined by the Office of Management and Budget:

MAXIMUM EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME ELIGIBILITY (UNDER EXISTING LAW), PERIOD OF JULY TO DECEMBER 1980

Family size:	Net income cutoff	Maximum gross income
1 <sup>1</sup>	\$3,790	\$7,588
2 <sup>2</sup>	5,010	9,113
3	6,230	10,638
4	7,450	12,162
5	8,670	13,687
6	9,890	15,212

<sup>1</sup>OMB poverty level.

<sup>2</sup>Assumes working household eligible for 20-percent earned income credit, \$80 standard deduction, \$110 dependent care/excess shelter deduction. (Does not assume deductions for payments above \$35 for medical expenses which are available for elderly, blind and disabled.)

Note.—Figures verified by Congressional Budget Office.

I do not believe that the majority of working taxpayers support the concept of providing benefits to those who are themselves above the poverty line in gross income.

The Department of Agriculture's most recent statistics, published in February 1980, indicate that approximately 13 percent of all benefits are paid to households with gross incomes above the poverty line.

This proposal provides a built-in work incentive to encourage nonworking households to obtain jobs and thereby work themselves off the food stamp rolls. For those families with earned income, the income eligibility ceiling would be 15 percent above the poverty line.

Again, as with the restoration of the purchase requirement, the elderly, blind, and disabled would be exempt from the gross income limitation. The existing net income limitations would continue to apply, effectively continuing the exemption for those elderly, blind, or disabled recipients who have high medical expenses—all above \$35 monthly of which is deductible from income.

## TIGHTEN WORK REGISTRATION

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Congress needs to tighten the work regis-

tration provisions of the food stamp program.

For instance, parents responsible for the care of children up to 12 years of age are presently exempted from registering for work.

Obviously, children customarily begin school around age 6, and thus there is no logical reason for allowing a higher age exempting the parent from work requirements otherwise applicable.

Additionally, the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services has a similar work provision, but Congress has set that age limit for children which exempts participation at age 6.

There has been some discussion within the Ways and Means Committee to reduce this level even further—possibly to age 3. Should the AFDC program be modified further, the food stamp program should parallel it in this respect.

An amendment to accomplish this change was offered by our colleague from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) during House consideration of S. 1309, and was initially accepted by the House. However, the provision was stricken in the conference on S. 1309 with the Senate.

The food stamp law provides a special deduction for dependent care expenses. This was included within the law specifically to encourage parents to work. Yet the high age exemption provides the opposite incentive. Congress should standardize the philosophy behind the program toward work incentives.

Latest statistics from the Department of Agriculture indicate that 35.1 percent of the present household heads are exempt from the work registration requirement because they are responsible for the care of children or incapacitated adults. Obviously this proposal is a modest and reasonable change which would encourage parents to begin registering for work when their youngest child reaches age 6.

## WORKFARE

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is important to more forcefully implement the concept of working as a prerequisite for food stamps.

Therefore, the bill includes a provision originally offered in a larger context of all public assistance bills by our colleague from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), which would mandate that States adopt "workfare" programs whereby able-bodied recipients would be required to perform some useful public work in exchange for Federal benefits.

The principle of work fare has been widely heralded by many Americans who believe that simple equity requires beneficiaries of Federal assist-

ance to perform useful tasks in exchange for these benefits.

Minimum requirements would be established by the Department of Agriculture as a foundation for these State work fare programs.

The successful reforms in California's welfare program implemented by President Ronald Reagan during his term as Governor should serve as a model for effective reform in work registration requirements in the food stamp program.

The community work experience program initiated in California required certain able-bodied adults to work 20 hours a week for their welfare grants.

Obviously, the provisions of this legislation are confined to the food stamp program although they do have broad implications for application in other public assistance programs as well.

Working recipients could provide needed services in community work projects that might otherwise go undone for lack of funds.

The work fare requirement would apply to those same people who presently must register for work. The requirement to perform public work would be terminated by their acceptance of paid employment which raises them above the eligibility limit.

## ELIMINATE STRIKERS

One area of the food stamp program where obvious savings could be obtained is through the total elimination of strikers from the food stamp rolls.

Present law presents the appearance of a prohibition against strikers, but, in reality, simultaneously provides an exception clause which allows most strikers to enroll in the program. Countless local communities can attest to this practice as food stamp offices are swamped with applications paralleling local labor disputes and strikes.

Indeed, under the expedited procedure of the food stamp program, strikers are often placed on the food stamp rolls within days of the initial walk-out.

Clearly, working American taxpayers should not be required to subsidize other Americans who have consciously and voluntarily decided not to work. The present practice of providing such generous and immediate benefits serves to place the Federal Government on the side of strikers. I believe the Federal Government should be neutral in such disputes.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's statistics, published in February 1980, indicated that approximately 2.1 percent of all food stamp households contained strikers. While this may be a small percentage of the caseload, it is nevertheless 2.1 percent too many.

The bill would eliminate the eligibility of strikers to receive food stamps unless they were otherwise entitled to receive them before the strike began.

## OVERLAP

One of the most obvious examples of food stamp abuse is in the area of overlap with other domestic funding programs.

The largest program in which this overlap of services occurs is the school lunch program. The General Accounting Office has noted this as long ago as June 13, 1978, in a report to Congress on domestic food assistance programs.

Under the present food stamp program, households are provided with an allotment of food stamps to pay for three meals per day at reasonable costs, providing a nutritionally adequate diet. However, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that approximately 6.8 million children whose families already receive food stamp allotments on their behalf are participating in the school lunch programs as well.

The net effect of this overlap is that families with children who receive federally financed free school lunches are subsidized for four, rather than three, meals per day, with resulting increased costs to the taxpayers.

This aspect of the omnibus legislation is modeled after legislation introduced in 1980 by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the new chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and other members of the Senate Agriculture, Budget, and Appropriations Committees.

A similar proposal was offered by our colleague from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN), both as a separate legislation and as an amendment to S. 1309 on May 8, 1980. While the amendment was rejected at that time, the continuing budget crisis makes it imperative to reconsider this reasonable reform proposal.

The provision would reduce the allotment of food stamps the most generous possible calculation of the food stamp programs assumed cost of one meal per day for family members participating in the school lunch program.

Such a restriction would eliminate duplication which the CBO estimates costs taxpayers over half a billion dollars a year. Needy children would still receive their school lunches. Their parents would continue to receive food stamps.

This is a modest proposal to reduce the dual compensation existing under the present circumstances. The entire duplication between these two programs would not be eliminated by this section. Short of an overly complex plan, some duplication would inevitably remain, but this provision is a move in the right direction.

It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the school lunch program is only

one of the programs which currently overlaps with the food stamp program.

Other domestic feeding programs which frequently provide food stamp families with additional nutritional benefits are the women, infants, and children (WIC) program, summer feeding, school breakfast, special milk, and child care feeding.

While the provisions of this particular bill only address the elimination of overlap between the food stamp and school lunch programs—the Agriculture Department's two largest feeding programs—other, smaller programs should also be considered.

Households with members participating in these other feeding programs—primarily designed for children—are being overcompensated in total food stamp benefits at a great cost to the American taxpayer.

One option would be for Congress to adopt a policy of considering total food benefits available to multiple-program participants when determining eligibility and level of benefits in the food stamp program as a means of eliminating the present duplication.

Another option would be similar to that proposed in this bill for the food stamp/school lunch overlap—to simply reduce by the per meal cost the food stamp benefits to which a recipient who participates in other feeding programs is entitled.

## ELIMINATE DINE-OUT

Mr. Speaker, one new feature of the food stamp program which is now small, but which contains the ingredients for massive expansion and abuse, is the so-called dine-out provision of the current law.

Under the dine-out pilot projects, certain food stamp recipients, currently limited to the elderly, blind, and disabled, may use food stamps in authorized restaurants.

While most Americans customarily think of food stamp redemption as confined to grocery stores, present law actually allows purchases at several types of locations.

For example, food stamps can be redeemed for meals served by alcohol and drug treatment centers, or even for hunting and fishing equipment in parts of Alaska. With regard to the elderly and disabled, stamps may be used in a variety of ways, for food at home or away from home.

The most common kinds of meals provided for the elderly are Meals on Wheels—meals at senior citizens' centers, apartment buildings occupied primarily by those over 60, or federally subsidized housing for the elderly—or meals from public or nonprofit organizations, including schools, eating establishments, and groups created for other purposes, but which offer meals for persons age 60 or more.

However, a thus far little-used provision of the law also allows food stamp redemption in private retail establish-

ments, such as restaurants that contract with the State to offer reduced price meals to persons 60 or over.

It is this latest category only which would be eliminated under the provisions of this legislation.

The administrative costs associated with seeking and setting up contractual arrangements with restaurants are excessive. Surely this provision goes beyond the original intent for the food stamp program.

Additionally, it is clear that the food stamp coupon allotments, which are based on at-home food costs, will rapidly be depleted under dine-out provisions at even the most economical restaurants.

Congress has been generous in establishing alternative redemption centers for the elderly, blind, and disabled as cited above.

However, the current provision allowing these recipients to eat at restaurants clearly abuses the concept of the program and holds it up to even greater public derision.

The Department is spending scarce resources trying to establish dine-out contracts which would prematurely exhaust the recipients' monthly coupon allotment. Such projects are simply not cost effective—for either the recipient or the taxpayer.

Since the existing food stamp law provides a myriad of other redemption processes to accommodate the mobility and health problems unique to the elderly, blind, and disabled, it seems to me prudent to eliminate this dine-out provision.

## ELIMINATE OUTREACH

To add to the irony of the food stamp program is the fact that despite the monumental growth of the program, the Federal Government requires the States administering the program to continue to seek additional participants.

At a time when the Federal Government should be seeking every reasonable means to streamline its operations, it is incongruous that official policy mandates this outreach aspect of the food stamp program.

Outreach is simply no longer needed and should be eliminated. To require scarce tax dollars to be spent advertising this program is a mistaken notion which should be ended immediately.

The House approved a limitation on outreach activities during the consideration of S. 1309 on May 8, 1980. However, that limitation was eliminated during the conference with the Senate.

Surely Congress can and should eliminate the Federal provision which has been interpreted by the Department of Agriculture to require telephone hotlines, films, media, radio and TV advertisements, and newspaper advertisements to be used to encourage food stamp participation.



The bill adopts the total ban on outreach activities—a proposal offered by our colleague from California, Mr. SHUMWAY, in 1980. Should the Government continue this outreach policy, the participation levels and costs of the food stamp program will continue to skyrocket.

#### ENERGY ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, one of the ways in which eligibility levels in the food stamp program are inflated is by excluding certain forms of income in the definition of "income" for eligibility purposes.

One such case is that of energy assistance. Federal, State, and local energy assistance payments made to needy households to assist them in paying their winter heating bills do, indeed, improve the overall financial condition of the household—freeing up income for other purposes.

To exempt such payments from the definition of income, as is the case presently, understates the true financial picture of the recipient household.

Such a practice effectively allows more households to qualify for food stamps and allows them to be eligible for more benefits than they would otherwise be entitled.

The first concurrent budget resolution for fiscal year 1981 included in the savings assumptions the provision that energy assistance be included in the definition of income for eligibility purposes.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the inclusion of this provision would result in savings of approximately \$200 million annually.

While this is a small savings relative to the overall expense of the program, it is important because an accumulation of such smaller savings can mean large savings, and in that as a matter of principle legitimate income should be defined as such.

A closely related matter is how the food stamp program should treat certain other in-kind benefits—particularly housing subsidies.

The value of public housing, reduced-cost housing, and otherwise federally subsidized housing clearly benefits the household and effectively improves its financial condition. Yet such housing transfers are not currently included within the definition of income.

While this bill does not deal specifically with housing assistance, I believe that Congress should consider the value of housing subsidies in the definition of income when determining eligibility for food stamp participation.

This concept would be consistent with the principle enunciated earlier of taking into account other food benefits when determining food stamp eligibility and benefits.

Food benefits and housing subsidies fall in the broad and growing category of in-kind benefits which presently are

excluded from the definition of income in the food stamp program. Yet these and other public assistance programs do enhance the overall condition of the recipient households. The value of benefits received under these programs should be counted in order to assess the true level of need in the food stamp program.

Actually, this principle has broad application. Benefits in one program should be considered in determining eligibility for other programs.

#### INDIVIDUALIZATION OF ALLOTMENTS

Another recommended reform is that the Food and Nutrition Service utilize various specific categories which it presently records in determining the proper level of benefits allotted to each household.

Mr. Speaker, one of the original objectives of the food stamp program was to target supplemental food assistance to those most in need in our society. It is an objective which needs more attention in the 1980's.

At the present time, there is an inequitable distribution of benefits to some households caused by the use of the standard allotment.

All food stamp allotments are based on the thrifty food plan costs for a four-person household consisting of two adults—a man and a woman—aged 20 to 54, and two children, one in the 6 to 8 age group and the other aged 9 to 11.

The thrifty food plan is the least costly of four food plans developed by the Department of Agriculture. It is designed to provide most of the National Academy of Sciences' 1974 recommended dietary allowances considered to be adequate to meet the known nutritional needs of healthy persons. This is the same food plan which the Department presently uses to determine food stamp costs.

The monthly uniform allotment for a four-person household in March of last year, for instance, was \$209.

Family of 4	Thrifty food plan cost
Male, 20 to 54 years.....	\$61.60
Female, 20 to 54 years.....	50.30
Child, 6 to 8 years.....	43.00
Child, 9 to 11 years.....	54.00
Total.....	208.90

However, the General Accounting Office estimated in 1978 that only 2.5 percent of food stamp households were composed of this particular combination of family members. The food stamp allotments for other household sizes are not determined by similarly calculating the average cost of food to households of varying age and sex composition, even though these figures are available from the Department of Agriculture. Rather, other allotment levels are determined by dividing the standard allotment level by

4, multiplying the result by household size, and applying an adjustment to reflect economies of scale.

The GAO noted the inequities which this system creates in its June 13, 1978, report, "Federal Domestic Food Assistance Programs—A Time for Assistance and Change":

Because the uniform allotment amounts are based on the needs of an average family, the combination of free food stamps and a reasonable investment of household funds could enable some recipients, such as a household consisting of a mother and three young children, to receive benefits above their thrifty food plan costs. On the other hand, a similar combination of free food stamps and a reasonable investment of household funds would probably not be enough to provide a nutritionally adequate diet for a five-person household in which the children are all teenage boys (p. 34).

Let us look at several inequities based on food cost prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

The uniform food stamp allotment for all participating four-person families in the continental United States is \$209, regardless of the actual age or sex of the family members.

Thus families whose composition vary from the uniform allotments receive either substantially more or less than the amounts needed to cover their food costs.

For example, a mother with three young children would have received a uniform food stamp allotment meeting about 135 percent of her family's nutritional needs based on the thrifty food plan:

Family of 4	Thrifty food plan cost
Female, 20 to 54 years.....	\$50.30
Child, 1 to 2 years.....	27.90
Child, 3 to 5 years.....	33.80
Child, 6 to 8 years.....	43.00
Total cost (need).....	155.00
Uniform coupon allotment.....	209.00

A family of four with two teenage boys, however, would have received a uniform allotment covering only about 90 percent of its nutritional needs:

Family of 4	Thrifty food plan cost
Male, 20 to 54 years.....	\$61.60
Female, 20 to 54 years.....	50.30
Male, 15 to 19 years.....	63.50
Male, 12 to 14 years.....	57.60
Total cost (need).....	233.00
Uniform coupon allotment.....	209.00

The GAO reported in 1978 that average uniform food stamp allotments exceeded appropriate thrifty food plan costs by 9 percent. Based on estimated program costs for fiscal year 1981 of \$10.7 billion, this proposal would result in substantial savings in the program, potentially as much as \$963 million.

Individualization of food stamp allotments would generate substantial savings and would simultaneously target benefits more equitably than the present system, where some households might be getting more than they need while others are getting less.

The Congressional Budget Office gave the same assessment of this recommendation in 1977:

Providing applicant food stamp households an allotment level determined by the specific sex and age characteristics of the household would significantly reduce federal bonus costs and presumably come closest to targeting benefits on specific nutritional needs. (The Food Stamp Program: "Income or Food Supplementation?", Congressional Budget Office, January 1977, p. 53.)

Mr. Speaker, the current categories which are used by the Food and Nutrition Service, including their March 1980 costs, and which would continue to be used under my amendment are as follows:

<i>Children</i>	
7 months to 1 year.....	\$25.80
1 to 2 years.....	29.00
3 to 5 years.....	35.20
6 to 8 years.....	44.90
9 to 11 years.....	56.30
<i>Males</i>	
12 to 14 years.....	60.10
15 to 19 years.....	66.10
20 to 54 years.....	64.10
55 and above.....	57.00
<i>Females</i>	
12 to 19 years.....	53.60
20 to 54 years.....	52.20
55 and above.....	47.30
Pregnant.....	65.80
Nursing mothers.....	69.80

The use of all of these categories would not be necessary. They could be clustered but still provide a more accurate assessment of nutritional need.

While there would be some book-keeping associated with this requirement, based on the GAO's savings estimate, the benefits would far outweigh the costs of implementing the proposal. Charts could easily be prepared for use by State agencies with a minimum of complexity.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, these food stamp reform proposals included in the legislation I am introducing, are drawn largely from recommendations made by the General Accounting Office, analyses of the Congressional Budget Office, and concepts previously considered by the Congress.

I believe that the severity of the Federal Government's present fiscal crisis in general, and the high cost of the food stamp program in particular, demand a careful reconsideration of the issues presented in this legislation.

I hope that these ideas can serve as a launching pad for constructive discussion and refinement of these and other concepts to retarget assistance to families who need it most, with consequent reduction in overall costs and

a savings to the hardworking American taxpayers whom we represent.●

#### TRIBUTE TO "WILLIE" NEESE

#### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Mr. W. J. "Willie" Neese of Paris, Tenn. Mr. Neese passed away recently at the age of 73. He was a civic-minded man who worked hard to improve the quality of life in his community, serving as its mayor for 4 years and its spokesman in the Tennessee State Legislature for four 2-year terms.

Right after returning from service in the U.S. Navy during World War II, Mr. Neese was instrumental in forming the Veterans for Better Government League in Paris. From the efforts of that organization, a new charter was written for the city.

Throughout his life, Mr. Neese was active in the Democratic Party and worked tirelessly in many political campaigns. His brother, Charles, was administrative assistant to the late Senator Estes Kefauver and now sits as a Federal district judge in Tennessee.

The loss of Willie Neese to west Tennessee is more than the loss of a civic-minded and hard-working public servant; it is also a deep personal loss to me. Willie Neese and I were longtime friends and I had great respect for him and his family. I want to express my deepest sympathy to his lovely wife, Allene and their children.

I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD the following two newspaper articles printed on the occasion of his death.

[From the Paris Post-Intelligencer, Jan. 12, 1981]

#### PUBLIC SERVICE MARKED LIFE OF W. J. NEESE

Death from a heart attack ended the mortal life of W. J. Neese Sunday morning, but he will long be remembered in his native community for his many accomplishments and public-spirited contributions to Paris and Henry County.

Better known by his nickname, "Willie," William Jerome Neese was a self-made man in the sense that he overcame early economic obstacles. Through his own ingenuity and hard work he became a successful businessman and developer.

But it is not for his business success that he will be remembered. Rather it will be his record of public service in the halls of the Tennessee Legislature, as mayor of Paris and for his activity in many other areas of civic and community endeavor which are listed in detail elsewhere in today's edition.

Standing as a perpetual memorial to his genius as a legislator is the state vocational-technical school that bears his name, located across from Henry County High School. As Henry County's representative, Neese single-handedly persuaded the late Gov.

Buford Ellington to include an appropriation in the state budget to begin construction of the trade school, which has since been doubled in size and which provides opportunity for young people and adults alike to learn skills and trades that will equip them to get better-paying jobs.

Of all his accomplishments, Willie Neese probably cherished the trade school above others, although his interest in young people extended beyond that. As a charter member and first exalted ruler of the Paris Elks Lodge and past president of the Tennessee Elks Association, his interest in the Elks extended beyond its fraternal aspects. As a trustee he worked consistently to raise funds for the Elks Foundation, used to provide grants to assist student nurses to complete their education and become qualified to assume positions of responsibility in the health field. His interest in the underprivileged was also well known as a result of his successful endeavors to provide better housing for those forced to exist in sub-standard homes.

W. J. Neese was a public figure who involved himself in local government to bring about changes for the good. But, as in the case of so many other successful men and women in public life, there was a private side of his life that few outside his immediate family knew about. In addition to being a devoted husband and father, he was compassionate and generous in giving help to the less fortunate, the needy and poor.

If there is such a thing as a self made man, W. J. (Willie) Neese was just that. To his credit, he used much of his material possessions and his God-given talents in public service to the county and community he loved.

And while no man is perfect or makes no mistakes, the life of this man could be well summed up in one of the creeds of the Benevolent Order of Elks which states: "The faults of our brothers, we write upon the sands; their virtues on the tablets of love and memory."

#### FORMER PARIS MAYOR NEESE DIES

Former Paris Mayor W. J. (Willie) Neese, 73, one of Henry County's most prominent citizens, died Sunday morning at Henry County General Hospital's emergency room following a heart attack.

Born on Sept. 10, 1907, in Elkhorn, Neese spent more than a decade as a state and local political office holder.

Following his graduation from Grove High School where he served as captain of his football team for one year, Neese attended Toler's Business College and the University of Tennessee. For several years he worked for retail outlets and the Miller-Jones Shoe Co. During World War II, he served with the U.S. Navy.

In the early 1940s he was instrumental in forming the Veterans Better Government League in Paris. From this league came the city manager charter for Paris.

Neese was elected in 1964 to represent this district in the state legislature and served four terms as representative. He served on numerous committees and devoted much of his energy to the areas of conservation, farm problems and vocational education.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, he was able to get a supplemental appropriation to begin construction on the W. J. Neese Area Vocational Technical School in Paris. He managed to have \$5 million allocated to Paris Landing State Park, and was instrumental in the passage of a bill allowing farmers to buy



temporary overweight license tags for their trucks.

In a tight race for Speaker of the House in 1970, Neese lost the speakership to Rep. James R. McKinney of Davidson County on the fourth ballot.

Neese was elected to the City Commission in 1972 and was elected mayor by the commission, a position he held for four years.

He was the son of the late Anna Nunn and Charles Gentry Neese. On Nov. 3, 1929, he was married to the former Mildred Allene Walker, and they became the parents of three children—Mrs. Charles (Ann) Walker of Madisonville, Ky., Mrs. Larry (Diann) Jordan of Memphis, and William J. (Bill) Neese Jr. of Clarksville.

Neese was a charter member of the Paris Elks Lodge, served as its first exalted ruler and was past president of the Tennessee Elks Association.

A member of the board of trustees of the Paris Lodge for many years, Neese also served a three-year term as a member of the Grand Lodge Americanism Committee. He was a strong supporter of the Elks National Foundation and organized the Elks Benevolent Trust Fund, which provides funding for the Tennessee Elks nursing scholarship program. Approximately \$30,000 a year is dispensed to deserving students who wish to follow nursing as a career. Neese had been named "Elk of the Year" by his lodge, and had held numerous offices in the state organization.

An avid checker player, Neese was the promoter of a national checker tournament held at the old Elks Lodge. He was a real estate developer, a member of the First United Methodist Church and at the time of his death was one of three directors on the local Natural Gas Board.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Tuesday at McEvoy Chapel with the Rev. Woodward Adams Jr. of First United Methodist Church officiating. Burial will follow in Maplewood Cemetery. First cousins of the deceased will serve as active and honorary pallbearers. Other honorary pallbearers will be members of Elks Lodge 816.

Visitation began at McEvoy's Funeral Home after 2 p.m. today.

In addition to his wife and three children, he is survived by his stepmother, Mrs. C. G. Neese of Chickasaw Rd.; one brother, Judge Charles G. Neese of Greenville; five grandchildren, Jay Walker of McKenzie, Cathy Neese of Clarksville, Jeanette Cope, Paige Walker and Jeaneese McGraw, all of Madisonville, Ky.; and two great-grandchildren, Deanna and Mandy Cope.

The family has suggested that persons wishing to make memorials address them to the Henry County Heart Fund. ●

## TAX RETURN HELP FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as an original member of the House Select Committee on Human Services, I am acutely aware of the many problems that confront citizens in performing the essential yet frequently difficult and time-consuming task of preparing their Federal income tax returns.

When the citizen is elderly or disabled, these problems are often multiplied.

In order to assist those in need, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a checklist of itemized deductions prepared by the Internal Revenue Service which senior citizens will find extremely beneficial in filing their 1980 tax returns. It will insure that those deserving citizens receive all to which they are entitled.

In addition to this report and to further facilitate the cumbersome tax-filing process, I would like to point out that the Internal Revenue Service as well as various community groups, by way of the volunteer income tax assistance (VITA) program, offer free tax return preparation assistance to the elderly, handicapped and low-income taxpayers. To obtain this assistance, senior citizens need simply to call one of the following toll-free IRS telephone numbers: (212) 732-0100 which is for residents of Manhattan, the Bronx and Staten Island, or (212) 596-3700, which is for residents of Queens and Brooklyn.

The IRS checklist I discussed earlier and present here is as follows:

### IRS ASSISTANCE IS AVAILABLE TO HELP YOU

How to find help: If you have questions or need assistance on any Federal tax matter, help is available at the IRS. The toll-free telephone number for your area is listed in your telephone directory under "United States Government, Internal Revenue Service," and in your tax forms instruction booklet. Should you need to visit an IRS office, call this toll-free number to find the location of the office nearest you.

Publications to assist you: The IRS also prepares many free publications which will help answer your tax questions. In addition to the general publication 17, "Your Federal Income Tax," there are publications available on specific topics, such as "Tax Benefits for Older Americans" (publication 554), "Credit for the Elderly" (publication 524), and "Estimated Tax and Withholding" (publication 505). Single copies of publications can be ordered by mail using the order form in your tax package or by calling the forms/tax information number listed in your telephone directory under "United States Government, Internal Revenue Service."

Other special programs offering assistance: In addition, through the volunteer income tax assistance (VITA) program, older Americans can obtain free tax return preparation assistance from IRS trained volunteers at conveniently located sites throughout the country. Your local IRS office will be able to tell you where and when you can find this assistance in your area. A special program to provide assistance to individuals age 60 and over will be available in some areas. The IRS can tell you if trained volunteers working in the tax counseling for the elderly program are located near you.

### CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE (FORM 1040)

#### Medical and dental expenses

Medical and dental expenses (unreimbursed by insurance or otherwise) are deductible to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

#### Insurance premiums

One-half of medical, hospital or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to \$150) without regard to the 3 percent limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted, but is subject to the 3 percent rule.

#### Drugs and medicines

Included in medical expenses (subject to 3 percent rule) but only to extent exceeding 1 percent of adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

#### Other medical expenses

Other allowable medical and dental expenses (subject to 3 percent limitation):

Abdominal supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Acupuncture services.

Ambulance hire.

Anesthetist.

Arch supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Artificial limbs and teeth.

Back supports (prescribed by a doctor).

Braces.

Capital expenditures for medical purposes (e.g., elevator for persons with a heart ailment)—deductible to the extent that the cost of the capital expenditure exceeds the increase in value to your home because of the capital expenditure. You should have an independent appraisal made to reflect clearly the increase in value.

Cardiographs.

Chiroprapist.

Chiropractor.

Christian Science practitioner, authorized.

Convalescent home (the entire cost, if the main reason for being there is to get medical care).

Crutches.

Dental services (e.g., cleaning, X-ray, filling teeth).

Dentures.

Dermatologist.

Eyeglasses.

Food or beverages specially prescribed by a physician (for treatment of illness, and in addition to, not as substitute for, regular diet; physician's statement needed).

Gynecologist.

Hearing aids and batteries.

Home health services.

Hospital expenses.

Insulin treatment.

Invalid chair.

Lab tests.

Lipreading lessons (designed to overcome a handicap).

Medicare A, voluntarily paid, if you are 65 or older and not entitled to social security benefits.

Medicare B, supplementary medical insurance.

Neurologist.

Nursing services (for medical care, including nurse's board paid by you).

Occupational therapist.

Ophthalmologist.

Optician.

Optometrist.

Oral surgery.

Osteopath, licensed.

Pediatrician.

Physical examinations.

Physical therapist.

Physician.

Podiatrist.

Psychiatrist.

Psychoanalyst.

Psychologist.

Psychotherapy.

Radium therapy.

Sacroiliac belt (prescribed by a doctor).  
Seeing-eye dog and maintenance.  
Speech therapist.  
Splints.  
Surgeon.  
Telephone/teletype special communications equipment for the deaf.

Transportation expenses for medical purposes (actual or 9¢ per mile plus parking and tolls; but not general repair and maintenance expenses, insurance, or depreciation in either case; or actual fares for taxi, buses, etc.).

#### Vaccines.

Vitamins prescribed by a doctor (but not taken as a food supplement or to preserve general health).

#### Wheelchairs.

Whirlpool baths for medical purposes.

#### X-rays.

Expenses may be deducted only in the year you paid them. If you charge medical expenses on your credit card, the expenses are deducted in the year the charge is made regardless of when the bill is paid.

#### Taxes

##### Real estate.

##### General sales.

##### State, local, or foreign income.

##### Personal property.

If sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, ordinarily you may add to the amount shown in the tax tables the sales tax paid on the purchase of the following items: Automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and materials used to build a new home when you are your own contractor.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income (e.g., Social Security, Veterans' pensions or compensation payments, Railroad Retirement annuities, workmen's compensation, untaxed portion of long-term capital gains, dividends untaxed under the dividend exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, untaxed part of unemployment compensation and public assistance payments).

#### Contributions

In general, contributions may be deducted up to 50 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040). However, contributions to certain private nonoperating foundations, veterans organizations, fraternal societies, or nonprofit cemetery companies, are limited to 20 percent of adjusted gross income.

Cash contributions to qualified organizations for (1) religious, charitable, scientific, literary or educational purposes, (2) prevention of cruelty to children or animals, or (3) Federal, State or local governmental units (tuition for children attending parochial schools is not deductible).

Fair market value of property (e.g., clothing, books, equipment, furniture) for charitable purposes. (For gifts of appreciated property, special rules apply. Contact local IRS office.)

Travel expenses (actual or 9¢ per mile plus parking and tolls) for charitable purposes (may not deduct general repair and maintenance expenses, insurance, or depreciation in either case).

Cost and upkeep of uniforms used in charitable activities (e.g., scoutmaster).

Purchase of goods or tickets from charitable organizations (excess of amount paid over the fair market value of the goods or services).

Out-of-pocket expenses (e.g., postage, stationery, phone calls) while rendering services for charitable organizations.

Care of unrelated students in your home under a written agreement with a qualifying organization (deduction is limited to \$50 per month).

#### Interest

##### Personal loan.

##### Home mortgage.

##### Auto loan.

Installment purchases (television, washer, dryer, etc.).

Bank credit card—can deduct the finance charge as interest if no part is for service charges, loan fees, credit investigation fees, or similar charges.

Other credit cards—you may deduct as interest the finance charges added to your monthly statement, expressed as an annual percentage rate, that are based on the unpaid monthly balance.

Points—deductible as interest by buyer where financing agreement provides that they are to be paid for use of lender's money and only if the charging of points is an established business practice in your area. Not deductible if points represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA loan points are service charges and are not deductible as interest). Not deductible if paid by seller (are treated as selling expenses and represent a reduction of amount realized).

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage—deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts—may deduct the separately stated "finance charge."

#### Casualty or theft losses

Casualty (e.g., tornado, flood, storm, fire, or auto accident provided not caused by a willful act or willful negligence) or theft losses—the amount of your casualty loss deduction is generally the lesser of (1) the decrease in fair market value of the property as a result of the casualty, or (2) your adjusted basis in the property. This amount must be further reduced by any insurance or other recovery, and, in the case of property held for personal use, by the \$100 limitation. Report your casualty or theft loss on Schedule A. If more than one item was involved in a single casualty or theft, or if you had more than one casualty or theft during the year, use Form 4684 for computing your personal casualty loss.

#### Miscellaneous

Appraisal fees to determine the amount of a casualty loss or to determine the fair market value of charitable contributions.

##### Union dues.

Cost of preparation of income tax return. Cost of tools for employee (depreciated over the useful life of the tools).

Dues for Chamber of Commerce (if as a business expense).

Rental cost of a safe-deposit box used to store taxable income-producing property records.

Fees paid to investment counselors (if the fees relate to investments that produce taxable income).

##### Subscriptions to business publications.

Telephone and postage in connection with investments.

Uniforms required for employment and not generally wearable off the job.

Maintenance of uniforms required for employment.

Special safety apparel (e.g., steel toe safety shoes or helmets worn by construction workers; special masks worn by welders).

##### Business entertainment expenses.

Business gift expenses not exceeding \$25 per recipient.

Employment agency fees under certain circumstances.

Cost of a periodic physical examination if required by employer to keep your job or in order to get the job.

Cost of bond if required for employment. Expenses of an office in your home if used regularly and exclusively for business purposes.

Educational expenses that are: (1) required by your employer to maintain your position; or (2) for maintaining or sharpening your skills for your employment.

#### Political campaign contributions

You may claim a credit (line 38, Form 1040, or line 12a, Form 1040A) for campaign contributions to an individual who is a candidate for nomination or election to any Federal, State, or local office in any primary, general, or special election. The credit is also applicable for any (1) committee supporting a candidate for Federal, State, or local elective public office, (2) national committee of a national political party, (3) State committee of a national political party, (4) local committee of a national political party, or (5) certain newsletter funds set up and maintained by a person who holds, has been elected to, or is a candidate for nomination or election to a public office. The amount of the tax credit is one-half of the political contribution, with a \$50 ceiling (\$100 for couples filing a joint return).

#### Presidential Election Campaign Fund

Additionally, you may voluntarily earmark \$1 of your taxes (\$2 on joint returns) for the Presidential Election Campaign Fund.

#### OTHER TAX RELIEF MEASURES

Filing status	Required to file a tax return if gross income is at least—
Single (under age 65)	\$3,300
Single (age 65 or older)	4,300
Qualifying widow(er) under 65 with dependent child	4,400
Qualifying widow(er) 65 or older with dependent child	5,400
Married couple (both spouses under 65) filing jointly	5,400
Married couple (1 spouse 65 or older) filing jointly	6,400
Married couple (both spouses 65 or older) filing jointly	7,400
Married filing separately	1,000

**Additional Exemption for Age.**—Besides the regular \$1,000 exemption, you are allowed an additional exemption of \$1,000 if you are age 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year. If both a husband and wife are 65 or older on the last day of the taxable year, each is entitled to an additional exemption of \$1,000 because of age. You are considered 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday is on January 1, 1981, you will be entitled to the additional \$1,000 exemption because of age for your 1980 Federal income tax return.

**"Zero Bracket Amount."**—The "zero bracket amount" is a flat amount that depends on your filing status. If you are married filing jointly or a qualifying widow or widower, your zero bracket amount is \$3,400. If you are single or a head of household, your zero bracket amount is \$2,300. If you are married filing separately, it is \$1,700. It is not a separate deduction; instead, the equivalent amount is built into the tax tables and tax rate schedules. Since this amount is built into the tax tables and tax rate schedules, you will need to make an adjustment if you itemize deductions. However, itemizers will not experience any



change in their tax liability and the tax computation will be simplified for many itemizers.

**Tax Tables.**—Tax tables have been developed to make it easier for you to find your tax if your income is under certain levels. Even if you itemize deductions, you may be able to use the tax tables to find your tax easier. In addition, you do not have to deduct \$1,000 for each exemption because this amount is also built into the tax table for you.

**Multiple Support Agreements.**—In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return. But in some cases, two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a \$1,000 dependency deduction if the following requirements are met for multiple support:

1. Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

2. Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10 percent of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

3. Each of the others must file a written statement that he will not claim the dependency deduction for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax return of the person who claims the dependency deduction. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

**Sale of Personal Residence.**—You may exclude from your gross income some or all of your gain from the sale or exchange of your principal residence, if you meet certain age, ownership, and occupancy requirements at the time of the sale or exchange. The exclusion is elective, and you may elect to exclude gain only once for sales or exchanges after July 26, 1978. If you were age 55 or older before the date of sale or exchange, you may elect to exclude up to \$100,000 of gain on the sale or exchange if you owned and occupied the residence for 3 of the 5 years ending on the date of sale (or 5 of 8 years if you were 65 or older on the date of the sale or exchange). This applies only to a sale or exchange before July 26, 1981. Form 2119 (Sale or Exchange of Principal Residence) is helpful in determining what gain, if any, may be excluded.

Additionally, payment of tax on the gain on the sale or exchange of your principal residence in excess of the excluded amount will be deferred if, within 18 months before or 18 months after the sale or exchange, you buy and occupy another residence, the cost of which equals or exceeds the adjusted sales price of the old residence. Additional time is allowed if (1) you construct the new residence; (2) you were on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces; or (3) your tax home was abroad. Publication 523 (Tax Information on Selling Your Home) may also be helpful.

**Credit for the Elderly.**—You may be able to claim this credit and reduce taxes by as much as \$375 (if single), or \$562.50 (if married filing jointly), if you are:

- (1) Age 65 or older, or
- (2) Under age 65 and retired under a public retirement system.

For more information, see instructions for Schedules R and RP.

**Credit for Child and Dependent Care Expenses.**—Certain payments made for child and dependent care may be claimed as a credit against tax.

If you maintained a household that included your dependent under age 15 or a dependent or spouse incapable of self-care, you may be allowed a 20 percent credit for employment related expenses. These expenses must have been paid during the taxable year in order to enable you to work either full or part time.

For detailed information, see the instructions in Form 2441.

**Earned Income Credit.**—If you have a dependent child who shares your principal place of abode in the United States, you may be entitled to a special payment or credit of up to \$500. This is called the earned income credit. It may come as a refund check or be applied against any taxes owed. Generally, if you reported earned income and had adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040) of less than \$10,000, you may be able to claim the credit.

Earned income means wages, salaries, tips, strike benefits, other employee compensation, disability pensions, and net earnings from self-employment (generally amount shown on Schedule SE (Form 1040) line 13). A married couple must file a joint return to be eligible for the credit. Certain married persons living apart with a dependent child may also be eligible to claim the credit.

For more information, see instructions for Form 1040 or 1040A.

#### Residential energy credit

The law provides certain tax incentives to encourage energy conservation and conversion to renewable energy sources.

A credit of up to \$300 may be claimed for expenditures for energy conservation property installed in or on your principal residence, whether you own or rent it. The residence must have been substantially completed by April 20, 1977. Items eligible for the credit are limited to the following: insulation (fiberglass, cellulose, etc.) for ceilings, walls, floors, roofs, water heaters, etc.; exterior storm (or thermal) windows or doors; caulking or weatherstripping for exterior windows or doors; a furnace replacement burner which reduces the amount of fuel used; a device to make flue openings (for a heating system) more efficient; an electrical or mechanical furnace ignition system which replaces a gas pilot light; an automatic energy-saving setback thermostat; and a meter which displays the cost of energy usage.

For years beginning after 1979, the maximum credit for renewable energy source property is \$4,000. Equipment used in the production or distribution of heat or electricity from solar, geothermal, or wind energy sources for residential heating, cooling, or other purposes may qualify for this credit.

Energy credits may be claimed by completing Form 5695 and attaching it to your Form 1040.

Examples of items which do not qualify for energy credit are the following: carpeting, drapes, awnings, shades, wood paneling, fire screens, new or replacement walls (except for insulation inside the walls), exterior siding, heat pump, wood- or peat-fueled burning stoves, fluorescent lights, hydrogen fueled residential equipment, equipment using wind energy for transportation, expenditures for a swimming pool used as

an energy storage medium, and greenhouses.

For further information, consult the instructions for Form 5695 and IRS Publication 903, Energy Credits for Individuals.●

#### EXCISE TAX AND THE SMALL BUS OPERATOR

HON. CECIL (CEC) HEFTTEL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. HEFTTEL. Mr. Speaker, in 1978, the Congress passed the Energy Tax Act—Public Law 95-618—which exempts specific bus operators from the Federal excise tax on diesel fuel. The intent was to encourage the use of the energy efficient intercity bus and to assure the continued viability of the intercity bus industry.

Internal Revenue Code section 6427B, however, requires a bus operator engaged in intercity, charter, local, and special operations to pay the excise tax and then file for a refund. Bus operators from across the country, including those from my own State of Hawaii, have advised me that this is an extremely inefficient procedure and is particularly burdensome to small bus operators.

The bill which I am proposing today will do nothing more than give effect to the intent of Congress as expressed in Public Law 95-618. Bus operators would no longer have to go through the long and complicated process of paying the tax and then filing for a refund. Essentially, they would be permitted to make their purchases free of the excise tax. The revenue impact would be minimal and would, in fact, save money in that the time and expense of processing and refunding the excise tax would no longer be necessary. The bill would also ease the time-consuming and expensive burden of Federal paperwork requirements. The intercity bus industry is comprised of primarily small businesses and the time and expense which they must now devote to Government paperwork requirements is staggering. My bill would help ease this burden and would enhance the ability of the small bus operator to utilize his time in more productive ways.

Mr. Speaker, in our energy conscious society, the bus engaged in charter, intercity, or special operations is rapidly proving to be an effective means for Americans to lessen their dependence on foreign oil. It is the most fuel efficient mode of transportation, achieving 146 passenger-miles per gallon in 1979. Fully loaded, a bus can get nearly 300 passenger-miles per gallon. Equally important, the intercity bus industry currently provides service to over 15,000 U.S. communities. The vast majority of these communities—

1952

14,000—have no other form of public transportation. It is an essential form of transportation which carries more people than any other form of public intercity transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today seeks to enhance the effectiveness of an important segment of our transportation industry, which plays a valuable role in our efforts to achieve energy independence. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.●

#### THE MARRIAGE TAX

**HON. PETER A. PEYSER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 5, 1981*

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, today the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Mrs. FENWICK, introduced legislation that would eliminate the marriage tax currently facing two-earner married couples, by allowing these couples the option of filing as if they were single. I strongly support this legislation.

Very shortly millions of Americans will be filing their Federal income tax returns, and 38 million of these people will be paying a tax penalty simply because they are married. The marriage tax phenomenon is familiar to all of us. It refers to the situation which occurs when couples get married and switch from computing their taxes individually to filing jointly, and as a result, pay additional taxes.

Under present tax law married couples are treated as one tax unit, which must pay tax on its total taxable income. While couples may elect to file separate returns, the tax law is carefully structured so that filing separate returns leads to a tax increase for almost all married couples. This has prompted some couples to file for divorce, or to decide not to marry.

This situation discourages one of the marriage partners from taking jobs. If one of the couple decides to work, that person's first dollar of income will be taxed at the same rate as the last dollar earned by that person's spouse. This penalty, combined with non-deductible commuting and housekeeping costs creates a work disincentive for many people.

Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, President Reagan will soon submit his proposal for tax reductions. I believe that any such proposal must include provisions to repeal the marriage penalty. It is clear that we must act to correct the discrimination that presently exists in our Tax Code as it relates to married couples. I urge my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to consider the correction of this inequity as a priority in their consideration of a tax cut.●

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

##### SRI LANKA'S 33D ANNIVERSARY

**HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 5, 1981*

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka on the 33d anniversary of the regaining of the nation's independence. The year 1981 is of added significance for Sri Lanka because this year marks the 50th anniversary of the granting of universal adult franchise.

Sri Lanka has pursued a policy of improvement for the nation's population through the provision of adequate health care, education, nutrition, and through the stimulation of economic growth. The success of these programs is evidenced in an impressive increase in the life expectancy to 64 years for males and 67 years for females and a literacy rate of 88 percent.

The present government has stressed economic development as a major national goal. To this end the government has emphasized agricultural self-sufficiency and the attraction of foreign investment for industrial growth. The government's landmark efforts in the field of reproductive health have been an important component of their overall plan to increase the quality of life for the citizenry.

I salute, Mr. Speaker, the nation of Sri Lanka on the anniversary of their independence.●

##### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1981*

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1776 our Founding Fathers proudly proclaimed our freedom from colonization and domination. As a result of that Declaration of Independence some 205 years ago, our Nation and the entire world has come to regard freedom as a basic human right; an integral part of our way of life. Our Nation's recent hostage ordeal underscored for all of us the grim reality of the deprivation of the precious right to liberty. While those feelings are still fresh in mind, let us focus our attention on a nation whose "hostage live" existence is subject to exploitation by the domination of an authoritarian power. January 22 marked the 63d anniversary of Ukrainian independence. At that time we were celebrating the return of our 52 freed Americans.

Mr. Speaker, there is a nation of people who for only a few short years, between 1918 and 1922, knew what was meant by the term freedom; and that

February 5, 1981

freedom was at best, unstable and weak. However, the aspirations and goals of the courageous Ukrainians remains steadfast in seeking to achieve freedom from foreign domination. At present the Ukrainians exist under Soviet rule. They live under the constant threat of Russification, of the elimination of Ukrainian identity, and the assimilation of the Soviet state. Yet they are somehow able to retain a strong national spirit in their fight to regain national independence.

The history of the Ukrainian people is more of struggle and instability. Until 1917, the Ukraine was known as "Little Russia", and czarist regimes tried for two centuries to Russinize all forms of Ukrainian life. In 1918, the hopes of the Ukrainian people were realized when Parliament proclaimed the Independent Ukrainian National Republic. Unfortunately, that independence and freedom from domination was short lived, as the Bolsheviks took control over the Republic in 1922. Since then, the Ukraine has been under the control of the Soviet Union. The Soviet leadership, under Mr. Brezhnev, states that "there are no oppressed, exploited class; there are no oppressed, exploited nationalities," in the Soviet Union. I know, and this Nation knows, that any country which is not an independent, free state, is indeed the victim of exploitation and oppression.

The American Ukrainian citizens annually celebrate the anniversary of Ukrainian independence on January 22. It is in this celebration that they reaffirm the vigil and hope for freedom and national independence. It is a day, however, for Ukrainian people in the U.S.S.R., like any other day. It is a day on which all celebrations are prohibited by the Soviet Government. Any acknowledgement of that important day may only be silently remembered.

Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of Ukrainian independence I urge my colleagues to support the Ukrainians in their struggle for independence. It is necessary that we keep them, and their plight, in mind as we discuss the foreign policy matters, and as we act out the ideals upon which this country was built. I believe it is important to uphold the ideals of human and national rights and to lend our aid and energies to the right and just goals of the oppressed states in the world including any Ukrainians living under Soviet domination.

##### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

**HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1981*

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, Ukrainians throughout the



free world commemorated the 63d anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. With the collapse of the czarist empire, the Ukrainian Republic began on January 22, 1918, and lasted for 2 independent and democratically free years. It was in 1920 that the Soviet imperialist aggression extinguished the Ukraine's flame of freedom, and the Ukraine has since been an occupied country, subject to the dictatorial will of Moscow. From 1920 until today, the political and spiritual courage of the Ukrainian people lives on in their struggle to regain their precious right of self-determination lost to them in Soviet domination and repression.

I am happy to join with all Americans of Ukrainian descent in celebrating the 63d anniversary of the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic on January 22, 1918. I also reaffirm my support of the cause of the Ukrainian people to reclaim their rightful privilege of self-government, based on the principles of political freedom, equality, and justice.

In recognition of the democratic heritage, distinctive cultural identity, and national heroism of the Ukrainian people, I join with Ukrainian Americans everywhere in observing the commemoration of their 63d anniversary of independence.●

#### FREE VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY

#### HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1981*

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish community of central New Jersey has expressed its deep concern for the plight of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky, leader of the Soviet Jewish emigration movement, who has been imprisoned since November for his efforts and is presently in very poor health.

I share that deeply felt concern and gladly join my colleagues in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 50, urging that Dr. Brailovsky receive proper medical attention and that he and his family be allowed to emigrate from the Soviet Union, a journey he has bravely sought for 8 years under continued Soviet harassment.

Dr. Brailovsky led a group of 237 other "refuseniks" in signing a letter to President Brezhnev last November protesting the refusal to grant them exit visas. This action led to his arrest, in clear violation of international law and fundamental human rights.

He has fought hard for those rights. Despite constant harassment, which has included the loss of his job as a noted teacher and researcher, the confiscation of valuable scientific and Jewish cultural papers, and repeated

arrests and subsequent imprisonment for his activities on behalf of Jews in the U.S.S.R., Dr. Brailovsky has persisted in his valiant struggle for freedom for the oppressed Soviet Jew.

Now he is fighting for his life, a fight he has waged continuously in the face of overt Soviet threats because he has the courage to fight to try and protect the fundamental liberties to which he and all others are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. FISH, and my esteemed colleagues who unite in this effort in behalf of Viktor Brailovsky, I hope that our interest will spur the Soviets into swift attention to his ordeal.

His is a chapter in the universal epoch of all those who came before him, those who are with him now, and those who will follow him, who have dedicated their lives to freedom.●

#### VIKTOR BRAILOVSKY

#### HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1981*

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in protesting the treatment of Dr. Viktor Brailovsky by the Soviet Union. Dr. Brailovsky has suffered the wrath of this totalitarian regime for 8 years. He has been subjected to several imprisonments, lengthy interrogations, and continuous harassment.

What terrible crime did he commit? Dr. Brailovsky's crime has been his staunch refusal to watch passively while the Soviet Government attempts to stamp out Judaism among its people, and his indefatigable determination to retain the most basic of human rights—freedom of thought and expression. Denied his job after applying for an exit visa, Dr. Brailovsky continued his work by founding the Moscow Seminar of Jewish Scientists. Not to be intimidated by totalitarian thuggery, Dr. Brailovsky was, until his most recent arrest, a co-founder and the single most important force behind the publication "Jews in the U.S.S.R.," an unofficial cultural journal that has been important in the dissemination of information to the Jewish community.

I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. FISH for bringing the matter of Dr. Brailovsky to the attention of the House. I also would like to expand our concern a little bit. Dr. Brailovsky's arrest on the eve of the Madrid Conference and his treatment in prison are vivid examples of official antisemitism in the Soviet Union. They show the bankruptcy of Soviet claims of adherence to the Helsinki accords.

He is not alone, however. The close to 3 million other Jews in the Soviet

Union are less visible than Dr. Brailovsky, but they are subjected to the same official mistreatment and harassment by the Soviet Government. I hope that all Members will join in asking the Soviet Government to end its abuse of Dr. Brailovsky, and challenging it to open its doors to all Jews who wish to leave the country for places where they might enjoy their basic human rights.●

#### REV. RAYMOND BAUMHART

#### HON. CARLISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 3, 1981*

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with immense pleasure and pride that I rise to pay tribute to the outstanding and sensitive leader of Loyola University of Chicago and a constituent, Rev. Raymond C. Baumhart.

On February 7, 1981, the alumni of Loyola University will honor the leadership and administration of a man who for 10 years served his university and surrounding Chicago community with insight and excellence excelled by none.

Reverend Baumhart, a distinguished man in his own right, a very talented and gifted writer, is equally at home in theology and philosophy as he is in the business world.

Father Baumhart has written extensively on business ethics and educational administration. He wrote the book, "An Honest Profit: What Businessmen Say About Ethics in Business" (Holt, Rinehart, 1968), and coauthored "Cases in Business Ethics" (Appleton-Century, 1968). His articles have appeared in numerous magazines, including America, Harvard Business Review, Social Order, and Printer's Ink.

He is a member of the Commercial Club of Chicago, the Economic Club of Chicago, the Tavern Club, the Chicago Committee, the Mid-America Club, Beta Gamma Sigma, and the Friends Committee of the Latino Institute of Chicago. He was Cardinal O'Hara lecturer at Notre Dame University, and is the recipient of the Order of Cavalier award from the Republic of Italy, the Rale Medallion from Boston College, and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Illinois College.

He also serves on the board of directors of the Jewel Cos., Inc.—since 1973, and the Continental Illinois Bank—since 1976. He was a member of the American Management Association's theologians advisory council (1964-69), and served as a consultant to the Fabricast Division of General Motors in Bedford, Ind. (1957), and to the National Conference of Christian Employers & Managers (1963-67).

By utilizing "the Jesuit flavored concern for the individual," Reverend Baumhart has combined job training, emphasis on humanities and arts, and adhering to budget limits, to make Loyola a first-rate institution. An institution sporting a new science facility, modern law school, research into such topics as neurology to the epistles of St. Paul. He has done it all and he had done it well.

In closing, I would like to share with my colleagues and Loyola alumni and friends a copy of a letter written to Father Baumhart last year by Archbishop John Cardinal Cody:

DEAR FATHER BAUMHART: Although I cannot be present in person to greet you and offer my congratulations as you round out ten years as President of Loyola University on July 31, 1980, I assure you that I will be joint with you, your brother Jesuits and friends in offering my thanks to you for all that you have done for the great metropolitan area of Chicago, the Archdiocese, Loyola University, the priests, religious, brothers and lay people who have benefited by your services as President of the University.

These have been indeed ten eventful years and under your guidance and leadership, the University has risen to new heights, both as an important community service as well as an Institution to which the Church can rightfully express its sincere appreciations. This I do as the Chief Shepherd of two and one-half million Catholics and I hope and pray that the growth and development of Loyola University and all its affiliates will continue to expand.

Wishing you personally an abundance of blessings as you continue your dedicated service, I am, dear Father Baumhart,

Very gratefully yours in Christ,

JOHN CARDINAL CODY,  
Archbishop of Chicago.

Father Baumhart, I am indeed humbled by your gifts. May the Lord continue to guide you in your efforts to educate Loyola, Chicago, and the Nation. ●

#### INFANT MORTALITY RATES

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 5, 1981

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, infant mortality rates are rising in the Soviet Union, and life expectancy is declining. Death rates for middle-age people have jumped.

These are some of the startling conclusions presented in an article by Nick Eberstadt in the February 19, 1981, issue of the New York Review of books. Mr. Eberstadt is a visiting fellow at the Harvard Center for Population Studies and the editor of "Fertility Decline in the Less Developed Countries."

His article is in the form of a review of "Rising Infant Mortality in the U.S.S.R. in the 1970's" by Christopher Davis and Murray Feshbach, U.S.

Bureau of the Census, and comments at length on that study, but the article's many footnotes attest to the fact that Mr. Eberstadt has drawn on many other sources as well.

The following comprises part I of the text of Mr. Eberstadt's article. To save space, the footnotes have been omitted. Likewise, part II, which attempts to explain the phenomena reported in part I and to assess their significance, is not included here:

#### THE HEALTH CRISIS IN THE U.S.S.R.

(By Nick Eberstadt)

If we could judge it solely by advances in health, the twentieth century would be a fabulous success. Few of us who take food and doctors for granted realize or appreciate this. In 1900 life expectancy for the whole of the human race was about thirty years. Today it is twice as long; at least sixty-one years, possibly sixty-three or more. Since the human lifespan was probably never much less than twenty for any length of time—to drop much below that level is to court eventual extinction—this means that about three-fourths of the improvement in longevity in the history of our species has occurred in the last eighty years.

Over much of this century the nation in the vanguard of the revolution in health was the Soviet Union. In 1897 Imperial Russia offered its people a life expectancy of perhaps thirty years. In European Russia, from what we can make out, infant mortality (that is, death in the first year) claimed about one child in four, and in Russia's Asian hinterlands the toll was probably closer to one in three. Yet by the late 1950s the average Soviet citizen could expect to live 68.7 years: longer than his American counterpart, who had begun the century with a seventeen-year lead. By 1960 the Soviet infant mortality rate, higher than any in Europe as late as the Twenties, was lower than that of Italy, Austria, or East Germany, and seemed sure to undercut such nations as Belgium and West Germany any year.

Results like this could not have been achieved without a total transformation of living conditions for the USSR's sizable Asian and Muslim minority. This indeed has taken place. By 1960 Moscow could demonstrate that its Central Asians were living fifteen years longer than the Iranians, twenty years longer than the peoples of Pakistan, and nearly twice as long as the Afghans. In the face of these and other equally impressive material accomplishments, Soviet claims about the superiority of their "socialist" system, its relevance to the poor countries, and the inevitability of its triumph over the capitalist order were not easily refuted.

Things look very different today. The Sixties and the Seventies have proved devastating to Soviet society. To observant travelers and analysts this is apparent in a hundred different ways; none, however, is so dramatic as the turn in health of the Soviet peoples. As Christopher Davis and Murray Feshbach's startling report argues in convincing detail, health conditions in the USSR have worsened steadily since the mid-1960s, and the deterioration shows no signs of stopping.

Although its findings are sensational, "Rising Infant Mortality in the U.S.S.R." is a very careful piece of work. The credentials of its authors are impeccable: Davis is now England's leading authority on Soviet

health care, Feshbach the foremost American expert on Soviet population trends. Their study is based on data not from spy satellites, intelligence agencies, or "think tanks," but rather from reports released by the Soviets themselves.

As the title suggests, Davis and Feshbach pay closest attention to infant mortality. According to Moscow's Central Statistical Bureau (TsSU), infant mortality increased by more than a third between 1970 and 1975. Since 1975 TsSU has not reported the USSR's infant mortality rate, but Feshbach's estimate, based on the fragmentary evidence of local reports and adjusted for the approximately 14 percent of all infant deaths that authorities do not include in their mortality totals, is that it could be as high as forty per thousand today. Infant mortality rates in both Western Europe and the United States are currently under thirteen per thousand.

Epidemic infant mortality, however, is only part of the picture. Except for teenagers, who are virtually indestructible so long as they do not kill themselves or each other, nearly every age group in the Soviet Union had higher death rates in 1975, the last year in which such figures were published, than in 1960. For men and women over thirty trends were particularly harsh. Death rates jumped almost 20 percent for people in their fifties, and by more than 30 percent for those in their forties. Men fared much worse than women: since 1965 their life expectancy may have declined as much as four years, to something like sixty-two today. Women, however, have not been spared: their life expectancy peaked at around seventy-three in the early 1970s, and may have dropped since then. This means that the average Soviet life span could be under sixty-eight today—lower, in other words, than it was in the late 1950s.

Measured by the health of its people, the Soviet Union is no longer a developed nation. Caloric intake, educational attainment, and the ratio of doctors to people all seem to be higher in the USSR than in Western Europe, and yet in the USSR life expectancy is six years lower, and its infant mortality rate three times as high. There is not a single country in all of Europe, in fact, in which lives are so short, or babies' death rates so high—not even impoverished, half-civilized Albania. In the realm of health, the Soviet Union's peers are to be found in Latin America and Asia. If Feshbach's estimates are right, life expectancy in the USSR is about the same as the average for Costa Rica, Jamaica, Malaysia, Mexico, and Sri Lanka. By the same token, the Soviet infant mortality rate could be replicated in a nation composed in equal parts of Chile, the Dominican Republic, Panama, Taiwan, and Trinidad. These nations, however, are moving up, while the Soviet Union is moving down. If current trends persist, most of Latin America and East Asia will surpass the Soviet Union in a matter of years.

There can be no mistaking it: the Soviet Union is in the grip of a devastating health crisis. We can only understand the full severity of this situation when we remember how difficult it is to push life expectancy down these days. The amenities of modern life—cheap food, clean water, mass education, rapid communications, easy travel, competent doctors, wonder drugs, and the like—make it extremely hard to stay sick or die young. The health-promoting force of these innovations is so powerful that it cannot be overcome even by modern warfare: World War I did not succeed in lower-



ing France's life expectancy, or World War II Japan's. The only country in modern times to have suffered a more serious setback in life expectancy was the "Democratic Republic of Kampuchea," Pol Pot's Cambodia. Clearly, something in Russia is going very, very wrong.

What is it that ails the Soviet Union? We cannot be sure. The only people in a position to know are the Soviet authorities, and they have been reluctant to advertise their nation's health crisis, or to highlight the flaws in their system responsible for it. As a consequence, Westerners are left with a puzzle in which most pieces are missing. Some of the blank spaces can be filled in reasonably well through detective work, and Davis and Feshbach turn out to be very good detectives. However, theirs is primarily a study of infant mortality, and every age group has its own set of vulnerabilities. The declining quality of baby food and nursing formula, the rising (though, by Western standards, hardly scandalous) rate of illegitimacy, and the uterine damage caused by the six to eight abortions the average Soviet woman undergoes during the childbearing years—all of which Davis and Feshbach document—may partly explain the increase in infant mortality, but it will not account for the rising death rates of metalworkers in Kharkov, elderly men in Georgia, or the middle-aged women who work on the USSR's collective farms.

We are not left wholly in the dark, however. The biggest problems affect everyone. One of these is alcoholism. Americans consider themselves a nation of problem drinkers, and not without reason, but the thirst for alcohol in the Soviet Union is a problem of an entirely different dimension. In the early 1970s, according to a study by Duke University's V. G. Trembl, the Soviet Union's per capita intake of hard liquor was more than twice as high as America's or Sweden's. Another report by Trembl suggests that drinking is even heavier today, thanks in part to the increase in purchasing power Soviet citizens enjoyed during the years of détente. Urban families in the Soviet Union devote nearly the same proportion of their weekly budget to alcohol that American families devote to food, and things have gotten to the point where factory foremen mark their workers sober and fit for duty if they can stand.

Mortality breakdowns by cause of death are hard to come by for the Soviet Union, but John Dutton, a researcher now at North Carolina State University, has made a strong case for the complicity of heart disease in pushing up men's death rates, and this is something alcoholism can exacerbate or even cause. Vodka and samogon (Russian moonshine) seem to take their toll on women and children as well. Davis and Feshbach note that Soviet doctors now rate alcoholism the third most frequent cause of illness for women, and that a report from Lithuania connects excessive drinking on the part of mothers and of mothers-to-be with half or more of the infant deaths in that Republic.

Then there is pollution. Again, we think of this as a Western affliction, which indeed it is. The condition, however, seems to take on new meaning in the USSR. Its most obvious manifestation is air pollution. Western visitors have compared the air quality in some Soviet cities unfavorably with Japan's. Davis and Feshbach show that the nation's rising incidence of respiratory disease is rather unfavorably linked with what Soviet doctors call "changes in the environment as-

sociated with urbanization." But those forms of pollution which can be seen are probably the least dangerous. Misuse and overuse of pesticides and fertilizers, the careless release of industrial waste and heavy metals into the waters, and radiation emitted from poorly constructed or only partially safeguarded nuclear facilities present far more deadly perils.

A samizdat book cited in "Rising Infant Mortality" suggests the sort of price the Soviet peoples may be paying for their government's indifference to these hazards. Purportedly based on suppressed official data, this study by "Boris Komarov" claims that birth defects in the USSR are rising by five to six percent a year, and that the number of "defective" children whose care must be left to the state is increasing by more than 200,000 annually. The work of "Komarov" is as yet uncorroborated, but if pollution is in fact wreaking this sort of havoc on the newborn it must be killing off adults as well.

Soviet reports often refer to death by "trauma"; this category seems to include suicide, murder, and fatal accidents. Suicide in the USSR may be on the rise, but there is really no way of telling: for official purposes, it does not exist. Conceivably, a spate of suicides could affect a nation's death rate, but suicide accounts for such a small fraction of all deaths—less than 1 percent even in Scandinavia—that this is unlikely. The same holds true for murder: a few populations suffering from pathologically high homicide rates do in fact experience a slight shortening of life span; but there is no evidence that any of the Soviet peoples are among these.

Accidents are another story. Heavy machinery and electrical equipment are dangerous under the best of circumstances, and become no safer when produced on shoddy assembly lines and placed in the hands of drunken workers. The Soviet Union may have only a tenth as many motor vehicles as the United States, but it has just as many traffic fatalities. The carnage in the factory and in the field, under the tractor or the blades of the harvester, is even greater. Davis and Feshbach have estimated elsewhere that as much as a fifth of the rise in death rates for men in their late thirties may be attributed to the increasing frequency of accidents.

Could a progressive decline in the health of an entire nation, affecting people of nearly every ethnic background and nearly every age group, take place without a breakdown in the medical system? In theory, the answer is yes, but given the specifics of the Soviet situation—a monotonous but clearly ample diet, a slow but steady improvement in housing, a well-educated and relatively skilled populace—some sort of failure in medical care would seem almost a foregone conclusion. Davis and Feshbach, always conservative in their appraisals, feel they lack sufficient evidence to prove the Soviet health care system is in decline; the picture they paint, however, hardly inspires confidence.

Influenza, which has been reduced to a nuisance in the rest of the industrial world, is not yet under control in the Soviet Union, and kills tens of thousands of babies each year. The proportion of children dying from "pneumonia," in fact, is said to be on the increase. Many of the young victims, it seems, start out ridden with rickets, which weakens them to the point where flu can finish them off. Rickets is unknown in the rest of the rich world, and in much of the poor world as well, because it is so easy to cure: it comes

from a want of vitamin D, and is remedied by either a change in diet, food fortification, or cheap and convenient vitamin supplements. If Soviet medicine is unable to deal with these simple problems, it is unlikely to be effective against the more serious and considerably more complicated challenges of cancer, renal disorder, or ischemic heart disease.

Why might the quality of medical care in the Soviet Union be declining? There are at least three reasons. First, the Soviet health strategy seems decidedly misguided. When extra funds are to be had, they are spent expanding facilities rather than upgrading them. Medicine is not a prestigious profession in the USSR. It is considered women's work, which means its practitioners can expect to be underpaid and poorly provided for. Like the Red Army of an earlier era, Soviet physicians assault the adversary in huge numbers, but without sufficient ammunition. The USSR has more than twice as many health personnel as the United States, but they must work in hospitals which frequently lack necessary drugs and anesthetics, in which such items as disposable bedding and needles are unknown, and in which even obtaining sterilized instruments can be a demanding ordeal. Their morale is probably not improved by the Ministry of Health's obvious insensitivity to the needs of the infirm. (What other nation can boast a cardiology clinic on the top floor of a five-story walk-up in its capital city?) For these and other reasons, doctor and patient alike do their best to avoid the hospital. According to Davis and Feshbach, obstetricians, gynecologists, and pediatricians now only work twenty-eight hours a week, and the number of patients treated per bed fell 20 percent from 1958 to 1974.

Corruption may also be playing its part. For obvious reasons, figures on the Soviet Union's "second economy" are unavailable, but it is known to be enormous, and to touch nearly everything. Among the goods for sale in the shadow markets are medical services, and patients who want to be sure of quick or competent treatment must be ready to pay their state-provided doctors a handsome "tip." Similarly, the invalid in search of nominally free but perennially scarce medication must be willing to pay cash and forgo questions. By pulling medical resources out of circulation, the "second economy" works precisely against those people who need help most: the poor and the people scattered in the country. Corruption is said to be on the rise in every part of the USSR's enormous "socialist" bureaucracy. If this is true it could help to account for a growing health problem on the part of the USSR's most vulnerable groups.

Finally, there is evidence that the Kremlin has decided to economize on medical care for its people. As medical techniques become more sophisticated, complex, and ambitious, they necessarily become more expensive, since diagnosing and treating disease must remain a human task in an increasingly automated economy. Yet over the past generation the Soviet Union has devoted an ever smaller fraction of its GNP to combating illness. According to one plausible set of estimates, the share was 9.8 percent in 1955, but only 7.5 percent in 1977. We may quibble with these specific numbers, but the trend is clear, and the Soviets themselves acknowledge it. According to one official quoted in *Rising Infant Mortality*, health expenditures as a share of the national budget fell from 6.6 percent around 1965 to 5.2 percent in 1978. The Soviet

Union may be the only advanced society to allocate progressively more modest proportions of its output to maintaining the health of its people.

It is one thing for a nation's leadership to embark upon a foolhardy policy or to find its plans undercut by the dishonesty of subordinates; it is quite another to pursue a course which will surely mean unnecessary hardship for most of its people. How can we account for what is apparently a high-level decision on the part of a "socialist" government to neglect health care? Inexplicable though this may seem to us, there could be good reasons for it if we take account of Soviet politics. In fact, from the perspective of the Politburo, this cruel choice might seem not only logical, but even reasonable.

From a financial standpoint, the towering problem of the post-Stalin era has been the inefficiency of the economy. A vigorous and dynamic economy is a *sine qua non* for successful long-term competition with the West. Unfortunately, the Soviet economy has always been an unpredictable machine, and in recent years it has become increasingly temperamental and stubborn. To force it on, its attendants must stoke it with ever greater quantities of capital. The USSR's rate of economic growth has dropped sharply since the mid-1960s, slipping below that of its OECD rivals in the 1970s, and yet investment has been eating up an ever larger share of total output. From 1965 to 1977 (the last year for which we have detailed estimates) capital requirements for the economy rose from something like one ruble in four to very nearly one in three. But investment had to be propped up at all costs; this necessarily meant trimming back elsewhere.

But what was expendable? The United States and its NATO allies were financing their rising investments in social services at the expense of the military, but for Soviet leaders this course was and remains unthinkable. (More than global ambitions are at stake here: a reduction in the role of the military in Soviet society could have very unsettling effects at home.) The masters of the planned economy were left with only one option; they had to reduce the proportion of goods and services for consumers.

In theory, this would be a simple operation; after all, their command over both society and economy is supposed to be total. In reality, it would prove a tricky business, it was no longer possible to force the populace to tighten its belt indefinitely in the name of a distant Socialist utopia. When Stalin died, standards of living by many

measures were lower than they had been under Nicholas II. As his successors disassembled his apparatus of terror, they discovered beneath it a phenomenon they associated with bourgeois nations, but understood only poorly: consumer expectations. These could be a powerful force, and had to be taken very seriously, as Nikita Khrushchev's unhappy career was to attest, for in the final analysis he was expelled from office in disgrace at least partly because he couldn't fill the larder.

This lesson was not lost on Brezhnev and Kosygin. If they were put in a position where they had to enforce sacrifices on the consuming public, they would do so quietly and very carefully. Tampering with the diet had become dangerous: peasants, workers, and bureaucrats alike now judged a regime by what it put on their plates. The availability and quality of food would have to be improved, even if it meant buying tens of millions of tons of grain from adversaries. Nor would it be feasible to save money by cutting back on the production of such things as brassieres or refrigerators: even a schoolboy would know that nothing in a public economy is so jealously coveted as private property. But who would notice or complain if the government skimmed a bit on public, and therefore essentially intangible, services like health care? Denying a sick man an operation, after all, is not nearly so difficult as taking away a healthy man's shoes.

There is more to keeping people healthy, however, than checkups and digitals. Medicine's role in lengthening lives is conspicuous because it is basically curative; of even greater importance are those quiet facets of our daily routine which prevent illness from breaking out in the first place. Decent meals, we all know, are a vital ingredient to a healthy life; less celebrated but perhaps no less essential is the web of personal relationships which can support us against adversity. A mother's care for her baby, a family's attention to its elderly or troubled members, and the will to live which such things inculcate, in an often unnoticed way, do for the health of an affluent nation what a ministry of health could never hope to duplicate.

Davis and Feshbach do not pass judgment on the state of mental and social health in the USSR. They are wise not to: their study is careful, fully documented, and grounded in statistics. By contrast, the evaluation of a nation's mood can only be impressionistic, ambiguous, and highly subjective. Nevertheless, the human element of any social prob-

lem is important, and remains impossible to ignore. If we treat the bits of information supplied by "Rising Infant Mortality" and the accounts of refugees and Western tourists as possibly misleading but important clues which we must put together into a plausible and consistent whole, we will have a better chance of understanding the role of human relations in the health crisis in the USSR.

Let us look at the evidence we have on hand. Death rates for men and women, babies and adults, for city and country, and so far as we can tell, for every ethnic group, are on the rise. Alcoholism, as I have pointed out, is apparently pandemic. (It is so much a part of daily life, in fact, that the state provides drying-out stations in the cities and alcoholic wards for most of the large factories.) Although we cannot tell about murder or suicide, death rates for accidents seem to be unusually high, and increasing.

"Rising Infant Mortality" points out that Soviet experts have linked the illness of many babies with contaminated infant formula; it seems that even though this problem has been recognized for several years, it has gone uncorrected. The death rate for children in state-run day care centers, Davis and Feshbach note, is twice as high as for those whose families look after them. Despite the evidently appalling conditions that must be endured in these institutions, some 40 percent of the Soviet Union's parents send their children to them. Abortion serves as the nation's primary form of contraception, and in any given year on the order of ten to sixteen million babies are aborted. The number of live births, by contrast, hovers between four and five million.

Moreover, refugees tell of dying patients denied treatment because their ambulance driver was out shopping, or turned up too drunk to get behind the wheel. Visitors who can read Russian often remark on the incessant complaints about absenteeism in the local papers, and the frequency with which party leaders insist that economic targets could be met, even exceeded, if only more workers showed up at their jobs.

What do these things say about alienation and depression, the desire of people to look after their health and to keep others alive? How can we fit these bits of information together to suggest that some virulent strain of anomie is not running rampant or that the Soviet social order is not in the midst of a deadly decay? ●