

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE GREAT ORANGE SQUEEZE:
"FORBIDDEN FRUIT"

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 3022, to reform the Agricultural Marketing Adjustment Act in order to better protect the interests of independent growers and packers and consumers.

This program is a perfect example of the kind of Federal regulation gone wild which President Reagan, most Members of this Congress, and the public have decried. A policy intended some 40 years ago to aid farmers now oppresses independent growers, enhances absentee speculators, encourages inefficiency and bleeds consumers.

MEMBERS ENJOY ORANGES

This year, millions of pounds of perfectly edible navel oranges are being withheld from the national market because of Marketing Order 907. Several hundred pieces of this condemned citrus were enjoyed by all of us in the Members' dining room a few weeks ago. Consumers will not be able to enjoy fruit exactly as good as that, however, because of the unfair way the marketing order operates.

H.R. 3022 would not eliminate the orders, but it would end the unjustifiable situation in which the Government has given broad regulatory powers over an entire industry to one segment of that industry, to the detriment of competitors and consumers alike.

USDA REVIEW

I am pleased that the Department of Agriculture has initiated a thorough review of marketing orders which I am hopeful will result in support for modifications along the lines of H.R. 3022, and I look forward to public hearings this summer.

CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN

I am also pleased that Members of Congress have joined in the call for a study of these orders by cosponsoring H.R. 3022.

INDUSTRY SUPPORT

Industry, too, supports reviewing the marketing orders. It is very important to note that much of the displeasure with the current progress emanates from the agricultural community itself—from growers, packers and handlers, large and small, who resent the orders' unwarranted interference in their right to do business competitively.

PRESS SUPPORT

Newspapers, too, are calling for a study of the program. The Fresno Bee, the major newspaper of central California's agricultural region, in a March 18, 1981, editorial, called the program outdated and lamented the unfairness to small farmers and the waste of food. The San Francisco Examiner editorialized, "The regulations run counter to commonsense *** They provide an excellent example of what President Reagan means when he speaks of government grown too large in its power."

The industry press has joined the call for a public hearing. The Packer, a major agriculture trade paper, noted, "If the prorate system [the marketing order] is a godsend for growers, shippers, and consumers alike, it should be able to withstand a public debate and a vote by the industry."

An article in a recent issue of Inquiry magazine did an excellent job of outlining the issues in this debate, and I want to share that article with my colleagues.

The article follows:

FORBIDDEN FRUIT

(By Doug Foster)

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY, CALIFORNIA—Along the "Famoso Drag Strip," oranges are piled in hillocks more than eight feet high, expanses of bright, round fruit stamped with the Sunkist label and left to rot in the sun. Rivers of orange juice wind off the pavement and soak into the soil. The smell is alternately sweet and putrid at the site of this tremendous orange dump made necessary by a raft of regulations governing agriculture, regulations that have become a source of fierce contention this year.

Forty miles away from the drag-strip dump a major California citrus grower motions toward a bookcase full of files and reports amassed in his battle against these rules, shakes his head, and frowns:

"They say these regulations are democratic. Yes, as democratic as the Kremlin. In fact, we call them the Red Menace. On second thought, I wish you wouldn't use that analogy because I don't believe communist Russia would ever allow this kind of waste of food. It's not even a good socialistic system. I don't know what it is."

The farmer is Carl Pescosolido, a Harvard-educated former oil marketer from Massachusetts who "fell in love with this greenhouse called the San Joaquin Valley" on a business trip west. Pescosolido bought into a 3600-acre citrus operation, became part owner of Exeter Orange Company, and settled in for a taste of rural life.

His first few years were pleasant enough. Pescosolido guided Exeter Orange Company out of the Sunkist orbit, and business boomed. But then the company hit a stone wall of government resistance to further expansion: a federal "marketing order" established by Sunkist attorneys in 1953. The

order controls how many oranges each grower will send to market during the season, how many of those will be shipped during any given week, and what size oranges will be allowed. Depending on the need to restrict supplies, golfball-sized oranges might be illegal this week but okay next month, when the softball sizes have been eliminated. The cops remain the same—inspectors for the federal and state governments—but the laws they enforce shift with the speed of a ferret.

Pescosolido quickly discovered that his problems with the navel orange marketing order were simply one piece of a regulatory puzzle established by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, a bill setting up legalized agricultural cartels that could constrict production and inflate food prices. When the bill passed in a Depression economy, American agriculture was on the ropes, milk was being dumped on the highways, and fields went unpicked because wholesale prices were so low. Legislators believed that overproduction and gluts hurt farmers and that the resulting shortages hurt consumers. So the bill they designed allowed the creation of agricultural trusts; herky-jerky fluctuations were out, stability was in.

As a result of the statute, more than half of all domestically grown fruits, vegetables, and nuts are covered by forty-eight federal marketing orders, separate state marketing orders for thirty-six additional crops in California, and eleven similar programs in other states. The orders cover crops as diverse as Idaho potatoes, winter tomatoes, Hawaiian papayas, and Florida grapefruit; and include nearly all of the nation's supply of citrus fruit, pears, nectarines, raisins, prunes, walnuts, almonds, filberts, hops, dates, and peanuts. Under those orders most rigorously enforced—and oranges are a prime example—the regulations are so restrictive that up to half the crop will be diverted from the fresh market; in this case to be mashed into frozen concentrate, dried, and turned to cattle feed, or simply left to rot. In California this year alone, an estimated 3.5 million pounds of oranges—enough to fill 1750 one-ton trucks—will be held off the open market. As though wasted food were not bad enough, the forty-eight existing marketing orders cost consumers more than \$10 million, from the nation's general fund, for the federal government's participation in enforcing these orders.

Pescosolido and like-minded farmers have just begun to rail against the entire marketing order system. They have targeted a dozen of the orders for legal challenges. But nowhere is the debate hotter than in oranges. Pitted against Pescosolido is the mammoth Sunkist Growers, Inc., the eighty-five-year-old cooperative whose employees wrote the original marketing order almost fifty years ago. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has also lined up against him, along with a considerable number of farmers afraid of any sudden change in what amounts to government-sponsored control of the market. Meanwhile Pescosolido has assembled an unlikely alliance, including other agribusiness entrepreneurs, Consumers Union, organic farmers who are placed at a disadvantage by produce quality stand-

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

ards that favor heavy pesticide users, and poor people's self-help groups.

The pressure will be on the White House to referee the coming war between these two sides. Although Reagan has often talked about getting government off our backs, it will take some political guts to stand on this principle when the largest corporation in an industry bends over and lays out a welcome mat. "Philosophically the Reagan people are receptive to the arguments against these marketing orders," one lobbyist says, "but politically, a lot of pressure is being brought by Sunkist and others. It will be interesting to see whether their principles rise above the politics of the situation."

The fight over agricultural production was recently dramatized when frustrated growers attempted to give fruit that had been diverted from the fresh market to inner city organizations. When Pescosolido turned over two million boxes of oranges to poor people's organizations in California and Massachusetts, he was threatened by a hefty fine from the Navel Orange Administrative Committee, the group of industry representatives—five of the ten chosen by Sunkist—which can sting rebellious farmers with fines equal to the value of produce they ship above quotas set by the committee. The threat handed Pescosolido a public relations windfall. "I went to East Oakland, and I'll admit something to you," Pescosolido says quietly, palms turned up. "I had never been there before. I'll never forget it the rest of my life. The horror of the place, in a physical sense, is what stays with you. But the scene I'll remember is seeing these little kids walking in to the West Oakland Food Coop and paying a nickel and taking away a pound of oranges. . . . I thought it was beautiful. It's that goddamn simple."

Beauty, however, was not an issue when Sunkist, then in control of 87 percent of the crop in California and Arizona, drafted the original order establishing the Navel Orange Administrative Committee. Sunkist gave itself majority control of the committee with five votes; two votes went to a competing cooperative, and three votes to the independent farmers. Sunkist's share of the orange market has dropped considerably during the past three decades, but it remains a hearty supporter of the order's continued existence. Indeed Sunkist has gone to some lengths to discredit Pescosolido, insisting that he simply wants to have the gloves taken off and the government's referee role eliminated so that he can drive small farmers out of business. "The average holding in this crop is from thirty-four to forty acres," Sunkist spokeswoman Ann Warring says. "Mr. Pescosolido has in excess of 3000 acres. His motives may not be all they seem to be."

Pescosolido angrily dismisses Sunkist's argument. "The small farmer doesn't exist. He hasn't existed for twenty-five years or more," he says flatly. Pescosolido and other marketing order critics believe government regulation hands supermarket chains an incentive for holding prices high instead of letting them fluctuate according to supply, rewards land speculators who need money-losing citrus groves as tax shelters despite the long-run folly of overproduction, and works largely to protect the interests of the largest corporations controlling production of a particular crop. "The marketing order was drafted by Sunkist lawyers. They created it to legalize their cartel," Pescosolido says.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

At western regional offices of Consumers Union in San Francisco, researchers have prepared documentation supporting Pescosolido's position. Union spokesman Carl Oshira reviewed the history of marketing orders and found they hewed fairly closely to the orange model. "Where you have a dominant co-op, you usually have a marketing order. Otherwise if Sunkist and Pure Gold [the other citrus cooperative] sat down together and said, 'What are we going to ship next week?' It would be an antitrust violation." Consumers Union, a lobbying group, first joined the battle over government regulation of agriculture five years ago, during a tough exchange over inflated milk prices. Oshira believes the successful campaign against milk price increases has saved consumer \$80 million a year, and the experience led the organization to probe regulation of produce sales.

During their probe, Consumers Union found that during the fifty years since marketing order became possible, conditions have changed radically in agriculture. In 1937, 25 percent of the population was engaged in agricultural production and racked up only 7 percent of the gross national product. Now, only 3 percent of the country's population works in agriculture but hauls in a bigger share of the nation's wealth. That shift means that marketing orders serve as a reverse Robin Hood, taking pennies from the pockets of the urban poor, who spend proportionately more on food than does the rest of the population, and turning over the money to the largest agriculture concerns. "Now the marketing order transfers income from poorer people in the inner cities to richer people in the country," Oshira argues.

Oshira cites orange prices as a prime example. Despite a bumper crop in California's lush San Joaquin Valley this year, diversion of fruit from the fresh market has caused up to a 26 percent increase in prices over last year's sales tag. Pescosolido contends that diversion of fruit from the fresh market by the Navel Orange Administrative Committee plays into the hands of supermarket chain managers, who never have to worry about small-time jobbers undercutting high prices; this results in a 200 to 300 percent retail markup in orange prices. "We're driving the consumer away from our commodity with those kinds of prices," he says.

Independent agricultural economists have found at least a kernel of truth in Pescosolido's argument. In a report to the Federal Trade Commission in 1976, staff researcher Alice Masson wrote that "If price competition were to develop, it is probable that the result would be a lower fresh fruit price and a larger quantity sold." In an internal memorandum in 1974 to then President Gerald Ford's Cost of Living Council, researchers found that the diversion of fresh oranges off the market was "economically wasteful and deprives American consumers of significant food supplies at a time when most consumers are facing rising prices and shrinking supplies of many food products."

Even statistics kept by the Navel Orange Administrative Committee itself seem to support his speculation. The marketing of fresh oranges in 1980 was below that of 1945, despite the protections of the marketing order, increases in population, and a surge of food faddism favoring fresh produce. Overall consumption of fresh citrus products has declined nearly 30 percent in the past twenty years, from an average per capita consumption of 32.5 pounds in 1960 to 24 pounds in 1979.

Pescosolido argues that the constraints of the marketing order, which predetermine how much fruit each grower can sell, destroy all incentive for producing particularly good fruit, marketing ingeniously, or farming efficiently. "Without the order, there would be a much more aggressive marketing program nationally," Pescosolido says. "Right now there's no reason to do it. If you strengthen your label and create more demand, you won't benefit from that."

Pescosolido has tried to make a profitable end run around the marketing order restrictions by building a large export business. The export market is not covered by the marketing order, and last March his block-long packing house hummed with the sounds of peak-season production. The tangerines being packed that day were headed for Germany. At a time when the tangerine, orange, and lemon industries are shipping 5 percent overseas, one of every four pieces of fruit in Pescosolido's operation is headed to foreign countries.

Rhetoric in the Great Orange Debate of 1981 has intensified recently, since Pescosolido filed a formal demand with the Department of Agriculture seeking to overturn the marketing order. Included in his supporting documents was a copy of a letter from one of the administrative committee's representatives, requesting payment of \$1 for every carload of oranges shipped from the Exeter Orange Company. Growers rarely wash their dirty linen in public, and submission of the letter helped turn the fight over the orange marketing order into an exchange of insults.

Pescosolido refused to make the payments. He points to the request as an example of the kind of corruption, albeit small-time, that the order encourages. "This representative was soliciting payment for service on the committee. You have the representatives from Sunkist and Pure Gold accepting compensation for their services. How can that committee serve in the industry's best interest? If some growers pay and others don't, can we expect to be treated equally?"

John Wollenman, a farmer with 500 acres in oranges, was the representative who solicited payment from Pescosolido and others. Wollenman is executive chairman of the executive committees covering regulation of both navel and valencia oranges, and he explains that since the law provides only \$25 per weekly meeting plus some minimal expense money, it has been necessary to raise more funds on the side. "Gasoline is very expensive now, you know," Wollenman complains. He acknowledges receiving \$3400 in payments from two orange packing houses this season, but denies that the payments influenced his votes on the committees.

In any case, the Department of Agriculture has advised Wollenman and other committee representatives to stop asking for extra compensation for their services. Donald Kuryloski, deputy director of the department's Food and Vegetable Division, says, "We don't condone that at all. You don't do anything that gives even an appearance of a conflict of interest. You just don't."

Sunkist spokesmen, members of the administrative committees, and federal officials all deny that the effect of marketing orders is to waste millions of tons of produce each year. The drag strip near the Kern-Tulare county line, where thousands of pounds of oranges are now rotting, is officially classified as one of fifty-five approved "processors"—including dairies, livestock

yards, trucking companies, and even a Litter Container Company—where fresh produce above a farmer's quota can be diverted. "That's not a dump. That's a dryin' area," Wollenman drawls. "This is not the first year we've sent fruit to the dryin' area." Wollenman says that after the fruit rots and the juice runs off, the leavings are mashed into cattle feed.

Sunkist has felt "quite frustrated" with the focus on waste in the fight over the orange marketing order. Says spokeswoman Ann Warring, "There's been a statement made that half of the crop will not make it to the consumer. Well, Sunkist has been processing all of its products." Nonetheless, even Sunkist acknowledges that navel oranges are ill suited for "processing" into frozen concentrate. The fruit is so tart that it must be mixed at a ratio of ten to one and, as a consequence, the return to farmers is below the cost of production. Consumers Union spokesman Oshira believes the diversion of table oranges to frozen concentrate and cattle feed is an overall waste of scarce resources: "We have a situation that's an outrage. Think of the land, the energy, the water, the capital used to grow that fruit. Think of the people who should love to buy that fruit at a price they could afford."

In San Francisco, USDA official Ben Darling scoffed at the picture Oshira drew of hungry consumers being denied produce because of the operation of marketing orders. Darling said his position would be altered if oranges were needed for survival. But, he allows: "Oranges are not an essential food. People don't need oranges. They can take vitamins."

Carl Pescosolido has been struggling to avoid dumping his oranges on the ground, but that task was made more difficult when the juice processing plant that normally handles diverted fruit from Exeter Orange—controlled by John Wollenman's brother, G. A. Wollenman—expelled Pescosolido's company from the facility. Pescosolido also endured a twelve-day "audit" by administrative committee investigators pursuing a possible fine against Exeter Orange. As if to underscore the risk of his rebelliousness, Pescosolido has only to reflect on the experience of his friend, former farmer Jacques Giddens, who defied administrative committee regulations in 1976 and was fined \$12,620 and driven out of business. Pescosolido knows he has a serious fight on his hands, and already he has plowed \$250,000 in legal fees into the effort. He's determined to continue his battle in the courts, and both his defenders and detractors see that as the first step in a radical new appraisal of agricultural regulation.

When hundreds of thousands of farmers in the Dust Bowl watched their topsoil blow away in the twenties and thirties and other farmers across the country were caught in the crossfire of overproduction and poor prices, John Steinbeck wrote about the tandem hunger and waste that resulted—twin poxes of a volatile economy. In "The Grapes of Wrath," published the same year the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act became the centerpiece of government control in agriculture, Steinbeck wrote: "Men who have created new fruits in the world cannot create a system whereby their fruits may be eaten. And the failure hangs over the State like a great sorrow."

"The works of the roots of the vines, of the trees, must be destroyed to keep up the price, and this is the saddest bitterest thing of all. Carloads of oranges dumped on the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ground. . . . A million people hungry, needing the fruit—and kerosene sprayed over the golden mounds.

"There is a crime here that goes beyond denunciation. There is a sorrow here that weeping cannot symbolize. There is a failure here that topples all our success."

Pescosolido reads through that passage in his office, and sinks back into his chair. "That's beautiful, that's exactly it," he says as he prepares for another round in the slugfest over government regulations originally imposed to prevent waste and curb the farmers' hardship and the consumers' uncertainty. The new alliance Pescosolido has joined, a coalition of independent farmers and consumer lobbyists, believes the government regulations only deepen the evil they were designed to cure. ●

IN RECOGNITION OF ALAMEDA EDUCATOR, MR. ARTHUR LEYDECKER

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the achievements of one of my constituents, Mr. Arthur Leydecker.

Mr. Leydecker is retiring this year after 30 years as an educator in the city of Alameda, Calif.

In addition to his responsibilities as a teacher and as an administrator, he has devoted much of his time to civic duties. He is past president of the Alameda Girls' Club, he is on the board of directors of the Alameda Boys' Club and the Rotary International. He has served on the Alameda Council, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Century Club. He received the Honorary Life Service Award of the PTA and the leadership award of ACSA.

It is indeed appropriate that we add our commendations to Mr. Leydecker upon his retirement and for his outstanding service to the youth and community of Alameda. ●

BURGER'S COMMENTS ON PRISON REFORM

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we can all be proud of the way American justice operates. Yet, improvements can always be made in the system.

I wish to congratulate the Chief Justice of the United States, Warren E. Burger, on his remarks to the law graduates at George Washington University recently.

Excerpts of those remarks were carried in the May 26 Washington Post.

His proposals for a cost-effective method to improve the penal system

and increase the rate of prisoner rehabilitation merits the concerns of the Congress and the country.

The article follows:

A MORAL OBLIGATION TO PRISONERS

No one questions that a criminal conviction should always be open to correct a miscarriage of justice. But no other system in the world invites our kind of never-ending warfare with society, long after criminal guilt has been established, beyond reasonable doubt, with all the safeguards of due process. Our system has moved thoughtful, sensitive observers who are dedicated to individual liberty to ask: "Is guilt irrelevant?"

Looking back, we see that over the past half century we have indulged in a certain amount of self-deception with euphemisms, sometimes perhaps to sugar-coat the acid pills of reality, and sometimes to express our humane aspirations for those who break our laws. Prisons became "penitentiaries"—places of penitence—juvenile prisons became "reform schools" and, more recently, we have begun "halfway houses" without being quite sure halfway from what to what.

I have long believed—and I have frequently said—that when society places a person behind walls and bars it has a moral obligation to take some steps to try to render him or her better equipped to return to a useful life a member of society. Now, I say "try," and I use the term moral obligation, not legal, not constitutional. The Constitution properly mandates due process and it mandates certain protective guarantees, but it mandates nothing concerning the subject of punishments except that they not be "cruel and unusual." To make these people good citizens is also for our own proper self-interest.

To do all the things that might have some chance of changing persons convicted of serious crimes will cost a great deal of money, and 1981, if you have listened to talk shows, is hardly the year in which to propose large public expenditures for new programs to change the physical plants and internal programs of penal institutions. So what I am about to propose are programs of relatively modest fiscal dimensions that I believe will help—but with no guaranteed results.

Two steps could reasonably be taken within the range of affordable expenditure. I relate them chiefly because they are affordable in an economic sense—and feasible in terms of the psychology and the political and economic realities of 1981. These proposals are closely related. Each bears on training and education—training of the inmates and training of the keepers.

In all too many state penal institutions, the personnel—the attendants and guards—are poorly trained and some are not trained at all for the sensitive role they should perform. A fairly recent study shows an astonishing rate of turnover of guards and correctional personnel.

An important and lasting consequence of lack of trained personnel is the impact on the inmate—the individual inmate—who continues his hostility toward society, toward fellow inmates and prison personnel. The keepers come to be the immediate symbols of the society that keeps them confined. Unfortunately, judicial holdings have not always discouraged this warfare. More often than not, and I emphasize this, inmates go back into society worse for their confinement.

The best of prison administrators cannot change some of the negative conditions

unless those in the high-turnover, lower-echelon categories are carefully screened, well-trained and reasonably paid. Psychological testing of applicants is imperative to screen out people with latent tendencies of hostility. The existing prohibitions on psychological screening must be reexamined. Today, those lower positions in most of the states are generally not paid adequately enough to get even minimally qualified people.

The time is ripe to extend the fine work begun in 1972 by the National Institute of Corrections, and we should proceed at once to create a national academy of corrections to train personnel much as the FBI has trained local and state police. This is especially needed for the states, which have no real training resources available. The academy should also provide technical assistance to state and local institutions.

The second step for which I would urge consideration is one that would need to be over a longer period of time. We should introduce or expand two kinds of educational programs in the prisons.

The first would be to make certain that every inmate who cannot read, write, spell and do simple arithmetic would be given that training—not as an optional matter but as a mandatory requirement. The number of young, functional illiterates in our institutions is appalling. Without these basic skills, what chance does any person have of securing a gainful occupation when that person is released and begins the search for employment—with the built-in handicap of a criminal conviction?

Focusing on the longer-term prisoner, the second phase of this educational program would require a large expansion of vocational training in the skilled and semi-skilled crafts. The objective would be that a prisoner would not leave the institution without some qualifications for employment in the construction, manufacturing or service industries. These vocational training programs should also be mandatory. An inmate who declines to cooperate must be motivated to do so by incentives including shortening the sentence. Just as good behavior credit is now allowed to reduce sentences, we should allow credit on sentences for those who cooperate by learning. We should help them to learn their way out of prison.

Even in this day of necessary budget austerity, I hope that the President and Congress, in whose hands such matters must rest, will be willing to consider these two modest, but important steps. No one can guarantee results, but if we accept the moral proposition that we are our brothers' keepers and the moral proposition that there is a divine spark in every human being—hard as that is to believe sometimes—we must try. ■

ISLANDER TEAM COMMENDED

HON. RAYMOND J. MCGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express great pride in the performance of the New York Islanders whose home ice is in the Nassau County Coliseum in New York's Fifth Congressional District. The Islanders' recent five-game victory over the Minnesota Northstars in the Stanley Cup finals

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

marks their second straight championship, an accomplishment which was only a dream to team members and their loyal fans a few short years ago. As the only major professional team on Long Island, the Islanders have given nearly 3 million residents of Nassau and Suffolk Counties a great sense of identity.

General Manager Bill Torrey, Coach Al Arbour, and the strong and skillful members of the Islander team are to be commended for their tremendous effort over a long and demanding season. Their work has provided wholesome entertainment for thousands of people and inspiration for many youngsters who participate in hockey and other team sports.

On behalf of many Islander fans in my district, I would like to take this opportunity to extend to the team and its management heartfelt congratulations and best wishes for future success. Finally, no expression of appreciation would be complete without recognizing the fine play of the Minnesota Northstars, who also put forth a gallant effort to participate in the Stanley Cup finals. ■

PRESERVING THE MEMORY OF THE HOLOCAUST CAN PREVENT ITS REPETITION

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very moving address on the meaning of the Holocaust to the younger generation which was delivered by Steven Kaiser, a member of the board of directors of Second Generation, a New York organization of children of Holocaust survivors.

Mr. Kaiser, a social worker and adviser to students at New York Institute of Technology and Nassau Community College, delivered this speech at the 38th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising. In it he pays tribute to the courage, tenacity, and spirit of the Jewish people.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this moving and insightful address to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE HOLOCAUST CANNOT BE FORGOTTEN

(By Steven Kaiser)

It is a truly great honor and a privilege for me to address you today to commemorate the 38th anniversary of the heroic Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, and to memorialize those millions of Jewish men, women and children who perished at the hand of the Nazis.

It is an honor for me to speak before this audience, the majority of whom are survivors of the Holocaust, including my Uncle, and to share with all of you my thoughts about the responsibilities of the children of survivors of the Holocaust.

And, finally, as a member of the Second Generation it is a great privilege for me to

participate in this commemoration with a man deeply committed to the well being of the Jewish people, a leader in the struggle to combat and prevent anti-Semitism, and a person of international stature, as a champion of human, civil and individual rights: Congressman Steven Solarz.

Both my parents survived the Holocaust. At age 16 my mother was incarcerated at Bergen-Belsen, living under sub-human conditions, and, amidst death, disease and destruction, she wrote plays, shared her food and thus preserved her humanity. My father is the lone survivor from a family of four. In 1942 his parents were deported to Treblinka. Later that year he received false identification papers, and posing as a non-Jew fought with the Polish underground. He participated in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising in 1943, the Warsaw uprising of 1944, and then served as an intelligence officer for the Allies.

As a child I denied my unique background. I was not interested in concentration camps, the Warsaw Ghetto, nor any other aspect of the Holocaust. I wanted to be like everyone else: a normal American child. Despite my denial, I knew there was a difference between myself and other children. It was a feeling I could not articulate nor define, but it was all-pervasive!

A few years ago I was able to accept my unique background and the strength and responsibility which came from being a child of survivors.

I frequently ask myself: What are my responsibilities as a child of survivors? What should my concerns be? These are questions which all children of survivors ask themselves.

As you probably know, our main concern is that the world never forget the sufferings of our parents nor the tragedies of the Holocaust.

There is a movement today among certain scholars and intellectuals to, as Elie Wiesel states, "de-Judaize" the Holocaust, and even among some, to deny its actual occurrence.

Can any rational person really think that our people did not suffer precisely because they were Jews? Or that they were simply few among many whom the Nazis thought undeserving of life? We cannot allow this insidious denial, if not perversion, of history!

I frequently ask myself: How will my children learn about the Holocaust? Who will be presented as the true Holocaust Historians? The survivors are the witnesses to the Holocaust. The survivors are the true Holocaust Historians. It is a responsibility as children of survivors, as witnesses to the witnesses, to ensure that the survivors' experiences are recorded and stand as the true history of the Holocaust.

It is not enough just to remember the suffering, the humiliation, the tragedy of 15 million Jews! It is imperative to remember the courage, heroism, resistance, creativity and humanity of our people, struggling against not only the insane ambitions of the Third Reich, but also the passive acceptance of its principles by the peoples of Europe.

We are all aware of the heroic resistance of the Warsaw Ghetto fighters. But it is not widely known that in every Ghetto, in every labor camp, and in every concentration camp there existed a Jewish Underground that committed acts of sabotage, organized armed revolts, and helped reduce physical and emotional suffering. Even in Treblinka, an uprising occurred against this massive death machine.

In addition to armed resistance, we must not forget how even in the death camps, Jews valiantly maintained what shreds they could of civilization and humanity.

In the midst of starvation people shared their meager rations. In the midst of barbarism writers produced poetry and plays. In the very midst of hell Jews celebrated their covenant by holding Passover seders.

The tremendous courage and tenacity of the Jewish people needs to be told, and passed on from generation to generation. This is one of the primary responsibilities of children of survivors!

Some of us here today are children of survivors of the Holocaust. Others personally suffered its horrors. Still others may not have been directly touched. But no Jew can say he was spared. All of us bear the scars of the Holocaust. And these scars make us acutely sensitive to oppression and tyranny wherever they are found.

In Cambodia, hundreds of thousands have been slain or starved to death because of their resistance to the new regime. In South Africa, the system of Apartheid exists which constantly violates peoples' human rights.

In the Soviet Union, the Government promotes lies about Jews, curtails their emigration and has systematically suspended the human, civil and individual rights of its Jewish citizens.

Recent history gives us many examples of the question of anti-Semitism and other violations of human rights. In the General Assembly of the United Nations a resolution to equate Zionism with Racism was passed by unanimous vote of the Communist and third world blocks.

In many Arab countries Jews are constantly terrorized and denied their religious and civil rights. Even in western countries, terrorism against Jews is becoming more prevalent. And in France after the bombing of a synagogue, the Minister of Interior stated he was sorry that innocent non-Jews were killed.

We, children of the survivors of the Holocaust, with our great compassion for suffering and injustice, are especially concerned about the persecution of Jews. We are outraged at the recent rise in anti-Semitic activity, including instances in our own country.

It is our responsibility as children of survivors, our moral obligation, to identify, challenge, and vanquish those who would suppress human rights, liberties and values.

To conclude, as children of survivors, it is our solemn responsibility to preserve the memory of the Holocaust, and to ensure that it never reoccurs.●

OIL TAKES BACK SEAT TO NUCLEAR ELECTRICITY

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there is some good news on the energy front. Industry Week in its May 18, 1981, issue reports the following item:

Although coal still remains king, for the first time the nation's utilities last year generated more electricity with nuclear energy than with oil. The Department of Energy reports. Coal fueled 50.8 percent of all electric power generated. Nuclear energy produced

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

11 percent, just surpassing oil's 10.8 percent. Other major sources of electricity were natural gas (15.1 percent), hydropower (12.1 percent), and geothermal, wood, and waste (0.2 percent).●

BELL SYSTEM MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to share with my colleagues the following synopsis of the Bell System's efforts in utilizing minority firms and affording these firms an equitable opportunity to compete for Bell System business. It is not very often that I have the pleasure of pointing to concerted efforts by established private entities to move minorities one step closer to economic parity. However, Mr. W. Orville Wright, division staff manager, government and community relations, has worked arduously in this area, and graciously consented to outline the Bell System minority business enterprise (MBE) program for my perusal. Through the efforts of Mr. Wright and others, this program has become a part of the Bell System's overall affirmative action program, and I pledge my support for it. A brief review of Bell System's historical involvement with minority businesses follows:

The Bell System has a long history of involvement with minority businesses. In 1968, the Western Electric Hawthorne Works (near Chicago) held the first minority trade fair, "Suppliers Opportunity Day." Western Electric organized and chaired the same event the following year, and the fair later evolved into the Chicago Purchasing Council, itself the forerunner to the National Minority Purchasing Council.

In 1972, then AT&T Chairman John D. deButts was the principal speaker at the Chicago Minority Opportunity Fair. He encouraged American industry to become involved in the minority business movement.

Over the years Bell companies have become involved in and have supported regional minority purchasing councils. Such involvement includes sponsoring local trade fairs, holding elective offices, volunteering time, and providing office space and clerical support.

In 1976, AT&T issued the Bell System's first model Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) Program. Among the recommended components were:

A statement of corporate policy to insure that maximum practicable opportunity be given to minority business enterprises to participate as suppliers and contractors to our business.

To see that fair and impartial consideration is given to each of the enterprises.

Definitions of minority group members, suppliers and contractors.

A methodology for providing maximum practicable opportunity to minority suppliers to be considered on an equal basis with other enterprises.●

The major objective of the Bell System Model Program each year is to surpass the previous year's dollar amount spent with minority suppliers and contractors.

Early in the development of the Model Program it became apparent that each of the Bell System companies should have corporate MBE coordinators. These coordinators would facilitate contracts between their companies and minority suppliers, and be responsible for the implementation of the program in their companies. Therefore, AT&T established corporate and local MBE coordinators. Although these people are not buyers themselves, they are in a position to direct suppliers to those who serve in that capacity in their companies. AT&T issued guidelines to aid coordinators in determining the effectiveness of their programs.

Each company MBE coordinator summarizes expenditures and issues quarterly reports that are sent to the department heads of each company. In order to insure that the MBE Program continues to obtain top level attention, each year AT&T provides company presidents their MBE expenditures for goods and services as compared to the other companies in the Bell System. Also included are recommendations which may be helpful in administering the program in each company.

Since 1975, Bell System expenditures for goods and services from minority suppliers are as follows:

1975, \$65 million; 1976, \$85 million; 1977, \$124 million; 1978, \$166 million; and 1979, \$212 million.

In 1979, expenditures with minority firms for construction and related professional services totaled \$27.6 million, compared to \$16.7 million in 1978.

Gross premiums of \$4.2 million were made to minority insurance companies participating under the Bell System Group Life Insurance Re-Insurance Program.

Bell System 1979 activity with minority banks was:

Total tax deposits, \$294 million; average on deposit per day, \$2 million; and total loans, \$7 million.

In 1978, the Bell System issued the first MBE booklet which contained a summary of system policy, objectives, activities of the MBE coordinator, a listing of all MBE coordinators in the System and a listing of what the Bell System purchases. This publication has been distributed to thousands of minority vendors at minority trade shows all over the country. In addition, each associated company has a more detailed booklet describing the individual company's needs. These booklets have been an excellent tool for bringing minority vendors together with our buyers in the associated companies.

An AT&T MBE Steering Committee was established in 1978 to expand awareness of the program on a departmental basis both at AT&T and in the associated companies. This group has sponsored a Bell System membership in the National Minority Supplier Development Council.

The Bell System believes that the success of our program cannot be measured in dollars alone. It can be measured by the commitment the Bell System has towards the program and by the Bell System people who spend immeasurable hours in aiding minority firms to become viable in the community.●

NASSAU COUNTY'S SENIOR CITIZEN OF THE YEAR, 1981

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

- **Mr. LeBOUTILLIER.** Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that during the month of May, which is Senior Citizen Month in Nassau County, that special recognition be extended to those seniors who have excelled on behalf of senior citizens causes and the community as a whole.

I am, therefore, extremely honored to note that this year's Nassau County Senior Citizen of the Year is Mr. Harry Griffin of 2 Hidden Lane, Westbury.

Mr. Griffin is a 30-year resident of Nassau County, having served numerous charitable and volunteer activities over the years. Among his many accomplishments, Mr. Griffin has recorded over 14,000 hours of volunteer service to the A. Holly Patterson Home. He has an excellent understanding of government, the private and voluntary sectors, and has demonstrated a superb willingness to bring people and services together.

I am equally pleased to note that Mr. Griffin has been nominated for the New York State Senior Citizen of the Year Award. Given the extent of his most impressive accomplishments, I extend him every best wish in his pursuit of this honored award.

The senior citizen occupies a very special place in our society today. More and more we younger Americans will look to those who have lived life so completely, and seek to benefit from their wisdom and experience.

Among the many who have honored Mr. Harry Griffin—I am honored to join in offering sincerest recognition to a man who has earned the respect and love of so many by doing for others.●

SALLY K. GRISWOLD

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

- **Ms. OAKAR.** Mr. Speaker, one of our outstanding citizens, Mrs. Sally K. Griswold, mirrors the extraordinary work being done throughout the country, and I know all my colleagues will be interested in her efforts as described in the article below which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

THIS GRANDMOTHER IS PEOPLE PROBLEM-SOLVER

"There is a time when one must decide either to risk everything to fulfill one's dream or sit for the rest of one's life in the back yard."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sally K. Griswold is not risking everything. But neither is she spending her life sitting in her back yard.

Quite the contrary. She is perpetual human motion and emotion, a member of almost every blue-ribbon organization in Greater Cleveland that deals with seeking solutions to the problems of people.

Griswold is on the distribution committee of the Cleveland Foundation and the board of trustees of the Benjamin Rose Institute and Golden Age Centers.

She chairs the trustees of John Carroll University, is on the board of overseers of Case Western Reserve University, belongs to the Growth Association's board of directors and co-chairs the Commission on Social Concerns of the Federation for Community Planning.

Griswold also is a member of the planning division of United Way, and is an advisory director of the Cleveland-area BancOhio National Bank. The latter is a paid position.

Despite all this, Griswold emphasizes that she has been, first and foremost, a mother and a housewife. She has four children.

She was PTA president while teaching at Mercer Elementary School in Shaker Heights. She served eight years on the Shaker Heights school board. A lover of the outdoors, she is a trustee of the Shaker Lakes Regional Nature Center.

Griswold's vitality and verve belie the fact that at least numerically, she qualifies as a senior citizen; she was born May 28, 1917, in Lakewood.

She received a bachelor's degree in education from the University of Michigan in 1938, after graduation from Heights High School. She obtained a master's degree in guidance and counseling from John Carroll in 1976.

The green-eyed grandmother of five likes to play golf, even though she has trouble finding time for the sport. She enjoys cooking, reading fiction and spending time with her family. Her husband, Bruce, is a member of the law firm of Calfee Halter & Griswold.

How does she find time for all her duties? Her answer is practical. "Well," she said, "not all boards and commissions meet at once. And a lot of work is done by paid staff members who make you look good."

Griswold is putting much of her energy into a few areas of concern: making day care available to children and the elderly, cutting health care costs and working with the Council on Mental Health to insure that the rights of the mentally ill and retarded are represented in the courts.

"We are working to place health care in reach of every segment of the population, and costs are escalating," she noted. "One way we can cut these costs is to care for the elderly's health needs in their homes as long as possible. Another way is to establish day care centers. We are also working to enact legislation for the state licensing of day care centers for children."

Of President Reagan's budget cuts, Griswold said, "Federal programs can't keep printing money. Too much money goes into administrative overhead, and our goal is to get money directly to the people."

The Cleveland area, she said, is "blessed by a wealth of volunteers. Volunteers work in a learning, educational experience which broadens your horizon."

"Sometimes we get a little satisfaction and a great deal of frustration. We keep seeing the same problems cropping up year after year. Solutions aren't always lasting. When you are involved you hope you could have

May 28, 1981

more impact on problems, but changes take place very slowly," she added.

Despite the frustrations and the snail-like pace of change, Griswold summed up her life cheerfully: "I give a little and get a lot back."●

STEEL INDUSTRY COMPLIANCE EXTENSION ACT

HON. GUS SAVAGE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

- **Mr. SAVAGE.** Mr. Speaker, today I was one of the Members who both supported and voted for passage of H.R. 3520, commonly known as the Steel Industry Compliance Extension Act.

As a member of the Congressional Steel Caucus and as a cosponsor of H.R. 1817, legislation similar in purpose and intent to this bill we passed under suspension of the rules today, I am pleased that Members from both sides of the aisle could join forces to lend the steel industry a helping hand. The action we took today should help insure that many presently employed steelworkers in my district will not be forced to join the thousands of laid-off Wisconsin steelworkers, also in my district, who have been victimized, in part by Government insensitivity. This legislation will give the steel industry some breathing room to come into compliance with requirements of the Clean Air Act respecting installation of pollution control equipment. If no action had been taken to relax the compliance deadline of December 31, 1982, I am afraid my district and others as well, would have come face to face with yet other heart-rending tragedies, the proportions of which would rival that of Wisconsin steel.

Further, as one who has always been a champion of the environment I am pleased that this legislation does not downgrade existing air quality standards. I have always insisted that concern for economic growth and concern for the environment need not be mutually exclusive goals.

The bill we passed grants the Environmental Protection Agency the authority, on a case-by-case basis, to stretch out the time within which a company has to meet air quality standards in those instances where demonstrable need is sufficiently proved. Finally, I take this occasion to say that the action we took today gives me some reason to hope that Members from both political camps will, in the ensuing months, increasingly show a compassion for people in other areas as well.●

THE SASOL LESSON

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I was invited to address the Metals and Minerals Conference in a World Context in South Africa as chairman of the House Coal Group and as a member of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee. Besides joining in on the discussion of nonfuel minerals, their importance to national security and technologies involved in their extraction, I had an opportunity to tour several coal mining operations in that country. South Africa is a major coal exporter. In addition, it is a world leader in the production and use of synthetic fuels derived from coal. The largest coal liquefaction facility in the world, Sasol, is in South Africa. It is a profitable operation and has drastically reduced that country's dependence on foreign oil.

The Sasol project began in 1950. Last year, due to the production of synthetic fuels from Sasol 1, only about 25 percent of South Africa's energy requirements were met by imported crude oil. With the completion of Sasol 2 and 3, that country's dependence on foreign oil will drop to less than 15 percent.

With the Sasol technology, South Africa has made an investment in the future. Thus, it was with some chagrin that I read an article in the Star, South Africa's largest daily newspaper, which led with this paragraph:

Like a piece of soft coal, the U.S. synthetic fuels programme has begun to crumble around the edges now that the Reagan administration has started handling it. And, as with the piece of coal, the projects under scrutiny are leaving a residue even after they are scrubbed.

It is the residue of this country's synthetic fuel efforts that I would like to address. It is the scrubbing of a project forged with international cooperation that I would like to decry. Among the synthetic fuel demonstration projects slated to be cut by the Reagan administration, SRC-II in Morgantown, W. Va., represented a commitment by the U.S. Government, the private sector and two of our allies, Germany and Japan, to jointly cooperate in reducing foreign oil imports by developing synthetics from coal. However, due to the administration's proposal to cut the Federal share of this project, West Germany seems ready to give up on it; Japan feels cheated; and, Gulf Oil, which is carrying the private share of costs, cannot continue its work.

It is strange that this administration is so shortsighted as to not realize the implications of its actions in this area.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is also discouraging that this Nation is 30 years behind South Africa in synthetic fuel technology.

With just a small degree of fortitude, we could reverse this tide and in a few years be in the enviable position of South Africa as far as reducing oil dependence goes. Yet, in its urgency to cut the Federal budget, the administration has not only reneged on commitments made to our allies, but has seriously damaged our efforts toward energy independence.

The SRC-II project calls for the conversion of 6,000 tons of coal into 20,000 barrels of oil per day during the demonstration phase. It would be the largest construction project in West Virginia's history. Moreover, it would provide the basis for future commercial-scale projects which were to produce the equivalent of 500,000 barrels of oil per day by 1987 and 2 million barrels per day by 1992.

Today, these goals are in jeopardy.

At present, the administration is negotiating the future of SRC-II with Japan, West Germany, and Gulf Oil. I would suggest that during these talks the administration stand by agreements which were signed in the Rose Garden last year by President Carter. I would urge the administration not to instill an element of distrust in our international allies by eroding this Nation's commitment to leading the way toward increased energy security. The technology being developed at the SCR-II plant is but one building block toward the creation of an entire industry. But, it is a very important building block as it is part of the foundation of an international effort among our allies, the Federal Government, and the private sector to jointly tackle the problems we all face in meeting the energy challenges of today and of those that will be faced by future generations.●

TRIBUTE TO WESLEY SANDERS, JR.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1981, the Brothers 3 will host a dinner at the Coconut Grove in Los Angeles Ambassador Hotel to honor Compton City Treasurer Wesley Sanders, Jr. This occasion is one more honor in Wesley's already distinguished life, for he has always excelled in both private and public ventures.

Wesley was born in Los Angeles on February 7, 1933. He attended Jordan High School, entered Harbor Community College to major in business administration, and graduated from the University of California at Santa Cruz

in 1957. In 1952 he entered the U.S. Air Force, eventually reaching the rank of staff sergeant. After leaving the Air Force, Wesley became involved in the meat and grocery packaging industries, becoming owner and operator of Triple Quality Meats in 1961. Wesley's 17 years in the industry were successful ones, as is evidenced by his selection as the Morrell Meat Packers' outstanding salesman of the year.

Succeeding in private business, Wesley has turned to public service in later years. He was a member of Compton Union High School's Personnel Commission, and advanced to serve on the personnel commission for the Compton Unified School District. In 1973, he was elected Compton city treasurer and has held that office since. As treasurer, he has guided the city's successful efforts toward urban revitalization, earning more interest income for the city than any other treasurer in Compton's history. Further proof of his effectiveness as treasurer lies in the fact that he ran unopposed in the last election.

Mr. Speaker, this is a man of talent and energy who continues to give his all to his community. Wesley belongs to over a dozen civic organizations, including the Compton Chamber of Commerce, the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Central Democratic Committee, and the Compton Police Officers' Reserve Corps. A man who has given so much of his time and energy to the growth of our area is deserving of this dinner in his honor.

My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing the very best for Wesley, who we know will continue his high level of excellence in the years ahead.●

SOCIAL SECURITY CUTBACKS

HON. DAVID W. EVANS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. EVANS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, because of my interest in and advocacy of the social security retirement system and as a member of the House Aging Committee, I wish to state my opposition to several of the administration's proposals to reduce certain social security benefits beginning January 1, 1982. I consider the administration's proposals to be an overreaction to the critical need to correct the many problems associated with the social security system.

Major elements of the administration's plan would reduce benefits for those persons retiring before age 65 and delay for 3 months an annual

cost-of-living allowance (COLA) scheduled for July 1982. Legislation already moving through Congress would raise the full benefit retirement age from 65 to 68 and eliminate the \$122 minimum monthly benefit as of January 1982, among other provisions. Enactment of all the social security proposals could save \$81.9 billion by the end of 1986. That seems good, yet, President Reagan's overall cut is three times greater than necessary to make the system financially sound and it ignores the recommendation of three major Presidential study commissions. I suggest the President read some of those studies.

Since social security is the principal source of income for most retirees the proposed cuts would be especially devastating to persons forced to take an early retirement because of poor health or unemployment. Recipients of social security benefit checks have already had their payments eroded by inflation and should not be asked to wait an additional 3 months for their adjustments. While I firmly believe we must reduce the Federal deficit, I am skeptical of measures that call for the deepest sacrifices to be made by the poor, the aged, and the disabled. The administration's proposal reflects a basic and deep misunderstanding of what the social security system is about. Social security is a long-term compact between its contributors and the Federal Government; contribute during your working years and the Government will pay you and your dependents what has been promised when you are retired, disabled, or dead. The public cannot maintain faith in the system if that system is subject to changes because of short-term political or economic goals.

Among the most criticized proposals in the President's package is a plan to reduce benefits for those who elect to retire early, starting January 1982. Under the current system, those who retire at age 62 receive 80 percent of the benefits they would be entitled to if they had retired at age 65. President Reagan wants those early benefits reduced to 55 percent of full benefits to encourage people to remain in the work force longer.

By the administration's own calculations, a worker entitled to the maximum social security benefit who retired next January would receive \$159 a month less than under present law—\$310.50 under the Reagan plan as compared with \$469.60. Under the administration's proposal, the early retirement benefit would not even be high enough for a single person to reach the poverty level.

The disability proposals of the plan are especially hard on women. A woman who is pregnant and wants to stay at home with her child for 3 years would not be eligible for disability benefits until after she had rejoined

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the work force and worked steadily for an additional 7 years should she become disabled on the job.

Tightening the social security bureaucracy is a more reasonable and acceptable goal that could result in much needed savings. Also, under legislation I am cosponsoring, certain aliens would not be able to obtain social security until they have been in this country at least 5 years.

The controversy over proposed social security benefit cutbacks is one that will receive considerable attention. As a member of the House Aging Committee and its Subcommittee on Retirement Income, I will continue to support reasonable and equitable alternatives to the administration plan to reduce earned retirement income.●

PRAISING THE MOUNT ST. CHARLES ACADEMY HOCKEY TEAM

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most often used phrases to describe the unlikelihood of the unusual occurring twice is "lightning striking twice in the same place." In a way, however, the most extraordinary has taken place in the town of Woonsocket, R.I., where I have lived my entire life. Though unlike lightning which is directed by chance, the reoccurrence of an event which has taken place in Woonsocket has been the result of hard work, commitment, talent, desire, and a bit of genius.

For the Mount St. Charles hockey team to have been cited as the No. 1 team in all the Nation is a tremendous honor and achievement. For the same school to have been chosen as the Nation's top hockey team for the second year in a row is a feat that is unmatched in the history of high school athletics and truly stands as one of the most outstanding efforts imaginable.

The Mount St. Charles team has played flawlessly in the past two seasons finishing with an undefeated record and the Nation's highest honor. Their coach Bill Belisle has led his teams to an equally amazing 157 victories in 163 matches over the past 5 years.

I believe the excellence of the Mount St. Charles hockey team is of such an outstanding and unusual nature that I felt compelled to share their achievements with you. They are the pride of not only Woonsocket but

May 28, 1981

of all Rhode Island. They are truly champions in the highest form and just the sort of sportsmen who could make the unusual happen—twice.●

A SALUTE TO SAC'S BEST

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Whiteman Air Force Base, located in the Fourth Congressional District of Missouri, had good news recently when its 351st Strategic Missile Wing won the coveted Blanchard Trophy. This is the fourth time they have achieved this distinction. The wing commander, Col. Norman Miner, Jr., and all of the 351st should be congratulated. The following is an editorial by Avis G. Tucker, editor of the Warrensburg Daily Star Journal, concerning this distinction:

A SALUTE TO SAC'S BEST

News of Whiteman's 351st Strategic Missile Wing capturing the victory in "Olympic Arena '81" competition was met yesterday with excitement and a surge of pride in the home area of Whiteman Air Force Base.

Winning this year was made extra-special, for it marked the fourth time WAFB has gained possession of the prized Blanchard Trophy—something no other missile team in the country has ever achieved.

There was also the added exhilarating feature of rolling into first place from behind, even though there was only a very small margin of points between the competing teams. The first eight were separated by only 47 points out of a possible 3,000, and a slim 14 points between the top four, as it came down to the finish line.

In each of the five categories—operations, maintenance, security police, communications and, civil engineering—experts are pitted against experts.

Team members from the SAC missile bases who converge on Vandenberg Air Force Base for the annual Olympic Arena competition are tops in their skills. Put to a rigid test is their technological expertise coupled with team spirit. The intensity of the latter is often the difference between winning and losing.

The happy wing commander, Col. Norman Miner, Jr., put the winning performance in perspective when he said, "We didn't have a single first place winner anywhere, but a good solid performance took it all."

Whiteman went into the competition with the motto, "Showing Them How It's Done in '81," and they turned it into reality. In executing their sharpness, they came out of the keen competition with the enviable reputation of being the best in SAC.

As these fine competitors make their triumphant return, we salute them and extend

sincere, hearty congratulations. They bring with them a well-deserved honor, recognition to their wing and to themselves and distinction for the entire WAFB area to enjoy.●

INTO THE HALL OF FAME

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● MR. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to your attention the fact that Emile Griffith of the Virgin Islands has been inducted into the Boxing Hall of Fame.

Emile Griffith has had an illustrious and brilliant career in the boxing ring which started in 1957 when he won both the New York Golden Gloves and the intercity titles in this weight class. He went on to win in the welterweight and later the middleweight classes a total of five titles—a feat matched only by Sugar Ray Robinson. It was an extraordinary achievement which displays the determination, dedication, and personal fortitude of Emile Griffith.

It also bespeaks of the same qualities in the people of the Virgin Islands—the small islands in the Caribbean which have produced an extraordinary number of world renowned athletes: Alvin McBean, the famous relief pitcher for the Pittsburgh Pirates; Elrod Hendricks, a catcher with the championship Baltimore Orioles team and now a coach with that club; Valmy Thomas, a catcher with the then New York Giants; Horace Clarke, a second baseman with the Yankees; Elmo Plaskett, a pitcher with the Pittsburgh Pirates, and Joe Christopher, an outfielder with that team; Jose Morales, an outfielder with the Baltimore Orioles; Jose Cruz, an infielder with the Chicago Cubs; Carl Plaskett of track and field fame; also in boxing, Olympic Bronze Medal winner in the junior welterweight division and now professional, Sugar Ray Sealey; and in basketball, Glen Williams of St. John University and Butch Lee of the Los Angeles Lakers, and upcoming Michigan State college star, Ronald Charles; recordbreaking swimming star Shelley Cramer; and many, many more. The number and the quality of athletes emanating from the Virgin Islands is truly remarkable. Their success is an inspiration to all Americans and it is only fitting and proper that their achievements are recognized, as has now been done with Emile Griffith's well-deserved induction to the Boxing Hall of Fame. I join with the people of the Virgin Islands in congratulating him.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GALBRAITH ON IMPERIALISM: PART III

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● MR. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, I inserted the first two parts of a three-part series authored by John Kenneth Galbraith on the decline of both United States and Russian imperialism during the past two decades. Today, I submit the third segment describing the enormous differences between classical imperialism and the pale substitute which goes by the same name today. This article, like the two preceding it, makes what I believe is an enormously logical case for a foreign policy almost entirely different from the one on which the Reagan administration presently appears to be embarked.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1981]

THINKING ABOUT IMPERIALISM (III)

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

In earlier articles, I've noted the promiscuous way in which we and the Soviets trade charges of imperialism in these days and the way, also, that what is so characterized has been for both powers a drastic retreat. For the Soviets, having regard for their position in China, Eastern Europe, Indonesia, Egypt and Algeria and various Western Communist parties, the loss of external influence in the last two decades has been enormous. That there have been gains of a sort in Afghanistan, Angola and Ethiopia, countries in which there is only a tenuous relationship between government and the governed, can hardly seem from Moscow to be compensation. Our experience has been much less drastic. But we have had the exceedingly painful reverses in Vietnam and Iran, and neither among the other industrial countries nor in Latin America and elsewhere do we have the all-but-automatic support that we took for granted 20 years back. So it comes about that each power now accuses the other of practicing something that is wonderfully in reverse. The reasons for this retreat, I would like to urge, are much the same for both countries, although they work more strongly against the Soviets than against ourselves.

Perception begins with the careless fashion in which the word imperialism is thrown around—in the delight that all foreign policy commentators, American, Russian and no doubt Papuan and Lebanese, have in giving substance to shadow, making concrete the subjective. What the word imperialism now describes bears no appreciable relationship to the practice of the last century and for centuries before. Then the imperial power governed with its own people, and it backed its government with its own soldiers or those sufficiently subject to its discipline. So it was in the Spanish, British, French, Portuguese and the more exiguous American empires and, of course, in the great eastern and southern reaches of Imperial Russia.

Where this imposed government and military power was weak, it was thrown out, and it did not matter that those so governed were culturally and ethnically identical with their imperial masters. It was Spaniards

who threw the Spanish out of New Spain, English who threw the English out of the North American colonies. The instinct for national identity, autonomy and self-government is one of the great constants of history. The real imperialism suppressed it but only because it brought its authority directly, comprehensively and obtrusively to bear.

The case of India is instructive. The British were greatly aided in conquest—a point conscientiously neglected by Indian historians—because they were in orderly contrast with the anarchic, rapacious and incompetent despots they displaced. They were, in the beginning, a liberating force. But by the middle of the last century their rule would not have lasted a month in the absence of a competent corps of British administrators backed by British and British-led troops. The mutiny of the Bengal Army in 1857 and the consequent (if temporary) collapse of British authority showed everyone where the real source of power lay. In the princely states, the Raj did govern through the prince and his public apparatus. But no one was in doubt that the true authority rested with the British resident and the armed force on which he could call. All knew that the prince could be superseded, i.e., sacked, if he did not conform; it happened not rarely, and one prince in western India was thrown out for staging an unduly expensive wedding between his favorite dogs.

In French, Portuguese and British Africa the same forthright principles were in effect; the ultimate British reliance in Africa was expressed in verse: "Whatever happens, we have got/The Maxim gun and they have not."

That is what true imperialism involved. And, in the end, it was not enough. Everywhere, contending with the urge for national self-identity, it collapsed.

The external influence that we or the Russians seek to exercise is, by comparison with the real imperialism, a pallid thing. To send in administrators is unthinkable; at most there may be technicians and advisers. And while, as in Afghanistan, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic and one hopes not Poland, troops have been dispatched, this is deeply against the conscience of the age. Government, in any case, must be by local politicians, and this ensures, as we learned in Vietnam and the Soviets are almost certainly discovering in Afghanistan, their discredit. There are, in fact, only two possibilities in such rule. If it is good and independent and has the confidence of its people, it will not long tolerate foreign guidance. If it is pliable and cooperative and accepts foreign domination, it will not long have the confidence of its people.

There is another fatal difference from the 19th century. Then there was no real thought of imposing an economic and social system; what was found in Asia and Africa was accepted. The only intrusion on the indigenous culture came from the trading and plantation enterprises, and while this on occasion, as in the sugar colonies, could be great, it reflected no systematic design. The missionaries did make an effort to alter the local culture and institutions; for this reason there was almost always friction between them and the colonial administrators.

In recent times, an avowed purpose of the great powers in extending their influence has been to preserve free enterprise, sometimes called free institutions, or to bring the liberating miracle of modern socialism. This compulsion is irrelevant and damaging, and especially so for the Soviets. The difference between capitalism and communism is rele-

vant only after there is capitalism. No one viewing a jungle, a tribal economy or a simple village society can tell whether it is capitalist or socialist because it is neither. The effort to extend a system causes more difficulties for the Soviets than for the United States because socialism is a definite, structured thing. When tried in the poor countries, it places a heavy demand on the scarcest of all resources, namely administrative capacity. Free enterprise, in contrast, is anything, however primitive, that happens to exist.

It is something of a puzzle, incidentally, as to why Soviet policy fails to recognize the extensive irrelevance of socialist development in the more elementary reaches of the Third World. Nothing was so clear in the mind of Marx; socialism must come after the organizing and socializing experience of capitalism. (He would have had grave doubts as to its feasibility even in a country anciently so talented in organization as China.) But we should not doubt that rhetoric about protecting free enterprise can be damaging; it suggests some dubious capitalist design; it is admirably useful to critics; and since the controlling influence on the economic system is not ideological choice but the stage of development, it does not make any difference.

There are other reasons why our influence and that of the Soviets are in retreat. Neither the economic system of the United States nor that of the Soviet Union has, in these last few years, been turning in the kind of performance that would make it a lodestar for the rest of the world. Both are highly organized systems; both could be showing the sclerotic tendencies that are inherent in all organization, public or private, socialist or non-socialist. But the main reason for the shared decline in influence is, without question, the unbounded determination of people to govern themselves and the contradiction in any surrogate effort from the outside that causes the good and strong leader to assert his independence, the compliant and weak one to sacrifice the confidence of his own people.

Two thoughts remain. I have spoken of decline; that is not synonymous with loss. One cannot suppose that we are worse off from living in a world of self-confident, self-assertive states. It does less for our national ego; but with the negotiation it requires, it could be a useful restraint on hasty or foolish action. Our heaviest reverse in these last 20 years was in South Vietnam. Can anyone suppose that we are economically, politically, culturally or militarily less well off because that unhappy peninsula has been returned to the obscurity for which one can only assume nature intended it? The dominoes. Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore—the main case for our intervention in Indochina—stand as upright as ever before.

What is dangerous is not the decline in influence but the misperception of it. Nations as now constituted can act dangerously out of an exuberant sense of their strength. But they can also act dangerously (or unwisely) out of the fear of seeming weak. It was such a fear that sent us into and kept us in Vietnam. It was the weakness of a client state and the fear of having this revealed that sent the Soviets into Afghanistan and could be the cause of action in Poland. We need to see, and must hope others can see, that what is called weakness is, in fact, an accommodation to the times—to the powerful instinct that causes people the world over to resist influence from the outside and to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

resist all the more strongly the tighter the embrace.●

HONORING HENRY F. MOZELL

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, 1981, at a testimonial dinner to be held in Oakland, Calif., one of my good friends and a respected member of the Oakland community will be honored for his many years of service to the people of the East Bay. I will be unable to attend the dinner honoring Mr. Mozell, but I want to pay tribute to him nonetheless.

Mr. Henry Mozell is the executive director and founder of the Oakland/Alameda County Consumer Council, and has been an effective leader in organizing advocacy groups and developing outreach programs on consumer issues. My staff and I have worked closely with him on a variety of consumer concerns, and his help has been invaluable.

So I join with those who are honoring Mr. Mozell in paying tribute to a man whose tireless efforts have helped many people in the Oakland area, and whose continued dedication is a source of inspiration to us all.●

H.R. 1776 HONOR ROLL—MORE THAN A MAJORITY

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS OF GEORGIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the Nation and the leadership of this House that, after less than 5 months of the 1st session of the 97th Congress, more than a majority of the Members of the House have now become cosponsors of H.R. 1776, the Administrative Rule-Making Control Act. Specifically, 220 of our colleagues have thus far joined the H.R. 1776 honor roll. By doing so, these Members have signaled their intention to help reaffirm the authority of the Congress to write our laws.

A veritable tidal wave of support is now overwhelming the opposition to the legislative veto.

I believe that the citizens of our country will be pleased to learn that they have now been joined by a majority of the Members of this body in the effort to restore to the Congress its lawmaking authority. Our constituents have been the ones who have suffered under the laws written and imposed by unelected bureaucrats, and they have made it clear that they want this situation to end. They want their laws made by people they can

see, talk to and vote for or against; they want their laws made by the Congress. And now they have new hope because more than a majority of the House have joined in this effort.

This fact should also be noted by the leadership of the House. It should serve as a signal that the time has come to take action, not just talk, on H.R. 1776.

The legislative veto is already contained in approximately 200 laws, but this piecemeal, albeit essential, approach leaves us with a hodgepodge of authority when uniformity is needed. The Congress should have the power to review and consider all of our laws, both the statutes themselves and the regulations written under them. H.R. 1776 will give Congress that authority.

The question is still a simple one but a fundamental one: Who makes the laws in this country, the elected Congress or the unelected bureaucracy?

The legislative veto, as embodied in H.R. 1776 would simply allow the elected Congress to review and, if necessary, veto any rule or regulation, having the force of law, issued by the unelected bureaucracy.

The administration and the House leadership must now recognize the wide base of support for H.R. 1776. Both in the House and with the public at large, this support crosses regional, ideological, and partisan lines. We cannot and should not ignore the will of a majority of our people or the will or a majority of our colleagues. It is time to put an end to legislating by administrative fiat.

It is time to act on H.R. 1776. We will be watching what happens. The American people will be looking to see the dispatch with which their desires and those of a majority of the House are given effect under our system of representative government.

H.R. 1776 HONOR ROLL

Mr. Albosta, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Anthony, Mr. Applegate, Mr. Archer, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. AuCoin, Mr. Badham, Mr. Bafalis, Mr. Bailey of Missouri, Mr. Bailey of Pennsylvania, Mr. Barnard, Mr. Beard, Mr. Benjamin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bereuter.

Mr. Bethune, Mr. Bevill, Mr. Blanchard, Mr. Boner of Tennessee, Mrs. Bouquard, Mr. Bowen, Mr. Breaux, Mr. Brinkley, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Burgener, Mr. Butler, Mrs. Byron, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Clausen, Mr. Clinger, Mr. Coats, Mr. Coelho.

Mr. Coleman, Mrs. Collins of Illinois, Mr. Collins of Texas, Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Coughlin, Mr. Courier, Mr. Daniel B. Crane, Mr. Philip M. Crane, Mr. D'Amours, Mr. Dan Daniel, Mr. Robert W. Daniel, Jr., Mr. Danemeyer, Mr. Daschle, Mr. Daub, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Dougherty.

Mr. Dornan of California, Mr. Dreier, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma, Mr. English, Mr. Emery, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Evans of Georgia, Mr. Evans of Delaware, Mr. Evans of Indiana, Mr. Evans of Iowa, Mr. Fazio, Mrs. Fenwick, Ms. Ferraro, Mr.

Findley, Mr. Fish, Mr. Flippo, Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Fountain.

Mr. Fowler, Mr. Frenzel, Mr. Frost, Mr. Fuqua, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Ginn, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Gradison, Mr. Gramm, Mr. Gregg, Mr. Grisham, Mr. Gunderson, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr. Sam B. Hall, Jr., Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hance, Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Hatcher, Mr. Hefner, Mr. Heftel, Mr. Hendon, Mr. Hightower, Mr. Hiler, Mr. Holland, Mrs. Holt, Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Horton, Mr. Hubbard, Mr. Huckaby, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Hutto, Mr. Hyde, Mr. Ireland, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Johnston, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Jones of Oklahoma, Mr. Jones of Tennessee, Mr. Kazen, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Kindness, Mr. Kogovsek, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Leath of Texas, Mr. LeBoutillier, Mr. Lee, Mr. Lent, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Loeffler, Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Lott, Mr. Lowery of California, Mr. Luken, Mr. Lujan, Mr. Lungren, Mr. McDonald, Mr. McGrath, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Madigan, Mr. Marlenee, Mr. Marriott, Mr. Martin of North Carolina, Mr. Mattox, Mr. Mavroules, Mr. Mazzoli, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Miller of Ohio, Mr. Mineta, Mr. Mitchell of New York.

Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Moore, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Mottl, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Myers, Mr. Neal, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Nichols, Mr. Nowak, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Parris, Mr. Pashayan, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pepper, Mr. Petri, Mr. Price, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Pursell.

Mr. Rahall, Mr. Ratchford, Mr. Regula, Mr. Ritter, Mr. Roberts of South Dakota, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Roe, Mr. Rose, Mr. Roth, Mr. Rousset, Mr. Rudd, Mr. Russo, Mr. Santini, Mr. Sawyer, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Sharp.

Mr. Shelby, Mr. Shumway, Mr. Skeen, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Smith of Oregon, Mr. Smith of Alabama, Mrs. Snowe, Mr. Solomon, Mr. Spence, Mr. Stangeland, Mr. Stump, Mr. Synar, Mr. Tauke, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Trible, Mr. Volkmer.

Mr. Walker, Mr. Wampler, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Weber of Minnesota, Mr. White, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Whittaker, Mr. Williams of Ohio, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Winn, Mr. Wolf, Mr. Wolpe, Mr. Won Pat, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Yatron, Mr. Young of Missouri, and Mr. Zefteretti.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

mentation of the Federal Crop Insurance Act of 1980.

"No" on rollcall No. 49—H.R. 2098, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to establish offices of inspector general in certain departments and agencies.

"No" on rollcall No. 50—H.R. 2979, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 1982-83.

"No" on rollcall No. 51—Conference report to House Concurrent Resolution 115, first concurrent resolution on the budget, fiscal year 1982.●

BRINGING THE VIETNAM VETS HOME

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I referred on the floor to an article which appeared in the June 1 issue of Time magazine. I believe this essay, by Lance Morrow, clearly describes the current mood of the country, the plight of the Vietnam veteran and the continuing need for support from the Congress for those who served during our last and longest war.

BRINGING THE VIETNAM VETS HOME

(By Lance Morrow)

For a long time now, the chief ceremonial function of Memorial Day has been simply to inform Americans that their summer has begun. Of course, residual touches of drumthumping Americana still cling to the occasion—men in deep middle age parading up and down the holiday, strutting the flag. It is a formal rite of remembering, but remembering at a major distance. In their V.F.W. or American Legion caps the old soldiers have long since made peace with their generation's war. They have worn their memories of combat smooth with the retelling. They have grown easy with what they did for their country as young men; they won, and they are proud of it. The horrors that they saw—or performed—so long ago in other countries have been effaced by time, by the approval of history and of the nation they fought for.

The soldiers who fought America's latest and longest war, in Viet Nam, do not participate very often in Memorial Day parades. The U.S. has not developed a moral context for them yet, and no one parades without a moral context. A nation does not fondly celebrate the memory of its convulsions.

Viet Nam arrived in the American mind like some strange, violent hallucination, just when the nation was most prosperous and ambitious, shooting spaceships at the moon. Sweet America cracked open like a geode. The bizarre catastrophe of that war shattered so much in American life (pride in country, faith in government, the idea of manhood and the worth of the dollar, to begin the list) that even now the damage has not yet been properly assessed. When the country came to, some time in the mid-'70s, it was stunned. In moral recoil from the military failure and the huge, lurid futility of the excursion, Americans did a hu-

manly understandable thing: they suppressed the memory of Viet Nam. They tried to recover from the wound by denying it.

But of course the veterans of Viet Nam were tangible evidence, the breathing testimony, that it had all been humiliatingly real. Whether walking straight or riding wheelchairs, whether prospering at their work or glaring out at the rest of the nation from a daze of rage and drugs and night sweats, they reminded America that the war had cost and that it had hurt. For years, at least some part of every Viet Nam veteran has inhabited a limbo of denial—the nation's or his own—often overcome by guilt and shame, and almost always by anger. Among other things, he has tended to think of himself as an awful sucker to have risked so much for so little. Most veterans (contrary to stereotype) have readjusted reasonably well to the civilian world. But many found that coming home was harder than fighting the war.

After World War I and World War II, the soldiers returned together with their units; they had the long trip back in which to hear each other's confessions and apologies. And of course the piers in New York or San Francisco were crammed with waiting wives and children, the grateful nation craning to get a look at its boys, its heroes. During Viet Nam, in keeping with an almost sinister Government tendency to treat the war as an elaborate bureaucratic illusion, the military shipped people out alone and brought them back alone. The process caused surreal dislocations: one day in a firefight in I Corps, the next day standing on the American tarmac somewhere, as if nothing had happened. One veteran remembers the awful solitude of homecoming: "They let us off on the Oakland side of the Bay Bridge. I had to hitchhike to the San Francisco airport because of a transit strike." The Americans who fought in Viet Nam responded when their country asked them to give up their freedom and possibly their lives to do violence in the name of something the Government deemed right. Veteran Ron Kovic's painful book "Born on the Fourth of July" described how the image of John Wayne unreeled in the adolescent mind functioned as recruiting poster and subliminal role model. In any case, they went. But psychically at least, the country did not want them back.

Now that may be changing. A new attitude seems to be developing, in both Viet Nam veterans and the nation at large. Americans seem more disposed than at any time in the 13 years since the Tet offensive to admit that the Viet Nam veterans have borne too much of the moral burden for a war that went all wrong. If there is a burden to be carried, it should be assigned to the men who conceived and directed the war; or, more broadly, it should be shared—in the most profound exploration of which they are capable—by all Americans, including those who went to Canada.

The denial has been peeling away slowly for several years. An odd breakthrough occurred last January after the extravagantly emotional, almost giddy welcome home that America staged for the 52 hostages from Iran. The nation was an orgy of yellow ribbons and misting eyes. But then, a few days later, a countertheme surfaced. Viet Nam veterans watched the spectacle of welcome (the routes of motorcades lined with cheering, weeping Americans, the nation glued to its TV sets, the new President doing the hostages proud in the Rose Garden), and their years of bitterness boiled up to a

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on May 19-20, 1981, I unavoidably missed five votes due to a prior commitment. I was paired on each vote but only received a live pair on rollcall No. 51. The following indicates how I would have voted had I been present.

"No" on rollcall No. 47—House Resolution 133, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the lifting of martial law in the Philippines is a positive development and that this step should be followed by further progress toward the restoration of democracy in that nation.

"No" on rollcall No. 48—S. 730, to insure necessary funds for the imple-

choked cry: "Where the hell is my parade?" The nation, flushed from its somewhat too easy outpouring over the hostages, began acquiring the grace to admit that the Viet Nam veterans had a point.

Perhaps, too, enough history has passed to allow the country to proceed to the next stage, to acknowledge the Viet Nam veterans without setting off a civil war or a national nervous breakdown. Fresh history has added a few new perspectives. Ronald Reagan, who last August described Viet Nam as a "noble cause," nonetheless proposed to eliminate \$691 million in benefits for the Viet Nam veterans, including \$30 million for the 91 valuable and even lifesaving storefront veterans' counseling centers around the country. Congress will probably save the counseling centers and some other benefits, and lobbying groups like the Viet Nam Veterans of America may find allies now among the voters who were not there before.

It is difficult to generalize about the Viet Nam veteran. The TV scriptwriter's vision in the '70s pictured him as a damply sweating craze-junkie who would erupt toward the end of the plot line and grease half of Southern California. A veteran named Glen Young took an elevator to a job interview recently and had a fellow passenger ask: "Are you one of the baby killers?"

A comprehensive group portrait of the veterans has become available in the past few weeks. The Veterans Administration has published a five-volume study of Viet Nam veterans by the Center for Policy Research in New York City. Viet Nam veterans, the study concluded, have been paying a disproportionate social price for their experience. The war tore loose the wiring in many of their lives.

But it is a mistake to view all Viet Nam veterans as profoundly troubled, as walking wounded. About half of the veterans, the study found, still carry disturbing, unsettling psychic baggage from Viet Nam. Even so, most cope pretty well. Americans may now be too quick to indulge in a "Lo, the Poor Vet" rhetoric. Dr. Arthur Egendorf, a Viet Nam veteran and a psychologist who was a principal author of the study, points out that those who pity Viet Nam veterans simply relegate them to the role of victim (which is not much help to the veterans). Liberals use their pity to help prove that the war was wrong. Some veterans, denied respect, make do with pity, and even trade on it. But that is sad.

Was the Viet Nam experience unique for those who fought it? History would have to go on a manically inventive jag to top Viet Nam for wild, lethal ironies and stage effects—"a black looneytune," writer Michael Herr called it in his Viet Nam masterpiece "Dispatches." Indochina became the demented intersection of a bizarrely inventive killer technology (all of those "daisy cutters" and carpet-laying B-52s and mad swarms of choppers and infra-red nightscopes) with a tunnel-digging peasantry in rubber-tire sandals: the amazing, night-dwelling Victor Charlie.

Still, Viet Nam was not unique in its effects upon the men who fought there. From Odysseus onward, almost all soldiers have come back angry from war. And they have had problems. In Elizabethan England, a disbandment of armies automatically meant a major increase in the number of thieves and highwaymen preying on civilians. In fact, veterans are almost always treated badly after a war, even if the brass bands do turn out for a ceremonial welcome home.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

During the '20s, the windows of the nation's pawnshops were filled with soldiers' medals for heroism from the Great War. Catiline, Hitler and Mussolini constructed their sinister power bases upon the grievances of veterans.

The fact is that fighting a war, any war, is a grisly, shattering business. Many men take years to recover from it; many never do. Curiously, societies almost always neglect their veterans for the first ten years after a war. Then the veterans get themselves organized into a political force (like the Grand Army of the Republic after the Civil War or the V.F.W. and American Legion after World War I) and politically extract the benefits and pensions that civilian gratitude or pity never got around to bestowing.

But Viet Nam was different from other American wars in one crucial respect: the U.S. lost it. When a man soldiers on the winning side, the social contract of arms holds up; the young conscript is asked to endure all discomforts of the field, including death, but if he returns, the grateful nation (though it may soon grow indifferent) promises at least a banal ration of glory, a ceremonious welcome, the admiring opinion of his fellow citizens. Sometime between Tet and the last helicopter off the embassy roof in 1975, America threw away its social contract with the soldiers and left them to struggle back into the society as best they could. A lot of them have still not made it.

But Americans can renegotiate the contract, can extract lessons and meaning from the disaster. They might begin by trying to help Viet Nam veterans restore their lives. Many veterans say that it is too late for rhetoric, too late for symbols such as the Viet Nam Veterans Memorial that will be built not far from the Lincoln Memorial next year. Such vets want concrete help: more assistance finding jobs, more time to use the G.I. Bill. They should get it. There is something notably irresponsible about a Government that dispatches its young to be chewed up in an obscure land and then does not know their names when it all goes bad. Among other things, that sort of disloyalty may make it difficult to recruit the young for future military enterprises.

But symbols and rhetoric are also incalculably important. The hostages' return last January, with its powerful, complex effects, was all ceremony and TV. Many veterans want chiefly to be thanked for what they did, for doing as their nation asked. They crave an acknowledgment, a respect from their fellow Americans that they have never had and may never get. The victor always gets respect, even if it is of a shallow and predictable kind. The veterans of Viet Nam are entitled to a deeper, different respect: the kind that goes to someone who has endured deep anguish, even failure, and survived.

Viet Nam still chokes Americans. The nation will not recover from it, or learn from all of that slaughter and guilt, until it acknowledges that the men who fought the nation's first teenage war (average age: 19.2 years) did not cook up that war themselves in a mischievous moment. That was all of America out there. "It was a collective enterprise," says Dr. Egendorf, "and we were all damaged by it. A family melodrama is still going on. Sometimes a psychologist cannot treat the individual alone; he must see the whole family together."

America lost 56,480 men in Viet Nam, the last irreclaimable body count. The nation also misplaced many thousands of men and women who did make it home. To embrace

May 28, 1981

them now may be a complicated, belated and awkward exercise, but it should be done—done with a clear historical eye, without pity or jingo or other illusions. It would mitigate an injustice and might even improve the nation's collective mental health. It would help to settle America's tedious quarrel with itself. Americans should be able to repeat Robert Lowell's line in a calm inward murmur: "My eyes have seen what my hand did."

CHARLES A. COLLIS: A TRIBUTE FOR SERVICE IN THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge a very special honor being conferred upon Mr. Charles A. Collis, a constituent, and generous benefactor to his native city, Taunton, Mass. On Tuesday, June 2, 1981, Mr. Collis is being inducted into the Direct Selling Hall of Fame, the highest honor the National Direct Selling Association can bestow on an individual in the direct selling industry.

Recognition is based on an individual's contributions to the industry and the association; personal achievement, stature and reputation; business and civic accomplishments, and overall leadership and inspirational qualities. Mr. Collis is being honored for his high level of achievement in all of these areas.

Held in the highest esteem by his colleagues, Mr. Collis exemplifies the best of the direct selling industry: he is an American entrepreneur in the truest sense of the term. In 1963 he founded Princess House, Inc., a North Dighton, Mass., firm which manufactures decorative accessories marketed by independent salespeople. Mr. Collis' corporate accomplishments are impressive. In 15 years he built Princess House into a multimillion-dollar firm which Colgate-Palmolive Cos. purchased in 1978. Princess House continues to grow and prosper, reflecting Mr. Collis' lasting legacy to the firm.

While at Princess House, Mr. Collis fostered a family atmosphere among his employees, gaining their respect and admiration. In gratitude for his concern and caring, his employees contacted his alma mater, Dartmouth College, and established a scholarship fund in his name. Although no longer associated with Princess House, his longtime employees continue to contribute to the fund, demonstrating their continuing admiration for his generosity and good will.

Mr. Collis has great affection for his employees, the direct selling industry and its independent sales force, and American consumers. His concern,

however, reaches beyond these groups. Interested in the future of the country's youth, Mr. Collis contributed \$5 million to Dartmouth College in 1979. Part of that sum is being used to rebuild an undergraduate social center and to endow a professorship in history. The remainder will be used primarily for scholarships.

Mr. Collis' induction into the prestigious Direct Selling Hall of Fame acknowledges his spirit of American entrepreneurship, his stance for ethics and honesty in the marketplace, and his concern for his fellow man—all qualities held in high regard by the direct selling industry, which offers some 4 million income-earning opportunities to Americans each year and contributes \$9 billion annually to the national economy.●

A TRIBUTE TO JOE McCAFFREY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has worked on Capitol Hill in any capacity during the last quarter century is aware of the fine work done by Joe McCaffrey. As a reporter he has distinguished his profession; as a human being he has been a consistent source of wit and wisdom; and as a student of the Congress as an institution, he has diligently, accurately, and, at times, almost singlehandedly recorded the follies and failures, victories and successes, and day-to-day activities of the Congress.

What a great reporter he is. He has never fallen victim to the temptation to place himself either in or in front of his own news stories. When Joe is reporting news, you know it is news; when he is making personal commentary you know it is commentary. He is, to use one word I know he admires, a professional.

For these and many other reasons, Joe was recently awarded the Congressional Merit Award by Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill. In the past 20 years, this prestigious award has been presented only twice—in 1962 to the great satirist Mark Russell and in 1974 to the equally admirable Dev O'Neill, the well-known photographer-humanitarian.

It has been said of Joe that he does not simply read the news—he gets it, writes it, and loves it. My congratulations go to this old pro. When the fashionable excesses of what is called the new journalism are long forgotten, the professional integrity of Joe McCaffrey will be long remembered.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WESTCHESTER COUNTY, N.Y., PROCLAIMS PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE DAY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that today has been proclaimed as Prisoner of Conscience Day in Westchester County, N.Y. Today the people of Westchester are joining in expressing concern for the countless victims of human rights abuses around the world. Three Westchester chapters of Amnesty International actively work for the release of these Prisoners of Conscience, and I applaud this great humanitarian effort.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues Westchester County Executive Alfred DelBello's proclamation for Prisoner of Conscience Day, and a statement issued by the Westchester Chapters of Amnesty International:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the principles of social justice and personal freedom are both basic and essential to the survival of all people, and;

Whereas countless individuals throughout the world are now denied these simple rights solely on the basis of their religious or political convictions, and;

Whereas dedicated members of Amnesty International are generously rendering their talents and abilities in a concerted effort to secure the release of these prisoners of conscience, and;

Whereas the citizens of Westchester are both pleased and honored to unite in commending the members of Amnesty International for their individual and collective contributions.

Now, therefore, I, Alfred B. DelBello, County Executive of Westchester County, do hereby proclaim Thursday, May 28, 1981 to be Prisoner of Conscience Day in Westchester, and join all who live and work within this County in expressing heartfelt concern for these gallant victims.

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE WESTCHESTER CHAPTERS OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

The Honorable Alfred DelBello has proclaimed Thursday, May 28, 1981, Prisoner of Conscience Day in Westchester County.

Although this is the 20th Anniversary of Amnesty International, the three Westchester Groups are not celebrating. There is much work to be done.

Group 125—The Hudson Valley Group has two Prisoners of Conscience. Juan Solorich Skriller, a lathe operator in Uruguay was arrested 11/75 and sentenced to five years, the charges are not known, but probably because he was a member of an outlawed political party. He is believed to be in his 50's and his health is poor. Rikhard Spalin from the Soviet Union, a Seventh Day Adventist was arrested 9/78 tried 6/79 and sentenced to seven years in a labor camp. He was convicted of "anti-Soviet slander". Spalin is in his 40's and has some serious health problems. Amnesty International believes he is being punished for his religious convictions.

Group 154—Mid Westchester Group has one Prisoner of Conscience, Leon Yelome from Benin, West Africa. He is now 21 years old, a law student arrested 8/79 and is being held without charge nor trial. Conditions in prisons are poor and unsanitary. Amnesty International believes he was arrested because he expressed his views that were critical of the government of Benin.

Group 42—The Lower Westchester Group has two Prisoners of Conscience. Kang Eun Gi a South Korean printer arrested 3/80 tried and sentenced 5/80 to three years for printing a book about Kim Jae-Kyn who was the head of the KCIA who assassinated President Park. Conditions in South Korean prisons are not good. Mr. Kang, 39 years old now has frostbite on one foot. He is married and has two young children. Gintautas Lesmantas from the Soviet Union is a 51 year old journalist in Lithuania. He was arrested 3/80 tried and sentenced 12/80 to 6 years imprisonment in a severe corrective labor and five years internal exile for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda". Amnesty International believes he has been imprisoned for exercising his right to freedom of expression.

More than 120 Westchesterites receive one of the three group's mailings monthly. We are reminded daily that people suffer because of their human rights, and our faith calls upon us to affirm the dignity and worth of every human being. We hope more people become interested and have compassion, that some individuals, perhaps may have their freedom restored as a result of the continued efforts of Amnesty International.

In the past two years, there have been some successes. The Westchester Chapters of Amnesty International have helped to secure the release of Prisoners of Conscience from Argentina, Mali, South Africa, Syria and Yugoslavia. Anyone interested and wanting to help, please contact:

Group 154—Mid Westchester Amnesty International, c/o Mr. R. Millette, 40 Moore Avenue, Mt. Kisco, NY 10549.

Group 125—Hudson Valley Amnesty International, c/o Mr. Meyher, 293 Benedict Avenue, Tarrytown, NY 10591.

Group 42—Lower Westchester Amnesty International, Community Unitarian Church, 468 Rosedale Avenue, White Plains, NY 10605.●

LIMITING THE SERVICE OF PRESIDENT AND HOUSE MEMBERS

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation that would amend the Constitution, limiting the President and Vice President to one 6-year term, House Members to three 4-year terms, and Senators to two 6-year terms.

This concept is hardly new. In fact, the idea was first raised at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, and has been debated more or less regularly ever since. Our Founding Fathers, Mr. Speaker, never intended for congressional service to become a career. As

late as the mid-1980's, nearly half of all Members of the House retired after a single term. But this tradition is now dead. Today, only 17 percent of my distinguished colleagues are freshmen. I would like to see that figure substantially increased, for I believe that a regular infusion of new blood, and new ideas, would be more in keeping with what the authors of our Constitution had in mind.

Members of the Constitutional Convention also debated a proposal to limit the President to a single 6-year term. Although the idea was not then adopted, it has been suggested at intervals ever since. I believe that this proposal would remove political considerations from many Presidential decisions, since incumbents would not constantly be running for reelection.

Public opinion polls show, Mr. Speaker, that the idea of limiting Presidential and congressional terms continues to interest a large segment of the American people. And yet the Judiciary Committee has scheduled no hearings on any of these proposals. In fact, when my staff contacted the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, which theoretically has jurisdiction in this area, staff members there could not even remember when hearings were last held on this subject.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is a simple one: When are we going to act? How much longer can we ignore this issue? I call on the Judiciary Committee to conduct a comprehensive study of this question. We have talked long enough. Now is the time to act. ●

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM IN PERIL: EMERGENCY LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed student loan program, a major source of college financial aid to millions of students in this country, is in danger of collapsing unless measures are taken to delay any changes in the program until October 1, 1981, instead of the proposed July 1, 1981, being pushed by the administration.

This student loan program today provides one out of every four college students with assistance and has opened the door to educational opportunity for countless citizens since 1978 when Congress expanded the program to allow all students to be eligible for aid, regardless of their income. Today, nearly 3 million students are borrowing under this program which provides interest-free loans to borrowers while they are in school at below-market in-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

terest rates of 9 percent for borrowers after January 1 of this year.

As New York's senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee where this program originates, I have been an original cosponsor of all legislation effecting this program since my election to Congress in 1969. I have seen this program grow particularly since 1978, when income eligibility for loans was removed and lending jumped from \$2 billion to upward of \$7 billion today.

The unique nature of this program stems from its voluntary nature of participation by lending institutions. Congress has carefully built upon this program, most recently during its re-authorization through 1985 last year, to insure that lenders keep their doors open to students. In 1979, I introduced similar emergency legislation which removed the "cap" placed upon the subsidy paid to lenders by the Federal Government when skyrocketing interest rates threatened to close down the program. Today, we are faced with a similar emergency situation: The need to postpone changes in this program to insure lender participation during the busiest period of the year; the quarter before students return to school for the coming academic year.

Under the provisions in the budget, approved by Congress and which I strongly opposed, we are required to effect substantial savings in the programs under the jurisdiction of our committee. One of the largest of these is the guaranteed student loan program. While we are deliberating savings for this program which would be the least damaging to both lenders and students in the long run, we need to provide assurances to the lending community that they can continue to process loans without fearing changes in the program before October 1 of this year at the earliest.

The need to delay these changes has been echoed by the higher education community in testifying before a Senate subcommittee last week on the implications for the program if changes occur before October 1. Their comments on this subject all reflect identical concerns: History has proven that such short notice for such vast changes in a program the size of the student loan program would be administratively impossible, like our experience in 1972 which resulted in a near-closure of the program.

In the weeks ahead, we on the Education and Labor Committee will be facing the painful task of reducing the costs of the guaranteed student loan program while at the same time preserving the function of the program: To provide financial aid to students who truly need it in order to complete their education.

This bill, House Joint Resolution 259, is an important step in preserving this vital program and I urge my col-

leagues to join in support. For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to insert the text of this bill into the RECORD.

H.J. RES. 259

Joint resolution to express the intention of Congress to make no legislative changes in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program which would be effective prior to October 1, 1981, and to prohibit the Secretary of Education from taking any action to make any administrative changes in that program prior to such date.

Whereas the applications for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program for fall semester of 1981 are currently being processed;

Whereas banks and other lending institutions that participate in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program do so on an entirely voluntary basis and reduce their participation in the program when Government red-tape increases;

Whereas changes in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program which might retroactively affect loan guarantees for loans currently being processed will drive lenders from the program and delay disbursements to students and their families during the critical summer and early fall periods when the greatest volume of applications for student loans under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program occurs;

Whereas the steps necessary to make any significant changes in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program effective (including revision of regulations, publication and comment, reprinting of forms, changes in administrative procedures, and notification of all parties of legislative modification) precludes implementation of changes in the program before October 1, 1981, at the earliest;

Whereas in 1972, Congress attempted to impose immediate program changes in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program which resulted in a near total shutdown of the program because most lenders simply withdrew from participation, requiring emergency legislation to delay the effective date of the changes; and

Whereas, to prevent a repeat of the 1972 shutdown of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, the lending community must be assured that such changes will not be effective before October 1, 1982; Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) it is the sense of Congress that no legislation that would make changes in operations of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program before October 1, 1981, should or will be enacted; and

(2) the Secretary of Education shall not promulgate any rule, regulation, order, schedule, or amendment thereof which has the effect of making changes in the operations of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program before October 1, 1981. ●

MR. CHARLIE TILLMAN

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1981, Mr. Charlie Tillman ended

his 4-year term on the Alameda, Calif., City Council. Mr. Tillman, retiring at the age of 74, has been both an inspiration and a driving force behind innumerable projects started and completed in Alameda in the last 4 years.

But Charlie Tillman does not end his years of dedicated service by his retirement last week. He will, for the next 3 years, serve on the California Commission on Aging, appointed by California Assembly Speaker Willie Brown. And I am honored to say that he will also serve as my appointee to the White House Commission on Aging to be held here in Washington next November.

Mr. Charlie Tillman's unending dedication and enthusiasm should serve as an example to us all. He has done more for the city of Alameda than any could imagine, and he will be greatly missed. It has been my privilege to know Charlie, and I know of a great many others who share my sentiments in wishing him well.●

THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, while the administration's concerns on domestic affairs are directed to improving the Nation's economy, there is a major centerpiece of the Nation's environmental law—the Clean Air Act—which demands the attention of this administration. The Clean Air Act expires September 30, 1981. There is no question that this act has a profound effect on the Nation's economy, jobs, energy production and, of course, the need to protect the environment and public health of the American people.

I wish my colleagues to be aware of concerns I have as expressed in my letter to President Reagan regarding both the question of timing by the administration in transmitting its proposal to Congress and the question of who within the administration is preparing his recommendations on the act. The letter follows:

HON. RONALD W. REAGAN,
The President, the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A few days ago the Acting Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Mr. Walter C. Barber, Jr., informed the Committee that the Administration has set June 30, 1981 as the target date for submission to Congress of proposed legislation to amend titles I, II, and III of the Clean Air Act.

While I appreciate the need for the new EPA Administrator and other top officials in the Administration to have time to acquaint themselves with the Act, implementing regulations, and the program in general, delaying the submission of the Administration's legislative recommendations until June 30 gives me great concern. Vice Presi-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

dent Bush's March 4 letter to Congressman Clarence J. Brown concerning the steel tripartite legislation states that the Administration was at that time "in the process of preparing legislation." My impression was that it would be ready in a manner of weeks, not months.

In the first place, the House will be in the middle of the Independence Day recess on June 30 and will not return until July 7. Thus, hearings on the Administration's proposals could not begin until after July 7. They will certainly require several days. This delay will put off Subcommittee markup until mid-July or later and would probably ensure that full Committee markup would not occur until after Labor Day.

This is unfortunate because at the urging of the Ranking Minority Members of the Committee and the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment a hearing schedule has been initiated which I support that in general contemplates completion of hearings in June. Such hearings have already begun. Adhering to this schedule would permit markup to begin early in the summer and make it possible to move the needed legislation through the House this year.

At the Joint House-Senate hearing in March on the National Commission on Air Quality's report, Senator Stafford, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, expressed the desire to adhere to a similar schedule.

The Administration's announcement jeopardizes that House-Senate schedule and makes it difficult to act "expeditiously" on its proposals as urged on March 4 by the Vice President.

Clearly, such a delay is not in the interests of the affected industries, their workers, or the public in general. Indeed, it may prove very detrimental to the environment and the economy. Both stationary and mobile source industries have serious time constraints placed on them which affect manufacturing and construction planning and costs and, of course, jobs.

I strongly urge that the Administration revise its schedule and transmit its proposals to Congress early in June. Such an acceleration should not be difficult, particularly now that the new EPA Administrator has been confirmed.

I am also concerned about reports that the Administration's legislative proposals regarding the Clean Air Act and the policies on which those proposals are based are being developed by the Secretary of the Interior and his Council on Natural Resources and Environment and not the EPA Administrator, who lacks cabinet status. She is not even a member of equal status on that Council. Recent Administration memoranda indicate that even at the working level the Office of Management and Budget and the Cabinet Council's Executive Secretary, Mr. Danny J. Boggs, apparently are having a greater input into the development of these legislative proposals than the EPA Administrator.

Clearly, the President is free to seek advice from his Cabinet and other Administration officials. However, responsibility for the administration of the EPA and the Clean Air Act is vested in the head of EPA, not Secretary Watt and his Cabinet Council. It is my hope that with Administrator Gorsuch confirmed, our Committee can look to her as the principal architect of the Administration's proposals and not be required to question Secretary Watt and the full Cabi-

net Council as well when the Administration's proposal is finally available.

I would appreciate your providing to me by June 1, 1981 assurances that the schedule will be significantly accelerated and that the EPA Administrator, not Secretary Watt, will have the lead role in developing Administration proposals.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.●

CONGRESSIONAL VIGIL ON SOVIET JEWRY

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, as part of the Congressional Vigil on Soviet Jewry I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the plight of Eitan and Alexandra Finkelshtein and their young daughter, Miriam.

Eitan Finkelshtein is a physicist and Alexandra is a biologist—oceanography. They are residents of Vilnius, Lithuanian SSR, U.S.S.R. They have been waiting for over 9 years to emigrate to Israel.

Eitan Finkelshtein, a member of the Lithuanian Helsinki monitoring group, has been trying to emigrate to Israel since 1971. He has not only been denied an exit visa but he has not been allowed to work in his professional field, physics, since he first applied for an exit visa.

The Finkelshteins are reported to be under constant surveillance, their telephone conversations monitored, and interrupted and their mail cut off.

Eitan has been active in the human rights movement and a contributor to the journal, Jews in the U.S.S.R.

Because of his concerns for human rights, because of his own desire to exercise the right to emigrate to Israel, Eitan Finkelshtein has lost his profession, been fired from even short-term menial jobs, and he and his family must live in virtual isolation.

This gross violation of human rights is the concern of all persons of good will the world over.

Whenever the free movement of people is denied, wherever the human spirit and free expression are restricted, in each instance that human dignity is degraded, then it is our obligation to speak out and to call attention to these violations of basic justice.

I do so today in behalf of the Finkelshtein family knowing full well that they are but one concrete example of an injustice which is repeated in other places and to other people.●

INTRODUCTION OF ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATION ON HEALTH MANPOWER PROGRAMS

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce H.R. 3723, the administration bill "to amend provisions of law concerned with health professions personnel, and for other purposes." Mr. BROYHILL, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, joins me as a cosponsor. While we are in general support of the administration's budgetary bottom line, we do realize that some worthy programs will be severely impacted by the proposal. Thus, we view the administration's bill as a starting point for discussions with all affected principals whose concerns are entitled to be heard.

The administration's rationale for the bill's enactment is embodied in Secretary Schweiker's May 15, 1981, letter of transmittal to the Speaker. The Secretary's analysis follows:

The draft bill would authorize appropriations of \$267,873,000 for fiscal year 1982, and "such sums as may be necessary" for fiscal years 1983 and 1984, for various health professions personnel authorities. A detailed summary of, and an authorizations table for, the draft bill are enclosed.

The primary objectives of the draft bill are to eliminate incentives for continued expansion of the capacity for training health professionals; promote an increase in the supply of primary care practitioners, provide incentives for health professionals to locate in underserved areas; ensure adequate access to financial resources for all students seeking a health professions education, and; target Federal resources on programs which promote other national priorities.

This draft bill is the result of a careful analysis of departmental programs within the context of restrained Federal spending. The role of the Federal Government concerning health professions personnel must change from its previous focus on increasing the aggregate supply of health professionals to a better targeting of the allocation of funds to projects of high national priority. Past Federal efforts have been successful in expanding the health professions training capacity of the nation. As a result, the current and projected supply of most health professionals should be adequate to meet the needs for health care delivery.

First, termination of capitation grants, and elimination of general construction grants and start-up assistance, would eliminate incentives for continued expansion of our health professions training capacity. However, short-term financial distress assistance would continue to provide grants to institutions experiencing serious financial difficulties and requiring assistance for achieving fiscal stability and managerial reforms.

Second, targeted support for primary care training (family medicine, general internal medicine, and general pediatrics) would con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tinue to promote increases in the supply of primary care practitioners. The location patterns of primary care practitioners approximate those of the general population. Training more primary care practitioners will therefore enhance our efforts to ensure adequate access to health care services.

Third, the expansion of the National Health Service Corps (NHSC) field strength to 2500 and maintenance of that level in the future would assist in meeting the health care needs of the most severely underserved areas. While new NHSC scholarships would not be awarded in fiscal years 1981 and 1982 (to slow the growth of the pipeline), new scholarships would be awarded in fiscal year 1983 to ensure a steady field size in the future. Continued support for the Area Health Education Center Program would encourage health professionals to locate in underserved areas and would provide them with the training necessary to provide services in those areas.

Fourth, the Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL) Program would be continued with modifications to ensure the availability of loan funds for all health professions students in the future. In addition, while no new capital contributions would be made by the Federal Government, health professions schools would be allowed to retain their Health Professions Student Loan (HPSL) and nursing student loan funds. These funds can be used by schools to meet the needs of students otherwise unable to obtain loans.

Fifth, a variety of other programs would be authorized to meet areas of high national priority including: preventive medicine departments and training, remote site training, allied health disease prevention and health promotion projects, veterinary medicine curriculum development, special projects for continuing education, and podiatry special projects. Support for nurse practitioner and advanced nurse training would be continued along with physician assistant training. The draft bill would also provide funding for nursing special projects.

We urge the Congress to give the draft bill its prompt and favorable consideration.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that enactment of the draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President. ●

NASSAU COUNTY'S 1980 SENIOR CITIZEN SPECIAL CONTRIBUTION AWARD WINNER

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, this past year, the Nassau County Department of Senior Citizens Affairs named Mr. Robert F. Bonner of Syosset as the recipient of the Nassau County Senior Citizen Special Contribution in 1980 Award.

Mr. Bonner has demonstrated an outstanding career in human and volunteer services. Since 1975, he has served as chairman of the advisory council to the Nassau County Department of Senior Citizens Affairs. His other activities include past involvement in the town of Oyster Bay senior

May 28, 1981

citizens program and numerous other volunteer organizations.

As May is the month during which Nassau County traditionally celebrates Senior Citizens Recognition Day, I am honored to join in acknowledging Mr. Bonner's glowing record of community service.

At this time, I would also like to take the opportunity to note that Mr. Bonner has been nominated for the New York State Senior Citizen Special Contribution in 1980 Award. His extraordinary efforts of the past year in behalf of others, most certainly justify his nomination, and I extend every best wish for success in his pursuit on still higher honors.

Mr. Robert F. Bonner has done all Long Island citizens a great service through the example he has set. He has shown that, at any age, effort extended for the benefit of the community and individuals is exemplary and deserving of imitation.

I extend my sincerest congratulations to Mr. Bonner in fitting recognition of his many accomplishments, and I urge all citizens to share his philosophy of service and community involvement. ●

CHALLENGES TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE EIGHTIES

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, Lt. Gen. William R. Richardson, Commandant of the Army's Command and General Staff College, addressed the Midwest Research Institute as part of a series of lectures that it sponsors for the Kansas City metropolitan area. His topic was "Challenges to Our National Security in the 1980's". I found his talk to be an excellent review of our needs and goals for our national defense. His comments are helpful to us in our duties as Members of this body.

CHALLENGES TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE EIGHTIES

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a distinct pleasure and an honor to have been invited to speak to you today. It is important that we in the military take opportunities such as this to inform interested groups of the status of our Armed Forces.

Since World War II, the United States and the free nations of the world have been faced by a formidable and expanding Soviet war machine. In recent years western intelligence analysts have observed with increasing concern that the Russian armaments buildup has exceeded any possible need for defensive purposes. The invasion of Afghanistan a year ago has dispelled any doubts as to the motive for the Soviet actions and the aggressive nature of their foreign policy. It is clear that the Soviet Union now has the capability and the will to project power beyond its borders and even

the borders of the Warsaw Pact. A look at some force comparisons will amplify this:

On manpower, the Soviets have about twice as many men under arms as we do—about 5 million men, backed up by a trained reserve force of at least another 5 million who have served on active duty within the past five years.

The Soviet Army is comprised of 173 ground force divisions of which 97 are available within days to fight in Central Europe. Although our divisions are slightly larger, we have the equivalent of only five divisions in Europe. And even if all NATO forces were counted, the Warsaw Pact would outnumber us 2 to 1 in combat divisions, 3 to 1 in tanks, and 2 to 1 in combat aircraft. Additionally, the Soviets can concentrate at the time and place of attack, while NATO forces are spread from Norway to Turkey.

The Soviets have been able to achieve that advantage in numbers because their annual budget allocates about \$60 billion more to the military than does ours—more than double the percentage of GNP that we spend.

For many years we discounted the Soviets' growing superior numbers with the comforting thesis that the United States possessed overwhelming technological superiority and that Soviet quantity was offset by American quality. There is clear evidence that this is no longer true. In virtually every area of ground combat, the Soviets have fielded major materiel systems which equal or exceed the technological quality of our systems or those of our Allies. This is particularly the case in chemical warfare and tactical nuclear warfare capabilities.

While a direct confrontation and conflict with the Soviet Union is the most dangerous threat to our national security, it is not necessarily the one our Armed Forces will most likely have to fight. We live in a world which grows ever smaller and more dangerous. It is a world which has seen the emergence of Soviet surrogates and other Third World nation states whose economic and ideological interests run counter to our own—nations whose armed forces have been equipped with highly sophisticated weapons systems made possible by the sale of oil or other scarce natural resources. These weapons in the hands of intractable nations could pose a more immediate and less predictable threat than those of the Warsaw Pact in Central Europe.

In short, the challenges for the 1980's are unprecedented. We face a decade of potential conflict, and we in the Army must be prepared to meet those challenges.

To be effective in the decade ahead, we must accomplish four tasks, and they apply to the other Services as well. We must: man the force; modernize the force; train the force; and we must be prepared to mobilize for war. I will address each of these tasks in turn.

Manning the force is a major challenge today. As a people we have decided that our Nation will be defended by volunteers. The All Volunteer Force was begun with the assumption that if soldiering were to be made competitive with employment in the civilian job market, military pay and benefits would have to be increased and maintained at commensurate levels. While pay inequities today are the major concern, other significant recruiting depressants exist.

In 1976, Congress eliminated the GI Bill, an attractive package of education benefits. This was accompanied by an increase in government funded educational programs with no military service obligation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Equal in importance to manning the Army is the critical task of modernizing the force to enable it to fight and win on the battlefield of the 1980's. The Army is now on the brink of the greatest modernization effort since World War II—the largest in our peacetime history. It is intended to achieve at least technological equivalence with the Soviets in fielded systems by 1985, and superiority by 1990.

Because our most dangerous potential adversaries have predominantly mechanized and armored units, much of our modernization effort has been designed to defeat that threat. I am speaking of such weapons systems as the XM1 Main Battle Tank which has demonstrated high cross-country mobility, the ability to shoot on the move with increased lethality, and superior crew protection. The companion Infantry Fighting Vehicle, which can itself defeat other armored vehicles, has mobility comparable to the XM1 tank and gives infantry the option to fight mounted or in the traditional dismounted role.

The division Air Defense Gun will replace today's totally inadequate systems. The Advanced Attack Helicopter is an all weather airborne tank-destroyer of unsurpassed quality. And the Blackhawk Utility Helicopter will improve tactical troop lift even in low density air environments like the Middle East.

Improvements in weapons systems are being accompanied by more versatile and lethal munitions for delivery by direct support field artillery.

We have a great potential for improving our battlefield performance through what is called Electronic Warfare. This can be a potent force multiplier. By that I mean an element of warfare which increases the combat effectiveness of a force by several times its normal value.

Advanced command and control radio equipment is being introduced into our tactical units. Aerial and ground mounted intelligence gathering and target acquisition sensors have greater accuracy and real-time data outposts.

As you can imagine, the bill for the modernization program the Army is undertaking will be substantial. Planned procurement for modernization during the 1981-1985 period is about \$33 billion, and an additional \$50 billion is required for full modernization.

To attain the best possible battlefield payoff for the dollars we are given, the Army is adopting a strategy of selective modernization. We are assessing which systems provide the best force multiplier effect and buying more of those or accelerating their development and production.

In addressing Army modernization to this point I have stressed the need for better materiel systems, but there are other dimensions to modernization. Prior to defining equipment and system requirements, there must be a concept of what is to be accomplished on the future battlefield and how that is to be done. Once that is established, then organizations to accomplish these tasks can be designed and necessary materiel systems can be identified, designed, and procured.

Recently, the Army has completed an effort of several years' duration to redesign the tactical forces to fight on potential battlefields in the coming decade. Because our potential adversaries are strongest in Europe, that war is the most dangerous scenario in which our Army might have to fight. Given America's global interest, how-

ever, there are many other places, in the world where we may have to fight on short notice.

We must, therefore, design flexible forces able to reinforce Europe or to respond to threats in Southwest Asia or elsewhere. Because of the distance from developed U.S. bases, rapid deployment can best be accomplished by air. The urgency of being able to respond to such a contingency has spurred the Army's effort to improve the force effectiveness of our light infantry divisions by still keep them air transportable.

Here again, technology is seen as offering the most promise in providing lightweight anti-armor systems, light high mobility vehicles, enhanced survivability, and new electronic warfare opportunities. This must be done without heavily mechanized units, which are difficult to transport quickly over long distances.

Modernization by the accession of new systems must be accompanied by a continuous program of maintenance of existing systems and the training and support facilities needed to sustain the forces which use them. In addition, we must provide our deployed forces with adequate stocks of ammunition, equipment to replace combat losses, and an adequate stockage of repair parts. Current levels in all three areas are woefully short today. For years, budget cutbacks have adversely affected these levels. This trend must be reversed and funding increased. Unless this is done, neither the present nor the future Army will be able to sustain itself in combat.

This brings me to the third major task facing our Army: Training the force. The main function of the Army in peacetime is the training of soldiers and units in the skills of combat so that when war comes we will be prepared to fight and win. The training of our soldiers begins on induction. In the Training Centers, the object is to convert a civilian into a motivated, disciplined, and physically fit soldier equipped with the skills needed to fight and survive in combat. The soldier must be shown that military service is an arduous and demanding experience in which success in battle can come only through each individual knowing how to do his job as a member of a team. The new soldier must be challenged to give his best, and higher standards are being required to make basic training tougher.

Upon graduation from the Training Center the soldier is assigned to a fighting unit either here in the United States or overseas. In the unit, individual skills are sharpened and more emphasis is placed on teaching the soldier how those skills must be integrated into the unit's mission as it prepares for combat. It is in our combat units that cohesion and stability become so important.

The ambitious modernization program I outlined previously carries with it some potential pitfalls in the area of training. Revolutionary technological advancements often outpace the ability of the human mind to control them. The potential for this exists in tomorrow's Army, where highly sophisticated weapons systems, electronic sensors and jammers, and necessary support equipment will be in the hands of the average soldier, nearly half of whom did not graduate from high school. Some of this problem can be engineered away. Still, there remains a substantial training challenge in mating man with machine in a way that allows the machine to be employed to its full effectiveness. We believe we are meeting this challenge quite well.

An associated problem is the expense and cost to the environment involved in unit training. Fuel and vehicular maintenance costs attendant to training have escalated sharply in recent years as has the cost of conventional ammunition. It is evident that new training techniques are necessary. The Army is placing greater emphasis on the use of training devices and simulations which may be as complex as a guided missile trainer or as simple as plastic ammunition which can be used close to troop living areas, thereby saving the cost of moving to remote ranges for small arms qualification. Simulations for unit commanders and staffs have also been developed. These are generally war games played on a mapboard in which the commander and staff are given a scenario and specific situation and mission. They are then required to perform the necessary estimates, analyses, and decision-making to conduct the battle.

Even with these advanced techniques, actual field training will still be the ultimate test short of war, and the Army must make the most of field training opportunities. The pinnacle of each mechanized and tank battalion's field training will be a trip every two years to the National Training Center, currently under development at Fort Irwin, California.

At the National Training Center a battalion task force will be able to draw equipment as though on a NATO deployment, then move into the field to perform tactical missions. There it will fight against a well trained force using Soviet tactics and replicated equipment. In live fire exercises the battalion will be able to maneuver against a moving target array which will also be designed to represent a Soviet force. By 1984 it is anticipated that 42 battalions per year will rotate through the National Training Center.

Our task to train the Army will provide one of our toughest but most exciting challenges. With proper leadership, it can have a big payoff. But an adequately manned force which has been properly trained and equipped with modern weapons is of limited value if it cannot be deployed to a theater of operations in a timely manner and sustained once there. This task is mobilization of the force, the fourth and last of the critical challenges.

Whenever we may be called upon to fight there will be some warning time. Initially, our response to either a reinforcement of NATO or deployment to a contingency area would be met with active forces now stationed in the United States. Because of the short warning time, force deployment will be by airlift, with the initial divisions going to Europe and drawing from pre-positioned equipment. If they deploy for actual combat, their home station set of equipment would be reallocated to Reserve units when they are mobilized.

Presently, most of our forward deployed forces have insufficient support structure to sustain themselves while fighting a high intensity war. Consequently, Reserve Component combat service support units must be quickly activated and deployed to provide the necessary wartime sustainment. The National Guard and Army Reserve are now more closely involved in national contingency planning than ever before. Nearly 60 percent of all Army units scheduled for deployment will come from the Reserve Components. To further compound the matter, our Navy and Air Force presently have insufficient assets to support a prolonged ground war in Europe, and recent events in South-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

west Asia have aggravated this shortfall. Because of the absence of pre-positioned stocks and equipment in such areas as the Persian Gulf, increased reliance on airlift and fast shipping will be required to alleviate this problem.

Thus far I have spoken about mobilization in terms of raising and deploying forces. Of equal importance is the mobilization of the industrial base, both the government owned factories and ancillary demands.

The Soviets maintain an active production base by turning out thousands of planes and armored vehicles every year. Ours is considerably less active and does not have the capability to ramp up quickly.

A collateral problem is the aging of the Army's industrial plant equipment, where metal cutting and forming tools are exceeding their useful service life. Limited suppliers for large forgings and castings, the shortage of components such as bearings and integrated circuits, and a scarcity of critical raw materials all detract from what little industrial capacity exists. The nation's transportation system also must be revitalized in order to quickly move troops and material to sea and aerial ports of debarkation.

These, then, are the four major tasks which must be accomplished in this decade if we are to have an Army capable of defending this nation's interests throughout the world. We are a proud Army willing to face the challenges ahead, but these challenges are not the private domain of the armed forces. They are challenges which demand a national consensus.

As George F. Will has said, "Armies don't fight wars, nations fight wars." A fighting force with a will to win springs from a collective national will. The preparation needed to win future conflicts will demand a sense of national purpose and a willingness by our citizens to make sacrifices for the betterment of our collective security.

You and I and our government must be willing to sacrifice something today to ensure our security tomorrow. British Air Marshal, Sir John Slesser, put it best some years ago when he said, "It is customary in the democratic countries to deplore expenditures on armaments as conflicting with the requirements of social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free." ●

TRIBUTE TO REESE WALTON

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in August of this year, the city of Hawthorne, Calif., loses one of its most dedicated public servants, as Hawthorne School Superintendent Reese Walton retires after 34 years in the city's school district.

Reese is in a rare position to understand the critical importance the public school system has in today's society, for he has had experience in all levels of the educational process, from student to superintendent. After graduating with a B.A. in history from Centenary College in Shreveport, La., Reese headed west to teach seventh and eighth graders at Hawthorne In-

termediate School. Three years later he moved on to become principal of Hawthorne's Washington Elementary School, and in 1952 he was promoted to the position of administrative assistant for the Hawthorne School District. Although busy with his career, Reese still found the time to complete a master's program in education administration at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, receiving his M.S. in 1955. The previous year he had received yet another promotion, this time to assistant superintendent of the Hawthorne School District. He held this position until 1961, when he obtained his present position—superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, Reese has been an extraordinary asset to the Hawthorne School District; however, aside from the significance his public role has for society's welfare, the private Reese Walton has been an exemplary citizen of his community. Let me list a few of his activities and achievements: member of the Centinela Valley YMCA Board of Directors, president 1962-63; member of the Rotary Club of Hawthorne, president 1967-68; member of the Southwest Community Health Clinic Association Board of Directors; member of the Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce; permanent director of the Oliver McCammon Memorial Scholarship Foundation; member of the Hawthorne Art and Cultural Society Board of Directors; member of the Hawthorne Memorial Center Corporation Board of Directors.

He has also been the recipient of several honors and awards, including the Hawthorne Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award for Outstanding Community Service in 1955; the Centinela Valley YMCA Man of the Year Award in 1960; and the Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year Award in 1975. The citizens of Hawthorne are certainly fortunate that Reese is staying in the city following his retirement, so that they will be able to continue to benefit from his service.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating and thanking Reese, along with his wife, Jo, their children, Mary Ann Martin and Betty Walton, and their grandchildren, David and Steven. ●

VELMA GREEN AND TENNESSEE VOLUNTEER GIRLS' STATE PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 30, the 35th annual Volunteer Girls' State program, held under the auspices of

Tennessee's American Legion Auxiliary, will convene and will run through June 5, 1981. Approximately 500 young women who are seniors in high schools from across Tennessee will gather for the instructional week which will focus on the development of a more effective government, the promotion of good citizenship, and the importance of leadership. The delegates from all 95 Tennessee counties are selected on the basis of interest in government, character, scholarship, leadership, and community participation. The girls will elect officials on the city, county, and State levels with the election of a Girls' State governor as a high point of the week.

Mrs. William Edgar (Velma) Green has served untiringly and unselfishly as director of Tennessee's Girls' State for the past 25 years. Mrs. Green serves as an outstanding role model for some 10,000 young women who have graduated from Tennessee's Girls State under her direction. She has demonstrated to them by her own community involvement, optimism, joy in living, assertiveness, leadership qualities, and success that women can and must strive for the betterment of their government, their lives, and their community, State, and Nation. In addition to her year-round work with Girls' State, Mrs. Green continues to be active in numerous other volunteer and community service projects. Mrs. Green is currently the president of the Lewisburg, Tenn., Pilot Club, president of the Marshall County Home Demonstration Club, and she serves as executive secretary for the Marshall County Red Cross, a position which she has held for over 20 years. She is active in the American Legion Auxiliary and has served as past president of Tennessee's State American Legion Auxiliary. In addition, she has served as president of the Lewisburg Garden Club and the Marshall County Women's Club. Mrs. Green has been an involved supporter of the PTA for over 40 years and has held both State and national offices. She is also a member of the Town and Country Home Demonstration Club, the Federation of Garden Clubs, and the Lewisburg Music Club.

Mrs. Green is married to William Edgar Green, Sr., and is the mother of two sons, Tom and William Edgar, Jr. She has five grandsons, and one granddaughter who will be a Volunteer Girls' State delegate this year. The achievements, activities, and leadership demonstrated by Mrs. Velma Green are exemplary of the attributes Girls' State tries to teach its citizens and she is to be commended for her service.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AID FOR THE STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, today the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 3520, the Steel Industry Compliance Extension Act. I wholeheartedly support this legislation, for I believe that it will provide a much-needed boost to our beleaguered steel industry.

The effect of H.R. 3520 is to free up capital that steel companies would otherwise have to spend for pollution abatement. These funds can now be used for the modernization of plants and equipment. The bottom line, of course, is that this will result in more efficient plants and more American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the product of a coalition of representatives from industry, labor, and environmental organizations. These groups succeeded in reaching a consensus as to the best method of aiding the steel industry without undermining the intent of the Clean Air Act. I sincerely hope that this cooperation continues, for without it, the difficulties that U.S. steel producers are experiencing in their competition with Japanese and European steelmakers will continue.●

FEDERAL AID TO MASS TRANSIT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have addressed my colleagues on the subject of mass transit and the desperate need for increased Federal commitment to our public transportation network. Such an investment by the Federal Government means jobs, increased mobility for all Americans, improved quality of the environment, a healthier economy, and energy conservation.

The fiscal year 1982 budget revisions submitted by the President propose a drastic Federal retrenchment in the area of mass transit, especially with regard to operating assistance. The administration has proposed that by 1985, mass transit operating assistance will be eliminated.

I submitted the following statement to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation during its deliberations on the fiscal year 1982 budget for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration. The statement indicates my concerns about the administration's cuts in mass transit aid and the devastating effects which these

budget reductions will have on the New York metropolitan commuter rail, bus, and subway systems as well as other systems across the country. I urge my colleagues to consider the grave consequences of these budget cuts during upcoming deliberations on the critical mass transit programs.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to submit a statement on the fiscal year 1982 budget for the programs of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

I represent Westchester County, New York. One-hundred and sixty-six thousand Westchester residents travel the 224-mile Hudson, Harlem, and New Haven commuter rail lines each day. My district is served by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the largest public transit system in the country. The health of that transit system will dictate the economic health of my communities and of New York City as a whole.

SECTION 5 OPERATING ASSISTANCE

The fiscal year 1982 budget revisions submitted by the President propose drastic and disastrous changes in the Section 5 operating assistance program—changes which will be devastating for the MTA system and for virtually all transit systems across the country. The President has proposed that beginning in 1983, operating assistance funds will be phased out until 1985 when they will be eliminated—a \$1.5 billion reduction in Federal spending. This action by the Federal Government will result in increased fares, reduced services, increased State and local taxes, deterioration of the physical condition of our transit systems, traffic congestion, pollution, oil import increases and urban decay.

The Federal retrenchment in this vital area will force some transit systems to close down altogether. For many commuters, this drastic change in Federal policy will force them back to their cars. For those who continue to ride mass transit—many by necessity—the President's program will mean at the very least higher transportation costs and less convenience.

If \$1 billion of the President's cut in operating assistance for mass transit had to be recovered in the fare box, fares would jump an average of 37 percent nationwide, according to a study of the Regional Plan Association. The Regional Plan Association projected that fare increases would be roughly 15 percent in New York and more than three times that amount in small cities across the country contributing to hardship and inflation. The New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority is now projecting fare increases for this summer between 20 and 40 percent! Just this year, fares have already jumped in Chicago, Dallas, Miami, Milwaukee, Salt Lake City, Toledo, and Washington, D.C.

The same study by the Regional Plan Association indicates that if fares rose to cover the loss of Federal operating assistance, transit ridership across the country would drop by 11 percent, and 80 percent of these former riders would switch to the car. This would mean an added 2.4 billion miles per year in car travel and the burning of 167 million extra gallons of gasoline. U.S. payments abroad for oil would rise between \$445 million and \$650 million annually and the GNP would drop by as much as \$1.1 billion.

The Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which serves the New York metropoli-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 28, 1981

tan area and my constituents, will receive \$207.9 million this year in Federal operating assistance, accounting for 7 percent of the MTA's annual operating budget. Faced with shrinking budgets and rapidly deteriorating equipment, facilities, and shops, the MTA must turn to the transit rider and to the local and State governments to help cover Federal cuts in operating assistance. There are few other alternatives if the system has a chance of survival.

In a press conference on May 14 in which the Chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Richard Ravitch, released the contents of a letter to Governor Carey, Mayor Koch and legislative leaders, the Chairman set forth the grim realities of MTA's operating deficit. The Chairman's letter noted:

"Without regard to capital financing, the size of MTA's operating deficits is staggering. I have attached a memo showing that under the circumstances assumed therein, our operating deficit could be as much as \$383 million for the next Transit Authority fiscal year, and \$68 million for the commuter railroads, this year.

"This grim set of numbers reflects not only inflation, but unexpected revenue shortfalls, new maintenance and power expenses, and the apparent phase-out of Federal operating assistance.

"But let us look beyond our current fiscal predicament and place the growth of operating expenses and revenues in long-term perspective. MTA's basic operating budget, including both the Transit Authority and the commuter railroads, has grown to over \$2.5 billion annually.

With an assumed 10 percent inflation rate, MTA's operating costs will initially increase by \$250 million a year. In the absence of additional subsidies, our inflation-driven deficit would, through this decade, require automatic fare increases of approximately 20 percent a year—or twice the rate of inflation. This result is not only economically unacceptable, but socially unjust."

Seventeen years ago, in response to a perceived need to promote mass transportation and in the wake of failing private transit systems, Congress enacted the Urban Mass Transportation Act. This act was legislated to:

"* * * assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques and methods * * * to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development * * * and to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such systems, to be operated by public or private mass transportation companies as determined by local needs."

Today, with the President's proposal to eliminate the Section 5 operating assistance program, the Federal government is preparing to abandon its operating support of public transit systems, thereby severing a major part of its commitment to foster public transportation. This action will cripple urban economies across the nation. To quote, again, the words of the Chairman of the New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority, "The transit situation * * * represents an equally grave threat to our economy, the social equilibrium and the survival of the greatest city in the world."

I respectfully request the subcommittee to reject all proposals to eliminate Section 5 operating assistance and to support levels of funding which encourage and sustain the

operation and growth of our cities' mass transportation networks.

SECTION 3 DISCRETIONARY CAPITAL ASSISTANCE

It is my understanding that the Administration has proposed reduced levels of funding for the Section 3 program, to be achieved primarily by cutting the amount of Section 3 funds allocated for the construction of new rail transit systems and extending existing systems. Further, the President has indicated in his fiscal year 1982 budget revisions that the "central focus of the Federal transit assistance program in the future will be on the maintenance and improvement of existing, proven transit systems."

I have been advised that the President's proposed actions with regard to the Section 3 program will not adversely affect capital assistance to the Metropolitan Transportation Authority and to its commuter rail system which serves Westchester County. I am very pleased by this information since Westchester County has benefited immensely from the Section 3 program. The critical Upper Harlem electrification project, on which I have addressed this committee in the past, is being funded with \$40 million in Section 3 money. The urban areas of White Plains and Mount Vernon, New York, are depending on federal mass transit capital assistance for the construction of critical downtown mass transportation facilities.

While I am relieved that the President's decimation of the federal budget will not take its toll on capital assistance to my area, I must raise my opposition to the proposed reductions in Section 3 because the Administration's action to halt the construction of new rail systems and the extension of existing systems means a drastic federal retrenchment in an area so crucial to the future of our national economy and the environment of this entire nation. It is another step by the Administration in the destruction of the social fabric of this country.

I thank the subcommittee for allowing me to express my strong feelings on the subject of Federal assistance for urban mass transportation. I urge the subcommittee to do whatever it can to maintain the Federal commitment to mass transit.

Thank you.●

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1979, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks entitled "Paging Rube Goldberg." My remarks were directed at the energy policies of President Jimmy Carter which I said looked like one of those wonderfully zany contraptions created by cartoonist Rube Goldberg of happy memory. In the midst of those remarks I stated:

And what about this Central Intelligence Agency study the President refers to and which has been used to back up his fundamental thesis which is that we are running out of energy? For years now we have been hearing criticism of CIA studies on subjects in which that organization presumably has competence—but now we are asked to swallow a study in a subject about which the

CIA has as little expertise as any non-energy-related organization.

As I recall, my criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency report was viewed with alarm by members of the majority who ordinarily wouldn't say a pleasant word about that organization. After all, the CIA study was bolstering the President's scarcity psychology. So anyone who criticized the CIA's findings must be wrong.

It turns out that my criticism was correct and the CIA has finally admitted it. As the Wall Street Journal noted on May 21, 1981:

An honest mistake—The CIA has finally revised its 1977 estimate of Soviet oil production, conceding that it was too pessimistic back then when it predicted that the Russians would be net oil importers on a sizable scale by 1985. It seems now that the Soviets won't be out competing with other buyers on the world market for several more years yet. The 1977 estimates, widely challenged by independent experts at the time, did not enhance the CIA's credibility, coming, as they did, when President Carter was trying to scare Congress into adopting his grandiose energy program. But if the error then was more than just mathematical, we assume the CIA has reviewed that as well.

Mr. Speaker, the record is now set straight. President Carter's policies rested on a foundation of sand. But we already know that, do we not?●

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH—1981

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans month. As we approach the midpoint of this month which pays special tribute to this country's great national resource—its older people—whose wisdom, experience, and knowledge could be of immeasurable benefit to the service of humanity, we should note that older people are one of this country's few valuable resources which is increasing instead of decreasing in supply. Longer life has become a visible fact of everyday life. Today, America can boast of 35 million people aged 60 and over. Moreover, as a group, older Americans are increasing in numbers at a rate much greater than that of children and youth groups. Accordingly, aging in America has become a success story: the product of tremendous improvements in health conditions and medical technology. But, as with most success stories, there is another side of the picture. The demographic shift has resulted in short-sighted policies and practices which often stereotype and segregate older Americans.

Service programs have been established which do not adequately meet their needs, and age discrimination still exists which leaves this valuable resource underutilized and at times purposely avoided.

Age 65 is not synonymous with old. Today, age 65 is seen as one of the several stages of chronological evolution. The stage of "senior adulthood" begins at about 65 and may last 15 years; this is followed by a period of "elderhood" which may continue into the eighties or nineties, even indefinitely, if aging is overcome. The many accomplishments and contributions of older Americans, both known and unknown, serve as a continuing reminder that age need not signify decline and dependence. Alexander Fleming developed penicillin between the ages of 60 and 70 and thereafter provided humanity with the information for utilizing antibiotics. Winston Churchill, at the age of 67, carried on the business of government during the height of World War II, by consistently working until 3 a.m. and rising at 8 a.m. Konrad Adenauer was well into his eighties when he engaged in the difficult task of redirecting postwar Germany. Harriet Tubman, the black abolitionist, continued her freedom fight until her death at 93. Albert Schweitzer continued his dedicated and strenuous practice of medicine until shortly prior to his death at age 90.

As a member of the House Select Committee on Aging since its inception in 1974, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal, State and Community Services whose primary responsibility is the continuous study of the effectiveness of services to the elderly, and a member of the Select Education Subcommittee which has legislative jurisdiction over the only Federal social services statute designed exclusively for the elderly, the Older Americans Act, I feel a special pride in Older Americans Month.

It is not sufficient to pay tribute to great older Americans of accomplishment. It is also necessary to provide legislation, adequate funding levels, and service programs to insure that both our Nation and our older population can benefit from technological advances which have given them longevity. For this reason, I am proud to have played a key role on May 5, in the House Education and Labor Committee's reauthorization hearings which not only continued the act's programs and services at a funding level of about \$1.4 billion, but also developed the strongest possible bill. The importance of the Older Americans Act cannot be minimized. The act mandates the goal providing the elderly with access to the social and human services they need to remain independent. In addition, the act is directed to provide senior citizens with opportuni-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ties for full participation in the benefits of our democratic society. As the population in our maturing society shifts from younger to older, the demands on social service dollars will increase, thereby compelling Federal programs to be responsive to the social and human needs of our aging population. Increased longevity has resulted in both positive and negative implications for society. A twentieth century variation of the "fountain of youth" has been created by enhanced physical and intellectual longevity. However, major problems have been created which gerontologists and policymakers must face. We must now solve the problems of how to improve the lives of older Americans and to correspondingly insure that these demographic shifts are accurately reflected in the educational, economic, political, and human services systems.●

SILVER-HAIRED LEGISLATURE

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the West Virginia Commission on Aging is in the process of setting up a unique opportunity for senior citizens in my State. In November, the first silver-haired legislature will convene in Charleston, W.Va.

This legislature will be a model 3-day session, and will be comprised of 134 representatives, age 60 and over, elected throughout the State by their peers.

The silver-haired legislature will provide these individuals with an understanding of the legislature process. It will allow them to develop a forum for senior citizens to set their own legislative priorities, and it will educate the public and Government officials on the issues and concerns that affect West Virginia's older population.

The silver-haired legislature concept has already proven to be a success in eight States, and in some cases, silver-haired legislative bills have served as a basis for new State laws. For this reason, I would like to thank and commend the West Virginia Commission on Aging for organizing the silver-haired legislature so that senior citizens in West Virginia can have a similar experience.

The silver-haired legislature concept is an excellent forum for elderly citizens from diverse social, economic, and geographic backgrounds to determine their legislative priorities. Because they receive training and firsthand experience in drafting bills, determining costs, hearing testimony and floor debate, the bills tend to be reasonable,

realistic, and feasible responses to the needs of the elderly.

At a time when older Americans are facing severe hardships due to inflation and the elimination of important assistance programs, this silver-haired legislature will allow them to voice their opinions and to make their voices heard.●

NEW YORK COUNTY SURROGATE SPEAKS OUT ON CRIMINAL LAWS

HON. JIM JEFFRIES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, Marie M. Lambert, surrogate of New York County, New York, delivered a speech at the Annual Rapallo Award Luncheon in New York City on May 9, 1981. Miss Lambert has established herself in her profession with many noteworthy honors. She graduated from the New York University Law School not only first in her class but with one of the highest averages ever achieved at the school. She is past president of the New York State Trial Lawyers Association, associate editor of the Trial Lawyers Quarterly and Trial Lawyers News and a member of the board of governors of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. Miss Lambert has been honored by AMITA as the woman who contributed the most to the field of law in the United States in 1975, Woman of Achievement by NYU Alumnae Club in 1976 and received the Award of Merit from the New York State Trial Lawyers. With this background and experience, here remarks about our criminal laws are especially noteworthy and I would like to commend her words to my colleagues' attention.

Not only do we celebrate the Rapallo Award today but we also pay tribute to the State of Israel on the anniversary of its establishment. It is fitting that I should be honored today on Israel's anniversary day by the Columbian lawyers further establishing the solidarity between the Jewish and Italian community.

I am deeply honored today to be in such distinguished company and to be the recipient of this award named after one of our great Italian-American jurists. I am particularly honored because I am the first woman to receive it.

A look at the roster of previous recipients of this award constitutes a who's who of American jurisprudence and reflects the impact which Italian-Americans have had on the formulation of law and legal concepts. That impact is not surprising when one considers that centuries ago, Rome stood as the wellspring of legal precepts and theory. In the case of Italian-American contributions to law, the past is clearly prologue. I stand before you as one of a multitude of Italian-American jurists who wish to offer a new preception and direction to the

way in which the law, specifically our criminal laws, are both interpreted and applied.

In my brief tenure as surrogate, I have been witness to a countless number of probate proceedings which indicate the cause of death as homicide. In several instances, the legend "multiple stabbing" or "multiple gunshot wounds" stand as a grim reminder that the constitutional promise of life and liberty have, for many individuals, been rendered meaningless. It is undeniable that the primary purpose of government is to provide physical safety of its populace and that in this task, it has failed miserably. The newspapers and telecommunications media are daily testaments to the assaults and injuries which are inflicted on our citizenry. Each new assault brings with it details which were previously thought to be too gruesome and too horrible for us to contemplate.

The fear etched on the faces of the children of Atlanta is but a composite photograph of the fear which pervades the daily life of each American. Each mugging, rape, robbery and murder strikes not only the victim but the society at large which sees its fundamental principles violated and shattered.

As members of the bar and bench, it is our responsibility to define the problem and to propose a solution. In that regard, it is important to note that our fellow citizens view us, the lawyers and judiciary, as part of the problem. At no time in the history of our republic have lawyers and the legal profession been held in such low regard and esteem. While some may shrug this off as the mere whimperings of a pampered populace, others will recognize it for what it is—a damning rebuke to the rule of law as we have fashioned it. Rightly or not the public at large holds our profession responsible for the construction of a criminal justice system which they view as criminally lacking in justice. Certainly, many of the theoretical underpinnings used to justify our present system must be re-examined. The first underpinning which must be re-examined is our overwhelming preoccupation with protecting the rights of the violent criminal. Each police activity, whether it includes the right to stop and frisk a subject, the right to make searches or the right to take a confession has been circumscribed by rules and procedures which extend beyond the protection afforded by the constitution. The right to counsel, for example, has been extended beyond the accusatory stage of a criminal proceeding and has been held to apply to administrative correctional proceedings. Justice Holmes observed in a 1904 dissent case, "at the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny." While some may argue that it is better to allow ten guilty men to go free than to convict one innocent person, others may ask how many additional crimes those ten men will inflict on an already suffering public. What is undeniable is that our preoccupation with the rights of criminals has led to both justice delayed and justice denied. Innumerable delays and adjournments have often resulted in either the disappearance or death of crucial witnesses. A strict application of the exclusionary rule has resulted in the inadmissibility of evidence which could have been gathered by other sources. Lenient bail policies have returned to the streets those violent individuals who use them as stalking grounds in search of another victim. Lenient sentencing decisions have allowed convicted mur-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

derers to walk out of the courthouse with nothing more than the imposition of probation. Just this week, despite the pleas of the prosecutor, a 15-year-old received only three years probation for the murder of a child, recently, a man convicted of manslaughter was given only five years probation because he was in the judge's words, "a fruitful member of society." And six months later this same man brutally assaulted, maimed and almost killed another young man. As Justice Cardozo said in *Synder v. Massachusetts*, "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament, we are to keep the balance true."

For those accountants who wish to view only the bottom line, the figures reveal that 100,000 felony arrests were made in New York City last year. With a population of approximately seven million people, that means that one out of every seventy citizens is the yearly victim of a felony. When you extrapolate those figures to the longevity tables, each person in this room would theoretically have one felony committed upon them during their lifetime. If those numbers are not disturbing enough, you should be aware that these numbers take into account only reported crimes and arrests actually made. Countless rapes and robberies are not reported because the victims are too ashamed or do not wish to be bothered anymore with making endless trips to court. What is equally depressing is that only 5,000 indictments and approximately 1,000 convictions have resulted from the yearly criminal onslaught.

The second underpinning which we need to re-examine is the belief that all crime should be pursued and prosecuted with the same vigor. In order to make a dramatic impact on crime, we must set priorities and vigorously pursue those crimes which we view as most heinous. Each passing day recounts in detail the time, attention and dollars spent to apprehend the perpetrators of non-violent infractions of the law. While the enforcement of securities laws, the anti-trust laws and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act are important, they pale in insignificance besides the need to protect our citizenry from murder, rape and robbery. Under previous administrations, the FBI took an active role in the apprehension of bank robbers and car thieves. Today, it is the avowed policy of that agency to focus on "white collar" crime. Some individuals, after viewing the recent abscam convictions, might even argue that the FBI is in the business of inducing crime. Our resources and our efforts should be focused on the elimination of violent crime. In a society where limited resources have been allocated to the fighting of crime, we cannot afford the luxury of spending vast sums of money on nonviolent crimes or infractions of the law.

Finally, we need to re-examine the philosophies which have guided our theories of punishment. In the past, our correctional policies have been shaped in the belief that rehabilitation of the criminal is the most important goal. Educational programs, better facilities and the development of psychological and sociological counseling programs have been designed with an eye toward turning the criminal into a useful member of society. Any review of the figures concerning recidivist crime (that is, repeat offenders) shows that these policies are not working. While there may be a few criminals who can be reclaimed from the

junkheap of humanity, the focus of our correctional policies must be on deterrence and, even retribution. Why is it wrong to say that certain crimes are so heinous that society does not have the right to exact retribution? Is the death penalty so inappropriate when one considers the crimes that Richard Speck, John Gacy, Charles Manson, David Berkowitz and Sirhan Sirhan committed? I, for one, am appalled to see the killer of Robert F. Kennedy, a man who has changed the course of history, get ready to walk the streets after a mere fifteen years in jail. I am also appalled to see certain criminals achieve celebrity status as the press and media vie for their attention. Why should any individual be allowed a public stage to recount, gory by gory detail, the acts which resulted in their prosecution? Why must so many of our criminals be glorified and the victims vilified? A recent example being the late Allard Lowenstein whose memory has been defiled by a certain press columnist in order to glorify and justify the act of the perpetrator. Even the dead victim is not free of vilification.

If we are to achieve change in our criminal justice system, it is clear that we must re-examine the attitudes upon which many of our policies have been founded. No amount of money can correct a system which places such emphasis on the rights of criminals rather than victims. Like Gresham's Law, any new infusion of funds will throw good money down a system which neither prosecutes effectively nor punishes adequately. After guilt has been established, it is time to discard the traditional responses offered by many that crime is a circumstance which results from individuals being trapped in a cycle of poverty. Many, if not most, of us present here today are only one or two generations removed from foreign soil. Many, like me, can remember eating a boiled potato or an onion sandwich for dinner during the depression. Yet, the result of our deprivations was education and hard work, not crime. It is time for our society to stop uttering *mea culpas* and to start placing the blame where it belongs—on the criminal. It is time for our lawmakers to stop proposing symbolic change and to start addressing the fundamental problems. In that regard, the reimposition of the death penalty for the murder of our protectors would be both a substantive and constructive first step. Finally, it is time for all of us, the leaders of the legal community to lend every effort in support of those who seek to reorient our priorities and reestablish our goals. Our Nation is the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. Its history is marked by the fulfillment of principles which we hold dear. The first and foremost such principle is the right to life and to liberty. What is liberty if our storekeepers must close their doors before sundown and our citizens must bolt themselves inside their apartments? What is liberty if a casual word or glance can anger some psychopath into setting a token booth ablaze or shoving some helpless victim under the wheels of an oncoming train? What is liberty when every article of clothing or property which we don must be scrutinized so that it will not make us an alluring target to some criminal? The ability to live life and to exercise our liberties must be viewed through the prism of our right to have freedom from fear.●

May 28, 1981

RAY D. NIXON POWERPLANT

HON. KEM KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today, concern for clean air and clean water is a greater factor than ever before in the design and operation of electric power generation facilities, particularly coal-fired plants.

In this light, I would like to call the Ray D. Nixon Powerplant, owned and operated by the city of Colorado Springs, to the attention of the House.

The Nixon plant attacks the problem of both scarce water and discharge problems with a recycling system, designed by the engineering firm of CH2M Hill, that first purifies brackish water and then uses the water in the generation process; 95 percent of the water is recycled through a continuous loop system.

For a 200 megawatt plant, this is a substantial achievement, and one which resulted in the engineering firm of CH2M Hill receiving an honor award in the 1981 American Consulting Engineers' Council's Engineering Excellence Awards Competition.

For the West particularly, where water is scarce, this accomplishment may well promise a new approach to water use in power generation, and I wanted to share this achievement with my colleagues.●

CAP ON MEDICAID EXPENDITURES

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BROYHILL) and I have introduced the Reagan administration's bill to cap medicaid expenditures and further amend the medicaid and medicare programs. This legislation, the Health Care Financing Amendments of 1981, is designed to slow the growth of medicaid, provide needed flexibility in State program management and make other necessary changes.

A copy of Secretary Schweiker's transmittal letter appears below. We believe that this communication ably describes the thrust of the bill, and commend it to our colleagues' attention.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1981.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for consideration by the Congress is a draft bill "To pro-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

vide a ceiling on Federal expenditures for Medicaid, to increase States' flexibility to determine the scope of their Medicaid programs, to make other amendments to the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes." When enacted, the bill would be cited as the "Health Care Financing Amendments of 1981".

The draft bill would set a ceiling on Federal expenditures for Medicaid for fiscal year 1981 and succeeding fiscal years. Federal financial assistance for Medicaid would be limited to \$16,399,914,000 for fiscal year 1981, and \$16,995,308,000 for fiscal year 1982. For succeeding fiscal years, Federal funding for Medicaid would change by a factor equal to the Gross National Product Deflator. Federal funding for automated eligibility determination and Medicaid management information systems would be subject to a separate ceiling. Funds for State fraud control units, and funds to reimburse States' claims for program costs incurred before fiscal year 1981, would be outside the ceiling.

In order to enable States to control costs to the fullest extent consistent with maintenance of program quality, and to assure that States would not be forced because of the ceiling on Federal payments to absorb a greater share of Medicaid costs than under present law, the draft bill would repeal or modify many State plan and other statutory requirements. In addition, the Secretary would be authorized to waive other State plan requirements where he found that the waivers sought would be consistent with program goals.

The amendments proposed by this draft bill would greatly increase States' flexibility to determine the scope of their Medicaid programs and to assure that services are provided in an efficient and cost-effective manner, while continuing to safeguard the access of beneficiaries to an adequate supply of quality health services. States would be able to tailor their eligibility criteria, benefit packages, reimbursement methods, and plan administration to make the best use of the resources available to meet the needs of their population. To cite only a few examples, these amendments would permit States to reimburse hospitals, physicians, and other providers of services in a more prudent manner, to use competitive bidding to obtain the most economical services, and to limit coverage of optional benefits to certain groups most in need of them (for example by providing influenza immunizations only to those groups most at risk).

In addition, the draft bill would enact reimbursement and systems reforms to allow more efficient and economical administration of the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and would enact amendments designed to reduce fraud and abuse in these programs.

The draft bill's provisions are described in detail in the enclosed sectional summary. We estimate that a net cost of \$201,000,000 for fiscal year 1981 and a net savings of \$2,133,000,000 for fiscal year 1982 would result from enactment of the draft bill. A net cost, rather than net savings, for fiscal year 1981 results solely from repeal of the postponement (enacted by the last Congress) from fiscal year 1981 to fiscal year 1982 of certain periodic Medicare payments to hospitals. An estimate of savings and costs (by section) for fiscal years 1981 through 1986 is enclosed.

We urge that the Congress give the draft bill its prompt and favorable consideration.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that enactment of this

draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
Secretary.●

SCOTTS BRANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL OF RANDALLSTOWN, MD., VISITS NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 27, 1981, 74 young men and women from the Scotts Branch Elementary School in Randallstown, Md., journeyed to Washington for a firsthand look at their Nation's Capital.

These students toured the Capitol Building, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Smithsonian museums.

They were led by the following teachers and parents: Mr. Eugene Langbehn, Mrs. Janet Steinbach, Mrs. Beverly Matthews, Mrs. Jacqueline Foote, Mrs. Kathleen Kemp, Mrs. Susan Rubin, Ms. Elen Kline, Ms. Ruby Darby, Ms. Mae Williams, Ms. Foyce Foust, Ms. Esther Finkelstein, Mrs. Rona Schrum, Ms. Sharon Attaway, Ms. Shirley Prostic, Ms. Elaine Harrison, Ms. Marie A. Penn.

I am delighted these students have taken an interest in our Nation's political process, and I hope their interest will continue.

Students who visited us Wednesday are: Elwood Agent, Diane Arnold, Davia Bailey, Sharon Butler, Gennady Elgart, Jora Foote, Gary Gardner, Edward Heard, Adam Henderson, Frank Holquist, Gary Hurst, Carla Jones, Robert Kemp, Debbie Kushner, Kobi Logan, Dean Martin, Janisha Matthews, Janisha McDowell, Kim Murray, Kelly Nisbet, Larry Perrin, Laurie Rubin, Hope Schachter, Stephanie Smith, Jason Steinhorn, Michael Wells, Rochelle White, Jowanda Wright.

Other students are: Jin Bahk, Anthony Bush, Patrick Goonan, Paul Harrison, Rufus Heath, Carlos Jones, Dwayne Mitchess, Greg Ruck, Scott Stansell, Troy Harris, Richard Sheppy, Kim Brice, Kim Bridgeforth, Trina Brown, Wendy Chatman, Yun Cho, Desrie Darby, Erin Fishman, Kristie Mathews, Tara Roberson, Sherri Hendrix, Rita Lambert, Bernard Battie, Michael Brown, Naron Bryant, Jimmy Dodson, Timothy Gerald, Brian Hargest, Bruce Hendricks, Artie Pacheco, Stuart Rubin, Jacques Smith, Constantine Spivak, Shawn Wagner, Edward Watlers, Linwood Franklin, Yolanda Bell, Yolanda Budd, Katasha Davis, Peggy Holtz, Nichele Penn, Emily Prostic, Melissa

Ruck, Laura Schrum, Echelle Rouzer,
Shallimara Perry.●

**UOSA BILL TO HELP
CONSUMERS**

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will correct a situation which plagues many of my constituents.

In the early seventies the Environmental Protection Agency promulgated standards for the construction of waste water treatment plants. These standards which were issued during the construction of the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority's treatment plant in Prince William County led to over \$30 million in cost overruns. Of this amount \$12 million has not yet been reimbursed by EPA and is directly attributable to a burdensome and excessive EPA regulation—which has now been removed from the books.

The tremendous cost of the debt service associated with this project continues to burden the consumers served by the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority plant and passage of this legislation will benefit those citizens by reducing a portion of their water bill now being consumed by the costs of debt service.

These people are not seeking any extraordinary assistance from the Federal Government. Rather they are simply asking the Government to pay for that part of the cost of construction directly attributable to the actions of the Federal Government through the EPA.

I am most pleased to be joined by my colleagues from Virginia, FRANK WOLF and J. KENNETH ROBINSON in this effort. This legislation has received the unanimous endorsement of all the governing bodies of the political jurisdiction within the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority. I trust this legislation will receive the early and favorable attention of the Congress.

A copy of the bill follows:

H.R. 3728

A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority to reimburse such Authority for a portion of the costs incurred by such Authority in constructing its advanced waste water treatment plant in the Occoquan Reservoir watershed area in Fairfax County, Virginia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Administrator") shall make grants to the Upper Occoquan Sewage Authority (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Authority") to reimburse the Au-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

thority for 50 per centum of the costs incurred by the Authority in constructing the advanced waste water treatment plant in the Occoquan Reservoir watershed area in Fairfax County, Virginia, and not otherwise reimbursed or paid by the United States or the State of Virginia.

(b) The total amount of Federal assistance provided to the Authority under this section may not exceed \$12,000,000.

SEC. 2. No grant may be made under this Act unless the Administrator receives such reasonable assurances as the Administrator may require to insure that the Authority will use all Federal assistance provided under such grant to reduce the sewer rates charged by the Authority to its customers in Fairfax and Prince William Counties, Virginia, and the cities of Manassas and Manassas Park, Virginia.

SEC. 3. Grants made under this Act may be subject to such terms and conditions as the Administrator may require to carry out the provisions of this Act.●

"THANK GOD! THEY'RE FREE AT LAST!"

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to remind my colleagues of the deep relief we all felt when the 52 former hostages were freed this past January. It is too soon to forget the emotional high that our country experienced following their safe return.

Mr. Kenneth Mutchler of Plymouth, Minn., wrote a touching poem commemorating the sense of pride millions of Americans experienced at that time. The poem calls attention to the former hostages' plight and celebrates their release. I would like to share this poem with all of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives:

THANK GOD! THEY'RE FREE AT LAST!

They kept our 52 fellow Americans
For more than four hundred days.
They were held in abject contempt
And mistreated in dastardly ways.

They said they rubbed America's nose
In their Iranian mud and grime.
But those brave hostages stood fast

Time . . . after time . . . after time!

They knew in their hearts that we
Were close and never too far away.
As they suffered trying humiliation
Day . . . after day . . . after day!

They were kicked and oft times beaten
And otherwise very brutally cowed.
But they remained true Americans
And still stood tall and proud!

They were simply innocent pawns
In a struggle of will and power.
But they made all America feel proud
By standing fast in their finest hour!●

May 28, 1981

**A POLICEMAN'S PLEA FOR
HANDGUN CONTROL**

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am including in today's RECORD a letter to the editor which recently appeared in the *Herald Statesmen*, Yonkers, N.Y. Written by New York City police officer Edward J. Lorch, Jr., this letter is a plea for effective Federal handgun control laws. Perhaps such laws might have helped save the life of his colleague, Officer John Scarangella, who was the 22d police officer killed in the line of duty in the last 3 years in New York City.

I am appalled at efforts to relax the 1968 Gun Control Act, particularly in light of the tragic rise in violent crimes and the shootings we have witnessed in past months. Indeed, the 1968 law needs to be strengthened. Under its provisions, to buy a handgun a person merely has to walk into any one of 170,000 handgun dealers, fill out a Federal form on which he places his name, address, and claims that he is of sufficient age, not an ex-felon, drug addict or mentally incompetent, and purchase the handgun. The ease with which one can purchase a concealable handgun has clearly contributed to the handgun deaths of over 11,000 Americans in 1980.

I fully agree with Mr. Lorch's assessment of the debate over handgun control:

The supporters of the "right" to go armed claim that people, not guns, kill people. Can they look a police widow in the eye and say that an effective gun control law couldn't possibly have saved her husband's life? I ask of the gun lobby one question: If people kill people, why give them the means to do it?

I commend Mr. Lorch's letter to the attention of my colleagues:

PEOPLE KILL WITH GUNS

On May 5, my brother and the brother of the thousands who attended his funeral was laid to rest. He was New York City Police Officer John Scarangella. Officer Scarangella was the 22nd police officer killed in the line of duty in the last three years in New York City alone. If his death and the death of all of the others are to have any meaning at all perhaps that meaning may be found in an open discussion of the subjects which somehow seem most relevant to their sacrifices.

Leading law enforcement officials have long called for the kind of effective gun control which can only be the product of federal legislation. That their cries have fallen on seemingly deaf ears would seem to be due to the lack of any real understanding of the scope of the problem by both the Congress and the people.

It is apparent that there is no real appreciation of just how readily available handguns have become. Nor is there an awareness of how our society has increasingly turned to violence to solve its problems, as

evidenced by the ever-increasing number of stranger-to-stranger homicides, sometimes the result of no more than a minor traffic incident.

The supporters of the "right" to go armed claim that people, not guns, kill people, but can they really explain away 2,000 deaths, triple the number of not many years ago? Can they look a police widow in the eye and say that an effective gun law couldn't possibly have saved her husband's life? I ask of the gun lobby one question: If people kill people, why give them the means to do it?

I realize that many supporters of gun control also support the death penalty. This is particularly true in the law enforcement community. I believe this to be unworthy of anyone who truly believes in the sanctity of human life. Let it be clear that this is not a statement to be construed as in any way supportive of concern for the lives of those heinous murders now occupying death row. I would march in no demonstration for them, their crimes put them in that horrifying place and their plight is of little consequence to me.

However, the brutalization of society, be it through the proliferation of weapons or through the use of the death penalty as a simplistic answer to much more complex problems, easily denied by the throwing of a switch or the dropping of a gas pellet, is my real concern. Throw the murderers into a prison fitting their crime, let them dwell on the reasons for their miserable existence all the long days of their lives, but let us not justify their actions by destroying any life, even theirs. Let us not defiantly usurp powers which do not belong to man.

Finally, can we not, as rational human beings, simply refrain from killing, just today. Perhaps then we will not kill tomorrow and the day after, until today's violence becomes nothing more than an historical footnote in a society that reveres life. •

BEN GILMAN: PATRIOT OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to learn that our friend and colleague, BEN GILMAN, has been presented with the prestigious Patriot of the Year Award by the Department of New York, Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

This award was given to BEN GILMAN for his advocacy of a strong, adequate military posture for the United States in the interest of national defense and national security and for his support of a well-trained, adequately equipped Reserve as an integral part of the total force policy of our Nation.

Congressman GILMAN represents the 26th Congressional District, State of New York, and serves as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Prior to his election to the House of Representatives, November 7, 1972, Congressman GILMAN served for three terms in the New York State Assembly.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

During World War II, he served with the 20th Air Force, 19th Bomb Group and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal for 35 missions over Japan.

My congratulations go to BEN GILMAN for the years of service to his country, in and out of uniform. •

THE ABORTION DILEMMA

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the questions raised by the abortion debate were pondered, in this fashion, by Aristotle. Though the ancient Greeks expounded on the properties of potentiality versus actuality, present-day philosophers, when bored with easy answers, still lapse into a discussion of "chicken and egg" metaphysics.

Scientific knowledge has solved many questions that have persisted throughout history, and much past controversy has been satisfactorily laid to rest. The question of when life begins or even when life ends, however, is not a simple one, and the answers cannot merely be proclaimed by institutional or individual authority. In pursuit of adequate answers to the difficult question of abortion, I believe we must listen to people from every perspective—we must hear from religious leaders, from those who care for unwanted children in institutions, and from women whose rights to determine questions about their own bodies may be frustrated by antiabortion laws, but who in the end are really not denied a choice.

I recently received a letter from Rev. Father John W. Tucker of St. Margaret's Episcopal Church in Miami Lakes, Fla., along with a letter from a member of his congregation, Mrs. Susan Connelly, expressing their views on this issue. Reverend Tucker stated his view that:

The Right to Life issue has many moral questions. However, I feel that the woman has the constitutional rights to determine questions about her body. I oppose the antiabortion constitutional amendment movement. A woman should have the right of choice. As it now stands, the law gives the woman the right of choice without becoming an outlaw.

Mrs. Connelly wrote about the harmful effect that the Reagan administration's budget cuts will have on unwanted children who depend upon public funds for their physical, mental, and social health. She stated in her letter:

What quality of life will these unwanted children have and what services could we offer in the future with the tremendous cutbacks in all social programs * * * I cannot see bringing more unwanted children into

our society when our society has not accepted the responsibility for what we already have, and on the policies clearly delineated by the present administration, the social welfare programs in this particular area will be even more greatly diminished.

It is extremely important for those of us who make public policy to not only understand what the consequences of our policymaking will be, but also to strive for some reasonable consistency when one policy decision has implications and perhaps some unintended consequences as suggested by Mrs. Connelly's insightful comments. •

HISTORIC SUMMERSEAT

HON. JAMES K. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. JAMES K. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, precious few historic buildings in this country can match the distinctive beauty and rich legacy of Summerseat in Morrisville, Pa.

Summerseat served as an important headquarters for the Colonial Army during the crucial early days in the Revolutionary War. General Washington personally chose Summerseat for his headquarters in December of 1776.

Later in its history, Summerseat was owned by both Robert Morris and George Clymer, each of whom signed the Declaration of Independence. According to legend, Summerseat also served as the site of a ball honoring Marquis de Lafayette.

A group of distinguished constituents—the Historic Morrisville Society—will be honoring Summerseat and its heritage on Patriots' Day, June 6. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent such a unique institution as Summerseat in Washington. And it is equally gratifying to represent the Historic Morrisville Society. They deserve much commendation for their tireless work on behalf of historic preservation. •

TREASURY SECRETARY REGAN ON U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will soon have to consider new legislation to authorize the new U.S. contributions to the multilateral development banks—MDB's. Although the MDB's are of invaluable assistance in helping Third World countries become economically developed and in furthering this country's strategic for-

sign policy, support for contributions to MDB's has always been lukewarm.

I believe that the administration's position will be crucial for the ultimate disposition of the development bill, because it has considerable influence over conservatives on this side of the aisle and for those on the other side of the aisle. Therefore, I want to share with all of my colleagues the testimony of Treasury Secretary Donald Regan before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, in which the Secretary registered the administration's strong support for continued U.S. participation in the MDB's. As the Secretary emphasized:

The banks are primarily the result of U.S. policy initiatives and they have functioned successfully for many years—since 1945 in the case of the World Bank. During that period, they have had bipartisan support in the Congress and under both Democratic and Republican Presidents. A withdrawal of U.S. support would be irresponsible and damaging to our national interest.

I hope that all of my colleagues will ponder the Secretary's eloquent words and approach this question in a truly bipartisan manner, because the administration's position is very worthy of support.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. DONALD T. REGAN,
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Committee today on the Administration's appropriations request for U.S. subscriptions and contributions to the multilateral development banks. I understand that the Subcommittee voted yesterday in favor of the Administration's supplemental request for fiscal year 1981. We appreciate this bipartisan display of support for the Administration on these foreign policy issues.

With the Committee's permission I would like to summarize the Administration's request orally and to provide—for the record—a more detailed description.

The Administration's first priority has been to develop a comprehensive domestic program to address our own economic requirements. The most important contribution we can make to the international economy at this time is to provide the basis for healthy, non-inflationary growth in the U.S. economy.

Reductions in the Federal Budget for fiscal year 1981 and fiscal year 1982 represent a vital part of the President's Economic Recovery Program. The recommendations sent to the Congress on March 10 represent a practical and realistic basis on which to begin our fight against inflation and to reduce the role of government in the economy.

Foreign assistance programs have not been spared from the President's budget review. Overall these programs have been cut back by 26 percent in fiscal year 1982 from the levels proposed by the previous Administration. On this basis, the request for budget authority for the multilateral development banks has been reduced by 34 percent for fiscal year 1981 and by 38 percent in fiscal year 1982. These reductions in requests for the banks will be accomplished

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

by deferring a very substantial portion of our subscriptions and contributions to future fiscal years.

At the same time, however, we are mindful that the banks are common multinational endeavors, initiated, in most cases, by the United States. We, therefore, intend to meet our existing responsibilities to the institutions and to our fellow members. To lessen the serious concern which has been expressed by developed and developing member countries about U.S. intentions, we have tried to structure the reductions in requested budget authority in a way which permits bank replenishments to continue within their general negotiated framework.

The United States should play a constructive and responsible role in the banks and in other international economic organizations. To do so, the Administration needs your support for the full multilateral development bank request for fiscal years 1981 and 1982.

THE APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST

The Administration's supplemental request for fiscal year 1981 is for \$558 million in budget authority and \$53.9 million in program limitations for callable capital subscriptions which do not result in outlays of funds. This is \$540 million less than the amount recommended for budget authority in January. The request for fiscal year 1982 calls for \$1.5 billion in budget authority and \$2.6 billion in program limitations for callable capital. This is \$936 million less than the amount recommended for budget authority in January. Our requests will fulfill already negotiated international agreements.

The outlays resulting from budget authority enacted in fiscal years 1981 and 1982 will occur over the next ten years. Only 4.28 percent of the budget authority request for fiscal year 1982 will result in outlays in fiscal year 1982.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1981 SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

I would like to mention briefly the exceptional circumstances which necessitate the supplemental request for fiscal year 1981, which the Subcommittee has approved. For the Sixth Replenishment of the International Development Association—IDA VI—we are seeking \$540 million in budget authority. To subscribe initially to the African Development Bank we propose \$18 million in budget authority and \$53.9 million in program limitations for callable capital.

The circumstances are particularly critical in the case of IDA VI. The failure of the United States to agree to participate in the replenishment and to make its first installment available has already delayed activation of the replenishment by nine months. Other donor countries have made advance contributions, which were fully committed by the end of March, but they indicated they will not provide additional support until U.S. participation is assured after the necessary authorization and appropriations are obtained.

In the case of the African Development Bank, the opening for accession to membership by the United States and other non-regional countries is expected to occur this spring. Much of the political benefit would be lost, if we were to accede months after most of the other non-regional members had done so. Moreover, our ability to select a U.S. Executive Director could be lost if there were a delay until fiscal year 1982.

Because of these exceptional circumstances, we are requesting supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1981 for these two institutions.

ADMINISTRATION VIEW OF THE BANKS

Over the years the banks have been important financial institutions and they will remain so in the future. As we see it, the issue for the United States is not whether we will continue to participate but rather the level of future U.S. support and the nature of U.S. participation in the various programs. A decision to continue U.S. participation in the banks, including IDA VI, the World Bank General Capital Increase and the African Development Bank, is consistent with this framework and it is based on the following considerations:

The banks are primarily the result of U.S. policy initiatives and they have functioned successfully for many years—since 1945 in the case of the World Bank. During that period, they have had bipartisan support in the Congress and under both Democratic and Republican Presidents. A withdrawal of U.S. support would be irresponsible and damaging to our national interest.

The banks are common endeavors. Their operations are shaped through intensive consultation among member countries, including the United States and our major allies who are the principal financial supporters. Cooperation in these banks is a key aspect of our overall relations with Europe, Japan and Canada.

There is also a humanitarian aspect to our participation in the banks. Willingness to help the needy has been an enduring American tradition. The banks provide a cost-effective way for us to continue that tradition in concert with other countries.

Leveraging of relatively small paid-in subscriptions with bank borrowings from private capital markets multiplies economic assistance which can be channelled through the banks. Put another way, the program pay-out for each budgetary dollar paid into the hard windows can be very high.

The programs of the institutions require advance planning and continuity. Disruptions in our subscriptions and contributions and those of other countries would entail high program costs for the banks and diminish their institutional effectiveness.

In addition, there are very practical commercial reasons for continuing our participation as negotiated. Last year U.S. firms received MDB contracts totalling about \$960 million.

These considerations have led us to conclude that participation in these institutions is in our national interest and that we should proceed in an orderly way with replenishments which have already been negotiated.

The Administration fully recognizes the important support that the banks can provide for the orderly, market-oriented economic development of a large number of developing countries. The Administration also recognizes that the multilateral character of the banks and the substantial resources at their command make these institutions well positioned to help promote growth-spurring economic policies in the developing world.

The economic well-being of the developing countries has a significant impact on both the international economy and on the U.S. economy. While these countries still confront formidable economic problems, nonetheless, they are presently a major source of world economic growth. Their growth immediately generates increased imports, and the non-oil developing countries take more than a fourth of our exports of goods and services.

I also want to touch on the benefits that continued U.S. participation in these institutions provides to our foreign policy and national security interests. The banks operate in countries throughout the developing world, very notably in areas of strategic concern to us.

The U.S. has mutual defense relationships with seven of the top ten IBRD recipients: Brazil, Turkey, Korea, Thailand, Colombia, the Philippines and Mexico. These countries alone borrowed \$3.6 billion from the IBRD in 1980 or nearly half of all new lending that year. The cost to the U.S. budget, over the years that these loans are disbursed, will be about \$70 million.

Seven of the top ten IDA recipients are on the periphery of the Indian Ocean: Tanzania, Kenya, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Sudan, Egypt and India. All have been subject to Soviet efforts to expand influence. The 30 percent share of IDA lending going to the African continent (approximately \$1.1 billion in 1980) also complements our objectives in that volatile region. In particular, we strongly support IDA programs in Egypt, Sudan and Kenya which provided \$500 million in 1980.

Three of the eight Asian Development Bank borrowers have mutual defense relationships with the United States: Philippines, Korea, and Thailand. They collectively borrowed nearly \$520 million from the ADB in 1979, the last year for which we have complete data. This amounted to almost 62 percent of total ADB lending in that year.

Six of the top ten African Development Bank borrowers maintain important military supply relationships with the United States: Tunisia, Morocco, Kenya, Zaire, Gabon and Egypt. More than one third of new loans from the AfDB went to these countries in 1979.

The top three Inter-American Development Bank recipients—Mexico, Brazil and Argentina—have important commercial and financial links with us. In 1980 the IDB made two-thirds of its loans to these three countries. Improving U.S. relations throughout Latin America and the Caribbean is an important policy objective of this Administration.

In their most recent fiscal years, these MDBs channelled \$7.7 billion in loan commitments to the countries I have cited. An increase of our bilateral aid program of that size is unrealistic. These sums are far higher than could have been provided by the U.S. alone—or even with its allies—in the absence of the cost sharing and financial leveraging possible only through the banks.

FUTURE U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE BANKS

The long-term nature of the development process, the importance of the U.S. position in the banks to other countries and institutions, the wide ranging public and Congressional commentary on the role and activities of the banks and the serious nature of our own budget situation have reinforced our view that the United States needs to develop a long term policy and planning perspective for the banks. It is our intention to establish an effective overall policy framework for future U.S. participation in the banks and to identify the major policy objectives which should be pursued in any future replenishment negotiation. I note that the Committee has itself called for a thorough assessment in its report on the fiscal year 1981 appropriations legislation last year.

Accordingly, the Administration is conducting such an assessment of all the var-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ious factors which should bear on U.S. participation in the banks. No decisions will be taken on any of the pending replenishments until the Administration's policy review is complete.

The assessment will take into account the full range of views that have been expressed about the banks in the past. This Committee has been an active commentator on the activities of the multilateral development banks for many years and has requested reports on MDB activities in specific areas of concern. You have expressed consistent concern that economic assistance through the development banks reach the poor, with particular emphasis on direct participation of local groups, which represent the poor, in the planning and execution of development projects. The Committee has stressed the use of appropriate, capital saving technology in labor surplus countries. These are important development issues, which will be considered carefully in the course of our assessment.

We look forward to discussing the results of the assessment with the Committee and we will welcome your views.

CONCLUSION

This then is the program we set before you. It is a program balancing fiscal integrity with international responsibility. Our cuts have been deep in both fiscal year 1981 and fiscal year 1982, but we are fulfilling our international pledges. We seek your support for passage of this program.●

WHAT \$100 BILLION BUYS FOR DEFENSE

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has suffered a severe decline in defense preparedness over the last decade, as the gap between the Soviet Union's defense commitment and our own has widened. President Reagan and this Congress, by substantially increasing our defense budget, have begun to reverse this decline and remedy this dangerous situation.

A recent editorial in the Phoenix Gazette sheds startling light on the net value of this spending gap in terms of our own national security. I would like to share this very relevant perspective with my colleagues:

[From the Phoenix Gazette, May 18, 1981]

WHAT \$100 BILLION BUYS FOR DEFENSE

Since 1973, the Soviet Union's military expenditures have exceeded U.S. defense spending by \$100 billion. By itself, the figure may not mean much, and critics of increased national defense spending pooh-pooh such comparisons as meaningless.

Gen. Bryce Poe II, commander of the Air Force Logistics Command, put the spending gap into some stark perspective, however, by making a list of the weaponry the United States could have added to its arsenal by matching the Soviet spending.

With \$100 billion, the United States could have purchased:

The B-1 bomber fleet of 241 aircraft.

The entire MX missile system.

Thirteen Trident submarines with associated missiles.

Seven thousand new XM-1 main battle tanks.

Five hundred advanced attack helicopters. Seven hundred infantry vehicles.

Three hundred tactical airlift planes and 1,200 new fighter aircraft for the Navy or 1,800 new fighters for the Air Force.

Of course, some trade-offs might have produced other results. American military forces surely would not have lost so many skilled personnel if pay had been increased during those years so that middle-ranking enlisted personnel did not have to rely on food stamps to keep families fed.

Congress is going along with hefty increases in defense spending proposed by President Reagan. Better late than never; the United States obviously has some catching up to do.●

SALUTE TO LABOR

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have on many occasions addressed this body about the many good things that are happening in my home district of Bronx County. I have on occasions entered into the RECORD the accomplishment of various individuals who have distinguished themselves in the areas of education, business, politics, government, and many other endeavors. Recently I spoke on the heroism of the individuals caught up in the attempted assassination of our President. Today, I wish to comment and salute a more subtle heroism, a heroism that happens many times in my beloved city but goes unmentioned, and unheralded, the heroism of the unpaid, over-worked hospital employees of New York.

I especially want to point out the members of local 1199 of Bronx Lebanon Hospital who recently, because of the deadlock of the State legislature over the budget for this fiscal year, went unpaid for 2 weeks but stayed at their posts and administered to the needs of the thousands of sick people who depended upon them as their only source for medical services. These hard working men and women who depend on their weekly pay for all of their needs, had to sacrifice necessities because they have no savings or extras to carry them over during hard times, yet, in spite of these adversities they thought only of the help needed by their fellow man. My good friend Leon Davis, president of 1199 is also to be congratulated because of the leadership, patience, and concern exercised by him and his capable assistants in seeing this continuing emergency through.

Bronx-Lebanon Hospital, which dispenses quality health services for this

district, could not have endured were it not for the unstinting and dedicated services of a young, dedicated, and most energetic director, Mr. Fred Silverman. Mr. Silverman for the past several years has kept this institution afloat on the heavy seas of financial distress. He has done this through hard work, his conviction of the hospital's need, and by establishing a good working relationship with all of the diverse compartments of his institution and the people it serves. All have heard of the difficulties experienced by the people of the South Bronx of New York City, these problems experienced every day by the workers of 1199 and other professionals such as Fred Silverman.

It is because of people like the workers of 1199, Leon Davis, Fred Silverman, and so many other unsung heroes that the South Bronx like the majestic mystical bird phoenix shall rise again and regain its place in the history of our great city.●

REAL CUTS AND REAL PAIN

HON. WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. RATCHFORD. Mr. Speaker, there have been dazzling arguments on both sides of the social security revisions presented 2 weeks ago by the administration. Proponents of the cut-back plan say it is the strong medicine an ailing retirement program needs; opponents say it is the wrong medicine, in the wrong dosage, at the wrong time, and that it will abruptly and unfairly affect the life plans of millions of older Americans.

To keep the arguments from becoming too cold and statistical, I ask my colleagues to take a moment to read the following letter I received the other day from Mrs. Evelyn Bobenski, a woman who lives in my district, and who speaks in the clearest voice of the real pain these proposed cuts would bring. There can be no plainer argument against the proposed drastic reduction next year in early retirement benefits.

This is what Mrs. Bobenski wrote:

I have paid social security since 1936—worked to help pay for a house we bought; worked to help put two boys through college.

My husband has heart trouble, so I have to work.

I will be 62 July 27, 1982.

I stand at a machine all day, for \$3.75 an hour, waiting for the day to collect social security.

How do you think I feel?●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PLASTIC BOTTLE WAR

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members of the House would be interested in seeing an informative article that appeared in the March 1981 issue of *Business Week* relating to the metric packaging of soft drinks.

I believe this article clearly demonstrates that some companies, especially in the soft drink industry, are finding it to their economic advantage to make the conversion to metric.

The article follows:

PLASTIC'S NEW ENTRY IN THE BOTTLE WARS

A new generation of machines that make plastic bottles will start bringing soft drinks to market in half-liter (16.9-oz.) size later this year, touching off a fresh round of competition in the huge market for containers. The prospect of big new inroads for plastic already has can makers laying defensive strategies, while plastic makers are predicting a turnaround for their depressed business and glassmakers are worried about a price war.

The half-liter soft drink bottle is made of the same polyethylene terephthalate (PET) as is the successful 2-liter bottle already on supermarket shelves. Coca-Cola Co. has been testing the half-liter size in four Ohio markets since November. "This little baby is dynamite," says a spokesman. Adds John Sculley, president of Pepsi-Cola Co.: "Everything we learned from the 2-liter suggests that the half-liter will be just as successful." A huge market. By June both Cincinnati Milacron Inc. and Van Dorn Co. will be shipping machines that at least triple the running speed of blow-molding equipment which can now turn out 2,400 2-liter bottles an hour. Japan's Nissei ASB Machine Co. is already shipping a slower machine. According to machinery makers, the new machines cut costs to the point at which half-liter plastic bottles can compete with 16-oz. non-returnable glass bottles, which cost about 8¢.

The market is huge. For soft drinks alone, glass-bottle makers shipped 3.8 billion 16-oz. nonreturnables last year and the market for returnables is even larger. Dwarfs glass, however, is the 12-oz. soft-drink can market of 26 billion units. A 50 percent operating rate last year has producers awash in excess PET resin capacity, but both Celanese Corp. and Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. predict that plastic's ability to expand into these new markets could balance demand for their resin with its supply.

A price war? "There could be some impact on the can share" of the market by plastic bottles, concedes Jay R. Gottlieb, managing director of beverage metal packaging for American Can Co. But the immediate target of the plastic bottles would appear to be glass. Says one glass company official: "I think you're going to see a price war. I don't think the glass industry is going to give up this market without a substantial fight." Responds John E. Maczko, marketing supervisor of PET bottle resin for Celanese Plastics & Specialties Co.: "There is no doubt that the half-liter PET bottle is here; it's going to stay, and no matter what glass does, it's unlikely to stop it."

May 28, 1981

Still, some container-industry executives believe that rising resin costs and more efficient glassmaking machinery will make it hard for PET to compete. The half-liter bottles will only nick the market this year. Executives at Owens-Illinois Inc., the largest U.S. glass-bottle maker and a leader in plastics as well, believe that the new container has yet to prove itself. There is a problem with carbonation retention, and the light weight and durability that brought consumers flocking to the 2-liter PET bottle are less important for smaller sizes.

"There's a lot of [development] work being done," says Charles K. Sewell, president of Dorsey Corp.'s Sewell Plastics Inc., a major bottle molder. "We expect to be in the marketplace with a lot of bottles sometime in 1981." ●

UNITED STATES CASTS VOTE FOR PROFIT

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I find it deeply disturbing that the administration decided to vote against a United Nations' code which would set guidelines on the marketing of infant food formula. The United States was nearly the only country to vote against this code at the U.N. World Health Assembly this week in Geneva.

Millions of infants every year suffer from malnutrition and disease—and many die—from the improper use of breast milk substitutes. Mothers in poor, developing countries are led to believe by aggressive advertising techniques that infant formulas are better for their babies than their own milk. For instance, one company employs salespeople in white uniforms to distribute free samples to pregnant women. After using the samples, these women can no longer produce their own milk and must purchase the substitute.

Unable to afford sufficient amounts of the formula, poor women often dilute the powder. Infants become malnourished and often develop serious complications from the use of contaminated water. The U.N. code recommends that countries outlaw direct advertising, prohibit distribution of free samples and limit exaggerated claims. However, the code is only a recommendation and would leave each nation free to develop its own appropriate regulations. The code in no way attempts to interfere with free trade and the rights of these companies to sell this product—it only attempts to set up guidelines on the marketing of infant formulas.

Three American manufacturers have lobbied fiercely against this code, arguing that there is no direct link between bottle formulas and disease. They say that mothers in the Third World Countries—of whom many are

illiterate—are not following the directions carefully.

I think the administration, by this action, is sending a very negative message to the Third World. It is a message which says to the world that the United States is more concerned about the profits of three companies than the lives of millions of children.●

INTRODUCTION OF ADMINISTRATION OMNIBUS LEGISLATION ON VARIOUS HEALTH PROGRAMS

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce H.R. 3724, the administration bill "to extend and amend various health authorities, and for other purposes." Mr. BROYHILL, the distinguished ranking minority member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, joins me as a cosponsor. Because the administration's proposal provides for several substantive changes to existing law, we would expect that some opposition will surface. Accordingly, we view the bill as a starting point for discussions with the various affected principals whose concerns are entitled to be heard.

An explanation of the bill, which is comprehensive in scope, is embodied in Secretary Schweiker's May 15, 1981, letter of transmittal to the Speaker. The Secretary's explanation follows:

The draft bill would authorize appropriations through fiscal year 1984 for health services research, health care technology activities, health statistics activities, National Research Service Awards, immunization programs, and assistance to medical libraries, and would enact changes to provisions of law concerned with health emergencies to permit a rapid and effective response to such emergencies.

The draft bill would in addition promote improved efficiency and management of Public Health Service programs. The draft bill would provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services with greater flexibility to provide additional special pay to Public Health Service Commissioned Corps physicians only if such pay were actually needed to recruit and retain physicians in certain specific locations and in certain specialties in which extraordinary recruitment and retention difficulties have been experienced. The Administration believes that Public Health Service physician requirements can be met under a more flexible and targeted approach and at less cost to the taxpayer than under the approach of current law, which maintains artificially high special pay levels for Commissioned Corps physicians. The draft bill would also eliminate Federal payment for institutional support services in connection with National Research Service Awards.

We estimate that total costs of \$216,742,000 for fiscal year 1982 would result from the draft bill's enactment. Detailed cost estimates and summary of the draft bill's provisions are enclosed.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We urge the Congress to give the draft bill its prompt and favorable consideration.

We are advised by the Office of Management and Budget that enactment of this draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President.●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN ARGENTINA AND U.S. POLICY

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the attention given recently to the case of Jacobo Timerman points up the seriousness of the human rights situation facing Jews in Argentina, and it also demonstrates how dramatically U.S. policies on human rights have shifted since the current administration took office.

There is compelling evidence that the Argentine Government has grossly violated the human rights of its citizens, such as Jacobo Timerman, who dared to disagree with its policies and decrees. In his recent book, Timerman has pointed to another aspect of repression in Argentina which has been less widely known—the fact that is peculiarly anti-Semitic. This was a factor in the vicious treatment of Timerman himself, and he and others have testified that anti-Semitism is widespread in Argentine society. I and many of my colleagues have spoken out against anti-Semitism and repression wherever they occur. Jacobo Timerman's account of the situation in Argentina should cause us to pay particular attention to these problems in that country.

It is especially ironic that just as public awareness of this situation is increasing, the administration has come forward and requested that the current prohibition against U.S. arms sales to Argentina be repealed. One justification for the request, offered by Secretary of State Alexander Haig, has been that the United States and Argentina share common values. There is no question that Argentine society is very advanced in many respects, and there is no question that the Government of Argentina, like our own, is opposed to Soviet-inspired turmoil in the Western Hemisphere. However, it is difficult to see how much further the similarities extend. Literally thousands of Argentine citizens have disappeared without explanation over the past 5 years. My own efforts to obtain information from the Argentine Government about two young Jewish citizens, Ruben Haber and Deborah Benshoam, who have been imprisoned but never formally charged with any crime, have met with no cooperation. It is clearly wrong to say that a government which has regularly abused those rights

which are the foundation of our own society has values in common with ours. Certainly, there is no justification for providing that government with the arms that will help it perpetuate the vicious practices which have made life a nightmare for so many people.●

Jacobo Timerman has stated that the outspoken human rights policy of the previous administration was responsible for saving thousands of lives in South America. He has said of the anti-Semitism in Argentina that "nothing equal to it has taken place in the Western world since 1945." The United States should not even appear to condone such a situation. In my view, the administration's apparent willingness to turn away from a policy of attempting to promote human rights in countries that wish to obtain assistance from the United States will not serve our foreign policy interests in the long term, and the cost in human terms to those whose rights are abused cannot be calculated. I hope that the message Jacobo Timerman has brought will not be lost on those formulating foreign policy for the administration.●

THE RE-EMERGENCE OF SWEATSHOPS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, no feature of our modern industrial system has been more abhorrent than the notorious garment sweatshops which flourished in the early years of this century. Through Federal and State fair labor laws, we thought that we had ridded our cities of this scourge. Tragically, we are now learning that the sweatshop has returned. Once again, tens of thousands of workers—especially women and children, and particularly undocumented aliens—are suffering the kinds of exploitation which we thought we had relegated to the history books.

The revival of sweatshops in the needle trades has been condemned by responsible garment manufacturers, trade unions, and public officials, including Secretary of Labor Raymond Donovan. But Mr. Donovan has, in a unilateral and thoroughly unjustified action, announced his intention to eliminate one of the key regulatory provisions against sweatshops—the prohibition on industrial homework.

At hearings last week conducted by the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, of which I am the chairman, we heard industry, labor, and consumers alike denounce this proposal. No one—not industry or labor—had advocated such a sweeping abolition of labor pro-

tections at the very time that sweatshops are reviving.

No one—not industry or labor—believes, as the Secretary contends, that abolition of the homework restriction will enhance the Government ability to enforce the law.

Every witness who testified, with the single exception of the departmental representatives, argued strenuously that removal of the homework ban would, in fact, stimulate the proliferation of sweatshops, a view endorsed by departmental experts with whom my office has spoken. The Secretary's proposed action, in the words of Kurt Barnard, spokesman for the 5,500-member Federated Apparel Manufacturers, will guarantee "the uncontrolled proliferation of at-home sweatshops [which will] foster the exploitation of unregistered aliens and adversely affect every American taxpayer *** [It] would literally pull the rug out from under the entire American apparel industry—union and non-union alike."

Much of the public attention which has been focused on the revival of sweatshops is due to the outstanding series by Merle Linda Wolin, "Sweatshop," published earlier this year in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner. Ms. Wolin's 16-part story was the result of an 8-month investigation, including undercover work as a Brazilian seamstress.

Ms. Wolin's series has already won two major journalism awards, the Mark Twain prize, and the Associated Press regional award for investigative reporting in class I newspapers. She deserves much more, because her series has achieved one of the highest goals of responsible journalism—enlightening the public about an inhuman and intolerable situation which demands change. That process of change has already begun with last week's hearings, and I want to credit Merle Wolin with providing a major stimulus to that action.

I want to share one segment of this series which summarizes many of the problems and the players in this crisis. The article follows:

PROBLEMS IN THE GARMENT INDUSTRY

(By Merle Linda Wolin)

What stands in the way of cleaning up California's rapidly growing \$3.5 billion garment industry, centered in Los Angeles and officially recognized as "the dirtiest in the state"?

After an intensive eight-month investigation, which included a month's undercover work posing as an illegal garment worker, the Herald Examiner discovered that the garment industry's major problems revolve around the manufacturers, not the contractors. These people, the manufacturers, control the purse strings of the industry yet are not held legally accountable for the health and labor conditions under which their garments are made.

But the manufacturers are not the sole cause of all the problems. Everyone contributes to them—from the workers, contractors

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and retailers to the regulatory agencies, prosecutors, judges and the unions.

Also not to be forgotten are the effects of imports, organized crime and the recession.

Here is a quick rundown of the problems in the industry, some structural, some economic, some attitudinal. Taken together, these elements make it nearly impossible for the business to run lawfully without violations. The human degradation and economic injustices call out for solution—drastic and immediate.

THE WORKERS

The backbone of the work force—an estimated 90 percent of the 125,000 workers in greater Los Angeles (which is 75 percent of the estimated total number of workers in California)—is undocumented labor, easily exploited illegal workers who are unfamiliar with U.S. laws and afraid to fight back.

Out of 20 basic non-agricultural industries in California, this worker earns conservatively 30 to 400 percent less than employees in other industries.

THE CONTRACTORS

An estimated 3,500 in the state. It is easy to go into business: all that is needed is a \$21 business tax and registration permit, a few machines and a roof overhead.

In sewing factories, most of which are small and employ less than 50, contractors, known as "glorified workers," do the bidding for manufacturers. They hire workers and run the operations where garments are sewn. They alone bear the burden of labor and health code violations. (More than 80 percent of them are in violation.)

There is a surplus of contractors. Many are undercapitalized. In the words of state Labor Commissioner James Quillen, many are "flakes" unfamiliar with U.S. law and the garment business. They see engaging in unfair competition (a direct result of hiring undocumented workers) as the only way to keep their shops afloat. They regularly undercut legitimate shop owners, often forcing them out of business. The attitude: anything to get the work.

The most frequent complaint of contractors is that manufacturers do not pay them enough to cover costs and make a profit. After they complete a job, they often find there is little money left to pay themselves a decent wage and, the way it goes, even less for the workers.

An estimated 30 percent of contractors go out of business each year.

MANUFACTURERS

There are approximately 600 in the state, 400 in Los Angeles. This group designs garments, cuts cloth, hires sewing contractors and sells the product. Once the garment is delivered to them, manufacturers ship it, on order, to retailers.

Manufacturers are not legally held accountable in any way for what goes on in their contractors' shops. Unlike other industries where the person who provides the service negotiates price with his potential client, here it's the other way around. The price is dictated by the manufacturer, who takes full advantage of the unfair competition.

The bulk of the profits in the industry is believed to be made by the manufacturers. Double-digit profits are the rule; a triple-digit markup is not uncommon on imports.

This group has been under some competitive pressure from imports—valued by the U.S. Department of Commerce at nearly \$6 billion in 1979 and growing—though no one seriously believes they are forced to underpay contractors to keep pace with foreign

apparel makers. (And certainly there seems to be no difference in price between foreign-made apparel and that made in the United States.)

RETAILERS

Everyone who sells garments to the public, from the owner of the local boutique to the corporate presidents of enormous department stores. Most claim they know nothing about the violations other than what they read in newspapers.

Retailers believe they are far too removed from the production end of the industry to get involved with what they call "policing." Their buyers shop the world from fancy showrooms. Though they are required to make sure all purchases meet the standards of the Federal Trade Commission, none are required to ask about the conditions under which the garments were made.

This group also makes handsome profits, though usually not as much as the manufacturers. Uniformly, they claim they want greater local and state enforcement of the health and labor codes.

REGULATORY AGENCIES

State and federal labor departments, county health departments, city fire departments, city building and safety departments, and the state agency administering the Occupational Safety and Health Act—all entrusted, among their many duties, with keeping the law in the garment industry.

California's most active agency, the \$1.2 million Concentrated Enforcement Program of the state's Department of Industrial Relations, focuses on violations of wage and hour, worker's compensation insurance, and industrial homework in "marginal" industries, like this one. Under federal and state law, their jurisdiction extends only to the relationship between employer-employee, not between employer-employer, which is considered to be the legal relationship between a manufacturer and a contractor.

The CEP is therefore, legally unable to hold manufacturers responsible for unfair business dealings with and by contractors. (This is ironic, however, since the National Labor Relations Act recognizes the dependence of contractors on manufacturers in certain situations, such as collective bargaining.)

The CEP's work, impressive as it is, is extremely limited by a shortage of investigators—30 for the entire state. These is no realistic way they can police violations. Officials complain about a lack of support from the courts—there are inordinate delays in prosecution; deals worked out with prosecutors frequently result in both "slap on the wrist" fines, and grace periods of up to two years for employers to pay back wages.

Since the program began in 1978, officials have collected nearly \$5 million in fines and back wages for workers, an amount they believe is only a fraction of what workers are actually due.

Officials at the CEP believe a legislative restructuring of the industry is the only way to actually stop violations.

The county Health Department, with only six full-time investigators, also is limited in its ability to clean up the industry. Since October 1979, officials have been vigorously issuing health licenses to all the shops they can find. By the end of October they had found 2,746 shops. Of an estimated 1,500 that have been investigated, 1,187 have been cited for one or more violations. Seventy-three cases have made it to the city attorney's office for adjudication.

Health officials claim the garment industry is "dirtier" than any other in the state. The U.S. Department of Labor's Employment Standards Administration in Los Angeles coordinates the work of at least six compliance officers, an educational program, and since 1974, three task-force investigations in the industry.

In practice, they only go after contractors although federal law does allow them to obtain an injunction against a manufacturer to prohibit the shipment of goods out of state.

Since last year, this federal agency has cited at least 64 shops, and is now in the process of collecting \$658,000 for 1,372 workers in federal court.

All other agencies, those of the city and Cal-OSHA, maintain a relatively low profile in the industry. Why? The fire, building and safety departments believe the violations under their jurisdiction are not inordinate or "life-threatening." Cal-OSHA believes it, too. Though mandated by federal law to investigate health and safety hazards in all industries, this agency gives first priority to construction and heavy manufacturing, the industries with the highest percentage of lethal hazards complaints.

PROSECUTORS AND THE JUDICIARY

The city attorney, the state labor commissioner and federal attorneys under the solicitor of labor all prosecute in the garment industry. Cases are heard either in municipal or superior courts or in federal district courts.

Since September 1979, in response to a major exposé of the industry which was televised here by KNXT, the city attorney has given special priority to garment cases.

Today, the city attorney's office prosecutes 100 percent of the cases referred to them by the regulatory agencies. In the last year, the office obtained convictions on more than 95 percent of all cases: 38 health and safety, 20 homework and 116 minimum wage.

City attorneys say they have the laws but, unfortunately, they are dependent on investigators to bring them cases—and there are severe shortages of investigators. City Attorney Burt Pines said, "If (they) referred 10 times as many cases, we would prosecute them."

These lawyers also complain that local judges do not mete out stiff sentences in white collar crime cases. Only rarely will a judge impose jail time.

Judges, according to the lawyers, are equally reluctant to severely penalize contractors who appear indigent.

Other major sources of aggravation for city attorneys: Their star witnesses, the victims, frequently do not show up at trials because they are undocumented workers afraid to testify. Also, under the law, manufacturers go scot-free.

At the federal level, the four attorneys who work for the solicitor of labor prosecute cases involving the industry. Since October 1979, they have obtained court orders against defendants in 15 of 17 cases heard.

Besides a shortage of investigators, their major complaints stem from the attitudes of federal judges who seem unwilling to impose business sanctions against manufacturers. For example, the "hot goods" injunction, mandated by law in 1938, has never been used in California. And today it takes judges so long to issue temporary restraining orders against the shipment of illegally made goods going out of state that by the time an order arrives, the garments have disappeared.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNIONS

Three try to organize in the garment industry: the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, and United Garment Workers Union. Their presence is barely felt—only 20 percent of all garment workers in the state work under a union contract.

Union officials cite several basic reasons for this:

It is difficult to organize the large pool of ethnically divided surplus labor, most of which is comprised of undocumented workers afraid of losing their jobs and being deported.

The National Labor Relations Board delays the adjudication of disputes. These delays work to the advantage of the employer and make it difficult for workers to organize.

Anti-union sentiment in Los Angeles as manifested by the police and the courts. Union officials often complain about the intimidating effects of what they call the employer "labor liaison squad" of the Los Angeles Police Department and the local judiciary's use of temporary restraining orders to effectively halt union activity.

IMPORTS

Apparel imports compete directly with California-manufactured goods. In 1979, \$5.876 billion worth of foreign-made goods were sold in the U.S., a whopping 426 percent increase over 1969, though the average rate of annual growth of imports in the last four years was only 4.7 percent.

Since 1973, the U.S. Labor Department's office of foreign economic policy estimates that 125,000 jobs have been lost in the apparel industry, a 10 percent decrease in the industry's employment.

Why are jobs being lost? Economists in Washington said it is both because U.S. manufacturers are doing business "offshore," and because of competition from what they call "low wage" countries. (Hourly wage in the Korean apparel industry, for example, is approximately 55 cents, including all benefits.)

Surprisingly, some of the regulations of the Federal Tariff Commission seem to encourage U.S. manufacturers to go abroad. Under section 807, manufacturers who cut their garments and then send them offshore to be sewn are exempt by two-thirds from paying the regular tariff on imported goods. In 1979, the U.S. government lost approximately \$90 million from this tariff "discount" given to manufacturers whose dollar volume of imports under this section was up more than 14,000 percent in the last nine years.

Though many manufacturers claim that rising prices in the United States make it increasingly difficult to compete with imports, the fact is most garments sold in this country are still made domestically and that California's garment business is one of the fastest growing industries in the country, expanding at an annual rate of 13.9 percent.

The volume of the apparel business in California increased 120 percent between 1970 and 1977. Within years, the industry here is expected to surpass that of the \$13 billion New York industry, the largest in the United States, whose annual growth rate is only 8 percent.

ORGANIZED CRIME

It is difficult to ascertain to what extent the Mafia has infiltrated the garment industry in California. FBI officials here believe the industry is rife with mob activity, a pat-

tern long observed in the industry in New York.

During the recent federal trial of five reputed leaders of the Los Angeles Mafia, informant Aladena "Jimmy the Weasel" Fratianno revealed that the mob considered a plan to extort money from Los Angeles business owners in the garment industry.

One of the men on trial was Louis Tom Dragna, 61, owner of Roberta's Manufacturing located in the industry's California Mart. He is said to be a longtime mafioso whose uncle, Jack Dragna, was the boss of the family in the 1940s and '50s.

In November, Dragna was convicted in U.S. District Court in connection with a scheme to shake down pornographers in the city.

Another figure mentioned during the trial, but only accused of associating with the mob, was Vic Werber, owner of Vic Werber Associates, a ladies' sportswear firm also located in the California Mart.

The 1978 report on organized crime by the state attorney general listed Werber, convicted in 1976 of loan sharking, as a crony of mobsters.

THE RECESSION

Business has been affected in the garment industry—though not as badly as other industries.

The California Employment Development Department reported that from their sample of garment industry employers who gave estimates of employment from January to December 1980, 6,300 fewer workers had jobs in the Los Angeles County garment industry than in 1979, the year of the lowest rate of increase in employment since the recession in 1974. One CEDD analyst called this slump "a significant decline, not the highest, but right up there with the top five losers in the (county's) manufacturing sector: automobiles, lumber, primary metals and rubber and plastic products."

Dun and Bradstreet, the leading international credit rating bureau, keeps records of all U.S. apparel manufacturers who have gone bankrupt or lost creditors—records that provide another indicator of the recession's possible effects.

Rowena Wyant, a vice president in the firm's New York business economic division, explained in a telephone interview that from January through July 1980 there was a 23.9 percent increase in failures of apparel and textile manufacturers over corresponding months in 1979. She said the increase of failures was the highest since the 1974 recession but noted that the nation's apparel manufacturers were not as hard hit as other manufacturers. (Transportation equipment and metals suffered rises of failure of 148 percent and 90 percent respectively.)

FREEDOM

HON. JAMES K. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. JAMES K. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to rise today on behalf of a patriotic American, a distinguished constituent, and an inspired poet—Mrs. Dolores A. Tull of Middletown Township, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, like every American, Mrs. Tull was awed by the return of our hostages from Iran several months ago. Mrs. Tull was so moved, in fact, that she dedicated a poem to the return of the hostages and their legacy. It is a lovely, powerful poem, Mr. Speaker; every American should cherish its words. That is why I am including it into today's RECORD.

FREEDOM

(By D. A. Tull)

Freedom's habor is anchored in men's souls,
Freedom's voice is a living sound,
Freedom's heart beat is endless,
Freedom is not Free.
Freedom's fire is disciplined by obedience,
Freedom's way of life is treasured,
Freedom's price is untold,
Freedom requires: respect, honor and is submissive,
Freedom is not Free.
Freedom's blood is noble,
Freedom's enemies are torture, hate and envy,
Freedom's cost is daily paid,
Freedom is not Free.
Freedom is Liberty's grace,
Freedom is spring's waters,
Freedom is restrained by caring love,
Freedom's will is to live strong with justice,
Freedom's land is at HOME in AMERICA,
Freedom is an attribute bestowed by GOD,
Freedom is not Free but is freely given.●

REAGAN'S SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, all responsible Members of the House of Representatives recognize the need for reforming our Nation's social security system; and, the President should be congratulated for addressing this very complicated and difficult issue. However, President Reagan's proposed changes to the social security system may be an example of the cure being worse than the disease. Alternative cures are available which will keep the social security system solvent without causing the enormous economic damage to retirees that would occur if the Reagan proposals were adopted.

Last Wednesday, the House Democratic Caucus adopted the following resolution, which I drafted, that expresses the concerns and guiding principles of those of us who will be working against the Reagan social security proposals while trying to construct fairer, more reasonable alternatives:

Resolved, That President Reagan's proposals regarding social security benefits for workers who retire at age 62 represent an unconscionable breach of faith with the first generation of workers that had contributed to social security for their whole lives. These proposals would immediately reduce benefits to workers who retire at age 62. Many have worked at back-breaking jobs and have made irreversible plans to retire and begin a new phase of their lives.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It is simply not fair to change the rules without notice. Our Speaker has promised to do everything in his power to see that these rules are not broken, so that those on the verge of retirement can be assured that they will receive their full benefits.

We express our appreciation to Representative Jake Pickle and the Democrats on his Social Security Subcommittee for their attention to this matter.

We will support reasonable and fair actions to protect the solvency of the social security system, but we will not destroy the program or a generation of retirees in the process.

I am happy to see that the Reagan social security reform package has already come under careful scrutiny by both the Congress and the American public, and I recommend the following article for those who desire more information on the issue. The article clearly points out that, while there is a crucial need for reforming the social security system, the Reagan proposals are needlessly extreme and punishing, and better alternatives exist.

[From The Washington Post, May 17, 1981]

REAGAN'S SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN: LESS FOR MORE

The first thing to be said about Social Security reform is that it is inevitable. The second thing is that President Reagan's proposed Social Security cuts are a serious mistake—grossly inequitable, larger than necessary and not even consistent with his own "supplyside" economics.

The most blatant flaw in the proposal is its punitive treatment of future retirees. The proposal amounts to a whopping 30 percent benefit cut for those who will retire between ages 62 and 65. That does not mean a 30 percent cut merely for three years, but for the rest of their lives.

One reason these early retirees now get only 80 percent of "normal" payments is to spread the benefits over their longer average retirement. The Reagan proposal would slash this to 55 percent, from the current average of \$370 a month to \$250.

As is now the case, benefits would stay at this much lower level throughout the retirement years. The accumulated loss to an average worker retiring at 62 would amount to \$23,000 in today's dollars.

Another reason for reduced early retirement benefits is to discourage early exits from the labor force. This hasn't worked very well; at present, 70 percent of all people who retire do so between 62 and 65. The Reagan proposal could well stem this early retirement tide, as it is intended to do.

Few older persons can afford to absorb income losses of the magnitude he is suggesting. Even under current standards, 14 percent of all older persons live in poverty. Millions more are kept out of poverty only by Social Security benefits. Many such people, therefore, would be forced to stay at jobs—if they are still able to hold jobs.

The inequity of all this is striking. Nobody else is being asked to take a financial cut of this scope in the name of fiscal austerity. Why should those retiring next year get far smaller benefits than those retiring this year? Both groups worked just as long and paid roughly the same payroll taxes. Indeed, future retirees will have paid much higher taxes than today's retirees because of continually rising Social Security tax rates. What we end up with is this: The generation that has paid the highest taxes in history is left with the lowest benefits.

May 28, 1981

President Reagan, of course, has vowed not to cut benefits of retired persons; they were to be regarded as among the "truly needy." That promise has now been interpreted, in very literal terms, to refer only to those already retired. The disingenuity of classifying today's retirees as "truly needy" and tomorrow's as not so is self-evident.

Nor are the Reagan arguments for this attack on future retirees very compelling. The administration is quick to point out, for example, that life expectancy has increased since 1935. In 1935, a 62-year-old had a life expectancy of 14 years; today it is 16 years. Hence, today's workers allegedly can postpone retirement for a couple of years without shortening their retirement.

But longer life expectancies are a potential source of extended retirement as well as of additional work. There is no reason to deny older persons either option. The Reagan proposal, in fact, effectively compels people to overcompensate for increased life expectancy and accept shorter retirement.

The president's benefit cuts are also defended on the basis of increased work incentives. Under present law, workers aged 65 and over lost 50 cents in Social Security benefits for every dollar they earn above \$5,500 a year. This 50 percent marginal tax on earnings, added to normal income and payroll taxes, leaves older workers facing some of the highest tax rates in the country. The administration proposes to phase out this "earnings limitation," thereby providing greater incentives to continued employment.

Strangely, its incentives for continued employment are not extended to those 62 to 64. Under present law, such persons lose 50 cents in benefits for every dollar earned in excess of \$4,800 a year. Yet the administration has not proposed to end this stringent earnings limitation. Potential early retirees confront only the stick, not the carrot.

Even if better incentives were available to those 62 to 64, though, not all of them could work. Job loss, long-term unemployment and declining health are also important factors in early retirement. These people would be left out in the cold by the Administration proposal. Whatever the merits of denying a viable retirement option to people who can continue working, they don't apply to older persons without employment possibilities.

The question here is not whether Social Security must be reformed. The Social Security Trust Fund will be overwhelmed by the coming "senior's boom." This is not a forecast; it is a demographic certainty. The post-war "baby boom" will start retiring after the year 2010. By the year 2025 the aged population will be twice as large as it is today. If the Social Security system is to survive, either benefits must be reduced or early retirement trends changed.

But the president's proposal, while responding to both short-term budget pressures and long-term Social Security deficits, is not the way to go. The price it exacts is too high in terms of intergenerational inequity, increased hardship among the poor and insufficient work incentives.

At a minimum, any benefit reductions must be spread more evenly. There is no reason to hold tomorrow's retirees hostage to Reagan's campaign promises. There are more equitable ways of sharing the budget-cutting burden, including across-the-board reductions in Social Security's cost-of-living adjustment and smaller penalties for early retirement.

Alternative mechanisms for encouraging delayed retirement should also be explored. At a minimum, the earnings limitation should be lifted for workers 62 to 64 so that they, too, have an incentive to continue working. This kind of voluntary, "supply-side" approach would certainly be more consistent with the president's economic philosophy than the punitive reforms now proposed.

Finally, the administration and the Congress should consider permanently distinguishing older workers from actual retirees. One-fifth of all "retirement" benefits now go to older persons still working. Should they really be included on the roster of Social Security beneficiaries? If we restricted retirement benefits to retired persons, there would be no Social Security crisis.

Older workers could be compensated for their lost benefits with general employment tax credits. This clear separation of workers and retirees would allow us to respond to the unique needs of each group. We could provide increased incentives for workers without sacrificing the economic security of retirees.

Although the president's proposals are deeply flawed—and poorly timed, because they will deflect debate from his broader economic program—they do have some merit. Until now, few politicians have been willing to "take on" Social Security reform. The president's initiatives will embolden Congress to debate this difficult issue. Hopefully, the debate will result in reforms that both encourage employment of older workers and minimize inequities.●

**THE SENSELESS LOSS OF LIFE
IN NORTHERN IRELAND**

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest the failure of the British Government to initiate steps that may have prevented the deaths of four hunger strikers in Northern Ireland. The intransigence of the British Government in this matter clearly led to this senseless loss of life. Also, regrettably, despite President Reagan's own St. Patrick's Day message, in which he offered "the good offices of the United States to those who wish fervently for peace" in Northern Ireland, our Government has done nothing to urge the British to seek a humanitarian resolution in this matter.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I joined several of my colleagues in contacting Prime Minister Thatcher and President Reagan to urge actions to save the lives of these hunger strikers. I protest their failure to even attempt to work for a peaceful outcome.

These deaths have sparked a new wave of violence in Northern Ireland—violence that could have been averted. At the same time, other hunger strikers have replaced the original four in protesting conditions in Belfast jails. Before another must die, and before the violence spreads even more, I call

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

again on the British Government to renew its efforts to develop a framework for lasting peace in Northern Ireland. I also call on our Government to work actively toward peaceful resolution of the critical situation in Northern Ireland.●

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mrs. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, we must now confront one of the most pressing and most difficult issues which the 97th Congress must face—social security reform. The social security system has contributed substantially to the financial well-being of the Nation's elderly, but there is no doubt it is in peril and it is imperative that we act soon to meet the program's short-term financing requirements.

We have an immediate problem in meeting projected benefits in the next 2 years. In 1978, the old age and survivors insurance (OASI) fund paid out \$5 billion more than it received, and in 1979, \$2.8 billion more than it received. If we do nothing, the system could go broke as early as fall 1982. The decreasing ratio of workers to retirees, which is now 3.25 to 1, is expected to decrease to 2 to 1 by the years 2000 to 2010. Therefore, we must also consider long-term financing problems, as we study for financing the program.

President Reagan has proposed a number of changes to the social security program which will affect retirement, survivor, and disability benefits, and change certain technicalities in the program. There are three major proposals. One, delay the indexing of benefits to the cost of living from July 1982 until October 1982, and continue to index benefits in October in future years. Two, the President has proposed substantially reducing benefits for people who retire before age 65. Currently, a worker who retires at age 65 receives 100 percent of the primary insurance amount (PIA), and a worker who retires at age 62 receives 80 percent of the PIA. Under the President's plan, a person retiring at age 62 would receive only 55 percent of the PIA, to encourage people to remain in the work force longer. Three, the President has proposed a reduction in the replacement ratios used to compute a worker's benefit. This means that all future retirees would receive a smaller benefit in relation to earnings, or that their benefits would be reduced an average of 7 percent.

We should not further reduce benefits for those who retire early, and we should oppose any changes which would affect workers who are near re-

tirement age who cannot change their plans, like those who are already locked into contracts which set a retirement age for them in advance.

The proposals to substantially reduce benefits for early retirees and to encourage workers to delay early retirement would certainly affect the majority of workers in my State of Maine. Maine is made up primarily of blue-collar workers who perform physically demanding work for below average wages. Lobstermen, woodcutters, papermill workers, shipbuilders, and people in other popular Maine vocations retire earlier than white-collar workers, due to the arduous physical strains of their jobs. The majority of workers in Maine elect early retirement and accept the reduced benefit. There were 168,494 old age and survivor beneficiaries in Maine as of December 31, 1979, and the average monthly benefit was \$248.20—close to the State's SSI benefit. A further reduction of benefits for early retirees would either force these people to work longer and endanger their health, or would force them to accept inadequate benefits which would push them below the poverty level, requiring many of these proud people to apply for public assistance.

Many Maine workers try to return to less physical jobs to supplement their social security benefits, but the jobs are few, and we are all familiar with the problem of age discrimination which older workers face. For these reasons, I do not think it is fair to use the social security program to bring about changes in the work patterns of our citizens. I do not think it is fair to penalize working class citizens who have spent the greater part of their lives paying into the program by forcing them to choose between more work or inadequate benefits. Any action taken toward encouraging people to work longer should be part of a long-range plan that would not affect those who are already in the system, as we should not jeopardize their future well-being.

Of course this issue deserves careful attention because we do face a crisis. All options to slow the growth of the program and secure the financial status of the trust funds must be examined closely. Reforming social security in an equitable manner is a difficult task, and we must realize that whatever changes Congress approves will probably meet with some criticism from certain sectors of the population. While we must face the fact that the program is due for reform, we must also keep our promise to current recipients who depend on their benefits and cannot plan for new sources of income, and to those who are quickly approaching retirement age. We must be sure that any action we take will be fair and equitable to all participants.

We must not abandon the social security program and its past years of success in the midst of our current economic problems, but must work harder to assure its continued success in the future.●

FORT GARRISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 28, 1981, 80 young men and women from the Fort Garrison Elementary School in Pikesville, will journey to Washington for a firsthand look at their Nation's Capital.

These students, lead by their teachers, Mrs. Carolyn Hubberman, Mrs. Anita Rozenel, and Mr. Ted Antonakos, will tour the Capitol Building, the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Bureau of Printing and Engraving.

I am delighted these students have taken the opportunity to visit with us, and I hope their interest in our Nation's political process will continue.

Students who will visit us Thursday are: David Ash, John Crain, Brian Fruman, Jonathan Guth, Stephen Hettleman, David Jacob, Jordan Kroop, Gregg Levin, John Morrow, Mark Mower, Steven Sackey, Jonathan Seaman, Kenneth Tepper, Hatim Youssef, Kimberly Adams, Joanne Bass, Jennifer Becker, Leslie David, Robin Margolis, Edana Menkes, Karen Oppel, Mary Rottenberg, Emily Serpick, Jody Spector, Michele Uhlfelder, Jennifer Wunder, Monica Sanches, Richard Barnstein, Robert Bowman, Jeffrey Greenebaum, Gil Grodzinsky, Brain Kowitz, Eric Kronthal, Jon Lefko, Alan Moskowitz, Jonas Needleman, Jeffrey Rosenfeld, Keith Simon, Andrew Trivas, David Weinstock, Jason Wexler, Lynn Berkowitz, Jill Green, Amy Grossblatt, Heather Hoover, Wendi Kellman, Carol Kennedy, Lisa Koenigsberg, Elizabeth Reamer, Lisa Silverstein, Elise Song, Stacey Steinhorn, Lori Wasserman, Bruce Auslander, Michael Bennet, Michael Caplan, Craig Diamond, Scott Ferber, Kevin Grodnitzky, Duane Massimore, Brian Nelson, Jason Oletsky, Matt O'Mansky, Carl Schwartzman, Jordan Segall, Allan Siegel, Joshua Wolfe, Deborah Abosch, Deborah Cohen, Karen Finkelstein, Julie Freeman, Jennifer Goodman, Pam Hameroff, Karen Hofkin, Lauren Mills, Linda Needle, Michele Schwartz, Jill Sirody, Inci Ulgur, and Caroline Baker.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REFORM OF FEDERAL REGULATORY PROCESS

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, each of us in the House of Representatives has become increasingly aware of the urgent need for congressional oversight and reform of the Federal regulatory process. Nowhere in the vast realm of the Federal bureaucracy is the need for congressional scrutiny better illustrated than with respect to the Federal Trade Commission.

During the discussions and hearings on the FTC authorization bill in the 96th Congress, I, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Finance, became acutely aware of the unprecedented attempts of the FTC to extend its regulatory activities, particularly with respect to its rulemaking proceedings, into areas that are and have been regulated at the State and Federal level.

One of the most questionable and controversial areas of expansion by the FTC in recent years has been its involvement in activities of State regulated professions. Even though it has never been given express authority by Congress to do so, it has increasingly sought to usurp State responsibility, override State laws, and preempt State regulation of State regulated professions.

The Commission has even gone one step further in assuming jurisdiction over nonprofit professional associations related to those same professions, totally disregarding a rejection by both the House and Senate Commerce Committees during the 95th Congress of their attempt to enact a specific statutory mandate for such authority.

Today Mr. Lee and I are introducing a bill to temporarily restrain such unauthorized activities, through the imposition of a moratorium, until Congress determines what appropriate role, if any, the Commission should have with respect to State regulated professions.

This proposed legislation represents a necessary, rational and moderate approach to resolving the problem of FTC intervention into traditionally State-oriented policy and enforcement activities. Although the legislation would apply to only a limited number of professions—specifically those which have a generally higher standard of self-regulation in the public interest and for only a limited period of time—I consider it a fair and effective middle ground between those who would write the Commission out of the profession regulation business and

May 28, 1981

those who would allow it to go along as it has been unchallenged.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress most certainly has a duty to define the parameters of FTC authority with respect to State regulated professions. but absent the specific granting of any such authority, it has a corresponding duty to allow the States and the professions involved from continued interference while hearings are held in both houses of Congress and a judgment is made. I strongly urge that this crucial issue receive a complete hearing before Senator KASTEN's Subcommittee on Consumer of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee and Chairman Jim Florio's Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation, and Tourism of the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

I think it is important to point out to my colleagues that this issue has been considered before, in the form of an amendment to the FTC authorization bill a year ago February. While that Senate floor effort fell two votes short of being agreed to, it did succeed in demonstrating substantial degree of interest in and concern over the FTC/State-regulated professions matter.

It is my hope that this bill can serve as a vehicle for the House of Representatives to now address that same issue. Indeed, we have the obligation and responsibility to resolve such fundamental questions of State-Federal jurisdiction, particularly when there has been such a sweeping assertion of Federal dominance without any real clear authority to justify it.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is not the only one concerned about this unauthorized expansion of FTC jurisdiction and authority. Several State attorneys general and even the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia have voiced concern about the FTC regulatory overriding efforts. In a case relating to an FTC ophthalmic goods and services rulemaking, the U.S. Court of Appeals remanded a trade regulation rule to the Commission stating that "The FTC's proposed preemption of State law is almost as thorough as human ingenuity could make it."

And in referring to its "enforcement of the State's power, the Court reprimanded the Commission for" *** asking it to assume that despite recent decisions of the Supreme Court, States will act against the interests of their citizens and in defiance of the dictates of the Constitution."

I do not know who is right absolutely or what the final resolution might be. But I do know that the FTC has, understandably, been "backing off" on its own in this area recently—which ought to suggest something—and that some awfully convincing arguments have been made to demonstrate a pattern of overzealous activity in the immediate past.

In my capacity as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee—and as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee with jurisdiction over the FTC—I have a genuine personal interest in taking the leadership initiative in this important area. And together with Mr. Lee as a member of the relevant Energy and Commerce Authorizing Subcommittee, I want to encourage my colleagues to join in the effort to fully examine the relationship between the States, the professions and the FTC.

As an interim measure, it seems to me that a moratorium approach makes sense and should be tried to give someone other than the regulatory bureaucracy the benefit of the doubt for a change. I want to stress to my colleagues that this bill is simply a vehicle for Congress to work its will and, if enacted, would operate only until Congress reaches a substantive determination. In the meantime, more than adequate regulatory and enforcement functions relative to the professions would continue by the States themselves, the Justice Department (as spelled out specifically in the legislation) and, of course, through private actions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would welcome the comments and support of other Members who share my concern over congressional responsibility to clarify the FTC's role in this manner. I look forward, in fact, to the opportunity to assist in fashioning that clarification once a moratorium is in place and we can move ahead unencumbered by the emotions which have accompanied this issue previously. If that can happen, then this bill will have served an extremely worthwhile purpose.

Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of my colleagues I am inserting the text of this proposal in the RECORD following my remarks.

H.R. —

A BILL To place a moratorium on activity of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to certain professions and professional associations until the Congress expressly authorizes such activity.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Federal Trade Commission shall not investigate, issue any order concerning, prescribe any rule or regulation with respect to, or take any other action against any State regulated profession until the Congress takes the actions specified in subsection (b).

(b) The prohibition established in subsection (a) shall apply until the Congress enacts legislation which expressly provides that—

*(1) the Commission has jurisdictional authority with respect to professions; and
(2) the authority of the Commission preempts the authority of States to regulate professions.*

Sec. 2. Any decision, finding, or other administrative action made or taken by the Commission which—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(1) occurs during the period beginning on May 28, 1981, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) is based in whole or in part on any activity specified in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act;

shall, upon the enactment of this Act, be vacated and have no force or effect.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as placing a moratorium upon, or otherwise affecting, the enforcement of any cause of action by the Attorney General of the United States arising under the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) or the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.).

Sec. 4. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) The term "professions" means organizations, associations, or other categories of professionals.

(3) The term "professional" means any individual engaged in the performance of work—

(A) requiring advanced knowledge in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning (as distinguished from knowledge acquired by a general academic education, from an apprenticeship, or from training in the performance of routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical activities);

(B) requiring the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance;

(C) which is predominantly intellectual and varied in character (as distinguished from routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work); and

(D) which is of such character that the output produced or the result accomplished by such work cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time.

(4) The term "State regulated profession" means any profession which is subject to any licensure, certification, or regulation by a State.

Sec. 5. Provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act. ●

LEV GENDIN—REFUSENIK

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, a man named Lev Gendin turned 40 last week in a country he has been trying to depart for the last decade—the Soviet Union. Lev lives, as best he can, in Moscow, but his wife, Aviva, lives in Israel. She fled the Soviet Union in 1972, 4 months after they were married. Aviva has not seen her husband since then, but she has worked tirelessly for his freedom.

Lev was dismissed from his job in an agency of the tractor machine-building industry in November of 1971, on the objectionable grounds that he had applied for permission to emigrate to Israel. From then on, Lev has not been able to find work in his area of expertise, engineering, but has found employment only in menial jobs. He has continued to apply for permission to

emigrate, and each request has been denied. His last denial brought with it the threat that he would be sent to Siberia, not Israel.

In May 1974, Lev was attacked and beaten into unconsciousness by strangers. Later that year, he was arrested in a train station, jailed on a pretext, and incarcerated in a solitary cell. He is the subject of frequent surveillance and persecution by the KGB, the Soviet's secret police, and has spent a total of 160 days behind bars. What is his crime? He wanted to go to Israel.

Lev Gendin is one example of the thousands of refuseniks in the Soviet Union, Jews denied permission to leave the country and then penalized for even expressing the interest.

We must not allow this callous disregard for individual rights and human dignity to continue in the Soviet Union. We must constantly apply pressure on behalf of Lev Gendin and all the other oppressed refuseniks who share his desire for freedom. ●

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the strategic petroleum reserve is a vital national security asset. Unfortunately, Congress and the administration have dropped SPR into a budgetary quagmire that threatens to seriously damage the program. The Senate believes it has found a way out by enacting an off-budget approach that is nearly identical to current SPR funding. The difference is that the SPR account would be disguised off budget. It is a sleight-of-hand approach that misrepresents the amount of total Federal spending.

This view was recently buttressed in two distinguished journals in an article for U.S. News & World Report by Marvin Stone and in the Oil and Gas Journal. I commend these articles to the attention of my colleagues:

[From U.S. News & World Report, June 1, 1981]

\$3 BILLION WELL SPENT

(By Marvin Stone)

It's time to stop playing politics with the nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

This costly but vital project is supposed to protect the U.S. against a sudden cutoff of foreign oil by stockpiling enough to tide us over an emergency. The danger of such a cutoff is very real, especially if the tension now building between Israel and Syria flares into a new Mideast war.

Despite compelling reasons, neither Congress nor the White House seems willing to spend the 3 billion dollars needed to purchase oil for the reserve in 1982. Unless the nation's leaders show more resolve, the oil

stockpiling program—already lagging badly—will fall further behind schedule.

The idea of a Strategic Petroleum Reserve grew out of the 1973-74 Arab oil embargo that forced American motorists to line up for gasoline and left the U.S. economy in shambles. In 1975, President Ford asked Congress to approve a billion-barrel stockpile, enough oil to replace the nation's import needs for 90 days. The first 500 million barrels were to be stored by 1982.

So far, only 135 million barrels have been stored in salt-dome caverns along the Louisiana-Texas coast. That would be about a month's supply if all imports were halted. The delays have been blamed on oil shortages, bureaucratic mismanagement and opposition from foreign oil producers.

Perhaps the most important reason, however, is the escalating cost of oil. The price of a 42-gallon barrel of oil has risen from \$10.38 in 1975 to around \$36 today. In 1975, a billion-barrel reserve was estimated to cost 6 billion dollars. Now, the estimate is 47 billion dollars for a scaled-down reserve of 750,000 barrels.

President Reagan, attempting to keep a campaign promise to build up the reserve, asked for 3.9 billion dollars for the program in 1982. That would have enabled the government to buy about 230,000 barrels a day.

However, under pressure to trim federal spending and move toward a balanced budget, both the House and Senate have voted to reduce appropriations for the reserve by 3 billion dollars next year on the assumption that members will agree on some other financing method.

There is a wide variety of alternate plans now floating around on Capitol Hill.

The Senate Energy Committee has voted to borrow the money by selling government bonds, a bookkeeping gimmick that would not show up in the regular budget.

Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kans.) wants to force major oil importers to contribute five days' worth of imports each year to the reserve in exchange for a 10 percent fee.

Representative Phil Gramm (D-Tex.) has introduced legislation that would allow the government to sell "oil bonds" to private investors. Each bond would be worth the price of a barrel of oil and could be redeemed at the end of 10 years or during an emergency at the then-prevailing price of oil.

Another scheme would allow the government to borrow the 3 billion dollars from the 17 billion earmarked for the new U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

Although both Treasury Secretary Donald Regan and Budget Director David Stockman have testified that a straightforward appropriation would be the best way to fund the reserve, the White House has remained strangely silent. Without leadership from President Reagan, there is a real danger that Congress will not be able to reach agreement on a plan for financing the reserve.

It may take a certain amount of political courage to spend 3 billion dollars on oil that may never be needed at a time when programs such as Social Security, school lunches and prenatal care are facing sharp cuts. But the consequences could be much worse—for the administration and Congress—if another catastrophic oil shortage ever sends Americans back to the gasoline lines.

[From Oil and Gas Journal, May 11, 1981]

GET SPR OFF DEAD CENTER

"The U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve appears to be the only element of national

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

energy policy enthusiastically endorsed by both political parties, conservatives and liberals, all segments of the petroleum industry, and the public.

"But despite all this support, the program is bogging down and the fill rate threatens to dwindle to a trickle if not to zero. The SPR is in dire danger of a crippling blow from budget-cutting axes wielded by Congress and the administration.

"Both the Senate and the House appear set either on chopping appropriations for the SPR to a sadly inadequate level or adopting one of many schemes for private or federal off-budget financing.

"There are lots of good reasons why direct, on-budget funding of SPR oil purchases should continue—even though it might make the worthy and difficult budget-cutting efforts still tougher. Foremost is that the SPR is vital to U.S. defense and national security. That is why it was created. We have no quarrel with those who contend that the existence of an adequate strategic reserve of oil would contribute more to U.S. security and defense posture than some of the costly military items which will be funded in the budget. And there's no question that U.S. diplomatic and political independence would be enhanced in dealing with producing countries which will be supplying U.S. oil imports.

"Off-budget financing schemes, on the other hand, tend to mask the value and the costs of any given program. They would disguise—but not reduce—the costs to the country. They would tend to add to regulatory complexity while undermining economic and market efficiency. And finally they would tend to uncouple the important connections between government control and government responsibility.

"And then there are the proposals in Congress that the SPR be funded in some way by the private sector—in this case, the oil industry. That's about like asking the steel industry to finance the military's tank-production program or the electronics industry to fund U.S. space ventures. And it ignores the staggering contribution the oil industry already is making to the U.S. Treasury.

"One of these proposals, a bill introduced by Sen. Nancy Kassebaum (R-Kan.), veils its impact on the industry with a proviso for 'paying back' firms contributing to the reserve.

"Her proposal would require importers of 75,000 b/d or more of crude to contribute oil to the reserve at the annual rate of five times their daily average imports. The government would pay these firms 10% a year for 11 years for the contributed oil until the oil were withdrawn. This proposal has been flayed by oilmen as discriminating against large importers, confiscatory, and as a means of forcing some companies to make interest-free loans to the government.

"Union Oil Co. of California correctly deduces that the Kassebaum bill would provide incentives to evade and would foster inefficiency. If it became law, Union says, the government could expect a 'proliferation of 74,000 b/d broker/importers' who would suddenly get rich.

"Union contends with much logic that payment for the SPR fill should come from general fund revenues provided by the so-called windfall profits tax on crude oil. Congress bought the WPT in part on grounds it would provide greater energy security, paying both for development of synfuels and the SPR. The Reagan administration, convinced that huge block grants isn't the way to go on synfuels (we agree), will spend

relatively little of the WPT proceeds for synfuels development. The administration wants the SPR filled but is waffling on how to fund it—declining so far to take a position in committee hearings. The funding should be from WPT revenues, and this should be nailed down quickly.

"Crude prices are soft, OPEC resistance to a U.S. SPR is evaporating, and no one knows when the next world crude crisis might come. It's time to get off dead-center."●

SUPPORT FOR PAYMENT-IN-LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, when this body recently passed legislation amending appropriations for the balance of fiscal year 1981, \$108 million were rescinded from the payment-in-lieu of taxes program. The full House did not have the opportunity to debate this matter which will substantially affect counties deprived of a property tax base by Federal lands. In my State of Arizona, where more than 70 percent of the land is federally owned, many counties will be financially devastated by this rescission because these funds have already been budgeted for this year.

I wish to share with my colleagues the resolutions of the Pinal County Board of Supervisors in support of the program, and urge the House conferees to restore the funds and fulfill the commitment which the Federal Government has made to these local governments.

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PAYMENTS-IN-LIEU OF TAXES ENTITLEMENT LEGISLATION

Whereas a payments-in-lieu of taxes program, to recognize the tax immunity of Federal lands, has been recommended by the Public Land Law Review Commission, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the National Association of Counties; and

Whereas the Congress has stated its intention to make payments-in-lieu of taxes as a policy in the Federal Land Planning and Management Act of 1976; and

Whereas the Congress enacted Public Law 94-565 to provide a fair and equitable formula for payments-in-lieu of taxes after thorough study and hearings; and

Whereas rescissions and appropriation cuts that have been proposed or enacted virtually every year have jeopardized the effectiveness of this important program, with the effect that the Federal Government is not fully honoring its property tax commitment as other landowners must; and

Whereas sufficient funds are available from royalties and revenues derived from the tax exempt public lands to provide secure funding for the payments-in-lieu of taxes program; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Pinal County Board of Supervisors, Florence, Arizona, in Regular Continued Session, this 18th day of May, 1981, supports legislation to provide pay-

ments-in-lieu of taxes funding as an entitlement program utilizing mineral leasing royalties and revenues derived from the public lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Association of Counties is hereby requested to actively pursue such entitlement legislation.

JAMES J. KARAM, JR.

Chairman.

JIMMIE B. KERR,

Member.

WM. "BILL" MATHIESON,

Member.

Attest:

CHARLES A. GUINN,

Clerk.

SMALL TOWNS AND BIG COMPANIES

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the Wall Street Journal ran a very interesting article entitled "Managers Find Move to Cities Hard to Take." The point of the article is that large corporations increasingly are finding that their middle-level managers do not want to be transferred from plants in smaller towns to corporate headquarters in big cities.

This article is of particular interest to me for two reasons.

First, the Journal chose as its focus the case of a constituent of mine, Mr. Ronald Bauermeister. When Land O'Lakes decided to close up an executive office it had in my district in Spencer, Iowa, Ron turned down an option to relocate to corporate headquarters in Minneapolis-St. Paul. The article notes Ron's ties to the local community and his involvement in a number of local organizations in Spencer.

The second reason this article interests me is because it presents another aspect of an issue explored by the House Small Business Committee in hearings I chaired last year. The Small Business Subcommittee on Antitrust examined conglomerate mergers and their effects on small business and local communities.

One matter that we examined in the course of our hearings was the adverse impact on smaller communities of large corporations moving executives in and out of town. We looked at this problem from the community's perspective, but the Journal article raises the equally valid issue of the strains this puts on the managers.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the full text of the Journal's article and an excerpt from the report of the House Small Business Committee:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 22, 1981]

MANAGERS FIND MOVE TO CITIES HARD TO TAKE

(By Lawrence Ingrassia)

For Ronald Bauermeister, living in Spencer, Iowa, is more important than continuing his corporate career.

So this summer, when Land O'Lakes Inc. moves the executive offices of its Spencer Beef division to corporate headquarters near Minneapolis-St. Paul, the vice president of finance will resign and stay behind.

Others will leave the northwest Iowa town to stay with Land O'Lakes, but many will be doing so reluctantly. "We aren't ready to move to a big town, but the job situation here is almost nil," a middle-level manager says.

With companies opening and closing offices all the time, the unwanted transfer is an occupational hazard for a lot of employees. But the problem is especially vexing for small-town executives, who often grow roots in a community that are deeper than their ties to a corporation. The roots such managers put down can make the transfer problem equally vexing for their employers.

FIVE MINUTES FROM WORK

In the close-knit society of a town such as Spencer (population 12,000), executives are apt to be on a first-name basis with much of the community, and they often help run the town as well as their company. Mr. Bauermeister, for instance, is a director of a savings and loan association and has been active in the YMCA, the Rotary Club and his church council. His house is a five-minute drive from his office. Going to the city would mean saying goodbye not only to long-time friends but a way of life.

It also would mean a lot more expense. The Spencer Beef middle manager who is reluctantly transferring to the Twin Cities area will have a smaller house than his Spencer home, at a \$20,000 higher cost. His auto insurance bill will rise \$600 a year.

Transferring to a metropolis also can be ego-shattering for a middle manager. "In a small- or medium-sized town, he's Mr. Industry; his family is treated that way, and he is treated that way," says a spokesman for Union Carbide Corp. "In Manhattan, he gets lost on the commuter train with guys making four or five times as much as he is, riding a dirty car."

I LEAVE NEW YORK

Union Carbide is well-acquainted with the problem. It has had so much trouble getting managers to transfer from small-town plants to corporate headquarters in New York City that it is moving its head office to Danbury, Conn.

"Carbide has plants scattered around the country, and many Carbide employees tend to be small-town persons," says Robert Stahl, a relocation consultant whose clients include the chemicals company. "As they move up the corporate ladder, they're asked to move to the Big Apple. Many don't want to, so Carbide ends up transferring its fifth choice instead of its first."

Land O'Lakes, which will keep a slaughtering plant in Spencer, has offered transfers to all 68 employees of the unit's executive office. Just 41 have agreed to move, including 30 of the 39 management people. Management people usually are more willing to transfer, in part because it is harder for them to find a comparable job at home.

THE WRITING ON THE WALL

Mr. Bauermeister, who is 45 years old, is staying behind even though "the job I have

is the best job I've ever had." A trip to Minneapolis-St. Paul convinced him and his wife that Spencer is a better place to raise their three sons. "I know they have good schools," he says, "but some people visited one and there was graffiti on the walls. There's nothing wrong with that, but it doesn't exist in Spencer, Iowa."

Mr. Bauermeister grew up in a small town, and 14 years ago he left an Omaha accounting firm for Spencer Beef because he wanted to live in a small town again. He is a CPA, so to stay in Spencer, he will go to work for a local accounting firm or set up his own office. He expects his income to drop as much as 25%. But, he says, "our family sat down and talked it over. We came to the realization that money isn't the most important thing in life to us."

To overcome such resistance when closing an office, some corporations offer special compensation to small-town employees who will transfer to a big city. One that does so is Champlin Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Union Pacific Corp. Champlin is moving its accounting and data-processing offices from Enid, Okla., (population about 50,000) to headquarters in Fort Worth, Texas (population 382,000).

Besides its standard benefits for all transferred workers, Champlin has arranged for a bank to make mortgage loans at 11 1/4% to transferring employees, well below the going rate of 14%. And for the next three years, transferees will get a mortgage differential payment on the entire amount of their new-home loan instead of just on the amount of principal they owed on their Enid house. All 270 workers at Enid were offered transfers, and 150, including about 75% of managers and professionals, agreed to move.

But like most companies, Champlin isn't offering a cost-of-living equalizer. As Dale Schueffner, manager of the Minneapolis office of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.'s executive-search practice, explains, "Companies can't disrupt their internal salary structures by paying a premium to get somebody to move in from a small town. If they did, they'd have mutiny on their hands from present employees."

Besides employees and their employers, the small towns themselves can find a mass transfer wrenching. Pillsbury has begun moving some offices of Green Giant Co., which it bought in 1979, from Green Giant's hometown of Le Sueur, Minn., to Minneapolis. With such a transfer, says Bruce Olness, president of Le Sueur State Bank, "what you really lose is way beyond salaries. You lose the ability to get things done and your brain trust."

[Excerpts from Report of the Committee on Small Business]

CONGLOMERATE MERGERS—THEIR EFFECTS ON SMALL BUSINESS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

A. THE CONGLOMERATE AND THE COMMUNITY

"Absentee control changed the corporation's view of the surrounding community. Communities were viewed as locations for plants which were appropriate only so long as the location provided economic advantages. When such a location was no longer economically rational, the plant was closed and facilities built elsewhere."

"This economic calculation creates a fundamental conflict between the calculus of corporate welfare and local community welfare. Local municipalities are viewed as potential obstacles to the free flow of capital and use of productive resources. Thus, companies with little or no stake in the mainte-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 28, 1981

nance of community life will see local governments as entities which may provide facilitating actions for the company or set up constraints which are perceived as nuisances for the business.

"Prof. ROBERT STERN."

The Subcommittee heard testimony about five communities that experienced the takeover of a major local business by a conglomerate corporation. This testimony provided the members of the Subcommittee with information and insight that laid the foundation for discussions with subsequent witnesses. The following sections will summarize the testimony from community witnesses as well as the thoughts of others on the effects of conglomerate mergers upon the local community.

The conflict between the conglomerate corporate structure and a community stems from their differing economic and social requirements.

Local business and civic leaders view their primary function as facilitating a strong, diversified economy that provides jobs and a secure tax base to assure the public services, such as a school system, a sanitation system and recreational facilities that enhance the quality of community life. When a community's economy is controlled by leaders who live in the community, the balance between social and economic requirements is determined by those with vested interests in the community.

The process by which a large conglomerate corporation allocates its resources conflicts with the structure that determines resource utilization at the community level. Conglomerate corporations find themselves involved in a number of diverse activities at a large number of locations. Because of this, large conglomerates have a high degree of capital mobility. That is, they have many choices between types of activities and communities in which to invest their capital.

Large conglomerate corporations admittedly attempt to allocate their capital and management resources in a manner that seeks to maximize their shareholders' return on investment. This pressure towards profit maximization requires conglomerate managers to play their many investment options off against each other. Within a conglomerate, product lines, production facilities and even communities compete for the attention and resources of the parent corporation. The conglomerate corporation tends only to allocate resources and attention to those units that best serve its own self-interests. Sociologist Robert Stern of Cornell University told the Subcommittee:

"There are many places in which you find that corporations make decisions without very much concern about the impact on the local community. The communities are simply viewed as locations, and as soon as the economic advantage of locating there disappears, the plant also disappears, or at least the corporation begins to consider moving the facility."

Alfred Dougherty, director of the Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Competition, told the Subcommittee that conglomerate corporations have created a new set of rules for an investment game that is played solely for their own benefit:

"A conglomerate—lacking community loyalty and playing an investment game with rules different from those that non-conglomerate companies have traditionally followed—can simply write off a line of business, a plant, a work force, or a whole community and can turn its attention elsewhere, leaving others to pick up the pieces."

Mr. Dougherty's comments take on added significance as it becomes apparent that many of the country's largest corporations are playing the "conglomerate game." Harold Williams, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, told the Subcommittee:

"It has become acceptable to treat corporations as the sum of their properties and to assume that corporate control may change hands with no greater concern about the consequences that accompanies an exchange of property deeds in a game of monopoly."

"But a corporation is more than the aggregate of its tangible assets—and more than the equity of its current shareholders—it is an institution with a complex of interpersonal and contractual relationships that create legitimate interests in the corporation among employees, suppliers, customers, communities, and the economy at large."

A TRIP TO THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 27, 1981, 58 young men and women from Dundalk Elementary School in Dundalk, Md., journeyed to Washington for a firsthand look at their Nation's Capital.

The students, led by teachers and parents, Mrs. Shepherd, Mrs. Medura, Mrs. Strine, Mrs. Ewing, Mr. Streckfus, Mrs. Minor, Mrs. Denny, and Mrs. Logston, toured the Capitol Building and visited the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Smithsonian Museum of Natural History.

I am delighted these students have taken an interest in our Nation's political process, and I hope their interest will continue.

Students who visited us Wednesday are Robert Amon, Mark Bergamy, David Chapman, Kenneth Ewing, John Haites, Patrick McKay, Josef Morales, Solomon Speed, Lawrence Rao, Gary Young, William Lock, Jennifer Asplen, Wendy Bean, Victoria Denny, Christy Doonan, Lisa Flemming, Chonte Harris, Jennifer McBrayer, Nicole Medura, Angela Minor, Renee Moor, Lisa Shell, Melissa Shepherd, Sandi Smith, Mary Lou Streckfus, Lisa Strine, Jeanette Wilson, Tami Wlajnity, Torrell Allen, Ralph Baker, Scott Brady, James Browne, Brian Burke, Mark Davis, Brian Dillow, Stephen Makres, Michael Minutelli, Kenneth Mondie, Harry Respass, Scott Stulich, Adam Sonntag, Melanie Avig, Michelle Barnett, Paula Eckloff, Stephanie Freeman, Sharonda Gardner, Wendy Hurst, Leslie Lating, Victoria Parrish, Rhonda Reynolds, Tiffany Sewell, Gina Shipp, Barbara Smith, Sindi Smith, Kristine Sutterfield, Johnnie

Tracey, Crystal Watson, Macella Wright.●

THE CONTINUING REPORTS ON WISE SOCIAL INVESTMENTS

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of continued full funding, as a separate function, for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Recent reports indicate that title I has been a significant factor in the growing educational successes of disadvantaged children. The success of this vital education program is a prime example of the kind of wise social investment the Federal Government makes in its greatest natural resource, the youth of America.

As we all know, the administration intends to cut education programs by at least 25 percent—local officials respond that the impact of these cuts will be much greater than the administration percentages. President Reagan had made our economic woes a No. 1 priority, which every one of my colleagues must agree is justified. The administration wants to reinvigorate the economy, spur development, and control inflation. We all agree that this is essential for the stability of the United States. In addition, the administration wants a strong national defense. Again, we all concur that this must be so. What the administration fails to see, or to understand, is that a well-educated population is the very backbone of a stable economy and a strong national defense. And, a firm foundation for a successful education begins at the nursery school and elementary school level.

Title I serves disadvantaged children who might otherwise not receive the attention they need to build that firm educational foundation. As the following New York Times article points out, "there is a growing body of evidence that early intervention can reverse declines and lead to dramatic increases in the achievement levels of disadvantaged pupils."

I believe that Federal dollars spent on programs such as title I are a real investment in the health and stability of this Nation and I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to read the following article and well consider their ax-wielding approach to putting our economy back on the track.

EARLY REMEDIAL TEACHING CITED AS A SUCCESS

(By Gene I. Maeroff)

Sixteen years after the passage of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a law that has fundamentally altered attitudes and practices in remedial

education, there is a growing body of evidence that early intervention can reverse declines and lead to dramatic increases in the achievement levels of disadvantaged pupils.

The latest indication of a breakthrough came from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the federally sponsored monitor of changes and trends in the nation's schools. It disclosed last month that large gains in reading were made in the 1970's among 9-year-old black students across the country, and the improvement was attributed to compensatory education programs of the sort financed through Title I. This finding echoed earlier reports favorable to Operation Head Start and other projects aimed at preschool children.

Studies favorable to Title I have been completed recently by the National Institute of Education, the Educational Testing Service and Stanford Research Institute. In Ypsilanti, Mich., a continuing study sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation has demonstrated the value of preschool education for the disadvantaged and in some urban school systems, including New York City, compensatory programs have reduced the proportion of children reading two or more years below grade level.

Carried through Congress on the wave of euphoria that surrounded the Johnson Administration's Great Society, Title I has poured \$29.5 billion into elementary and secondary education, providing the personnel and materials for the neediest students to get extra attention in the basics, particularly in reading.

BUDGET CUTS PROPOSED

Now, however, as part of its budgetary retrenchment, the Reagan Administration proposes to reduce Federal expenditures for elementary and secondary education, including those provided by Title I, by 25 percent. Moreover, the Government would eliminate the requirement that Title I funds be used only to supplement and not replace local dollars. In fact, under the proposed block grant approach, state agencies would not have to spend the money on poor children.

Education Secretary T. H. Bell said that the proposed budget cuts were based "on a belief that educators will by and large try their best to serve students well rather than a belief that such officials are not to be trusted or that their views have not been affected by Federal goals over the last 15 years."

Remedial education has now demonstrated, according to many authorities, that progress in reading is possible among disadvantaged pupils if enough time is spent on the task in the formative years, particularly when students are instructed individually and in small groups. Title I has been the prod in persuading educators to give priority to reading, providing a proving ground for theories and techniques that are now accepted features in most of the nation's schools.

With Title I as the centerpiece, a growing assortment of Federal, state and local programs has been assembled to concentrate on ameliorating learning deficiencies before their cumulative effect become irreversible, which sometimes seems to happen by the time students reach high school. The record of remedial education at the secondary level has been far less satisfactory.

Sixteen states have created their own remedial education programs, many of which have been extended to all students who are lagging, regardless of economic background.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

which is the criterion by which the Federal Government distributes Title I funds.

The public schools in New York City, for instance, annually get \$163 million in Title I funds and \$60 million from a state program. Pupils with Special Educational Needs. There are 4,693 teachers and 4,785 paraprofessionals in the city working exclusively in remedial education with their salaries paid entirely by the two remedial programs.

The effects of budget cuts could be far-reaching because Title I has affected not only students who are directly involved but virtually all pupils as a result of changes it has inspired.

Reading instruction was once almost entirely in the hands of generalists—classroom teachers responsible for the teaching of reading along with all other subjects. Now, there are thousands of specialists, experts who augment the work of the regular teachers to give designated children up to an hour a day of additional attention in reading.

ANNUAL MONITORING REQUIRED

In addition, the diagnostic-prescriptive methods that experts have developed to analyze reading ability and to aid remedial students have now spread to the teaching of all youngsters. A host of new materials has emerged to assist teachers in tailoring instruction around the strengths and weaknesses of pupils, often breaking the reading process into separate parts so that students can work on their particular deficiencies.

The Title I mandate calling for the monitoring of programs has led to testing at the beginning and end of the school year, which has provided a kind of accountability not always present in regular programs, though there is concern about narrowing the curriculum too closely to boost test scores.

In addition, the hiring of paraprofessional aides to help teachers, a feature of many Title I projects, has spread beyond remedial education, as has the use of the parent advisory councils that are required for Title I programs.

A typical remedial classroom is run by Marie O'Neill and her two aides, Doris Silverstein and Ruby Giles, at Public School 173 in Washington Heights, a neighborhood at the northern tip of Manhattan. They see 80 children a day, all first graders, who come in groups of about 15 from their regular classes to receive 45 minutes of reading instruction to supplement the 45 minutes of reading that they get in their home room.

AN INDIVIDUAL APPROACH

During an afternoon last week, Mrs. O'Neill wheeled a portable blackboard into the long, narrow room, a converted storage closet now painted a bright yellow, and began drilling 10 of the children on phonics. She asked the pupils to pronounce the sound of each letter of every word as she printed it, then asked them to blend the sounds into words and finally to read the sentences.

Meanwhile, Mrs. Silverstein had taken three other youngsters into the hall, where she was pronouncing words and asking them to print the letters that created the sounds. Mrs. Giles was absent this particular day.

After 20 minutes, the three children returned to the room and Miss O'Neill had all the pupils work in small groups as she and Mrs. Silverstein circulated among them, providing individual attention.

Three of the pupils put on earphones, sitting silently around a tiny table listening to a cassette and following the story in their books. Four others worked in pairs, facing

each other, taking turns showing flash cards on which they had to pronounce the sounds of the letters. Two sprawled on the floor, arranging cards with pictures and sentences so that they could get a better understanding of what educators call "sequencing," the ability to recognize logical order. Another child assembled a puzzle in which each piece was keyed to the first letter in an animal's name.

"Many of our children come to school with limited backgrounds," said Mrs. O'Neill, who began her career in 1959 as a first-grade teacher and shifted into her specialty after extensive graduate study in the teaching of reading. "Most of the children have had no nursery school, and 31 of the 80 first graders in this program did not even attend kindergarten."

Statistics from big-city school systems show that many of the remedial students never make up the disadvantages in their background, but for those who do, Title I and other compensatory education programs are apparently the key experiences in bridging the gap.●

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 3671

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

• Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill (H.R. 3671) which would give the President the emergency powers to deal with what is becoming a serious problem to this country's economy; namely, the disintegration of the savings and loan industry. As I know my colleagues are aware, this problem is a complex one and there have been many proposed remedies such as placing reserve requirements on money market funds and the lifting of interest ceilings on savings accounts. While these actions may help alleviate the situation, I do not believe they go to the heart of the problem. Reserve requirements on money market funds will not provide enough incentive to get savers to put their money back in savings accounts, and raising the interest on savings will create a hardship on savings institutions that have long-term, low-interest loans on their books.

Why should the Federal Government be in the position of giving emergency assistance to the savings and loan industry? The answer is that we need to keep this industry viable because it is a primary source of residential mortgage money in this country. Without these institutions, the economic crunch on our housing industry will worsen and the dream of homeownership will all but disappear.

The problem facing the savings and loan industry is not simply that savers are putting their money in higher yielding money market certificates. Savings institutions are operating at a severe deficit because of the combined effect of the decline in savings along

with their increasingly unprofitable long-term mortgage portfolios. In my own district, the cash growth in savings at savings and loans has experienced a drop of 91 percent between the fourth quarter of 1980 and the first quarter of 1981. The average cost of money to the savings and loans has risen from 9.32 to 10.38 percent while the average mortgage portfolio yield has increased from 9.49 percent to 9.56 percent. As a result, these institutions are consistently posting losses, and mortgage money is virtually nonexistent in my district. I do not believe that this example is unique, but rather it is the norm throughout the country. We may well be approaching a crisis of unprecedented proportions in the savings and loan industry.

I believe that an effective way to give some relief to the industry and stimulate housing at the same time is to allow the savings and loans to dispose of their low-interest rate mortgages. To do this there must be an incentive for someone to buy these unprofitable long-term obligations. Giving a tax break to purchasers of these mortgages would provide them with the incentive they need to buy the mortgages and it would provide an influx of badly needed cash to the savings and loans which they in turn could use for making new mortgage loans at current market rates.

My bill does not mandate any financial assistance to the savings and loan industry. It allows the President, upon his determination that the industry is in such need of emergency assistance, to permit investors in the secondary mortgage market to purchase residential mortgages from savings and loans and not to be taxed on the interest received from these mortgages. The President would also have the authority to determine limits on the interest rates and maturity dates of the mortgages that could be purchased under this program. The legislation limits the effectiveness of this program to a period of 6 months, commencing on the date that the President puts it into effect. It further limits this authority to a one-time use. If the President were to activate this program, it would expire at the end of 6 months and Congress would have to authorize any further action.

I realize that there is no perfect solution to the problems facing the savings and loan industry. My bill, if enacted and implemented, would cost the Federal Government more than \$1 billion in lost revenues. That is why I have sought to make this an emergency power of the President rather than having Congress mandate the program. In this era of reduced Government spending, such an action would not be popular and would only be taken as a measure of last resort to help the troubled savings and housing industries. I would urge my colleagues

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to consider this or some other form of emergency measure before it is too late.●

PEGGY STUART-COOLIDGE

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, this past May 7, a great and talented woman, Peggy Stuart-Coolidge, passed away. Peggy Stuart-Coolidge is the only woman composer from the United States to be honored abroad. Aram Khachaturian invited her to send some of her music to Russia and then invited her to be present when the Moscow Symphony performed her work. Instead of one piece, the full 1½ hours were devoted to her music alone and people from the American Embassy in Moscow were special guests.

She was honored by the Polish and Soviet Composers Society. Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands selected her work from international competition for the World Wild Life Society and honored her when the work was presented in London.

Ms. Coolidge had works presented and performed in Italy, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, Germany, Austria, Canada, and Japan and given awards in all of these countries, but never once received one here in her own country.

As a special contribution to world understanding she did a documentary on communication through music in Japan, Hong Kong, Thailand, and India.

It is an honor and pleasure for me to share the following article outlining some of the accomplishments of this brilliant American composer:

PEGGY STUART-COOLIDGE

Peggy Stuart-Coolidge is believed to be the first American woman composer of symphonic works to be heralded by an album devoted solely to her own compositions. Entitled "American Reflections," the recording was released by Vox Productions in June 1976.

The former Peggy Stuart of Boston, Massachusetts, began composing at the age of nine. She is now one of the few American women composers with international standing, since her works have been performed in Italy, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, Germany, Austria, Canada, and Japan. At the invitation of the Union of Soviet Composers, Miss Coolidge was invited to Moscow in 1970, where her works, submitted to the Union, resulted in a concert devoted exclusively to her compositions, introduced by Aram Khachaturian. The Coolidges were later advised that no other American composer had been accorded the honor of a one-composer concert in the Soviet Union. She was awarded the Medal of the Soviet House of Workers in Art. From 1970 on, perfor-

May 28, 1981

mances of her works multiplied over Western Europe, including East Berlin.

She is unique in the fact that while she was in these countries for performances of her music, she was continually assimilating their musical attitudes and absorbing their culture. This is clearly visualized in the documentary film that was made of her experiences with the musical communities of Tokyo, Hong Kong, Thailand and India. The sequences include visits to a narcotic rehabilitation center orchestra, playing and singing for children at a convalescent home in Hong Kong, attending performances by refugees from the Peking Opera and folk dances performed in the foothills of the Himalayas, as well as a performance of an orchestra of Tibetan lamas accompanying prayer chants.

Married to Joseph R. Coolidge, a writer and editor, Miss Coolidge has pursued with her husband their dedication to conservation and the environment as members of the World Wildlife Fund. At the request of the president of the organization, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, the Coolidges created a narrative composition entitled "The Blue Planet" which was first presented at the International Congress of the World Wildlife Fund in Bonn in 1972. The ten minute composition has become the musical motto for the organization. The theme was subsequently performed in San Francisco in November 1976 as part of the program of the Fourth International Congress of the World Wildlife Fund.

Miss Coolidge was represented on the first program of the Eleventh Annual American Music Festival at the National Gallery of Art in Washington in April 1977. Conductor Richard Bales selected Miss Coolidge's "Pioneer Dances" for the program.

Miss Coolidge's most ambitious achievement is the completion of a full length ballet, "An Evening in New Orleans," with a fictional scenario by Joseph Coolidge, based on the historical hero Jim Bowie in the year 1832.

In May of 1978 Miss Coolidge's "American Mosaic" was performed by the American Wind Symphony Orchestra of Western Pennsylvania, Robert Austin Boudreau, conductor. The overture, commissioned by the orchestra, had its premiere performance in Pittsburgh and remains a part of the orchestra's standard repertoire.

Miss Coolidge studied with one of the last pupils of Leschetizky, Heinrich Gebhard, teacher also of Leonard Bernstein. She studied composition privately with Raymond Robinson, then head of Boston University's Music Department and with Quincy Porter of the New England Conservatory.

Highlights of Miss Coolidge's career include:

Presented symposia for the Polish and Soviet Composers' Society in Warsaw and Moscow on the subject of the overlap of serious and popular music.

Composition of a film score for "A Silken Affair," starring David Niven.

Incidental music for a New York production of Sean O'Casey's "Red Roses for Me," starring Martyn Green, and incidental music for Richard Lortz's Broadway play "Voices," starring Julie Harris and Richard Kiley.

"Pioneer Dances" heard in the album of Miss Coolidge's compositions is included in the repertoire of the United States Marine Orchestra for performance at the White House.

As an unofficial cultural ambassador in other countries, she has been praised on the

floor of the Senate by former Congresswoman Margaret Chase Smith. Senator Tom McIntyre of New Hampshire arranged for a flag to be flown for a day over the National Capitol in her honor with the citation "... for furthering better understanding among nations through the universal language of music".

"Pioneer Dances" performed at Carnegie Hall in 1975 in celebration of the 15th anniversary of Norwegian Immigration, King Olaf present.

"American Mosaic" commissioned by the American Wind Symphony Orchestra of Western Pennsylvania, Robert Austin Boureau, conductor, premiered on May 20th 1978 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

REVIEWS

"I consider her one of the most brilliant composers in America."—Aram Khachaturian, September 14, 1977.

"Richly melodic, brightly orchestrated music, expertly written in the American idioms pioneered by Copland and Gershwin and immediately enjoyable on first hearing for anyone who likes those composers. There are touches of jazz in the 'Rhapsody' and the 'Spirituals,' a charming folk-music flavor on the 'Pioneer Dances,' a haunting evocation of mountain landscapes and a lively depiction of a county fair in 'New England Autumn.'"—Joseph McLellan, Washington Post, May 22, 1977.

"Brilliant orchestration, slightly modal harmonies and rhythmic insistence . . . Coolidge's 'Pioneer Dances'—a rollicking stomp, a quiet dreamy piece, and a fiddle tune—are spirited, nicely worked out pieces."—Joan Reinhaler, Washington Post, April 18, 1977.

"Also bears strong affinities to the serious contributions of Morton Gould . . . strongly appealing . . . intriguingly orchestrated."—Paul Kresh, Stage Review, January 1977.

"Here she has recorded her 1965 piece 'Rhapsody': many moods mostly as mellow as a ripe pineapple and with just that touch of tang, realized in full orchestral sound. 'New England Autumn' advances mellow into nostalgia although injected with a measure of gaiety. 'Pioneer Dances' continues the folk flavor of bygone times still fresh in memory. And then there are Miss Coolidge's own 'Spirituals' (1969) at times yearning, at times triumphant, which fit into the complimentary texture of this collection."—Christian Science Monitor, August 20, 1976.

"Bright, optimistic . . . plainly the work of a practiced professional."—Irving Lowens, Washington Star, April 4, 1977.●

THE SPREAD OF ATOMIC BOMBS

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems facing mankind is the spread of atomic bombs to a multitude of countries around the world. I am extremely concerned about the direct link between commercial nuclear power technology and the ability to acquire an atomic bomb. I would like to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal which articulates the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

dilemma which nuclear trade and commerce in the peaceful atom has created for world security.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 11, 1981]

NUCLEAR CURRY

The Reagan administration, with good reason, is striving for a rapprochement with Pakistan by offering that country a hefty, long-term package of military and economic assistance in order to counterpose the Soviet threat in Southwest Asia. What, however, should be the U.S. response if, as seems likely, Pakistan detonates a nuclear bomb?

Sen. Alan Cranston recently disclosed U.S. intelligence information that Pakistan is building a horizontal tunnel in the Baluchistan Mountains near Afghanistan for a probable test of a nuclear warhead "by the end of the year, most likely by the end of 1982." Other intelligence information and news reports reveal that Pakistani physicists, while working in European nuclear-energy programs, acquired knowledge to produce plutonium—the essential component of a nuclear bomb. French and Swiss companies have supplied the necessary technical hardware, and Libya's col. Khadafy has provided funding for the project and subsidized the purchase of uranium supplies from Niger.

Pakistan's zeal for a nuclear bomb is the consequence of the "peaceful" nuclear bomb exploded by its neighboring adversary, India, in 1974. At that time, India used a Canadian reactor and U.S. heavy water to produce its bomb. Unlike Canada, which immediately cut off nuclear trade with India after the 1974 explosion, the U.S. has continued to supply India with nuclear fuel despite its refusal to permit international inspection of all its nuclear facilities and to disavow further fabrication of nuclear weapons. According to intelligence sources, India is poised to explode another nuclear device at its Pikanan test site, and the Reagan administration is considering curtailment of additional fuel shipments to India, though there is no guarantee that India will not use the U.S.-supplied fuel in its possession to construct additional bombs.

The U.S. should not send any additional uranium to India until it accepts "full-scope safeguards" and ends its bomb program. But it should be made plain that the U.S. is not abrogating its agreement, but that India has violated our mutual contracts. The U.S., which is India's largest trading partner, could use economic leverage to dissuade India from pursuing its nuclear program by holding back this year's \$250 million in economic assistance and by seeking similar prohibitions from such international organizations as the World Bank.

As for Pakistan, the U.S. should of course try to preserve that nation's nuclear-weapons virginity, but it is rather late in the game considering the lack of sanctions against India. It is not clear whether we could do more to contain the spread of nuclear weapons by ostracizing Pakistan than not doing so. It already has the money, technology and uranium to produce a bomb, plus the incentive of the Indian program. And the biggest danger is not a Pakistani bomb but an "Islamic bomb," with Pakistan sharing its technology with its Libyan bank-rollers, who in turn might pass it along to the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Thus the U.S. faces difficult and painful choices in its anti-proliferation policy, choices that might have been avoided if the

U.S. had not set out on its Atoms for Peace Program, had imposed sanctions promptly after the Indian explosion, and had otherwise conducted anti-proliferation policy with a seriousness that has been sadly lacking.●

YOU'RE IN GOOD HANDS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 28, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following article written by Loren Stell for the Westchester Gannett Newspaper chain which appeared on Sunday, May 10, 1981.

The article, an interview with Dr. Barry Commoner, reveals Dr. Commoner's great wisdom and provides important insights to solving our energy problems.

I offer this article for my colleagues' attention:

BARRY COMMONER WANTS THE POWER IN YOUR HANDS

(By Loren Stell)

Up to now, money-saving solar energy has been directed at people who can afford a \$25,000 mortgage increase. But many lower-income families have an option they haven't heard about.

There are millions of row-houses up and down the East Coast that could take advantage of cogeneration and solar energy. What we're going to do is develop an optimal energy system.

Before deciding to run for president last year, Dr. Barry Commoner took a long survey of the political thicket. He saw Jimmy Carter wandering, lost. He feared the havoc of Ronald Reagan's budget machete and military spending. Only a new party, he believed, could begin the natural process that would return the nation to its place in the sun.

That he captured less than 1 percent of the vote doesn't bother him. He says his campaign firmly established the Citizens Party, dedicated to the proposition that Americans don't have to be impoverished by the high cost of energy or by the mistakes of reckless corporations chasing profits.

As Reagan arrived in Washington, the energetic Commoner, now 63, bobbed up in his native New York city, where he has begun to offer new prescriptions for our energy ills.

The engine for change is the sun, now the only feasible long-term hope, according to Commoner. He says the nation—and the world—must make the "solar transition" to renewable fuels. He is opposed to the alternative offered by nuclear proponents: breeder reactors that are supposed to make more nuclear fuel than they burn. Such reactors, Commoner says, are too expensive, too complicated, too unreliable and too dangerous.

A biologist, Commoner has long been an environmentalist leader, having started his Center for the Biology of Natural Systems in 1966 at St. Louis' Washington University. His book, "The Closing Circle," sums up many of the findings of his early work.

The environmental studies led to Commoner's interest in the energy crisis, which

resulted in his most recent volume, "The Politics of Energy."

Commoner didn't get much coverage in last year's campaign until he used barnyard terms in a radio spot to criticize Reagan and Carter policies. That was too bad, because his views are startling in their commonsense simplicity.

Working out of his center, now based at Queens College, Commoner plans to apply the "solar transition" to a block of row houses. He will first install a cogenerator—an engine that can provide space heat while making electricity—and later add solar panels and photovoltaic cells.

The implications of the project are broad. If it is practical on a wide scale, the nation would have to burn less of its scarcest fuels. In addition, each American family would gain far more control over its energy production and costs. Commoner's ideas could, in short, truly return power to the people, as he explains:

Question. Can New York really cut down its appetite for energy?

Answer. Absolutely. In Queens, we are introducing energy-saving and solar processes into areas where poor people live—because the poor suffer most in the energy crisis. Up to now, steps taken to introduce money-saving solar energy have been directed at people who can afford a \$25,000 increase on their mortgage. But thousands of lower-income families have an option they haven't yet heard about.

Question. To make the "solar transition?"

Answer. Right. Cogeneration—the production of electricity without throwing away the heat made in the process—is the key to an energy-efficient system.

People can form small energy co-operatives out of a group of row houses. In a row house, you've got a group of houses with just one wall between their basements. Our idea is to put a cogenerator in one building that would produce electricity and heat for the entire row-house block, delivered by a single pipe driven through the interconnecting walls.

Once that's set up, the savings start immediately, because in generating your own electricity, you are also producing free heat. Then you can begin to introduce solar savings in three different ways: by putting heat collectors on the roof and adding it into the circulating hot water from the cogenerator, installing photovoltaic cells when the price comes down, and finally by the substitution of methane produced from garbage or sewage for the natural gas burned in your cogenerators.

Question. These cogenerators are just converted auto engines?

Answer. Yes, four-cylinder Fiat engines, which have been converted to burn natural gas instead of gasoline. In Europe, they're very popular and are often used banded together. There is no reason why such units couldn't be made in the U.S. You would have to design the whole thing, but it's not terribly complicated.

Question. Why did you pick row houses, rather than high-rises?

Answer. The practicality of cogeneration in high-rise apartment buildings is known in Europe and here. Several huge complexes in Brooklyn and Queens already have cogeneration units. But you have more difficulty introducing solar energy, because tall buildings have relatively little roof space.

There are millions of row houses up and down the East Coast that could take advantage of cogeneration and solar energy. What we're going to do is develop on optimal

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

energy system—and also a way of evaluating any given set of row houses with respect to their structure—so that any metropolitan homeowner group can compute how big a cogenerator has to go in, what the relative advantages would be, what value solar heaters would add, and so on.

Row houses are ideal in the city. In the suburbs, one-family houses in small neighborhoods could be connected by pipes in ditches. Although no one I know of in the suburbs has built such a district-heating system, neighborhood cogeneration will eventually be economical too, especially because suburban houses have more roof area available for solar devices.

Question. If everyone begins producing his own electricity, how would that affect the utility companies?

Answer. Wall Street is no longer looking at utilities as a good investment and very soon neighborhoods might start out-competing them in producing cheap energy. In a solar transition, of course, utilities everywhere are going to be in trouble. It is very unlikely that they can maintain a centralized power grid as a private enterprise. They probably should all go into public ownership.

Question. Until that happens, how would your row-house cogenerators hook up to the utility system?

Answer. The mathematics will have to be worked out. You could keep the size of the row-house cogenerator down, and when there is a peak demand for the use of electricity—in the middle of the summer—you may buy some from Con Edison.

On the other hand, you may choose to have a cogenerator big enough so that you could always meet your peak demand. Then you're bound to have extra electricity in the winter. So you'd sell it. Con Edison wouldn't like that, but they'd have to buy it. There are rules about that now.

Question. What other projects are underway at the center?

Answer. We have come up with a method of analyzing urine to determine whether a person has been exposed to carcinogens. Here we hope to test children's urine—since they are not industrially exposed and not smoking—in order to get a picture of the distribution of carcinogens in the general environment.

We plan to test kids in the city and the suburbs, particularly northern New Jersey where there are heavy levels of pollution.

Also, we are trying to research whether it's possible to pump up the sludge that's been dumped offshore all these years in the New York Bight and convert it into methane.

Question. Aren't you going to have to sign up a billionaire to help you get these projects off the ground?

Answer. It's going to be very hard, because the research money we have been using has largely depended on the federal government. Now Reagan has decided that the Department of Energy should be reduced to exploring nuclear power—precisely the wrong thing to do.

Question. Would you say that you hope to make New York self-reliant?

Answer. Certainly not. It's out of the question. Self-reliance is a trap in some ways. When I testified before Congress, I calculated that there just isn't enough solar area in Manhattan to support the people who live there. New York will always have to depend on imported energy.

Question. That might take a whole Middle East oil field.

Answer. Not necessarily. The imported energy should be solar energy. The important thing to do now in New York and other big cities is to set up systems that will readily accept imported solar energy. That's why natural gas is so important. Because the natural-gas pipe system can also accept methane gas from biomass, such as farmers' compost or garbage. There is a plan to pipe methane from the Pelham Bay Park landfill to Co-Op City, for instance. This is a form of renewable solar energy. Our studies have shown that the most efficient and economical way to cogenerate electricity and heat locally is with methane gas.

Question. Why not generate electricity centrally as we do now?

Answer. The main reason is that the most energetic way to transmit energy—that is, with the least loss—is by piping gas. Transmitting electricity over distance is very wasteful. It has to overcome resistance in the lines. More, when you conduct electricity from a central power plant, you are producing an awful lot of heat at one place and it's difficult to get enough people to live around a plant to make efficient use of that heat. Beyond that, the biggest expense is the amount of capital needed for central plants, especially for nuclear-produced electricity.

Question. Not a lot of people are heading to Three Mile Island.

Answer. That's right. When people learn that decentralized production of electricity—through cogenerators—makes sense, then the need for methane and natural gas becomes obvious.

With people living close together, you have to have a fuel for their cogenerators that won't pollute. And natural gas and methane do not pollute—back to the row-house project.

What we are doing makes sense today simply based on the economics of cogeneration. Eventually, my idea is that surplus methane produced from biomass plants above ground could be pumped the other way back underground into natural gas tanks.

Question. You've come a long way from where you started—with air, earth and water—to this overriding concern about energy.

Answer. Our environmental research led us to energy. The pollution problems came about because of faults in our production system—the way in which we produce cars, fabrics and food. In many ways, energy is the most crucial element in redesigning our system of production. Without energy, no production takes place. If you reduce my concern to one central theme, it's not pollution or energy. It's reorganizing the system of production. That explains why I went into politics. We will need profound political reorganization to confront the problems of energy and pollution.

Question. Besides talking about corporate mismanagement due to the goals of simply making profits, you've written that pollution—and the huge debt it's incurred—also makes political reorganization a necessity.

Answer. Absolutely. Take the business of toxic wastes. There are at least 5,000 Love Canals all over the country. How large a problem they present can be seen from the superfund Congress voted to begin the cleanup. A lot of taxpayers' money has been unnecessarily wasted. How did this happen?

Basically it happened because of the development of the petrochemical industry after World War II, which proceeded to put a burden on the environment. It was

cheaper for the companies to just dump waste, rather than to detoxify the poisons. But cleaning it up now is a lot more expensive than preventing it in the first place would have been.

The question has never been asked, when these decisions are made, "Is this going to be good for the people of the country?"

No, the essential decision is made by a corporation asking only one question, "Is this good for our corporation, for our profits? And if it is, we'll do it." Then later we discover whether it is good or bad for the country.

In "The Closing Circle" I wrote that a series of decisions made by the auto companies, the utilities and the petrochemical industry—decisions good for short-term profits—were bad and unprofitable for the country. This raises the basic issue: How do we prevent such corporate short-sightedness?

Question. This was part of your concern when you were campaigning for the Citizens Party?

Answer. Right. We are heading for very serious economic problems. We've got an auto industry that is deteriorating; we've got a subway system in New York—and mass transit all over—that's in bad shape; we've got inflation and unemployment. Clearly, we have to rebuild the economy.

The energy crisis leads to various opportunities to rebuild in a much more efficient way. For example, we could have our auto system on alcohol, as in Brazil, which is moving into total alcohol fuel. The Ford factory there is building 100 percent alcohol-fueled cars. People are buying them as fast as they can build them. Imagine if we did that here?

Question. Then the energy crisis may actually lead to an economic upswing?

Answer. Perhaps. But it's going to take major capital investment, and I don't see any way of getting the capital unless we cut drastically the capital we're wasting in military production.

There's a very simple, fundamental point that's very hard to get across to the pundits and the media. It is that the rate of inflation—the ability of an economy to grow—is directly related to the percent of the economy that goes into military production.

It's no accident that the highest rate of inflation in any industrialized country is in Israel, because the Israeli economy has been so heavily turned toward the military. Among the large countries, the U.S. has the highest rate of inflation. And, of the large countries, the U.S. has the highest percentage of its budget going into the military.

At the other end of the scale are Japan and West Germany. They're in great economic shape because they cleverly lost World War II and for many years were held back by the treaties from investing in the military. This simple fact—that big increases in unproductive military spending pushes inflation higher—is being ignored totally by the Reagan administration.

Question. How did your campaign audiences respond when you spoke this way?

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Answer. A lot of them would say at first: "My God, the Russians will overrun us if you take this stance. The huge military expense is justified, because we are in danger."

I'd tell them another way to look at it is to remember what we were told by the administration at the time of the Vietnam War—that we had to get involved because of this threat to the U.S. because of Soviet and Chinese expansion. We listened, got involved and lost. And even though we lost, we haven't been threatened. If it's true, as any objective military expert will tell you, that the government in Vietnam is not a threat to the U.S., it means the entire tragedy—the huge expenditure in Vietnam—served no purpose relative to our security.

Question. Estimates range as high as \$200 billion, I believe.

Answer. And thousands of lives. And, in some ways even more importantly, Vietnam destroyed the credibility of the government so much so that the people have now elected a president who is basically an anarchist.

Question. How are you defining anarchist?

Answer. Reagan I consider to be, in a sense, an anarchist. He tells us the big problem is the government. That's what anarchy is about. Anarchists claim that if you do away with the government, everything will be all right. And, as you might imagine, I consider that bad, because government allows us to improve civilized life.

Question. Out in the hustings when you were trying to get elected . . .

Answer. I wasn't trying to get elected. That was not my mandate or intention. We were organizing a party . . . And the Citizens Party is established now. Of course, the election was very strange in many ways. Nationally we received .27 percent of the vote. You say that's very little. But it's not an accurate measure of our constituency.

Wherever we had a local candidate, the vote was enormously higher. In Missouri, where we had write-in campaigns, two local candidates ran. One got 10 percent of the vote and the other got 19. This makes me believe that our true constituency is about 10 percent.

Question. What are some of the issues that the Citizens Party will be keeping alive?

Answer. Well, expenditures on public enterprises—water, sanitation, garbage—have been neglected. The propaganda against public expenditures has had a disastrous effect on the quality of these systems and therefore on the quality of life. There is no way we're going to have a decent standard of living without paying attention to these things. For example, maintenance and development of the whole New York City water supply has been neglected, as has been the mass-transit system.

Question. Have you a vision of what a solar New York would be like?

Answer. One of the things that would be immediately apparent would be the neighborhoodness of the city. Clearly what would be happening would be the establishment of local co-operatives. They would begin ini-

tially around the business of producing energy and you can see how the thing would spin out.

You might have a row-house cooperative or a block association covering one block or 10 square blocks. An issue in the neighborhood newsletter might be, since there would likely be an excess of energy generated at the co-op power stations, "Hey why don't we buy some electric cars for the neighborhood that all members could use to go shopping?" The batteries would sop up the extra electricity and members would be provided with a convenient service.

The cars and the generating plant would provide jobs for local people. And out of that might come the notion of also buying an electric truck to go outside the city to a farmers' co-operative to pick up food where it's freshest.

Eventually, perhaps, some food co-ops might link up with the energy co-ops. These new associations of consumers would invade the territory which is now thought to be the province of the utilities and the supermarkets. Maybe a few windmills would whirl and garbage collection would gain in status—it would be an important resource for methane for the cogenerators.

Question. Is it possible, using some of the logic in *The Closing Circle*, to say our government has to learn to close its own circle?

Answer. I don't usually equate biological and social issues. Science deals with molecules, not people. . . . What I was talking about in the book was the origin of life. The way in which it happened was that we had organic matter laid down chemically on the surface of the earth. The first living things arose as users of the organic matter. That's where they got their energy from. And if nothing else had happened, life would very soon have gone right down the drain—using up all the earth's organic matter.

But photosynthesis arose, a natural means of constantly re-creating organic matter, as in plants, through solar energy—thus closing the circle. If it weren't for that closed circle, we wouldn't be here today . . . Our system of production is now dealing with our resources in this unilateral way—burning up non-renewable organic matter like oil—and failing to recognize the need to fit into this balanced system. We now have to restore the integrity of the system.

Question. I still wonder if you can't extend your metaphor? If the profit motive can be seen as a linear kind of phenomenon—unwittingly using up the earth's resources without replacing them—then shouldn't enlightened government "close the circle" and create a kind of "human photosynthesis"?

Answer. It's not inevitable that we will succeed as nature does. But I would agree; what we must have is a government that recognizes the need for concerted social action as a way of sustaining individual human lives.●