EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LOCAL CONTROL

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1981

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the slogans that had great currency in the last election was a strong call for local control, for getting the Federal Government off our backs. I am totally in agreement with that sentiment. There is no excuse that I can see for the Federal Government to be involved in decisions that are in the legitimate jurisdictions of local governments, whether they be State, county, or municipal.

That, I suppose, is why I was so disappointed in the action this body took last Thursday when, in a display of political expediency overcoming rational legal and constitutional processes, a majority of the House repealed the District sexual assault reform law.

I do not want to speak to the particular merits of the bill under question. Those have been extensively discussed, for those who cared to listen, in the debate on this floor last Thursday. Nor do I wish to impugn the individual motivations of any of the Members who voted for the repeal. An individual's own conscience is the final determiner of whether an action was taken out of honest conviction, or out of fear of political reprisal.

I only know that, in my own conscience, I could not agree to an action which intrudes the Federal Government into a local determination of what a local law should be. That is true whether a municipality is Sioux Falls, S. Dak. or Washington, D.C.

An editiorial in the October 5 edition of the Washington Post speaks very well to this problem. I would urge my colleagues to give it a careful reading:

[From the Washington Post]

BEATING UP ON THE DISTRICT

Seizing on bundles of inaccurate, sensationalist information and with no regard for any sanctity of local self-government in the capital, a majority of the House of Representatives has dealt a severe blow to the District of Columbia by striking down the city's sexual assault reform law. How this came to pass is a tragedy of errors, compounded by misinformed and slightly hysterical members of the House eager to score points at home with a cheap shot at a helpless city that has no vote in the chamber.

That the House ever came to care about this bill is one mixed-up story; what happened as a result is even worse. It began in the D.C. Council—duly created by Congress and elected by the voters of this city to act as the local legislature. After a long and careful study by one of the council's most careful legal minds—member David A. Clarke—legislation was drafted and enacted to improve the sexual assault laws and to make others more enforceable and punishable. At no time—no matter what members of the House read, thought or were told by frenzied opponents—did the local council consider any move that would have encouraged or otherwise sanctioned behavior that could be deemed immoral.

But starting with misleading words such as "legalize" that were used to describe the legislation, members of Congress and various political and religious organizations interpreted this recodification effort as a wild effort to turn Washington into Sin City. In fact, the proposed revisions would have made the laws here similar to those in the states from which so much congressional opposition arose.

But then—and this is where the real crime was committed—the opponents, including a minority of local residents urged by nervous religious leaders to plead for congressional intervention—revived the medieval days of colonial rule in the District of Columbia by pressuring the House into its vote to strike down the city's act.

There is no legal question that the House has the authority to shoot down any action of the city government—but the whole congressional idea of the charter that established the elected mayor and council in this city was to allow local government to act on purely local matters. Certain criteria were established for deciding how this congressional oversight should work:

The first question about any council-passed act is, does it violate the D.C. Charter Act? Clearly, this act did not. Second, does it violate the U.S. Constitution? No one argued that this act did. Finally, does enactment raise a federal issue or obstruct the federal interest? This one did not, except by wild stretches of prurient imagination and the most liberal interpretations of the federal interest—often by members who would never stretch the federal interest that far into their own states and laws, and whose own state laws are virtually the same as that which the District is trying to adopt.

Rep. Bob Livingston, a Republican from Louisiana, was one of the few who took the trouble to study the legislation rather than merely rely on a "Hey—dirty pictures!" fantasy about it. In a vain effort to get his colleagues off their approach, he told them:

"It does not in my reading make legal any public displays of homosexuality or any lewd or lascivious conduct. . . . I have gone through this bill extensively, and I am concerned again that the members . . . simply have not taken the time to look at District of Columbia Act 4-69. If they were to do that, they would realize that many of the rumors that have been promulgated about this particular act are not as valid as they think.

"I have to say that I have been labeled as a conservative. I am an ex-prosecutor, and I am not trying to defend homosexuality, incest or any other deviation of mankind, but what I am trying to say is, let us not run away with the emotionalism of the hour, but carefully consider if we want to overturn an act which appears to have been rationally considered by a capable deliberative body within the District of Columbia."

The vote to reject was 281 to 119—a terrible blow to home rule. Nevertheless, it should not be considered a precedent for further incursions into local government in this city, but rather as a gross aberration based on misinformation. The city should proceed to draft the best possible revision of the laws as intended—and Congress should let local democracy work in the capital city.●

TASK FORCE REPORT MAKES COMMONSENSE ON IMPROVED FEDERAL HANDGUN LAWS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the Task Force on Violent Crime established by Attorney General William French Smith and headed by Illinois Gov. James Thompson and former U.S. Attorney General Griffin Bell of Georgia made profound recommendations for helping to reduce crime in America.

One of these recommendations related to the subject of handguns and the need for improving our Federal laws to help local and State law enforcement officials in reducing the use of handguns by criminals.

A thoughtful commentary was composed recently by the conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in the Tuesday, September 29, 1981, edition of the Washington Post.

Jack Kilpatrick touches upon the subject of handgun legislation and several other significant elements in the task force report. I am inserting the column for the further edification of my colleagues.

GUNS, BAIL AND COMMON SENSE

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The statistics on crime no longer shock. We have grown numb to them: one murder every 23 minutes, one forcible rape every six minutes, one robbery every 58 seconds. The mind's eye turns away: it will not look at the fearful reality.

Yet violent crime in the United States is indeed a fearful reality. We think of ourselves as a free people living in a free society, but in every major city in the nation our people are not free. They are held hostage by criminals, most of them young punks, most of them hopped up on drugs.

What can be done about it? Last month the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime brought in a report containing 64 specific recommendations. The proposals make sense. Except for one grant-in-aid program, intended to assist the states in building more prisons, the report does not ask for

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

legislative appropriations. It asks only for legislative will.

Let me deal here with two recommendations only. One has to do with handguns, the other with bail. In order to act in these areas, Congress must stand up to the gun lobby in the one case, and it must fend off the bleeding hearts in the other. This is what is meant by legislative will.

Handguns figured in half of all murders last year, and in 40 percent of the robberies. We have laws—hundreds of laws—intended to control the sale and to punish the use of handguns, but the laws are often contradictory and their enforcement is inconsistent. Congress has power, under the Commerce Clause, to enact a few laws of national scope—laws with teeth in them.

For one example, federal law now permits, but does not require, the imposition of an additional one- to 10-year sentence for use of a firearm in the commission of a federal felony. The task force urges that the statute be made mandatory, a recommendation President Reagan endorsed in a speech on crime yesterday.

The task force also calls for an amendment to the Gun Control Act of 1968 that would require a waiting period before completion of a firearms sale. The period would permit a tighter check on purchasers, the better to keep weapons out of the hands of criminals and lunatics.

Under present law, the importation of certain concealable handguns is prohibited—but the act is flawed by an intolerable omission: it does not prohibit the importation of the unassembled parts of such guns. The task force would close the loophole.

These and other recommendations on firearms are moderate, realistic and sensible. Only the most paranoid members of the gun lobby could oppose them—and surely Congress can find the backbone to overcome their objections.

The recommendations on bail, also endorsed yesterday by the president, are equally sound. Under present law, judges must release a suspect on bail unless there is convincing evidence to indicate that the suspect will fail to show up for trial. Nothing else matters. The task force remarks that people have never been able to understand why the law permits the release of manifestly dangerous criminals "not only before trial but even after conviction while awaiting sentence." The present Bail Reform Act should be amended to give judges greater discretion.

"It is obvious," says the report, "that there are defendants as to whom no conditions of release will reasonably assure the safety of particular persons or the community. With respect to such defendants, the courts must be given the authority to deny bail."

When the proposal was advanced last month, spokesmen for the American Civil Liberties Union wept tears of anguish. How could the "dangerousness" of a defendant be assessed? The common-sense answer is to let judges use their common sense. And, indeed, this is the short-term, immediate answer to many of the problems of violent crime. Let us cut through the blubber and put the punks behind bars.●

JOHN A. YOUNG, JR.—EAGLE SCOUT

HON. JAMES A. COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1981

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the residents of Jefferson Township in New Jersey, and Boy Scout Troop 111, I have been asked to say a few words in honor of Mr. John A. Young, Jr., who was awarded the rank of Eagle Scout on September 29, 1981, for his outstanding efforts on behalf of the community.

John Young was awarded the highest honor bestowed upon a Scout for the leadership and responsibility he demonstrated in organizing a recent community blood drive for Jefferson Township residents. At only 14 years of age, John contacted the donor recruiter for the North Jersey Blood Center, and explained his intentions. His enthusiasm and hard work made the drive a successful one.

The Eagle Scout Award is a hard one to attain, and takes several years of concentrated effort to try and accomplish each of the tasks required. John has received many badges of merit and skill awards which demonstrate his further work in the community. By participating in the Boy Scouts, he has made a meaningful contribution to the betterment of his community, and I am sure that his family and friends are very proud of him.

I think it is appropriate now to take a moment to thank John Young from all of his friends, family, and neighbors. May he have continued success in all of his future endeavors.●

A TRIBUTE TO STANLEY BRANCH

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1981

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to bring before my colleagues a name which will be familiar to many of them, the name of Stanley Branch. Stanley Branch is a singular man, an extraordinary man, no matter what standards of judgment might be used to evaluate him. I am proud to call him my friend.

Last Friday, he agreed to become chairman of the National Black Veterans Organization. I know of no one more qualified for the job. Stanley Branch is himself a veteran of many wars. As a soldier, he fought on foreign soil in Korea. As a believer in the rights of men—all men—he has struggled for civil rights on all fronts. As head of the Chester, Pa., NAACP, Stanley was an organizer, a fighter, and a leader. When the time came to march, he marched. When the time came to talk, he talked. And when the time came to show his convictions by putting himself on the line physically, to reject intimidation, he was there too. More than once, Stanley Branch's blood has been spilled in the fight to make the words of American democracy true for all people.

Today, Stanley Branch is a very successful man, a man who continues to lead, not just by the beliefs that he holds, but by the example that he sets. As chairman of the board of Atchison & Keller Mechanical Contractors of Washington, D.C., a black-owned company that is one of the largest in the area, he is an example of what is possible in America today. The constraints placed on his time by his position are great, but that has not stopped nor slowed Stanley's dedication to others. He has agreed to serve as chairman to the National Black Veterans Organization at a time when such work is most needed. The moneys that organization like this one have traditionally relied on, such as Federal and municiple funds, are becoming harder to find. Many may not survive. But rather than wait for events to overtake them, the NBVO, under Stanley Branch, is preparing to meet the task by separating itself from Government funds, by becoming independent and raising its own revenues through its own efforts. At such a time, Stanley's leadership, his energy, and his creativity, are indispensible. His efforts will help to make not just independence possible, they will help the NBVO to become more valuable to black veterans around the Nation. The guidance of the NBVO in self-help, in jobs, in housing, and in direction, will make them the kind of organization we will need to help us sustain, and improve, our commitment to others.

I have known Stanley Branch a long while, and in each of his endeavors, I have seen him succeed where others failed, and persevere where others quit. I am honored to be able to recognize him here today.●

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3603, THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1981

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1981

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Vermont and I plan to offer an amendment to H.R. 3603, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1981. The amendment was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday, October 1. Mr. JEFFORDS' name was not included in the RECORD;

but I want to make it clear at this time that the amendment is a joint effort.

Mr. JEFFORDS and I are gratified by the support we have received from groups such as the National Milk Producers Federation, the National Grange, Bread for the World, and Friends Committee on National Legislation.

We hope that our amendment, which provides for the distribution of surplus dairy products to senior citizens meal sites, child nutrition programs, and food banks will also receive the support of our colleagues.●

KEEP THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 5, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to me to read that consideration is being given to the demise of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. This Agency, with which I have had numerous contacts in my role as ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee, deserves the fullest support of the administration and Congress.

BATF performs admirably in connection with its multiple responsibilities—principally in the area of illegal trafficking of alcohol, tobacco, and firearms.

The Bureau is a principal weapon against the crime of arson and is possessed of an expertise which is irreplacable.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the merits of retaining, and indeed strengthening the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, will be considered thoroughly and that the rumors relating to its transfer or dissolution will be proved incorrect.

At this point in the RECORD I include the following article.

GUNNING FOR THE FIREARMS AGENCY

The American people should be dismayed at a move reportedly underway in Washington to abolish the agency directly charged with administering the nation's federal gun-control laws—the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. If the effort is successful, there will be no little amount of glee at the National Rifle Association, which has been waging a relentless campaign, including use of a questionable television film, to vilify and discredit the bureau.

Surely the American people, who have repeatedly indicated their desire to control illicit firearms in the US and help reduce the nation's intolerable crime problem, will not approve such a shortsighted step—provided they are alerted to what is happening.

A minuscule agency by government standards, with a staff of around 3,500 people, most of them agents, the ATF was set up as a separate bureau of the Treasury back in 1972. Before that it had been a division of the Internal Revenue Service. Years back ATF agents went after "moonshiners."

The agency's budget for fiscal 1982 has already been cut as part of the federal retrenchment effort. But Mr. Reagan stopped short of totally scuttling the bureau, in part apparently because of the intervention of Treasury Secretary Donald Regan. Now, so the rumors have it, the administration will call for dismantling ATF in the next round of cuts.

Remember the assassination attempt on President Reagan? Well, it was the ATF that ran the gun check on the weapon used in that incident, tracing it back to a pawn shop in something like 16 minutes. During the 18-month period ending this past March 31, according to the head of the bureau, the ATF sought prosecution in some 2,017 cases, of which 499 involved drug traffickers, 257 organized crime members, 192 motorcycle gang members, and 74 persons linked to extremist groups—apprehended primarily for firearms violations. Also, out of all prosecutions recommended last year, 67 percent involved persons with prior criminal records. What is most needed, in the eyes of many gun control advocates, is to boldly strengthen the enforcement role of the ATF, in whichever department it is placed. But why fragment it? The answer, legitimate budget considerations aside, would seem to be found in the opposition of the NRA. An NRA film currently being shown on television stations around the nation depicts the agency as made up of "jack-booted fascists."

The NRA is naturally concerned about abuses against individuals suspected of gun crimes by ATF agents. But the bureau has already taken steps to prevent the types of occurrences mentioned in the film.

If the bureau is disbanded, it is assumed that its firearms and explosives role would go either to the Secret Service or the Department of Justice. Regulatory and tax-collecting functions would go to the IRS and the Customs Service.

But such a total dismemberment seems dubious. At this particular time law enforcement agencies should be strengthened, not dismantled.●

COAL EXPORT POLICY

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the administration is beginning to realize the importance of coal exports to this Nation's balance of payments as witnessed by the formation of the Coal Interagency Working Group's coal export policy. By some estimates, coal exports to Europe and the Asian rim could bring in more revenue to the United States than grain exports within a few years.

However, many problems are faced by those who export coal. In the short term, these problems take shape in the form of antiquated and inadequate coal-loading facilities and lack of ground storage space at the port facilities in addition to the failure in some instances to coordinate the production and transportation of coal from mine to port to be loaded in waiting vessels. The following article ran in the New York Times this Sunday and gives some idea of the problems coal traders must tackle during this age of booming steam coal exports.

This Wednesday, at 9 a.m. in 2167 Rayburn, the Congressional Coal Group is holding a meeting with the Coal Interagency Working Group to discuss its coal export policy and views on legislation to improve this Nation's ocean ports. Also attending this meeting will be interested members from the Subcommittee on Water Resources, Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Congressional Port Caucus, Congressional Shipyard Coalition and Congressional Export Task Force. However, attendance to this meeting is not limited to the above and all interested Members and staff are invited to come.

The New York Times article follows:

[From the New York Times Oct. 4, 1981]

COAL TRADER: PIETER L. M. VISMANS OF SSM, HE JUGGLES A HOT NEW COMMODITY IN WORLD TRADE

(By Agis Salpukas)

Pieter L. M. Vismans, looked in exasperation at the Telex message from the Port of New Orleans. It notified him that the coal carrier Royal Lynx, which had arrived there to pick up coal that day, would not be loaded right away.

"That's a loss of two days," he said in an interview on the sixth floor of the Helmsley Spear building on Park Avenue, where the SSM Coal Company has its offices. He estimated that the demurrage, or the costs paid to the owner of the vessel because of the delay, would total $22,000. "That's 50 cents a day for each ton of coal," he calculated quickly. "There's no way to make that up."

Such sudden changes in fortune are commonplace in the world of the coal trader. It has been made even more volatile by the surge in world coal trade as many nations convert their power plants to coal from oil and begin ambitious projects to build new coal-fired plants.

Some coal-trading companies such as SSM have ridden the surge in the coal business, expanding their offices, buying new rapid computer communications systems and expanding their ability to handle coal.

SSM, based in Rotterdam, is a division of SHV, a big Netherlands corporation with annual sales of $4.7 billion that is active in trade and associated services. SSM, which has been trading coal since 1896, began in 1976 to expand its organization to capitalize on the growing coal trade.

Now it is one of the larger coal-trading companies. From six offices in those preboom days it has grown to 22, which are tied together by a satellite communications network that can put Mr. Vismans, the president of the New York office, in constant touch with SSM's far-flung staff of traders. The New York office exported 693,662 tons of coal in 1980, a big increase over the 399,442 tons it handled in 1979. The company doesn't disclose sales and profits.

Mr. Vismans, 54 years old, is a stocky man whose office is filled with industry knickknacks, including figurines of miners carved out of coal. He has been in the business since 1950, when he joined the chartering department in the Netherlands. He came to the United States two years later and worked for an American coal exporter until he joined the Pittston Company, where he learned how a producer handles the export business. In 1976 he decided to join the SSM group and set up the office in New York. He now has a staff of 15.

There are about 25 coal-trading companies operating in the United States that are not subsidiaries of major coal producers or major coal customers. It is an industry where most of the participants know each other on a first-name basis.

Their business consists of taking an order from a customer and then rounding up the coal from producers and arranging the shipping and delivery at an agreed-on price by a certain date.

It is a business in which one can take all precautions, do everything right and still lose one's shirt on a transaction because of unforeseen circumstances. One can also be lucky and reap windfalls that make up for the losses.

The risks and opportunities have increased with the sudden growth of the international trade in steam coal since the energy crisis of 1973. In 1980, exports of steam coal from the United States rose to 26.8 million tons from 14.1 million tons in 1979.

The risks were dramatically shown last year when some traders had to pay huge amounts in demurrage costs in the scramble for coal that erupted in anticipation of the coal strike. There was such a rush of ships to the major coal ports, such as Norfolk, Va., and Baltimore, that some had to wait three to four months to be loaded.

"Last year we paid $9.2 million in demurrage that we ate," Mr. Vismans said of the costs incurred by his company.

From a thick log of records on his desk he dug out a report on the Alexandra Dio, a 110,000-ton vessel chartered by SSM that arrived at Norfolk on Feb. 2, getting in line with about a hundred other ships that were waiting to be loaded. The ship was caught in a crunch with others in the port that were trying to load before late March, when the coal strike was to begin. On top of that, the Norfolk & Western had just adopted new loading regulations at the port that the ship lost time in meeting. As a result of those complications and the strike, the Alexandra Dio did not sail until April 26. The delay cost SSM $1.95 million in demurrage costs.

Last fall, few traders foresaw the magnitude of the coming congestion and failed to factor the possible costs of demurrage in the prices they agreed on with customers. If they had tried to, Mr. Vismans said, the business might have gone to competitors offering lower prices.

On top of misjudging the extent of port congestion, coal brokers were often caught off guard by wild swings in foreign exchange rates and occasional cheating on coal loading at the mines.

There's a "constant battle to keep people honest," Mr. Vismans said. "If it's black, it's put in the boat. It's a small element in a low market but becomes a big element in a high market. When you scramble for coal anything goes."

One of the major "anythings," he said, is car topping. "It's the curse of the coal trade," he said, shaking his head. Some companies fill the bottom of a railroad hopper car with low-grade coal of 30 percent ash content and then top off each car with high quality coal of 10 percent ash content. "The sampling is done from the top," Mr. Vismans said with a smile.

There are no smiles from him and his customer, however, when it is discovered in Norfolk, or sometimes in Rotterdam, where SSM has a major coal terminal, that the quality does not meet the contract made with the customer. SSM either has to absorb a penalty on the price or fight the producer.

If the producer is a long-time, normally reputable supplier, Mr. Vismans said he would seek a compromise. "You call the guy up and say, 'You really messed up this time but I can handle it. Don't let it happen again or try to make it up on the load next week.'"

"I can compromise and keep him as a friend," he explained. "You've got to be hard-nosed but you have to know when to be hard-nosed."

To keep car topping in check, one of Mr. Vismans's sons, Thomas, who has been a miner in West Virginia, is now working for the company spot-checking the loading of coal cars. He has already earned his salary, Mr. Vismans said, by spotting a small producer using car topping on a recent shipment.

Even when times are slow, such as now when demand is down because of stockpiles built up for the strike and a greater-than-expected drop in consumption of electricity, there can still be problems with producers.

He recalled that he had recently contracted with a small producer for a certain specialized high-grade coal that is in limited supply. A competitor seeking the same coal offered $5 more a ton and the supplier backed out of the agreement with SSM.

"I get the excuses," he said. "The other guy gets the coal. There's very little loyalty from some of the smaller companies you deal with."

The reason that many customers, particularly utilities, use coal trading companies, he said, is that the customers often lack the expertise and staff to deal in the complications of the coal trade. Mr. Visman's traditional customers are Dutch and Danish utilities, along with steel mills such as Cockerill, a major Belgian steel producer; a smaller producer, Société Gustav Boel, and a big coke plant that supplies French steel producers.

Customers also turn to his company, he explained, because "we can offer to supply the client at his pace."

A smaller steel producer such as Boel, he said, does not want to buy 50,000 tons of coal at a time. It may only want 10,000 tons to keep inventory costs down. Mr. Vismans can put together several orders from different customers to fill a 50,000-ton coal carrier. By using a trader, rather than shipping the coal themselves, customers are also spared dealing with all the unexpected problems that can arise even under the best conditions.

Though business is slow now, Mr. Vismans said that as far as demurrage the tide has turned in favor of the traders. Most of them have now protected themselves in terms of asking a higher price for the coal or having the customers take the risk of paying demurrage. Demurrage has also gone down significantly. In some cases ships have been loaded faster than expected, which results in added profits to the exporters. Mr. Vismans noted that the company was reaping some unexpected profits as a result.

New procedures instituted by some of the major railroads no longer require ships to wait in line to be loaded. Once they arrive at the port they are assigned dates at which they must come back and be ready for loading. As a result, congestion has eased considerably.

Still, problems such as the delay on the Royal Lynx or the loss of an expected supply of coal keep Mr. Vismans on his toes. About 20 years ago when he developed an ulcer, he recalled he took the advice of his doctor and learned to leave his problems at the office.

While on the job, he said after taking a call from one of his salesmen overseas, "I keep putting out fires." He added, "I'd rather worry about business on the books than worry about no business on the books."●

MOOG SYNTHESIZER

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, western New York State has long been acknowledged as an area whose economic climate encourages and fosters the growth of small business. In increasing numbers, the small businesses of western New York are finding themselves successful in their efforts to become leading enterprises in the business community. This day, I would like to briefly level more testimony to these facts.

The Moog synthesizer, a high-tech electronic musical instrument, manufactured by Moog Music, Inc., a small business of western New York, is currently featured as a major component of the Eureka exhibit.

Sponsored by the Office of Advocacy of the U.S. Small Business Administration, the Eureka exhibit features America's 12 most innovative inventions of the past 200 years. Selected by the Association of Science-Technology Centers of Washington, D.C., the Moog synthesizer is accompanied by the telephone, heart valve, ice cream cone, safety razor, and zipper in the exhibit. Following a tour of 10 major science museums throughout the United States, Eureka is scheduled to be installed as a permanent exhibit at the Smithsonian Institute.

Founded near Ithaca, N.Y. in 1964, Moog Music, Inc. was established by Dr. Robert Moog, who envisioned his invention as a major breakthrough in the world of musical instrumentation. In 1970, Moog Music, Inc. relocated near Buffalo, N.Y. where they presently design, manufacture and market their state-of-the-art electronic music synthesizers. Employing 250 persons, Moog Music, Inc. ships their products to every corner of the world, and have established themselves as the leader in an ever growing industry of electronic music.

Playing to over 2½ million enthusiasts, the Moog synthesizer is easily the most popular component of the Eureka exhibit.

Moog Music, Inc. is proud of their well-deserved honor to represent the arts in the Eureka exhibit and are equally as proud to represent the small businessman in and through their achievements.●

OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL CHURCH AND PARISH—75 YEARS OF LOVING SERVICE TO GOD

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1981, the Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, on East 187th Street in the Belmont-Fordam area of the Bronx, N.Y., will celebrate its diamond jubilee, 75 years of loving service to God, in a joyous dinner and dance observance at the Chateau Pelham, Bronx. It will be a time for all the family of Mount Carmel, present and former parishioners, friends and countless admirers who are in some way associated with Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish, to come together to renew old friendships and relive cherished memories and, above all, rejoice and give thanks to God.

In the story of this great parish, we can see how the need of immigrant settlers to worship God, how their resourcefulness and initiative, laid a foundation of community, a fellowship and brotherhood of common good and spirituality, dedicated to God. Theirs is a story of how a seed, once planted and nurtured, grows and blossoms forth with branches and seedlings far beyond its original capacities or expectations. It is a story of how the Kingdom of God is comprised of many smaller municipalities, seedling structures at first, born out of hope and nurtured by the faith of humble servants, which together, with God's loving guidance, do his work here on Earth.

It is a personal pleasure for me today to present the story of this great parish to my colleagues, and for the benefit of their constituencies throughout the Nation, so that all can duly appreciate the work of the great pioneers of Mount Carmel, and witness the fruits of their labors, in the men and women, all over this country and the world, who still consider Our Lady of Mount Carmel as their church and their home and their roots, no matter where they are.

The story of the Parish of Our Lady of Mount Carmel in the Bronx goes back to 1906-1907. Seventy-five years, and almost four generations have passsed since its humble and modest beginnings. It was just a few years after the turn of the 20th century when Belmont-Fordham was yet a rural hamlet. To this idyllic area first came hundreds, followed soon by thousands, of Italian immigrants to settle with their brides to start and raise their young families. They came from Italy, their beloved motherland and the cradle of western civilization. They brought with them their cultural heritage, century old knowledge and learning, their pride, their industriousness, their ingenuity, and their traditions. Above all, they brought with them their precious and treasured Catholic faith. They had no church to worship God, nor shrine to honor and venerate His Blessed Mother Mary. They had no priest to minister to their spiritual needs.

In June 1906, a small store was rented by Msgr. Daniel F. X. Burke, pastor of St. Philip Neri on 202d Street and Grand Concourse, and with his young curate who also had recently arrived from Italy, Father Giuseppe Caffuzzi, a mission chapel was prepared under the patronage of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. The little grain of mustard seed in this corner of God's Kingdom on Earth had been planted. Indeed, it was the smallest of seeds. In June 1907 the cornerstone was dedicated for the basement church, and finally in 1917 it began to sprout and grow and flourish.

Watered and nurtured by the zeal and love of its founders, the tiny seed grew up and became the largest of plants. The thousands of families were joined by many thousands more, and Mount Carmel parish grew into a huge and beautiful tree. The Kingdom of God in Belmont-Fordham was firmly established and began to produce its fruit. Through the preaching of God's Word, and the reception of the sacraments, the family of man was molded into the family of God. The parish became the focal point, the very life of its people and, like a mighty magnet, drew all to share in the life of God and reflect His divine image.

The parish history has been made up of days and years of ecstatic joys, and days and years of sadness and sorrow in times of peace and war, in times of depression, and in times of prosperity and abundance. The people of Mount Carmel have seen and felt, endured, and overcome all with unbounding faith in God, and confidence in the motherly protection of Our Lady of Mount Carmel.

Mount Carmel holds many indelible memories, and a deep loyalty and love in the minds and hearts of thousands of faithful men and women who still live in Belmont-Fordham. The tens of thousands of her sons and daughters, who are now scattered all over these United States, and in many parts around the world, still consider Mt. Carmel as their own. This love and loyalty has been welded and forged into a mighty and unbreakable chain, with links that will withstand and defy time and distance.

For three quarters of a century, Our Lady of Mount Carmel parish has seen the Pontificates of eight Popes, the leadership of four Cardinal Archbishops of New York, and the service of six pastors, working with hosts of dedicated self-sacrificing priests, all working tirelessly for the glory of God, and the salvation of souls. The beloved pastors of Mount Carmel were Msgr. Daniel F. X. Burke, from 1906 to 1921; Msgr. Joseph Caffuzzi, from 1921 to 1931; Father Severino Focacci, from 1931 to 1944; Bishop Joseph M. Pernicone, from 1944 to 1966, and Msgr. Charles F. Rizzo, from 1966 to 1972. Msgr. Louis A. Martorella is the present pastor, having served since 1972. They have all shaped a holy people, precious in the sight of the Lord. Each man, woman, and child of Our Lady of Mount Carmel was thought to be, by this devoted clergy, a precious diamond in the crown of Our Lady, the Queen Beauty of Carmel, the Patroness of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church and parish. With so many representatives expected at the 75th anniversary celebration, each a precious diamond, it will indeed be a diamond jubilee.

Standing proudly and invulnerable like a mighty fortress, Mount Carmel Church continues to be the source, the sign, and the pivot of vitality, unity, strength, and stability of the Belmont-Fordham community. The parish and church of Our Lady of Mount Carmel is still very much alive and well, and still growing strong, a vital and active portion of God's Kingdom that started as a grain of mustard seed, the smallest of seeds, and grew up to be the largest of plants.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and my colleagues here today join with me in saluting Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church and parish on this, their 75th diamond jubilee celebration of loving service to God. To Monsignor Martorella as pastor; Rev. Anthony Napolitano, administrator; Rev. Anthony D'Antonio, Rev. Sebastin Calvo, James Orumpkatt, and dinner chairmen, Salvatore Calabro, Michael Mangovi, and Frank Mantanaro, we extend our best wishes for success as they celebrate this very special event. May God continue to give His blessings to this very devoted clergy for their continuing guidance and inspiration, and to the men, women and children of Mount Carmel who continue to give their church and parish life, each of whom is still yet another precious diamond in the crown of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. May God bless and keep you all.●

AWACS SALE

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

• Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, recent attempts by the administration to resolve the "control issue" regarding the AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia have failed miserable, and with good reason.

At the heart of the "control issue" is the question of how the AWACS will be employed by the Saudis—and if our most advanced reconnaissance technology can be kept from enemy hands. The President's claim that "we will not permit Saudi Arabia to be an Iran" is not assurance enough—given the administration's repeated failure to address Saudi internal instability and to secure adequate American control over the planes. The administration has also consistently ignored the Saudi policy of putting Israel—not the Soviet Union—at the top of their enemies list. Is it any wonder then that the Congress must question how the Saudis—left to their own devices—might possibly employ the AWACS?

It is the duty of the Congress to see to the security of its own Nation and its own defenses—as well as tend to our Nation's responsibility as an ally. To approve the sale under current conditions would be to fail on both accounts.•

GUNSMOKE 1981

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

• Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the results of a recent worldwide USAF Fighter Gunnary meet at Nellis AFB in Nevada should be of interest to all my colleagues.

Twelve four-plane teams from the U.S. Air Force, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard were selected from earlier elimination events to participate in "Gunsmoke '81"—a competition recognized as the world series of Air Force tactical bombing and strafing events. The team of Vought A-7D aircraft from the Air National Guard's 140th Tactical Fighter Wing won first place in this competition. Other competing aircraft were the A-10 and the F-4.

It should be recognized that this week-long competition was a rigorous test of the skill of the pilots and the ground crews. But it was an equally rigorous test of the combat effectiveness and the versatility of the aircraft.

The spectacular win by the A-7D team should be a source of satisfaction to the Members of this House who, only a short time ago, voted by a wide margin to continue procurement of A-7's for the Air National Guard. The Air Guard's A-7 Gunsmoke win underlines the wisdom of that vote.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that the A-7 is no newcomer to championships in tactical aviation competition. A-7's were flown by the Air Force Tactical Air Command pilots to victory in the British Royal Air Force's international bombing and strafing competition. It won those honors in 1977 and 1978, the only 2 years the A-7's competed.

The A-7's also excelled in our Rapid Deployment Force exercises in Egypt last November. The New Mexico Air Guard's A-7's flew nonstop from Pease AFB in New Hampshire to a desert base in Egypt. Two hours after landing, the A-7's were again airborne for a combat-type exercise. They maintained a 97 percent mission capable availability for the entire operation ad every one of their bombs and cannon fire were on target.

All these achievements demonstrate that the A-7 is the best attack aircraft in the world. It should be of added interest in these days of budget cutting to know that the A-7 is also the least expensive attack aircraft available.

I am confident that the Members of the House join me in voicing appreciation to the U.S. Air Force for conducting this very important combat-type tactical air competition. A special congratulation, I believe, also goes to the Colorado Air Guard A-7 pilots for their impressive victory.•

WALL STREET JOURNAL CRITIC MAKES SENSE

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the favorite whipping boys of those who want to save money in the Federal budget—and we all fall in the category of wanting to save money in the Federal budget—is the National Endowment for the Arts. Someone can always find an illustration somewhere of something that is "not in good taste," because, obviously, the matter of taste differs.

But some day we will be remembered as a civilization not for the highways or the bombers we build or the nuclear weapons we have accumulated, but for our symphonies, for our operas, for our paintings, for things that add to the symphony of life and enrich it immensely.

The finest commentary I have seen yet on this whole question appeared in The Wall Street Journal, written by Edwin Wilson, the Journal's theater critic.

I would urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to read his remarks which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

DOES THE REAGAN TEAM UNDERSTAND THE ARTS?

(By Edwin Wilson)

The great trumpet player Louis Armstrong once said when asked what jazz is: "Man, if you gotta ask you'll never know." That observation unfortunately describes the confusion of many Americans vis-a-vis the arts in general. Right now a presidential task force is preparing a report on funding the arts and one can't help wondering whether the Reagan administration does not suffer from the same problem as Satchmo's questioner.

Historically Americans have been wary of the arts. The country was founded in part by the Puritans, the same group that closed all the theaters in London in 1642 and banned, among others, Shakespeare from the stage. As Lewis Lapham pointed out in a recent article in Harper's magazine, John Adams at the time of the Revolution said that the arts had always been the product of despotism and superstition and had no place in our republic. Mr. Lapham also quoted Ben Franklin's remark that "to Americans one schoolmaster is worth a dozen poets, and the invention of a machine . . . of far more importance than a masterpiece of Raphael."

In certain cities, individuals—most of them strongly influenced by their European heritage—founded and supported symphony orchestras and museums, but the notion that as a nation we should endorse the arts was alien to us. We have been visionaries in many fields, but not in this.

We failed to acknowledge that art is as much a necessity of life as clothing, shelter and sleep. It is not frivolous. The evidence for this is all around us. Every child engages in role-playing and imitation—forms of acting—as ways of learning and growing up. Every society on record has ceremonies complete with costumes. (The Galanos gowns worn by Mrs. Reagan as well as the other finery on view in London at the royal wedding were such costumes.)

On a more mundane level, everyday speech is dependent on devices of poetry. Language and mathematics are symbols pure and simple, and when a scientist speaks of the "big bang" theory of creation, or a businessman of the "bottom line" he is using metaphor.

If the use of art is universal, the question becomes the kind of art a civilization chooses to develop. A nation can survive on junk art just as it can on junk food. Some societies, however, have recognized the profound possibilities of art and have gone for the best. This was the case with the Greeks in the 5th Century B.C. who built the Parthenon and produced the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles, with the people in Medieval France who built the cathedral at Chartres and with the Medicis, the great patrons of the arts in Renaissance Florence.

Even extremely macho societies—no less macho than our American West—have recognized the vaule of art. The Japanese samurai, among the most disciplined warriors the world has known, were expected to be as adept at writing poetry as at wielding a sword.

We, on the other hand, came quite late to the realization that there may be something to the arts. A mere 15 years ago the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) was founded along with the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Most state arts councils are even younger. Twenty-five years ago large foundations began funding the arts and recently corporate giving has been on the rise.

Almost as quickly as we began to support the arts on this scale it became apparent that we were ill-prepared to deal with the situation. After our long history of selling the arts short, we did not have a group of citizens with the background and experience to make intelligent decisions in awarding grants to individual artists and organizations. There were exceptions of course—in cities like Minneapolis and Winston-Salem. But by and large there was a lack of individuals with a genuine understanding of art. As a result, those responsible found it difficult to tell a true artist from a charlatan. Arts panels and boards of directors often backed a flamboyant artistic director who sent an organization's budget through the roof and at other times picked a cautious mediocrity who couldn't tell an abstract painting from a child's doodle.

Despite these problems, though, a beginning was made. Now President Reagan seems determined to turn the clock back. He has asked for a 50% cut in NEA funding, as if it was one of those bloated agencies with an outsized budget. By federal standards the NEA budget is infinitesimal: $159 million in the current year which is two one-hundredths of one percent of the total.

A few pieces of military hardware—a dozen Trident missiles or F16 fighter planes—would cover the entire cost. If we funded the arts on the same per capita basis as France, our budget would be nearly $3 billion, and if the same as Austria, $22 billion.

At the same time that he argued for cuts, the President appointed a task force headed by movie actor Charlton Heston, college president Hanna H. Gray and Daniel J. Terra, ambassador at large for cultural affairs. The main job of the task force, which makes its report in a few days, is to find sources of funding to make up for the losses when the NEA is cut back.

It is almost certain that the differences will not be made up regardless of the clever tax mechanisms to be proposed. And more importantly, this emphasis on money shows where the President's heart is.

Where the arts are concerned there are important issues facing this country; dealing with them should be the first order of business for any task force. Should we stress preserving art from the past, or the creation of new work? If both, in what proportions? Should we fund institutions exclusively, or individual artists as well? Do we support only "serious" or "high" art, or also popular arts like folk music and handicrafts? These are complex issues that can be settled only by a prolonged dialog, not by simplistic pronouncements.

Underlying these questions are more fundamental ones: What values do we seek from the arts, and what role should they play in our national life? How do we educate young people in the arts so that they can assume responsibility for these decisions in the future?

There are indications that some members of the task force wanted to focus on these questions and they are right. Once we settle these matters, the financing becomes easy. If we are convinced that art can play an indispensable role in informing our national spirit, we will find the money.

Of course we could decide that the arts do not matter, in which case we would not have to fund them at all. That would also be tantamount to saying that as a nation we have no soul.●

A TRIBUTE TO AN EXTRAORDINARY TEACHER: ROBERT KARP

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, next weekend a group of eighth grade students from Kenilworth, Ill., will embark on the 14th annual Joseph Sears School trip to the Nation's Capital. This will be the last group led by Robert A. Karp, a teacher at the Sears School, who plans to retire at the end of this school year.

I call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Karp because he is noted by his fellow teachers and local parents and students as one who has set high standards of creativity, rigor and personal devotion in the classroom, to which all educators should aspire.

During his 35 years as a social studies teacher, Mr. Karp has developed many innovative teaching methods to heighten his students' interest in some of the drier subjects included in the junior high school curriculum. Among the better known of these is "geography baseball," which is fondly referred to by an entire generation of Sears students as "G.O.B.O." Yet the "Karp Constitution Challenge," a rigorous written test on the contents and interpretation of the fundamental law of the United States, dispels any notion that Mr. Karp merely presides over child's play.

But most of all, Bob Karp should be commended for the personality he infuses into his lessons. No textbook can match the interest in American history Mr. Karp stimulates among his students with his riveting classroom tales of his experiences in the South Pacific as a Navy fighter pilot during World War II.

I am honored to pay tribute to Robert A. Karp, to extend a warm welcome to Mr. Karp and to the students who have the good fortune to accompany him on his final class visit to Washington, D.C., and to wish him a retirement filled with many long years of happiness and health and fond memories of an extraordinary teaching career.●

JEFFCO MENTAL HEALTH CENTER RELIEF BILL

HON. TIMOTHY E. WIRTH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1635 which will provide long overdue justice for the Jefferson County Mental Health Center, located in Lakewood, Colo.

The center, which provides mental health services for a tricounty area has suffered from a series of administrative misunderstanding with the Internal Revenue Service which can only be remedied through legislation.

The problem developed over the payment of social security taxes by the center. As a nonprofit organization, the Jefferson County Mental Health Center is exempt from employee participation in the social security program. But employees elected to participate and the proper forms were filed with the IRS.

FICA taxes were deducted and paid by the center. But during an IRS review of the center, it was claimed by the IRS that the center had not filed the proper forms for employee participation.

The center reimbursed 133 employees a total of $74,128, under orders from the IRS. But later, the IRS found out that the proper forms had indeed been filed and were located.

By this time, it was too late to get the money back from the employees. The IRS lacks the legal authority to reimburse the center. The bill I have introduced would provide the reimbursement of funds paid by the center in good faith. I urge your support for this bill. This mental health center needs the money to continue its important work, and should no longer suffer from administrative mistakes.●

NATIONAL END HANDGUN VIOLENCE WEEK, OCTOBER 25-31, 1981

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, Today I am joining with my colleagues Mr. Russo and Mr. Garcia in introducing a resolution to designate the week beginning October 25, 1981, as "National End Handgun Violence Week."

Last year over 21,000 Americans were killed by handguns, bringing this grisly total of murders, suicides, and accidents to 250,000 persons since 1968. This violence continues unabated with 63 Americans killed every day with handguns. The United States has the unenviable notoriety of leading the countries of the world in the number of handgun murders and accidents.

Because this is an issue that needs to be brought before the American people, the National Coalition to Ban Handguns has organized National end Handgun Violence Week. It will be a week when public officials, the clergy, educators, and thousands of citizens will engage in a nationwide effort to address the problem of how to bring the increasing violence attributable to handguns under control. We cannot afford in human terms to ignore the damage the handgun does to our society. The handgun's availability means that our citizens will continue to be killed and injured at an alarming rate. A majority to Americans have expressed themselves time and time again on this subject and I am hopeful that National End Handgun Violence Week will give all of us an opportunity to listen to what our constituents have to tell us about their feeling on this issue.

On August 17, 1981, the Attorney General's Task Force on Violent Crime, appointed by Attorney General William French Smith, submitted their recommendations to him. There are several items in this report which relate to handguns, including recommendations that a waiting period be required for the purchase of a handgun and a prohibition be established on the importation of parts for the manufacture of "Saturday night specials." Among the other recommendations of the task force was a requirement to report the loss or theft of a handgun to a local law enforcement agency and mandatory sentences for the use of a firearm in the commission of a Federal felony. I have written President Reagan urging that he endorse all these recommendations. Given the increasing concern in this area, it is important to point out the reports which are circulating that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms is going to be abolished or have its budget and enforcement capability cut drastically. These are some of the issues which need to be examined, and it is my belief that this will occur to an extent never before seen in our country during National End Handgun Violence Week.

I urge all citizens to participate in the activities which will take place during the week of October 25, 1981, at churches, synagogues, high schools, colleges, and at many community events. I strongly recommend to my colleagues in Congress to listen to what the majority of Americans have to say on the subject of handgun violence.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS OF HUNGARY

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the ideals that motivate men and women to be free, to control their own destiny, to be rid of foreign domination, have remained the strongest and most dynamic force of history throughout the ages.

A quarter century ago, it was the sons and daughters of my native Hungary who erupted as a volcano against the Soviet tyranny; it was they who shed their precious blood to be rid of Soviet oppressors.

Though the odds against them were overwhelming, and the outcome predictable, their momentary success and their historic role remained beacons of freedom in the dark annals of Soviet imperialism. Their actions and their heroism were what inspired Prague's wondrous spring of democracy, Poland's present drama, and the Afghan freedom fighters' battle against the Red army.

The will to live as free women and men will be a force on this planet long after the Soviet police state has vanished. Children around the world will honor the brave fighters of Budapest who made their bold strike for their place in the sun, only to be blown off the stage of history by the chill autumn winds of brute totalitarian force.●

ADDRESS TO CONGRESS ON CAPTIVE NATIONS DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you an address to the Congress of the United States given by Yaroslav Stetsko on the occasion of Captive Nations Day on July 15, 1981.

The Ukraine is a Soviet bloc country which shares a desire with other East European countries and the United States to remove the yoke of Russian oppression that dominates all captive nations. Although less publicized than Poland or Afghanistan, the Ukraine is also a strong and persistent country. Having resisted the Russians and Germans in World War II, they will not today or in the future willingly surrender to tyranny and oppression. Their history and commitment to freedom is best expressed in the following address which I commend to you:

ADDRESS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES BY YAROSLAV STETSKO, PRIME MINISTER, UKRAINIAN GOVERNMENT, 1941, HEAD OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS (OUN), PRESIDENT OF THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC OF NATIONS

I would like to begin by thanking the Congress of the United States for adopting the Captive Nations Resolution on July 17, 1959 and for reaffirming your commitment to the principles therein over the course of the last 22 years. I am particularly pleased that the resolution was adopted unanimously and I expect that this resolution, which remains in the interests of not only the subjugated nations but also the entire free world, will be an integral component of the United States foreign policy.

Allow me to express my heartfelt appreciation to Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, Hon. Samuel Stratton and to Dr. Dobriansky for organizing today's commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the Declaration of the Reestablishment of the Independent Ukrainian State. I would also like to convey my sincere gratitude to Hon. William Green for introducing a resolution in the House of Representatives designating June 30, 1981 as Ukrainian Independence Day. The future will justify the support that you are demonstrating today for the liberation of Ukraine by commemorating the latest period of Ukrainian Statehood which began with the reestablishment of the independent Ukrainian state on June 30, 1941 and lasting through 1951.

It is my conviction that the events of June 30, 1941 were of historical significance not only for my own nation, but also for all other subjugated nations. The Proclamation of the Restoration of Ukrainian Statehood of June 30, 1941 marked the beginning of a period in our history known under international law as the Ukrainian Underground State. As a result of this proclamation the Ukrainian nation launched a two-front war of liberation against Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia—two of the greatest imperialistic, totalitarian and military powers of the twentieth century. The act of June 30, 1941 and the subsequent struggle to consolidate the renewal of Ukrainian statehood are a manifestation of the unshakable will of the Ukrainian nation to achieve the restoration of its freedom and independence.

The Ukrainian Government, created following the proclamation of independence, included not only representatives of the organization of Ukrainian Nationalists under the leadership of Stepan Bandera, but also National Democrats, Socialists, Social Revolutionaries and individuals not affiliated with any party. On the initiative of the organization of Ukrainian Nationalists a parliamentary body was formed under the chairmanship of Dr. Konstantyn Levytskyj, a National Democrat and former Prime Minister of the Western Ukrainian National Republic of 1918. The present patriarch of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Cardinal Josyph Slipyj, was a leading Member of Parliament, while Metropolitan Count Andreas Sheptytskyj was elected Honorary President. Both the primate of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and Metropolitan Polikarp Sikorskyj of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church issued pastoral letters in support of the newly formed Government. The new Ukrainian Government enjoyed the total support and loyalty of all strata of the Ukrainian nation. This was the only democratic Government and Parliament in continental Europe at that time.

The ideological and political foundation upon which Ukrainian statehood was restored in 1941 was contained in a manifesto issued in 1940 by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, which stated: "We Ukrainians have raised the banner of struggle for the freedom of nations and man . . . We struggle for the dignity and freedom of man, for the right to openly profess one's beliefs, for freedom of all religious denominations and full freedom of conscience. We struggle for the right of the working man to openly profess his political convictions, for freedom of assembly and the establishment of political, social and professional organizations." Furthermore, the manifesto called upon the revolutionaries of other subjugated nations to join forces with the Ukrainian Nationalists in the struggle to destroy the Soviet Russian Empire. This was the origin of ABN. It also stood as a challenge to Nazi Germany at the time when both totalitarian powers, having divided Europe between themselves, were at the zenith of their might.

The newly-formed Government had the support of the Ukarainian Nationalist Military Formation and numerous insurgent units throughout Ukraine, which immediately engaged the Soviet Army on the field of battle. Having secured the main radio station in Lvov, the revolutionary Government informed the nation of the restoration of Ukrainian statehood. Upon learning of these momentous developments, the Ukrainian population openly and enthusiastically endorsed the new Government at mass assemblies in towns and villages throughout the country.

Consequently, the Nazis were forced to divulge their imperiocolonial aims. Following a period of tempestuous activity of consolidation of the newly-formed state, myself and other members of our Government, as well as several leading members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, including its leader Stepan Bandera, were arrested by the Gestapo and sent into the concentration camps. Later, the Gestapo murdered three members of the Government. Subseqently, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists went underground to continue the struggle for Ukraine's independence.

On behalf of our Government, I sent my last letter of protest against the Nazi military occupation of Ukraine to the German Reich's Chancellor in October, 1941 from the police prison in Berlin. In that letter I warned that Germany's war in the east would be lost within three years, resulting in the Russian Communist occupation of vast areas of Central Europe. Despite this projection, I openly stated that Ukraine and the other freedom-loving subjugated nations would never cease their just struggle for liberty and independence.

On three separate occasions I was confronted with an ultimatum from the highest levels of the German Reich to revoke the declaration of Ukrainian state independence, to resign as Prime Minister and to dismiss the Government. Each of these demands were adamantly rejected.

A state of war existed between Germany and Ukraine. Many thousands of Ukrainian Nationalists and other patriots were executed upon capture, hundreds of thousands were put in prisons and concentration camps. A two-front war against the Russian and German occupiers of Ukraine was fought by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army. Operating underground, the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council continued the work of the arrested Government.

By autumn of 1941, thousands of members of the organization of Ukrainian Nationalists were executed, many more thousands were imprisoned by the Nazis who were acting on orders from Berlin such as these:

HEADQUARTERS,
November 25, 1941.

From the Service Command of the Security Police and of the Security Service S/5

To the Advanced Posts of Kyiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Rivne, Mykolaiv, Zhytomyr, and Vinnytsia.

Subject: Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Bandera Movement)

It has been ascertained that the Bandera Movement is preparing a revolt in the Reichscommissariat which has as its ultimate aim the establishment of an independent Ukraine. All functionaries of the Bandera Movement must be arrested at once and, after thorough interrogation, are to be secretly liquidated as marauders.

Records of such interrogation must be forwarded to the Service Command C/5.

Heads of commands must destroy these instructions on having made a due notice of them.

——

SS—Obersturmbannfuhrer.

The Ukrainian underground state and the mass armed struggle continued from 1941 to 1951. The Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council, as the natural extension of the Ukrainian Government, exercised national authority for a decade on various parts of Ukrainian territory. The sovereignty of revolutionary authority was preserved through the military underground of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

The scope of the struggle had even been acknowledged by the Russians and Germans alike. For example, Nikita Khrushchev wrote in his memoirs that, and I quote: "During the second half of the war he (Stepan Bandera, leader of the Ukrainian Liberation Movement—Y.S.) fought against both us and the Germans. Later, after the war, we lost thousands of men in a bitter struggle between the Ukrainian Nationalists and the forces of Soviet power."

A German general, Ernst Koestring, also reported that, and I quote again: "The military organization known as the Ukrainska Povstanska Armiya (the Ukrainian Insurgent Army) was formed with the aim of establishing an indepenedent Ukraine, controlled neither by Moscow, nor by Germany. When Western Ukraine was recaptured by the Red army the OUN and the UPA called upon the Ukrainian masses to fight against the Bolshevists—the Russian Enemy. German officers who fought their way back to us in 1945 reported that the plight of the Red army was similar to ours: It controlled only the towns and the main communictions routes, while the country itself remained in the hands of the resistance movement."

The contemporary international situation is particularly grave. The expansion of Russian imperialism is well known to us all. Policies of friendship, appeasement, containment, convergence and détente have proven to be useless in stemming the centuries old brazen Russian imperialism which aims at complete world domination.

But the West must realize that within the Russian Empire there exists a new ideological and political revolutionary superpower—the subjugated nations, which is destroying the empire from within. The processes of the disintegration of the Russian Empire are at different stages in the various subjugated nations: Afghanistan, Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, Turkestan among others.

Taking this factor into consideration, the following points should be included in Western political and military strategy:

(1) The free world should engage Soviet Russia in the struggle of ideas and ideologies by recognizing the liberation movements of the subjugated nations as the legitimate representatives of these countries at all international forums including the United Nations;

(2) The West should provide access to the national liberation movements to the various forms of mass media to facilitate communication with their countrymen behind the Iron Curtain on a mass scale;

(3) Assistance should also be provided in the form of military training as well as other political, material and technological means of support;

(4) All the nations of the free world should proclaim a great charter of independence for all of the nations subjugated by Russian imperialism and communism.

The danger of nuclear holocaust cannot be negotiated away. Soviet Russia has skillfully exploited Western fears of nuclear war by blackmailing the West into weekly acquiescing to ever-increasing conquests. Our strategic alternative is based on the knowledge that the subjugated nations within the Russian Empire represent a vast untapped force, which in a common front with the nations of the free world provides the stragetic raison d'etre for defeating the last remaining empire. Synchronized national liberation revolutions within the Russian Colonial Empire is the only alternative.

I would like to end my address to you, ladies and gentlemen, with the words of an unforgettable personal friend of mine and an outstanding British military thinker, Major General J. F. C. Fuller, who wrote: "Only the unity of the Western Nations and their agreement with the national liberation movements behind the Iron Curtain can insure final victory. The reason should be obvious. It is that the Kremlin is living on a volcano, and it knows that the most explosive force in the world is not to be found in the hydrogen bomb, but in the hearts of the subjugated peoples crushed under its iron heel . . ."●

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL OPPOSE RADIOACTIVE TRANSPORTATION REGULATION

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, many urban residents are opposed to a regulation promulgated earlier this year by the Department of Transportation which will allow radioactive shipments through densely populated areas. These shipments unnecessarily create the possibility of a major accident contaminating a large portion of a city, injuring and, possibly killing, thousands.

The National Association of Attorneys General recently adopted a resolution opposing the regulation and supporting legislation which would prevent the regulation from taking effect as scheduled on February 1, 1982. The resolution cites the potential dangers of a radioactive accident and recognizes the special need for States to have direct authority over radioactive shipments. As coauthor of this legisaltion along with Representative GERALDINE FERRARO, I commend the NAAG's resolution, which follows.

RESOLUTION—ROUTING AND TRANSPORTATION OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS

Whereas by notice in the Federal Register of January 19, 1981, the Department of Transportation has proposed regulations which would preempt state laws and rules concerning the routing and transportation of radioactive materials; and

Whereas accidents involving vehicles transporting radioactive materials could have very serious health impacts and endanger the health, safety, and welfare of persons located in the vicinity of such accidents; and

Whereas states have a legitimate interest in the routing of radioactive materials within their jurisdictions and have the power to regulate such routing in order to promote the health, safety and welfare of their residents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of Attorneys General supports legislation which would prevent these regulations, as now drafted, from taking effect.●

HOMEBUILDERS ASSOCIATION ON HIGH INTEREST RATES

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, today, representatives from the National Association of Homebuilders from all over the country are in town to press their case for relief from high interest rates. Their concern is understandable in light of statistics showing near-record slumps in housing starts. Far from being the "chicken little" alarmists the President recently criticized, the homebuilders have a legitimate right to demand that the interest rate situation become the most pressing concern of the President and his economic advisors. It is ironical that the industries whose health are most critical to the administration's economic recovery are the industries most damaged by the byproduct of his program—persistently high interest rates. Any of these industries whose operations depend on the availability of credit—including the homebuilding industry—will be on the losing side of credit competition if the administration does not move to control interest rate increases. Among the options the President should consider are counseling the Federal Reserve to loosen up its tight monetary policy and reevaluating his support for an immediate 3 year tax cut. Failure to consider either of these options is tantamount to accepting permanently high interest rates and will inevitably jeopardize the recovery of the homebuilding industry.●

SALUTE TO THE IRCSI

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fine work being done by the International Rabbinical Committee for the Safety of Israel.

The IRCSI, through its member rabbis, addresses over 250,000 Jews from their pulpits each week on numerous issues affecting the safety and security of Israel. These messages are ones that should be closely listened to by all Americans, regardless of faith, since Israel is, after all, our only reliable ally in that troubled area of the world.

I would like to salute the chairmen of the IRCSI, Rabbis Isaac Pupko, Herbert Bomzer, Sholom Gold, and Zev Segal, for their outstanding leadership. I am proud to call them friends as well as constitutents.●

ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT SADAT SHOULD DOOM THE AWACS SALE

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, this morning's shocking assassination of President Sadat of Egypt should end any further attempt to sell our invaluable AWACS radar planes and highly secret Sidewinder AIM 9L air-to-air missiles to Saudi Arabia.

Nothing could demonstrate with greater impact the fatal instability of the ruling regimes of Arab nations in this most volatile part of the world. Time and time again we have seen violence overtake and topple seemingly powerful rulers. Time and time again they have been undermined by religious or political or military enemies within their own countries.

Some of these rulers have been friendly to the United States—the Shah of Iran perhaps the outstanding example. Others have been unfriendly. Still others have attempted to be neutral.

But their one common fate was that they were subject to assassination, or removal from office at the whim of an internal enemy.

In just the last three decades violent upheavals have toppled governments in Iran (three times); in Iraq, Egypt, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Syria, and Lebanon, and, yes, even in Saudi Arabia, where the present monarch rules because of the assassination of his predecessor.

Now the death of President Sadat, a towering figure in the Middle East peace process, gives us still another chilling example of this inherent instability in Arab regimes. With this long and tragic record before us, it is the height of folly to put our trust in the stability of the current monarchy ruling Saudi Arabia. To provide them with some of our newest, most secret weapons and radar equipment is to invite a takeover by internal enemies of the current Saudi regime. The weapons and the radar planes are worthless in preventing internal strife, but invaluable to whatever forces might win an internal struggle.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my colleagues that there is only one country in this uneasy part of the world which has—for more than three decades—demonstrated reliable stability of government, and reliable friendship toward the United States. I refer, of course, to the nation of Israel. In this region of upheaval and strife, Israel's principles of democracy have provided a constant, consistent, and stable government, with a foreign policy firmly allied to American interests in this vital oil-rich region. Prime Ministers have come and gone regularly in Israel, but the strength and reliability of the governments over which they presided stemmed from the firm base of democracy which elected them.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon our President to place his full faith and trust in our only stable, dependable, and faithful ally in the Middle East—Israel. The tragic event of this morning in Egypt should convince even the stoutest advocate of the sale of $8.5 billion worth of additional weapons to Saudi Arabia that it is a mistake, and will work against the best interests of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon our President to withdraw his proposal now. If the President will not withdraw his proposal, then, Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to vote to disapprove the sale when the matter comes before the House. I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Maryland (Mr. LONG) who coauthored our resolution of disapproval, and I, have more than 250 Members of this body as cosponsors of our resolution. I firmly believe that today's tragic event in Egypt will increase still further the strong majority against the sale.

HAZEL SCOTT, 61, JAZZ PIANIST, ACTED IN FILMS, ON BROADWAY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I rise to note the passing of one of my dearest constitutents, and a great jazz artist, Ms. Hazel Scott, who passed away this weekend at Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York. Her passing marks the end of a fantastic career as a jazz pianist, that ended just a short time ago, since this courageous woman was determined to perform just as long as she was alive. I would like to enter into the RECORD the New York Times article that recalls her life for those of us who enjoyed her music so much:

HAZEL SCOTT, 61, JAZZ PIANIST, ACTED IN FILMS, ON BROADWAY

(By Les Ledbetter)

Hazel Scott, the pianist and singer who was once married to the late Adam Clayton Powell Jr., died of cancer yesterday at Mount Sinai Medical Center. She was 61 years old.

Miss Scott was known to much of the world only as a performer of jazz, and although that was her forte, she was also accomplished in politics, dramatic acting and classical music.

To these endeavors she brought a certain swinging style that marked her life from its earliest days through last August, when she performed at the Milford Plaza Hotel despite the fact she knew she was dying.

In December 1940, when Miss Scott made her piano debut at Carnegie Hall, she began by playing Liszt's Hungarian Rhapsody No. 2 in a conventional style. Then, to the relief of her fans, she switched the tempo to her own modern-jazz interpretation. "It was witty, daring, modern, but never irreverent," wrote a critic reviewing the performance. "Liszt would have been delighted."

In her most recent performances, Miss Scott's repertory ranged from show tunes to pop to rock to blues and jazz, all sung in an eclectic profusion. Of her performance, John Wilson, jazz critic of the New York Times wrote, "She can be a musical chameleon, but her changes are not just on the surface. Miss Scott has an unusual ability to get into her material, to find the right interpretive qualities, whether she's singing a ballad or a blues or making her piano jump."

BORN IN TRINIDAD

Born in Port of Spain, Trinidad, on June 11, 1920, Hazel Dorothy Scott was the child of an upper-middle-class professional family. Her father, R. Thomas Scott, had been a scholar in Liverpool before emigrating to the then British colony to teach English at St. Mary's College. Her mother, Alma Long Scott, was a talented musician and the daughter of an architect.

In 1924 the family moved to the United States, where Mr. Scott had secured another university position. They settled in Harlem, and Hazel began to show what a prodigy she was. In that year, the 4-year-old Hazel was reading, demonstrated that she had perfect pitch and was already playing the piano with confidence, occasionally improvising.

Her grandmother once told an interviewer that she had discovered Hazel alone in the parlor playing her own arrangements of the lullabies sung to her nightly, including "Rock-a-Bye-Baby" and "Gentle Jesus."

A few years later, Prof. Paul Wagner of the Juilliard School of Music was the first American artist to recognize young Hazel Scott. "I am in the presence of a genius," he said when she finished playing Rachmaninoff's "Prelude" for him at an audition. He immediately began teaching her himself when the school ruled that she was too young to enter.

TO BROADWAY AND HOLLYWOOD

On November 24, 1933, Miss Scott was presented in her first formal recital at the age of 13. When she was 14, her father died and her mother took a job as saxophonist in Mrs. Louis Armstrong's all-girl band. A few months later, Miss Scott's mother organized her own women's band. Hazel played the piano and the trumpet.

At 18, Miss Scott, by then a veteran road musician, appeared on Broadway in "Sing Out the News." The following year, 1939, she appeared at the New York World's Fair.

Soon she was off to Hollywood, where she appeared in numerous films, including "The George Gershwin Story." She returned to Broadway to appear in "Priorities of 1942." Of her performance, Brooks Atkinson, the Times drama critic, wrote: "She has the most incandescent personality of anyone in the show, and she is dressed and turned out to make the best possible use of it. There is not a dull spot in her number. Every moment counts as she intends it to."

Miss Scott was also a fighter for racial justice, and on September 14, 1950 she appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities to defend her appearances and performances at rallies and fund raisers for various groups and causes.

Miss Scott was wed in 1945 to Representative Adam Clayton Powell Jr., the Harlem politician and minister who became one of the most powerful Congressmen in the nation.

She is survived by their son, Adam Clayton Powell III, and two grandchildren.●

COMPOSITE CAUCUS

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the formation of a new caucus in this House. This caucus is inspired by our national pastime with special reference to the season just concluded.

The caucus is to be designated the "Composite Caucus," and the organizing Members are from the area surrounding Cincinnati and St. Louis.

This Congress has had occasion in the past, and the present, to look at organized sports from the viewpoint of the consumer, the fan.

The Composite Caucus is considering legislation to accomplish several purposes:

First. Name the Cincinnati Reds the Composite Champions of the National League—West.

Second. Name the St. Louis Cardinals as the Composite Champions of the National League—East.

Third. Outlaw split seasons in the future.

Fourth. Prohibit the "rewarding of incompetence" in any future season.

The Reds and the Cardinals have the best records in baseball, and are not in the playoffs. For that reason, our Members considered organizing a Fair Play Caucus, but decided on Composite because it sounds like compost, and that is what we think of the whole past season. The season reminds us of Bowie Bull, and the second half, from August to October was Bowie Ball. The whole thing was un-American and un-National.

And finally, the Congress should order the Reds and Cardinals to play in the real world's series.●

A BIRTHDAY WISH FOR A PATRIOT

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. LEBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1981, we marked, with mixed feelings of lament and hope, the 63d anniversary of the Independence of Estonia. Today, on October 6, 1981, I would like to take this opportunity to mark, with feelings of pride and admiration, the 80th anniversary of the birth of a very special resident of New York's Sixth District, Mr. Eduard Vallaste. Mr. Vallaste, a leader in the Estonian American community, is a patriot who has never given up the battle to regain the independence of his native Estonia from Soviet Communist domination.

On September 24 the New York-based, nationally distributed Estonian newspaper, Free Estonian Word, printed a tribute to Eduard Vallaste. Another Estonian patriot and resident of my district, Mr. Hans Kruusamagi, was kind enough to provide me with an English translation of that article which I am privileged to be able to reprint here:

Mr. Eduard Vallaste, a renowned journalist and newspaper editor, had to flee his native country of Estonia, a Baltic Republic, to escape being arrested and shot, as an Estonian patriot and anti-Communist, by the Soviets.

After the end of WWII, Mr. Vallaste was in the service of the British military government in a capacity as Commander of the Dispatched Persons Camp in Goettingen, West Germany, a university town and British occupation zone.

Arriving in the United States in 1949, and becoming a naturalized U.S. citizen, Mr. Vallaste was, for ten years, the editor of the government-financed radio Estonian Voice of Freedom in New York.

In 1964, Mr. Vallaste was elected to the post of Secretary General on the Estonian American National Council and the Estonian World Council, based in New York, and is still working daily. At the same time he is the Estonian delegate to Baltic Liberation, Inc., a central organization of the Estonian war veterans associations, and a member of the boards of directors of some other Estonian central organizations.

Faithful to his journalistic profession, Mr. Vallaste is still writing a weekly column on domestic and international political topics in the newspaper, Free Estonian Word.

Mr. Speaker, Eduard Vallaste is a credit to the Estonian American community. But he is also much more. He is a man of undying patriotism. He is a man of abounding hope and courage. He is a man who will not yield his efforts in his dream of independence for his homeland. Eduard Vallaste is an example and an inspiration to us all.

I know that my colleagues will want to join me in wishing Eduard Vallaste a very happy and healthy 80th birthday and the realization of his dream with which to celebrate his 81st.●

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, recently, Albert W. Bloom, executive editor of the Jewish Chronicle of Pittsburgh, Pa., wrote an open letter to President Ronald Reagan. The letter was printed in the October 1, 1981, issue of the Chronicle. Because Mr. Bloom's article raises cogent questions about the proposed sale of arms to Saudi Arabia, I include the article at this point in the RECORD. I recommend that my colleagues read the letter to the President.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT

(By Albert W. Bloom)

President RONALD REAGAN,
The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: AWACS and Anti-semitism?

Please forgive me if I trouble you with a theoretical question which now may not be so theoretical when you are seeking practical answers to the pragmatic questions that beset our country.

Your courage, good humor, and good intent are an inspiration to America, even among those who disagree with some of your policies.

The economy, trillion-dollar deficit, budget cuts, budget-setting and budget-balancing, social security, bloated bureacracy, the creeping Soviet global glacier, the rebuilding of our national military posture all pretty formidable stuff making up the burden bundled onto the shoulders of one man in the White House while back at the ranch in California chopping wood is more exhilirating than dropping budgets. Our sympathies, sir.

So, you will excuse me if I respectfully suggest that some of the people around you might unwittingly, or witlessly, be feeding the fires of antisemitism on the Saudi AWACS deal by putting a wild or weird focus on the reasons for its impending failure.

In truth, the Saudi AWACS deal just won't fly for purely American reasons of prudent strategic interest.

Some Washington honchos are blaming, warning, and with veiled threats saying that Israel and the American Jewish Community will suffer untold discriminations if the Senate for reasons of its own, shoots down the Saudi AWACS.

How all the President's men could have foisted such a flawed bill of political goods (bads) on you is a head-shaking mystery, a political-military policy flop if ever there was one. But that is grist for the mill of another essay at another time.

Now I should like most respectfully to suggest that this issue is an American issue, a policy issue, our own country's issue.

Israel's security concern is very real but that is not the main issue today.

The supersecret AWACS technology that we would not give or sell to Britain or to our NATO allies in Europe we would hand over to a medieval Saudi regime that has openly flouted US Middle East policy—political, military, and economic?

Remember high-jacking-up the price of oil and the Saudis blocking our strategic oil reserves fillup to hinder our ability to protect the free world? Remember?

Such are spinoffs of the main issue.

The real issue is: Can a great America find peace and comfort in a policy of petro-appeasement of Saudi Arabia?

Is the latter-day variation on Chamberlain's umbrella to be a Saudi AWACS radar dish?

Is giving away our top-secret electronic-eye-in-the sky and air battle control technology to an unstable, unfriendly, feudal regime that could be knocked off and toppled tomorrow by internal enemies, or Soviet-surrogates, wise policy?

On the contrary, it is deadly and dangerous to us and to our to our natural allies in the area.

To allow anyone in the political-military-industrial complex in Washington to try to make it a mono-dimensional Israel-interest affair is demagoguery of the worst order, worthy of KKK or Goebbels-type mental misfits.

Don't let it happen, Mr. President.

Do not let them feed the consuming fires of anti-semitism by impugning the people and the motives against the giveaway of U.S. secret AWACS technology to slippery Saudia.

If we all don't look at this issue clearly it could harm the social fabric of America.

Don't let 'em say it is "Begin versus Reagan".

That is horrible in its stupidity the Hitlerian "Big Lie" still stirring evil amongst the decent world.

Even if that is not the intention, it does feed antisemitic feelings. There are still a lot of crazies out here, Mr. President.

As for Israel, of course they stand four-square on any danger to their security. Why not? AWACS in the hands of the "jihad" screaming Saudia is a danger to Israel's security.

Nor is a "joint control" compromise, with due respect to Sen. John Glenn, an answer. If Saudi AWACS eye-spy plane endangers Israel and someone decides to shoot it down, how shuddering that would be with our Americans on board the Saudian craft.

And what a setup for PLO terrorist plot to camouflage a plane to make it look like an Israeli craft, though it really be a radical mischief-making venture from Iran, Iraq, or Libya.

Remember the PLO is funded with Saudi oiled "protection" payoffs. In cahoots, they both can easily set up an "international incident" with PLO terrorists bombs planted in a Saudi AWACS with Americans aboard.

The grim possibilities are endless and dangerous.

Mr. President, we all want to make and keep America safe and strong. Do not allow the misguided petro-buck greedies or the Arabists of Foggy Bottom to splinter us.

If Scandinavia of Benelux protests U.S. neutron bomb or medium range missiles deployed in Europe, no one accuses them of "interfering" with or tripping up US policy. So why cannot Israel raise its voice about dangers to it even more vulnerable security without being demeaned or impugned?

Mr. President, in the interest of American fair play and decency, stop those who so demean and impugn honest differences at home or abroad.

Further, those who sneer at a so-called Jewish lobby impugn the American system where citizens are, and of right ought to be, free to speak out forcefully on national issues affecting us all.

Widespread Senate and House opposition to Saudi AWACS is a spectrum as varied as the individual legislators who rightly are concerned for real American security.

Remember back in 1975, Gen. David Jones, then Air Force Chief of Staff, now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said:

"The system I think is the greatest breakthrough in command and control in my entire military career is the AWACS . . . the central nervous system of our entire force structure."

What more need be said, Mr. President?

AWACS are already on patrol over Saudi Arabia. Keep them there under full American control.

Don't muddy the waters of US Middle East air security control by giving away top secret technology to a shaky regime that might not last out the decade, or even to the next election in USA.

Americans of all faiths, political parties, ethnic backgrounds, and patriotic postures are formed into the ranks of opposition to the Saudi AWACS giveaway.

Mr. President, please don't let the unwisdom of Saudi AWACS deplete us or divide us in America the Beautiful.

With deep respect and may you be "Inscribed in the Book of Life" for the liturgical New Year of 5742.

SHALOM PEACE.
THE EDITOR.●

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S LATEST BUDGET CUTS

HON. RONALD M. MOTTL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. MOTTL. Mr. Speaker, the President's latest fiscal year 1982 budget cuts, as outlined in the enclosures to his September 30, 1981, letter to you, have come to my attention. To say I was shocked would be a gross understatement.

The Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which I chair, has the responsibility to insure that quality and quantity medical services are rendered to veterans. The White House press secretary's office lulled me into a false sense of security for the veteran's medical program by the "Fact Sheet" it released on September 24, 1981, at the time of President Reagan's address to the Nation. After reviewing the enclosures to the President's September 30 letter to you, I must conclude that any similarity in the data in the "Fact Sheet" and the President's proposed additional cuts are purely accidental and fictional.

For the information of Members, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs recommeded a $441.2 million cut in outlays for veterans programs in fiscal year 1982 in lieu of the $830.9 million recommended by the administration on March 10, 1981. Now the administration is asking for an additional cut of $451.7 million over and above the $441.2 that was agreed to. Some $395.9 million of the latest proposed budget cuts would be in veterans' medical programs.

If you compare the current budget recommendations for fiscal year 1982 and the President's March 10, 1981, budget submission to the Congress for veterans' benefits, you will find a surprising similarity. Yet, this second round of budget cuts comes after an agreement had been reached with the administration prior to the House passage of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35. I, for one, have the uncomfortable feeling of having the rug pulled out from under me. Never have I seen an agreement go down the drain so fast and without any apparent discussion or thought going into the process.

In respect to veterans' benefits, Gramm-Latta II and the Jones budget for fiscal year 1982 were identical, and David Stockman assured us that our figures met with the approval of the administration. Now the administration comes to the Congress requesting practically the same cuts asked for last March. What kind of agreement is this? Does the deficit figure become so allusive that it fluctuates like the Dow-Jones index of leading stocks on the New York Stock Exchange?

Mr. Speaker, veterans' benefits are as much a part of national defense as a weapons system. How can we expect to get the young men and women of this Nation to serve in the Armed Forces when we renege on the promises made to them by a grateful country? You can be sure veterans will be loud in their condemnation if we fail to meet these commitments. It should not come as a surprise to anyone how such a failure would adversely affect the future manpower requirements of the Armed Forces.

I, for one, shall oppose any further reduction in veterans' benefits, and I urge all Members to examine the President's latest recommendations carefully and also reject them.●

JOSEPH VELTRI—MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the lifetime of outstanding work done by Mr. Joseph Veltri.

Since 1935, Mr. Veltri has served as an usher at Our Lady of Grace Roman Catholic Church in Brooklyn, N.Y. He has become a veritable institution in the parish. A man of kindness and compassion, Joe Veltri symbolizes through thought, word, and deed what it means to be a Christian and a good citizen.

On Saturday, October 20, Joe will be rightly honored for his decades of service. A dinner, hosted by Msgr. Dominick Sclafani and attended by hundreds of Joe's friends, relatives, and neighbors, will be a well-deserved tribute to this special man.

I look forward to joining my friends at Our Lady of Grace for this memorable event.●

IN HONOR OF PRESIDENT SADAT

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, if the unconfirmed reports that President Sadat has indeed been assassinated are true—and it seems they are—then the world has lost a statesman and the United States, a friend. President Sadat had the vision and the courage to bring peace to his country. He saw the future as one in which Arabs and Israelis could live together in the Middle East, peacefully, in harmony, working out their differences at the peace table, not on the battlefield. We hope that his legacy will not be lost and that the peace process he helped begin will continue.

Nevertheless, we have grave cause for concern. The Camp David accords are in their infancy. Peace between Israel and Egypt has yet to be institutionalized, and President Sadat's passing only reminds us again how precarious the political situation is in the Middle East. Indeed, it reminds us all how tenuous the peace we all enjoy might be.

Mr. Speaker, President Sadat's loss is tragic. We can only hope that the path he has established is one we will continue to follow. In his honor, let us reaffirm our commitment to his legacy: "the spirit of Camp David."●

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD ABSORB COSTS INCURRED IN SAVINGS ALLOTMENT PROGRAM

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will require the Federal Government to provide payroll deduction allotments under the savings allotment program at no cost to the Federal employee or to the recipient financial institution.

Payroll deductions have proved to be an effective and efficient means of encouraging savings for all citizens. It is a sure method by which they can contribute to an overall improvement in our economy, help stall inflation, and play a positive role in bringing down the exorbitant rates of interest we suffer from today. Congress should do all it possibly can to encourage thrift and savings. It is for this reason that my bill is extremely timely and on target.

Mr. Speaker, service charges for the processing of allotment checks are imposed only on savings allotments made under 31 U.S.C. 492(b) which requires that Federal agencies be reimbursed for the additional administrative costs incurred in processing savings allotments for Federal civilian employees by their recipient financial institutions. In other words, under current law, the Federal Government will absorb the administrative cost of sending one check to an employee's designated financial organization—that is, bank, savings bank, savings and loan association, or credit union—but the appropriate Federal agency must be reimbursed by the designated financial organization for any administrative costs incurred in processing additional savings allotment checks, which under current law is limited to two. My bill would simply delete the requirement that administrative costs be reimbursed by the financial organization, and it would require the Federal Government to absorb all administrative costs incurred in the savings allotment program. There is no doubt that the benefits to our economy as a whole as provided by this legislation will far outweigh any additional costs to the Government—which are minimal. The revenues received by the Government for savings accounts allotments averaged $1.67 million per year for fiscal year 1979 and fiscal year 1980. More-over, it is a fact that most of the private sector now provides such services for their employees at no cost to the employees or to the financial institutions involved.

Under current law, only active and retired military personnel and Department of Defense civilians working overseas are now authorized to make allotments to financial institutions at no cost to them or to their recipient institutions.

Allotments for civilian employees of the Federal Government were permitted in 1961 (5 U.S.C. 5525). These allotments were limited to labor dues, charitable contributions, and taxes—at no charge to the employee. The program was expanded in 1965 by allowing Federal employees to have allotments sent to financial institutions—but it did not require the Government to impose fees for these services. It was not until 1968 that charges for sending allotments to designated institutions were established by the Department of the Treasury. Under 31 U.S.C. 492(b) as amended by Public Law 90-365, the Treasury Department was given the authority to establish charges for two additional allotments sent to financial institutions, excluding an allotment for an employee's regular paycheck—which has been and continues to be sent at no cost to the employee or the designated institution, since it is considered to be an entitlement to the employee. Incidentally, charges were imposed on extra allotments because it was feared that additional allotments might constitute an excessive expense for the Federal Government. However as late as May of last year, the Office of Personnel Management concluded otherwise and proposed a rule which would substantially liberalize the use of payroll allotment programs.

Despite the OPM's findings, the Department of Treasury, on May 22, 1981, published a notice of proposed rulemaking to increase the service charge for allotments of pay to savings accounts of Federal civilian employees. Under the proposal, service charges would increase from 6 cents to 12 cents for each individual payroll deduction and from 12 cents to 27 cents for each check sent to a financial organization.

Although the Treasury Department admitted that the savings allotment program had come far in promoting thrift among Federal employees, that participation by employees and financial organizations led to a steady growth in the program—which would not have been possible without the cooperation and interest that has been demonstrated by financial institutions, and that the proposed increase may impose an additional burden on financial institutions—and therefore, ultimately on the Federal employee; it, nonetheless, concluded that the law requires the recovery of processing costs. Mr. Speaker, how ironic it is that we in the Congress, on the one hand, enact legislation such as the all savers, individual retirement accounts, and other provisions contained in the recently passed Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, to encourage savings, and yet, on the other hand, we impose an impediment on our loyal Federal employees who want to save by requiring the Federal Government to charge the employee or the designated financial institution the cost of processing the savings allotment. It simply does not make any sense and my bill corrects this inequity.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a fact that agency costs for administering the allotment program have declined since charges were first imposed in 1968 through the development of more sophisticated electronic delivery systems; it is also a fact, as noted earlier, that most private sector businesses provide allotment benefits cost free to their employees. It is time for the Federal Government to follow the lead of the private sector and provide cost-free allotment benefits to all Federal employees, the cost of which is minimal to the Federal Treasury and at the same time a painless way to fight inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that my bill has the full support of the Credit Union National Association (CUNA), the Defense Credit Union Council (DCUC), the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU), and other financial organizations interested in thrift and savings for the Federal employee and for all Americans.●

BONA FESTE CELEBRATION IN EASTON, PA.

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, the Nation will pause to mark Columbus Day, the holiday set aside to honor the brilliant Italian explorer whose diligence and commitment to an idea led to the colonization of the Western Hemisphere. It is also the time when we honor the many fine contributions to our Nation and our national culture by Italian Americans throughout the 50 States.

In my own community, Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, it is the time of the annual Bona Feste celebration organized by a long list of Italian-American ethnic organizations in Easton and Northampton County.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first year in some time that I will not be present at this celebration. I regret deeply that congressional duties will keep me away.

But my regret at not being able to be present in no way diminishes my esteem for the organizers of this annual event and for the many Italian Americans who live in Easton and throughout the Lehigh Valley. In a region of Pennsylvania known for its strong ethnic ties, the Lehigh Valley Italian-American community can be especially proud of its achievements and of its efforts to keep Italian culture alive in the United States.

The Bona Feste, in particular, is known far and wide as a celebration at which everyone can be Italian. Held in Easton's Center Square, it is a day-long event that features Italian food and music and underscores the contributions of Italian Americans to the richness of life in the Lehigh Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will want to join me in wishing the Easton-Northampton County Columbus Organization, Inc., well on the occasion of this year's Bona Feste, being held Saturday, October 10. I know, too, they will want to congratulate the organizers of this event for being involved in such a worthwhile project. And most of all, Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will want to join me in saying "Bona Fortuna" to the entire Lehigh Valley Italian-American community as we mark Columbus Day, 1981.●

REAGANOMICS—THE CHALLENGE TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues a column from the Council Reports, the monthly publication of the New England Council, Inc. This column was reprinted in the Boston Herald American of September 22, 1981.

The Column follows:

REAGANOMICS—THE CHALLENGE TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

(By Congressman BRIAN J. DONNELLY)

In less than eight months, the entire federal government has changed course. The tax code has been redesigned to promote capital formation, investment, and research and development. Government spending is being cut back sharply and few proposals for extending new government benefits are likely to get serious consideration. Regulators are now talking about growth and development with the same verve once reserved for talk about protecting the environment and the consumer from the effects of unchecked growth and development.

In short, the government has adopted the program advocated by the business community for improving the quality of life in the United States.

THE ONE QUESTION YET TO BE ANSWERED IS: WILL IT WORK?

Senate Republican leader Howard Baker has publicly labelled the tax program "a riverboat gamble." Other prominent supporters of the new economic order, in and out of government, privately express similiar doubts about the entire program.

The business community cannot content itself to celebrate the political victories of 1981. It must now prove to Congress and to the country that its program can and will work. If it does not, the political victories will be reversed, and more importantly, the nation will suffer.

If the program is to work, the private sector will have to demonstrate that it is far more adept than the government at providing for the needs of the country that were identified and addressed by Washington in the 60's and 70's.

Jobs must be created and training must be readily available for those who lack skills or whose skills are no longer in demand. The CETA jobs program has been wiped out, but the people it was designed to serve remain.

The cost of higher education continues to rise, but fewer families will qualify for federally backed loans and grants. Our nation's social and economic strength demands a well-educated populace.

The elderly and the poor—too often the same—still require safe and healthful and affordable housing. The federal commitment to subsidized housing is being sharply cut back, though again, the need remains.

The new heads of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Interior Department have expressed an increased sensitivity to the costs of regulation and the need for business development. This does not mean Americans cherish any less our beautiful and fruitful environment.

The federal government is winding down its support for public broadcasting and for the arts and humanities. This decision represents government austerity, not national philistinism.

Most importantly, the government is reducing the share of individual and corporate earnings that it takes in taxes to support public purposes. This is most especially the case among individuals with the highest incomes.

The advocates of this tax program promised the money left in the hands of the taxpayers would not be used for inflation-generating consumer spending. Instead, they claimed it would be used for more productive and socially useful purposes through savings and investment. The health and growth of our economy is depending on it.

A large burden has been shifted from the government to the private sector—to business people as individuals, as investors, as corporate executives and directors. Now it has become largely your responsibility to generate economic growth, restrain inflationary pressures, and promote general welfare. It is no small challenge.●

SHOCKING NEWS NO LONGER SHOCKING

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, you have to wonder when it is all going to stop.

This morning I awoke to the no-longer-shocking news that yet another world leader had been the target of an assassination attempt. There, in the comfort of my living room, interspersed between the highlights of the Atlanta-Philadelphia football game and a feature story on the AWACS sale to Saudi Arabia, I suddenly heard that all-too-familiar warning: "We interrupt this program for a special announcement."

As we all know by now, Egyptian President Anwar Sadat was the subject of that announcement. While viewing a military parade in the city of Cairo, a band of terrorists suddenly opened fire upon his reviewing stand. And, unlike the more fortunate likes of President Reagan and Pope John Paul II, President Sadat did not survive the attack.

Some will say it is ironic that this prince of peace, who devoted most of his life to seeking a nonviolent solution to the crisis in the Middle East, should die in such a violent manner. On the other hand, such incidents seem to be the norm. We need only recall the likes of Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Bobby Kennedy, to remember that advocates of peace are, unfortunately, at the mercy of those who condone violence. We can only pray that the prophets of peace are not deterred in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I could spend this time citing the accomplishments of Anwar Sadat, but that is not necessary. Suffice it to say that he was indeed a "great" man who will be missed by people throughout the world.

I wanted to use this time to express my frustration and despair. When President John Kennedy was killed in 1963 our hearts stopped. Over the years, however, we've become numb to such tragedies. Now, our hearts rarely skip a beat when those "Special Bulletins" interrupt our day. It is this acceptance of violence as the normal course of things that distresses me and it makes me wonder what the future holds for mankind.●

NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

HON. CLEVE BENEDICT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Speaker, last week I submitted comments stating my position on the Clean Air Act and indicated the need for action by my colleagues on this important issue. Today I would like to follow up on those remarks with an assessment of the Clean Air Act relating to national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).

There is no doubt that these federally established baselines for nonhazardous pollutants form the backbone of the entire stationary source control program. Through this structure, ambient air quality in this country has been measured, resulting in the classification of nonattainment areas—subject to the requirements under Part D: Nonattainment, of the act—where air standards are not being met and attainment areas—subject to Part C: Prevention of Significant Deterioration, of the act—where air standards are being met.

The initial step in establishing a national ambient air quality standard is the development and publication of criteria documents. These documents are an encyclopedic compilation of information on a specific pollutant and have been compiled for seven pollutants to date.

EPA has been criticized for not using the best scientific information to set NAAQS. This is certainly a valid criticism in light of the fact that EPA has not had to evaluate the quality of the material it reviews or assess the validity of the scientific technique used to obtain this material. EPA's own ongoing reappraisal of the scientific basis for the present ambient standards indicates that much of the evidence of adverse health effects relied upon in 1971 is either flawed or uncomfirmed by later studies. Furthermore, previous EPA Administrators have used the information in the criteria documents selectively when setting standards. As a result, there is no guarantee now that the standards are appropriate to public health and welfare needs.

In an attempt to correct this situation, the 1977 Clean Air Act amendments created the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) to assist the Administrator in developing criteria documents. CASAC presently serves as an advisory committee, appointed by the EPA Administrator. This group has no legal authority, however, and EPA continues to set standards which are not based in all instances on the best scientific information available for public or judicial review.

H.R. 3471 contains sound proposals to overcome these shortcomings and make the Clean Air Act a more effective instrument in helping to reach our objective of a healthful environment.

In the process of reviewing scientific studies, CASAC will have the authority to question the validity and scientific acceptability of the design, methodology, analytical techniques, results, and reported conclusions of all essential studies. EPA will continue to devise and administer the review process. No air quality criteria will be issued in final form without the prior approval of CASAC.

To enhance the independent nature of CASAC, membership will be expanded to include nine members. This new membership should include at a minimum one member each appointed by the head of the National Institutes of Health, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Surgeon General.

Utilizing this framework, EPA will be required to revise existing NAAQS, both primary and secondary, within 3 years of enactment of Clean Air Act amendments. Standards then will be subject to review every 10 years thereafter.

These and other changes are essential to a continuation of progress toward cleaner air and economic growth. The facts are clear and there is no longer any justification for maintaining an inefficient and detrimental regulatory structure when the means for improvement are at hand. Again, I urge my colleagues to seriously consider the implications of further inaction on the Clean Air Act.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, due to family illness I was unavoidably absent from the House floor during two votes on Friday, October 2, 1981.

On rollcall No. 234, the motion to approve the Journal of Thursday's proceedings, I would have voted "aye." On rollcall No. 235, adoption of the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3603, the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, I would have voted "aye."●

MAYOR LUCILLE J. REED

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, one of Cuyahoga County's finest public servants has announced her retirement after 20 years of forceful, unselfish public service. Mayor Lucille Reed of Bedford Heights, Ohio, has been an outstanding Democrat and a role model for women throughout the country. We know that her retirement will continue to be a creative experience for her. From all of the people of the 20th District of Ohio, we say, "Well done, Your Honor."

The following is an article which appeared recently in the Bedford Times-Register which mirrors her illustrious career.

[From the Bedford Times-Register, July 23, 1981]

AND AFTER 20 YEARS, LUCILLE RESTED

(By Bradley Neckar)

"Somebody should be in there on the people's side." It was this philosophy towards government that caused Lucille J. Reed to enter the male-dominated world of politics as a councilwoman in 1962. She has carried that ideal throughout a 20 year political career that will earn her a formidable niche in the history of the city of Bedford Heights.

Mayor Reed's recent announcement of her impending retirement almost instinctively forces one to reflect back over her two terms as a councilwoman and eight terms as mayor.

An entire generation of young Bedford Heights residents were raised during the political tenure of Lucille Reed. That generation and the one that voted her into the mayor's office eight times will remember a central figure dominating the body politic of Bedford Heights.

Mayor Reed has had her share of detractors and controversies but also a goodly number of successes. As time weaves its way those controversies and the opinions of her detractors will mellow. Maybe then, they will agree with Reed's contention that she, with the cooperation of her friends and co-workers, "helped to build a city."

Reed was born April 29, 1926, as the first of eight children of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Barbato. Her father co-founded and headed the Order Sons of Italy for 15 years. Reed says that she has always been extremely competitive and interested in politics. As a resident of Maple Heights and then Bedford Heights, she was an active volunteer in political campaigns.

It was the issue of spot rezoning that intensified Reed's political participation. A series of apartments was slated to be built near Reed's neighborhood. She and others went to protest the rezoning but their efforts were in vain. Her disagreement with the idea of spot rezoning would carry over to her early administrations as mayor. Now Reed confidently reports that her administration has "stopped all spot rezoning" in the city.

Her first defeat with the powers that be did dissuade her from running and winning a council seat in 1962. Her successful last minute campaign would never have occurred had not two confident councilmen announced their lack of opposition to the then "citizen Reed."

After two terms as council-woman, Reed made her bid for mayor, taking office in January of 1966.

Within her 16 years of public service as mayor, Reed enumerates several accomplishments that give her the greatest sense of satisfaction. The first is the Lucille Reed Municipal Park. The land, a ravine, was purchased by Reed for one dollar. The Mayor helped design the park and persuaded area businessmen to donate to the project.

The designing and building of the new city hall is the second charm in Reed's administrative bracelet. Critics call it a fortress, a designation Reed half-heartedly admits to. However that does not diminish her pride in the building. She feels people can "sense a woman's touch" with the interior design.

The third aspect of her years as mayor that has special significance to her is the people. The people she has worked with. The people she has served. "I will miss the people I worked with," says Reed. "I didn't do it by myself, it took cooperation."

"One person does not build a mountain."

Mayor Reed feels confident that now is the time to step down. The recent passage of the increase in the city income tax allowed her the security of leaving office knowing the "the city is solvent." "If the tax issue had failed, I would have run again," states Reed. She foresees no financial problems for future administrations. The city can continue to "keep its fine city services," says Reed. Reed estimates that if a citizen utilizes all of the city services available, they can "save $220 to $250 a year."

Reed does not see herself politically active after retirement. "I am willing to give advice if asked but I will not poke my nose into other administrations."

As for her successor, Mayor Reed has already endorsed Councilman Rogert Furlong. She feels they both share much the same philosophy toward public service. She cites his credentials and his compassion for people. Consequently, Reed is "pretty positive" that Furlong will be the next mayor.

Reed summarized her career as one of a small minority of female mayors by saying that she is "very honored to have served eight terms and be part of the history of this country." "I've been lucky," says Reed. "I have good health, a good husband, family, and fantastic friends."●

SOCIAL SECURITY AS A CONTRIBUTORY PENSION

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, as the debate over the financial status of the social security system continues, James H. Wathen of 31 Comer Drive, Madisonville, Ky., a city that I represent in Congress, has written me urging that social security should be made solely a contributory pension. I feel Mr. Wathen's letter is one which should be shared with my colleagues and I wish to do so at this time. The letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HUBBARD: Much has been said about the possibility of the Social Security system going broke. The debate has led to the ideas of raising retirement age, of cutting benefits like cost of living increases or other such measures. It seems to me that these remedies miss the point.

Social Security was written into law as a form of contributory pension. But over the years, Congress has appended to that statute a series of entitlements which include medical benefits, aid to student survivors of prematurely deceased wage earners, alcohol and drug treatment centers, etc.

As a concerned citizen and member of "Citizen's Choice", I would like to offer the solution to the problem. Make Social Security a contributory pension period! Take away the entitlements and subject them to annual review and fund them outside of the Social Security system.

As an Insurance Agent, I can guarantee that $1,000/year contribution from age 30 to age 65 at 3½% interest will yield $64,867.15 or $421.64/monthly for life. Imagine what insurance companies could do with the income from Social Security each year as pure pension. Most people contribute more than $1,000 and interest rates on loans to the government would yield more than 10% (not 3½%).

Also, there is another area to attack. Federal employees do not participate in Social Security. They retire on more income than Social Security would provide. Then, they may qualify for Social Security benefits in addition to their pension. They should be unable to draw both.

It is my opinion that some graduated means of participation in the Social Security system by federal employees should be implemented. Since they are half the work force, wouldn't that give the system some immediate relief?

Sincerely,

JAMES H. WATHEN.●

NATIONAL END HANDGUN VIOLENCE WEEK

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, today we are introducing a resolution that would designate October 25, 1981, to October 31, 1981, as National End Handgun Violence Week.

The main instrument of murder in this country is the handgun. It is a simple truth, a fact. Everyone in this room knows it and the American people know it. And yet the opponents of gun control legislation remain victorious. It is time to marshal and get the people to join with us. That is what this week is about—a nationwide effort to focus attention on the brutal and senseless deaths and to say, "No more."

I am pleased that today we are introducing legislation to designate National End Handgun Violence Week and to authorize the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate activities. This is a bipartisan resolution and reflects the support and recognition of the importance of national attention to the problem of handgun violence.

During my time with the States attorney office in Chicago, I had the opportunity to work with law enforcement officials, and their overwhelming opinion was that we need some form of gun control. The polls, the mail that comes into my offices, my conversations with the people back home, all indicate the support for limiting this instrument of death. What is missing? Maybe the problem is that too many people accept a view of our country as violent and are almost resigned to it, helpless in the face of the random violence. We are not helpless. Let us say that loudly the week of October 25, 1981, to October 31, 1981. As a country we have to start dealing with the violence in our culture, whether it is directed at the President of the United States or the corner grocer.

I am asking my colleagues to support the National End Handgun Violence Week, Thank you.●

AUDUBON ENERGY PLAN IS PRACTICAL PROPOSAL FOR U.S. ENERGY MIX BY THE YEAR 2000

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to urge my colleagues to read a recent speech by a distinguished American, Dr. M. Rupert Cutler, the senior vice president of the National Audubon Society. Dr. Cutler, who served from 1977 to 1980 as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Conservation, Research, and Education, was addressing the subject of energy and the environment. The conference on the economic future of the Central Gulf South was sponsored by the University of New Orleans College of Business Administration on September 4, 1981.

I believe that the Audubon energy plan, about which Dr. Cutler spoke, is a practical proposal for assuring ourselves of ample energy supplies by the year 2000 without sacrificing environmental quality. This plan envisions a much more limited role for nuclear power than the U.S. Department of Energy and the nuclear industry have proposed. Instead, nuclear power is presented as a temporary expedient during the transition to renewable and safe energy sources that will be completed early in the next century. The Audubon projection for nuclear power is based on the continuation of the present de facto moratorium on new reactor construction. Further, it assumes that only two-thirds of those reactors now under construction will be completed.

Dr. Cutler's speech follows:

AUDUBON'S ENERGY PLAN PROVIDES ENERGY WHILE PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

There's a maxim in the Environmental Movement that goes like this: In the long run there can't be a healthy economy unless there is a healthy environment to support it. Sometimes, when people express objections about the high cost of pollution controls, we put it as a question: What will the cost be if we don't clean up? How much will pollution cost the nation in added health expenses * * * property damage * * * destruction of farmland, grazing lands, and fisheries * * * squandered resources?

Environmental protection is not a rival interest competing with economic programs; it is a vital underpinning of the economy.

Of course, it works both ways. Without a healthy economy we can neither enjoy nor protect our environment. Our food may come from soil, sun, and rain—but it is delivered to us by barges, trains and trucks, and we pay for it with money that comes from a complex economic system. Economic disaster could leave us just as hungry as environmental disaster could. What the Central Gulf South and the rest of the nation must strive for is a wise balance between the interdependent needs of both sides of the equation.

To bring those sweeping generalizations down to more useful specifics, I'd like to tell you briefly about two things my organization, the National Audubon Society, has been working on. One is an innovative technology for meeting future energy needs. The other is a campaign to convince the nation that the Reagan administration has adopted a dangerously retrogressive environmental policy in the misguided belief it will help the economy.

First, the Audubon Energy Plan.

We have drawn up an energy plan which we believe could save the United States hundreds of billions of dollars during the next decade—yes, I said hundreds of billions of dollars—and could also stave off threatened destruction of the environment. Before you dismiss this claim as the impractical dream of some environmentalist do-gooders off in their ivory tower, I ask you to hear me out. We are not advocating a secret plan nobody else has thought of. We are recommending an approach that is shared by a large body of scientific, government, business, and academic leaders around the world. What's more, it is an approach that is already being used by substantial numbers of business leaders and private citizens in this country.

To put our plan in proper context, I must first remind you that energy is one of the overriding environmental concerns of our era. During the two centuries since the Industrial Revolution, the procurement, transportation, and use of wood, coal, and oil to fuel our economy has had a devastating effect on our natural environment and on the health of plants, animals, and people. Most of the pollutants that foul our air come from the production or use of energy: carbon monoxide, sulfur and nitrogen oxides, acid rain, hydrocarbons, coal dust, and particulates. Strip-mining has ripped up fertile lands, marred scenic beauty, and poisoned streams and rivers. Oil spills have smeared coastlines.

An August 28 article in Science reports on the latest findings on the so-called "greenhouse" effect—the trend toward a warmer climate that apparently is due in large part to an increasing level of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere, carbon dioxide released as we burn coal, wood, gas, oil, and gasoline. The heat rise is very slow, but there is evidence that within the next century this effect of burning fossil fuels will be enough to melt part of the Antarctic ice cap, which—among other things—could raise the level of the sea by 15 to 20 feet and flood 25 percent of Louisiana and Florida. This isn't a scare story from "Kooks for the Environment." It is a respected study by scientists of the Goddard Spaceflight Center of the National Atmospheric and Oceanic Administration.

No organization concerned with environmental quality can ignore the energy question. Two years ago we started expanding our science division, and our first major environmental policy study—it took a year to complete—was on energy. We collected facts and figures from all available sources, including oil companies, government agencies, and university research teams. We costed out the alternatives, and came to the following conclusion:

A combination of energy conservation and solar power would cost far less, promote a healthier economy, do more to strengthen national security, and do much less damage to the environment than an all-out effort to produce more oil, nuclear power, and synthetic fuels.

I want to stress that when we talk about energy conservation we don't mean scrimping and lowering the standard of living. We are talking about using available energy sources more efficiently. We contend that by shifting to technologies that are more energy-efficient, this country could be producing 50 to 80 percent more goods and services in the year 2000 than it is producing now without any increase over present energy consumption.

Efficiency is good business. The higher the cost of conventional fuels rises, the more money can be saved by using fuel efficiently. As I said earlier, large numbers of people are already practicing what we are preaching: Homeowners are insulating, drivers are buying more gasoline-efficient automobiles, industries are adopting fuel-saving measures.

The results have been astonishing. In August of 1979 this country was importing about 8.5 million barrels of oil a day. Last month the figure was 5.2 million. That is a drop of almost 40 percent in two years. It also means our annual payments to foreign producers have decreased by about $40 billion dollars—$40 billion dollars a year that is no longer being lost to the U.S. economy. And militarily we have become much less vulnerable. That's what conservation can do.

Speaking of rising costs, I haven't mentioned the cost of nuclear power. A flagrant example of the disappointment that has followed the dream of cheap, safe nuclear power is the partially completed Nine Mile 2 plant beside Lake Ontario in northern New York State. It was originally expected to cost $450 million and to be ready in 1977. It is still unfinished and the cost, it is now estimated, may run as high as $5.6 billion. The industry has often blamed environmentalists and the government red tape for many of its problems, but it hardly would be reasonable to contend those factors could account for a cost overrun of 1,450 percent.

The other half of the Audubon Energy Plan is solar power. Or perhaps I should refer to it as "renewable" energy sources, since we are including indirect solar sources such as wind and water power, and biomass—conversion of plant material into energy in such ways as burning waste wood in the timber industry or turning plant material into alcohol to mix with gasoline and for other energy uses.

Our plan sets realistic goals. Although we favor an eventual phase-out of nuclear power, we do not see any possibility of closing down existing nuclear plants or those under construction: our figures are based on an increase in nuclear power—from 4 to 8 percent of total energy supply—in the next 20 years. We also see no realistic alternative to substantial use of coal in the years immediately ahead, despite the threats it holds for the environment. Likewise, we recognize that there can be pitfalls to wise use of renewable energy sources. Biomass, for example, is a source that could be abused; we have been conservative in our projections. By the year 2000, under our program, 25 percent of the nation's energy supply would come from renewable sources (hydropower and biomass are already supplying 7 percent), 28 percent would come from coal, 39 percent from oil and gas, and, as I mentioned a moment ago, 8 percent from nuclear plants.

The environmental advantages of moving toward increased reliance on renewable energy sources are obvious. The financial advantages may not be. It would cost huge amounts of money to rebuild, retool and replan for the program we propose. Roughly speaking, our plan calls for an investment of $700 billions in energy-efficient buildings, machines, and technologies over the next two decades, plus another $600 billion in renewable energy technologies like biomass, heat collectors, windpower, and photovoltaics for direct conversion of sunlight into electricity.

But the cost of the alternative is far greater. The nation's total energy bill for last year alone was $350 billion. That's five times greater than the yearly cost of the investments required under the Audubon Plan. Reliance on domestic, imported, and synthetic oil could run into the trillions of dollars by the year 2000.

We believe conservation and solar power are the paths to the wisest balance between the needs of the economy and the environment. We believe the rising price of conventional fuels will continue to encourage this path through the play of the free market. But we believe that, in addition, the government should be encouraging and aiding this course.

This brings me to my second point, our campaign to counter this Administration's environmental policies.

A year ago, when Ronald Reagan was campaigning for the Presidency, a major plank in his platform was that the pendulum had swung too far. The powers of big government were out of balance with the powers of state and local government, he said, and bureaucracy and red tape were out of balance with the workings of the free market.

I hope that is a fair paraphrase. I am not taking issue with the President's campaign stand. Like millions of other voters, I agreed that our federal laws and procedures could stand improvement, and I include the environmental protection laws in that statement. My quarrel with the Administration concerns what has been happening to the nation's environmental protection laws since Election Day.

The pendulum has already swung back well past dead center. It is swinging on back toward the Harding and Coolidge era of more than half a century ago when the business of America was business—when the nation believed that if government would just leave business alone, prosperity would follow.

That era—which to some extent was a pendulum swing away from the conservation and anti-trust policies of Teddy Roosevelt—ended in the Great Depression. Then the pendulum started swinging toward environmental protection again. During the next few decades there were major advances in soil conservation and expansion of the national park and national wildlife refuge systems. More recently, as a combination of continued population growth and technological developments have brought new threats to the environment, the Nixon, Ford, and Carter Administrations introduced federal programs to control air and water pollution, to require reclamation of land torn up by strip-mining, protect our wetlands and coastal zones, and—perhaps most important—to establish the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council on Environmental Quality to help the federal government find its way to a sound balance between environmental and economic policies.

Let's take a quick look at what has been happening to some of those agencies and programs under the present Administration.

At CEQ, virtually the entire staff was fired and was replaced by a staff and budget less than one third the size it was when my boss—Russell Peterson, president of the National Audubon Society—was chairman of CEQ during the Nixon and Ford Administrations.

At EPA, the enforcement division has been disbanded and its personnel assigned to providing "technical assistance" to state enforcement efforts. Most of the top appointive posts at EPA, an agency with a highly technical orientation, have been filled by attorneys who have represented corporations in legal actions against EPA rulings and regulations. The administrator herself, while a Colorado legislator, joined in a law suit to block Clean Air Act rulings by EPA in her state.

My successor as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of the Forest Service wants to raise the annual cut of timber in the National forests to double the amount recommended by the professionals of the Forest Service. And his ultimate goal is to triple the cut.

The newly launched program to save the nation's coastal wetlands has been all but destroyed by budget cuts.

The inspection and enforcement staff of the Office of Surface Mining is being reduced to less than one third of its previous strength. Again, a critic of the act has been appointed to administer the program.

Interior Secretary Watt proposes to make 200 million acres per year available for offshore oil and gas development—five times greater than the total amount leased over the last 40 years and far more than can be developed in an orderly way or supervised effectively.

The Administration has revoked the order that public buildings be heated only up to 65 degrees in winter and air conditioners be set no lower than 78 in summer—an order that accomplished real savings as well as helping to spread a conservation message.

The Administration has backed legislation that would in effect call off any further Forest Service wilderness reviews and discourage Congress from adding more Forest Service lands to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The Administration, from the top down, has given encouragement to the goals of the Sagebrush Rebellion, the purpose of which is to wrest the public lands of the West away from the federal government and open them more widely to grazing, oil and mineral developments, and timbering—if not to turn them over to private ownership altogether.

Secretary Watt would like to divest his department of the urban park program that was instituted during the Nixon Administration to bring the parks closer to where the people are.

The Department of Energy is cutting the budget for energy conservation and solar energy programs by 77 percent, while increasing nuclear power subsidies by 35 percent—the path directly opposite to the one recommended in the Audubon Energy Plan.

I could go on, but these examples should suffice. There is no way such a record can be construed as an evenhanded attempt to balance economic needs with environmental ones. Clearly, this Administration believes the economy is more important than the environment.

On this issue, the President is dead wrong. Neither is "more important" than the other. The two are interdependent and cannot be separated. We can't have a healthy economy without a healthy environment.●

TRIBUTE TO HELP THE HANDICAPPED

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, as the International Year of Disabled Persons enters its last quarter and as we observe Employ the Handicapped Week, I rise today in tribute to those in the State of Nebraska who have selflessly dedicated their time and talents to this important cause.

Through a comprehensive program of films, lectures, workshops, school contests, and conferences, the Nebraska Commission on the International Year of Disabled Persons has been a leader in raising public consciousness and awareness of the potential of disabled persons. Transportation is being made accessible, recreation areas are being adapted, and employment opportunities are being accelerated.

Community, civic, and business efforts are also meeting with success. For example, the Telephone Pioneers, a group of employees at Northwestern Bell in Omaha, have developed the "Beep Ball"—an invention that enables the blind to play softball. Further, they have built a running track for blind children with wires stretched taut along the running lanes that allow the blind runner to follow the track. Creative achievements such as these are not limited to recreational purposes.

Parallel accomplishments in the business environment have opened up new opportunities for the disabled, and this points to the most important challenge before us—to bring the disabled fully into the American economic mainstream.

Many enlightened businessmen and women have learned that hiring the handicapped is not an exercise in charity but rather a wise business decision. Removing workplace barriers—whether they be physical or psychological—not only gives the disabled individual access to new employment opportunities but also gives the employer access to a previously untapped source of workers. With severe shortages of skilled workers projected for the mid-eighties and with a working population that by 1990 will increase its average age by 20 percent, companies that have implemented a policy of hiring the disabled and adapting their workplaces will be better prepared for these developments than their competitors.

Allowing each of our citizens to develop their full potential allows our Nation to develop to its full potential, and this is surely a goal that we all share. I urge all Americans, including my fellow Nebraskans, to support the long-term goals developed jointly by the U.S. Council for the International Year of Disabled Persons and the U.S. Government's Federal Interagency Committee for the International Year of Disabled Persons which calls for: Expanded educational opportunity; improved access to housing, buildings, and transportation; greater opportunity for employment; greater participation in recreational, social, and cultural activities; expanded and strengthened rehabilitation progams and facilities; purposeful application of biomedical research aimed at conquering major disabling conditions; reduction in the incidence of disability through accident and disease prevention; increased application of technology to ameliorate the effects of disability; and expanded international exchange of information and experience to benefit all disabled persons.

With 1,850 communities, 330 national organizations, all 55 Governors of States and territories, and 270 corporations joined in a partnership of pursuing this nine-point program of the International Year of Disabled Persons this year, I urge all Americans to continue this mission well beyond the end of this year. I commend those in my home State of Nebraska who have long recognized this effort and who have worked to advance the rights and the dignity of the disabled. In the words of Eleanor Roosevelt, "Universal human rights begin in small places, close to home—so close that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world." The International Year of the Disabled Persons has offered an opportune time to bring the needs and feelings of those who are disabled to the public's awareness and I am certainly proud of those in my State who are dedicated to these efforts.●

TURNAROUND TAKES TIME

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I read a recent editorial in the York News-Times that I would like to share with my colleagues.

It reaffirms a point I have been making. Our economic problems did not occur overnight, and they will not be cured overnight.

Let us give the President's economic recovery plan a chance. If further changes are necessary, let us be deliberate and cautious in our actions.

I ask permission to have the editorial reprinted as follows:

[From York News-Times, Sept. 25, 1981]

OPINION: TURNAROUND TAKES TIME

Whether or not President Reagan's appeal to the nation for support of his economic recovery plan will succeed is almost immaterial, since it's up to a somewhat less than public-conscious Congress which will do the actual deciding.

Democrats in particular and the news media in general have been giving President Reagan a bum rap, because the budget problems he now has aren't of his doing but rather those of his predecessor, James Earl Carter. President Reagan's actual first budget doesn't start until the 1982 fiscal year which will begin Thursday.

Apparently most of the nation felt that as soon as President Reagan was inaugurated, the economy would make a turnaround. Given the fact of a paranoid stock market that can be influenced by such egotistical, power-mad and weird characters as Joseph Granville, it was obvious some time ago that the economy would take time to make a recovery.

Just as a seriously ill patient doesn't get out of a hospital bed and go home the day after receiving a life-saving dose of medicine, neither will our economy climb to dizzying heights of prosperity based on the simple fact a different president was put into office.

President Reagan has been in office less than three-quarters of a year and has had to work with a deficit-ridden budget of his predecessor and yet support for his economy recovery plan is waning. Certainly there can be no one in the nation with any intelligence who expected we would go from a near-depression to prosperity in nine months. If anyone did think that, they are awfully optimistic or pretty stupid.

Democrats against any part of an economic recovery plan seem to dwell mostly on the fact several hundred thousand governmental workers are going to get the axe. That's tough. The Democrats are responsible for the burgeoning federal payroll, padding it with millions of workers who are unneeded and unwanted. Now that the deadwood is being cleaned out, some of the northeastern states' Democratic congressional representatives are starting to cry for their constituents.

Had there been any fiscal responsibility shown prior to the inauguration of President Reagan by the then in-power party, we would likely not be in the fiscal mess that we now are.

It is, in fact, impossible to remedy in a year or even two or three years what the fiscally irresponsible ruling party has accomplished over a period of two decades.

The president needs to be given the chance to see if his economic recovery plan can work. Give him two or three years. After all, we gave the Democrats more than 20 years and look how they screwed everything up. President Reagan deserves a chance. If his plan doesn't work after three years, then we still have 17 coming from the Democrats to find another solution.

But in the meantime, he deserves the support of not only the nation but of the recalcitrant Congress which seems to believe itself collectively smarter than any other body on earth. The plain truth is that although Congress has some extremely intelligent members, it collectively is about as intelligent as your standard tree stump.●

ANWAR SADAT

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, in April of 1977, my wife and I made a vacation trip to Egypt and Israel. We were fortunate to spend the good portion of a day with Anwar Sadat in his summer villa outside of Cairo. It was a stimulating meeting and a pleasurable and memorable time for us.

Since our visit my admiration and respect for this man of vision and peace has grown and deepened. Anwar Sadat lived a life of positive brinksmanship.

A soldier and a violent revolutionary, he moved the biggest nation in the Middle East to the brink of a lasting peace with Israel. A man of calm and daring who lived always on the brink of violence—a violence which ultimately consumed him—he challenges us all to dare to bring peace to our worlds. At a time when most of us are consumed by the problems of the present, he was able to take a larger view, to take greater risks, and to make seemingly impossible dreams come true.

He reached across boundaries of culture and language and history to touch that which is human in all of us. I shall never forget the picture of Anwar Sadat seated on a couch swapping grandchildren stories with Golda Meir. His pipe, his hearty laugh and his willingness to cloak the outrageous in warm personal terms will be sorely missed in a world where shrill voices and narrow ideologies dominate.

Needless to say, I am stunned by his death and feel a sense of loss for myself and for all persons seeking peace.

Each verse of the Koran starts with the phrase "In the name of God the compassionate and the merciful . . ." At this time of crisis let us hope that compassion and mercy will be shown to Anwar Sadat's successor and to all of us who remain to carry out the dreams that he has challenged us to realize.●

TAX CUTS

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Wall Street Journal, Prof. Walter Heller of the University of Minnesota explained why the massive tax cuts that Congress enacted last summer at the request of President Reagan will deal a staggering blow to our Nation's economy—unless the revenue loss is offset substantially by new revenue sources.

Professor Heller would prefer that the third-year 10 percent tax cut be rescinded and that the ill-considered decision to index the tax system after 1985 be put in cold storage. However, he also points out that there are a number of measures we could take to enhance our tax revenues that won't require a rollback of the recent tax cuts. These measures include: removing certain unwarranted tax preferences and expenditures, such as the deduction for interest on consumer debt; enacting user fees for private aviation, waterways, and boating; and, boosting the excise taxes on tobacco, liquor, and gasoline.

As Professor Heller concluded: "One could put together a $30 billion to $40 billion revenue program without touching the 1981 cuts."

Virtually all of the Heller suggestions are incorporated in the share-the-burden budget, that I am developing.

The share-the-burden budget would cut spending by $6 billion and raise some $40 billion in new revenue for 1982 in a way that is fair to all Americans. It would provide the restraint called for in today's economic climate without heaping additional hardships on those who have been most seriously burdened by the spending cuts that have already been made at the President's request. Instead, my share-the-burden budget proposal would spread the burden fairly.

First, user fees for a variety of Government services would be imposed or raised to cover costs. There is no reason why yacht owners should not pay for the services they receive from the Coast Guard, why international travelers should not pay for customs services, why inventors should not pay for the protection rendered by the Patent Office, or why recreational and corporate aviation should not pay for safety services rendered by the FAA.

Second, a number of special tax breaks for individuals and businesses would be ended.

Third, excise taxes would be raised on cigarettes, alcoholic beverages, and gasoline.

Finally, social security and Government pensions would be indexed to either the CPI or average wages, to insure that the income of retirees rise only as fast as the incomes of those who are still working.

It is time for a bipartisan effort to get our economy back in shape, by following a prudent budget policy that requires everyone to sacrifice fairly. This is the goal of the share-the-burden budget.

I welcome my colleagues' support and cosponsorship of the share-the-burden budget and I am sure they will be interested in reviewing Professor Heller's excellent article, which follows.

REAGANOMICS: IS THAT ALL THERE IS?

(By Walter W. Heller)

One thing is perfectly clear: Reaganomics is not about to succeed through Great Expectations. Another: With super-supply-siders now revealing that salvation requires not just tax cuts but the gold standard (and, for kicks, the public flogging of Treasury Undersecretary Beryl Sprinkel), they also reveal how threadbare their theory is.

And when Mr. Reagan pins his hopes for lowering interest rates and calming Wall Street's nerves on further budget cuts, one has to ask: Is that all there is? Do we have options other than relentless budget slashing to lead us out of the wilderness of towering interest rates?

"High interest rates are killing us" is the cry of borrowers everywhere, especially in housing, savings institutions, farming, small business, and state and local government. Their cries reflect the escalating costs of containing inflation through tight money:

Economic slack and slow growth: The most obvious impact is the suppression of economic expansion. The White House, as such, has no anti-inflationary program (leaving aside long-run effects of deregulation and investment stimulus) other than to say to the Fed: "sic'em." In fact, by running a pro-inflationary fiscal program, it makes the Fed's job harder.

Retarded investment: Here, the conflict between loose fiscal and tight money policy is particularly evident. The most generous tax breaks for savings and investment in U.S. history show no signs of being able to overcome the stultifying effect of high interest rates. Recent Commerce Department and Conference Board surveys show business fixed investment flat in real terms for 1981-82.

LOW HOUSING STARTS

Housing and autos: They are gasping. Only twice in the past 35 years have housing starts fallen as low as August's annual rate of 937,000 units.

Small business, savings institutions and state-local government: A rising tide of small-business bankruptcies, forced mergers of savings and loans and the withering impact of 14 percent and 15 percent interest rates on state-local borrowing reveal severe economic strain.

Cost-push inflation: As money costs soar into the 15 percent-25 percent range, Federal Reserve efforts to curb demand inflation generate more cost inflation. Mortgage costs, now above 18 percent, are an obvious case. Less obvious is the sharply rising burden of net interest costs of non-financial corporations. From an average of $40 billion a year in 1976-79, that burden rose to $56 billion in 1980 and ran at a rate of $62 billion in the first half of 1981. Insidiously, this tends to give business a vested interest in inflation—a sharp drop in price advances in the face of these soaring fixed charges on business debt would put a big squeeze on profit margins. We are witnessing a transfer of the risks of inflation from lender to borrower.

Pressure on foreign economies: Our high interest rates are forcing restrictive policies on our trading partners that account in significant part for their stagnant economies. Less developed economies are also finding the refinancing of their dollar debts a burden.

Pressure on the federal budget: Interest costs are the fastest-rising and least-controllable major component of the federal budget. The budget is caught in a vicious circle of ballooning deficits that soak up credit and thus generate still higher interest rates, resulting in still higher deficits. In the past decade, the budget as a whole has risen at an 11 percent annual rate while interest rates have risen at a 19 percent annual clip. Since March, the federal tab for interest-related costs in 1982 has been raised by over $15 billion—$10.3 billion from March to July and another $5 billion or $6 billion since the Mid-Session Review.

These costs dominate the Reagan "budget creep" from the $695 billion level promised in March to $726 billion today (prior to new cuts).

Eroded asset values: Fears of flying at high-altitude deficit levels for years to come have played the major role in chopping some $200 billion off stock values and $300 billion off fixed-interest security values since June.

Inequities: High interest rates shift burdens from the strong to the weak. Businesses and individuals in high-income brackets have an automatic shield against the full impact of high interest costs. Those with little or no income have no such shield. Lower-income groups suffer triple exposure: as net debtors or as would-be debtors who can't afford to buy a car or house; as targets of further budget cuts to offset the unanticipated rise in interest on the public debt; and as the ones most likely to lose jobs as tight money squeezes the economy.

It was all supposed to have been so easy. The "new faith" Reaganomics promised to deliver robust growth, ebbing inflation and interest rates and balanced budgets. No hard choices, no tough trade-offs in this economic wonderland that zealous supply siders and monetarists—united in shotgun marriage—offered the Reagan White House. It was, and is, unreal.

In reality, unswerving pursuit of present policies offers huge deficits, suffocating interest rates and a fits-and-starts economy. How can we find some relief from the sky-high interest rates of Reaganomics?

Much of the answer lies in taking some of the excessive burden of fighting inflation off the shoulders of the Federal Reserve by budget cuts and courageous tax action. But part of the answer lies in the Fed's own hands. If it insists on a monetarist target, a sensible first step would be to change cleanly to M1-B, the best index of transaction funds, as its money supply gauge. With M1-B running below the Fed's targets, with the economy sputtering and with favorable breaks on the inflation front, a letup in credit stringency makes sense. It would not relieve us of the inherent contradiction in Reaganomics, but it would allow some short-run trimming of interest rates.

A second step would be for the Fed to provide some informal credit guidance, a few words to the wise in the banking community asking them to conserve the limited supply of credit, to guide it into the most productive channels. It would not take a very heavy hand to dissuade bankers from pumping money into corporate takeovers, commodity speculation and excessive foreign loans in order to give higher priority to plant and equipment investment, farming, small business, residential construction and the like.

This guidance or "credit conservation" would be a logical counterpart to the tax guidance so liberally practiced by the White House and Congress in the Economic Recovery Act of 1981. For example, savings are guided—almost bludgeoned—into All Savers Certificates. Business funds are lured into buildings, refineries and long-lived equipment by 15-10-5-3 depreciation and so forth.

Funds are nudged into public utilities through tax-free dividend reinvestment. Moribund companies are given succor through juicy tax-sheltered leasing arrangements. For the Fed to guide lendable funds into constructive and productive uses is surely no greater interference with private markets than the powerful tax guidance encoded in the 1981 act.

In tightening fiscal policy, the name of the Reagan game is to slash social programs. Surely careful pruning of the defense budget could save more than $13 billion, or 2 percent of the $667 billion of defense spending, in the next three years. Such targets as uneconomic river and harbor projects, overindexing of Social Security, unwarranted tobacco, maritime and peanut subsidies and overgenerous hospital benefits for veterans have hardly been touched. But political and economic limits will stop budget-cutters far short of a balanced budget by 1984.

Mr. Reagan has to recognize that massive tax cuts lie at the heart of the country's deficit jitters. Tax cuts that will cost $150 billion in 1984, $200 billion in 1985 and a staggering $267 billion in 1986—roughly 4½% of projected GNP are widely viewed as fiscally irresponsible.

A COURAGEOUS TAX POLICY

The most important step that should be taken to inject fiscal prudence into Reaganomics lies in a courageous tax policy. Mr. Reagan has back-tracked gracefully on Social Security and school-lunch cutbacks. Why not on tax cuts? Why not roll back the recent tax cut, as Sen. Hollings proposes, or make the third-stage 10 percent tax cut contingent on the outlook for deficits and inflation? Tax indexing, adopted in haste and without hearings, should be put in cold storage. If such logical moves are beyond the political pale, there will be growing pressure for the value-added tax or some other form of consumption tax in a few years.

Significant tax action need not wait on such major moves. The President has already opened a tiny crack with his proposed $3 billion of tax tightening. Indeed removal of some unwarranted income tax preferences or "tax expenditures" should have high priority. Eliminating the deduction of interest on consumer debt could bring in $6 billion a year. Putting a $5,000 lid on deduction of mortgage interest would add $4 billion more. Including half of Social Security benefit payment in taxable incomes for taxpayers with incomes above $15,000 would yield $4.5 billion a year. One might also limit the exemption of contributions to employer health plans; apply withholding to interest and dividends; eliminate deductions for retail sales taxes; and give the IRS funds to bring the underground economy above ground for tax purposes.

The revenue agenda should include not just higher user fees for commercial aviation, waterways, irrigation projects and boating, but boosts in excises on liquor, tobacco and gasoline and extension of the windfall profits tax to deregulated natural gas. One could put together a $30 billion to $40 billion revenue program without touching the 1981 cuts.

Mr. Reagan's new economics of "gains without pains" won't work. If he would open his mind to a balanced approach embracing not just budget cuts, but tax increases and credit guidance (with some White House appeals for wage-price restraint thrown in for good measure), he could quickly improve the economic climate with a minimum of pain.●

SECRETARY HAIG'S MEETING WITH GROMYKO

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to praise Secretary of State Haig for his initiative and wisdom in meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko. It is a measure of the administration's seriousness and thoroughness in its consideration of United States-Soviet relations that Secretary Haig did not rush off to Moscow at an earlier date. I believe that this measured approach to the Soviet Union reflects our realistic appraisal that rapid progress over key issues with the Soviets is unlikely, but that serious progress can be achieved, over the long run, if we fully prepare ourselves in advance, and approach the Soviets in a determined and balanced manner.

The Haig meeting with Gromyko enabled the administration to give the Soviets an authoritative and comprehensive explanation of U.S. foreign policy. The concept, for example, that arms control is important to the United States, but not the centerpiece of our relationship with the Soviet Union, was clearly set forth for Soviet consumption. The Soviets now understand that the Carter administration's policy of achieving an arms control agreement at any price just would not wash in the Reagan administration. Gone are the days when the United States will turn a blind eye toward Soviet aggression in the Third World or Eastern Europe, lest we rock the invisible boat of détente. Now the Soviets firmly understand that the United States perceives linkages in our complex world. Soviet behavior, good or bad, will have an effect on the full spectrum of our relationship. This realistic approach expounded by Secretary Haig has now put the Soviets on notice that the United States will defend its interests and support its allies, rather than jeopardizing them for fear of the impact upon alleged Soviet goodwill in the arms control arena.

It is significant that the administration's philosophy of negotiating from strength has resulted in an agreement from the Soviets to begin Theatre Nuclear Force negotiations in Geneva on November 30. The administration's determination to press ahead with Pershing and Cruise missile deployment in Europe has no doubt demonstrated to the Soviets that only serious negotiations can bring about peace between us. We now have before us the prospect of actually limiting the number of nuclear weapons on the European battlefield. Had the administration not forced the Soviets' hand by pushing our own nuclear deployment, it is unlikely that the Soviets would feel it necessary to enter into meaningful talks.

Secretary Haig certainly deserves a strong measure of praise for his handling of Soviet relations to date. His experience has proven invaluable in assessing the Soviet mind, and understanding the web of factors surrounding the United States-Soviet relationship. He has initiated a serious dialog with the Soviets, and has done so on terms most beneficial to the United States. I believe that this first encounter with Gromyko has set the stage for more fruitful negotiations in the future. The administation's success in the long run will be gaged not by how quickly we move to accommodate Soviet interests and assuage their fears, but by how far we move the Soviets toward accepting solutions that further the peace process in a meaningful fashion, thereby furthering both of our interests.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL HENDON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. HENDON. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in North Carolina, I was unavoidably absent from the House earlier today. If I had been present, I would have voted in the following way:

Roll No. 243—motion to approve the House Journal of Monday, October 5, "Yea."

Roll No. 244—Motion to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4560, Labor-HHS Appropriations for fiscal year 1982, "No."

Roll No. 245—Natcher amendment to reduce work incentives program, salaries and expenses by $74 million, "Yea."

Roll No. 246—Bliley amendment to allow medicaid and medicare reimbursement for prescription drugs which the FDA has not yet ruled to be effective, but which are available to the general public by prescription, "Yea."●

AN ADEQUATE NUCLEAR DEFENSE OF AMERICA

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues remarks that my father, Hon. Hamilton Fish, recently made before the Conservative Party of Putnam County, N.Y. My father's remarks express his views on the state of our Nation's defense and I feel that they are quite timely in view of the President's arms proposals of last week.

I know my colleagues share my concern and my father's concern over the need for an adequate nuclear defense of our country. The following remarks are the strong opinions of a former Member of Congress, having served in this House for 25 years and a decorated veteran of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, we must never lose sight that our goal is not a prolonged and costly arms race. Rather, it must be the gradual reduction of nuclear weapons by all nuclear powers, culminating in the elimination of all nuclear weapons and facilities throughout the world. Until such a time as all nations of the world accept this view, we must, unfortunately, continue our efforts to give America a defense that will deter aggression.

I am delighted to be invited to speak to the Conservatives of Putnam County, one of the fastest growing counties in the state. I propose to speak to you about by far the most important issue that has confronted the American people since the Declaration of Independence as it affects the lives of most Americans, regardless of partisanship.

As Chairman of the First Congressional Committee to Investigate Communist Policies I declare war on any Republicans, Democrats or Conservatives who are soft on defense and soft on Communism. Most Americans favor strengthening our common defense to provide for sufficiency or parity to protect their own lives and the security of the nation. I also publicly declare war on misguided advocates of a nuclear superiority race that would bankrupt the United States and lead to the destruction of the whole world. The time has come to publicly expose the harm these war mongers, chauvinists and enemies of peace could do. President Reagan, whom I admire for his courage and leadership, should curb this disastrous race for nuclear superiority. They are not the defenders of our nation, or of peace, but would involve us in a holocaust nuclear war which must be avoided. The American people want peace through strength, sufficiency and parity and as far as possible within the next 4 years in order to protect their own lives and the security of the nation. I congratulate the President on reducing the military budget by 13 billion and hope the time will soon come to reduce it further. But, in the meanwhile, I urge we copy the Soviet Union and immediately build 100 25 megaton weapons and by drilling tunnels into mountains covered by 500 feet of rock. These could be built in 3 or 4 years which are the critical years and be the most effective way of preventing a nuclear holocaust at half the cost of the MX project that will take 8 to 10 years. The dreadful truth, which has been kept from the American people by the media and the Carter Administration is that the 25 megaton Communist bomb could destroy New York City for 30 miles around and when the bomb explodes it will not ask if you are a Democrat, Republican, Conservative, mother or child or black or white. The tragedy of the entire situation is due to some of the media and international appeasers and unilateral disarmers that have covered up the real menace to our own survival within the next 4 or 5 years. I speak to you with as much authority on Communism as anyone in this nation, not only as former Chairman of the First Committee to Investigate Communism, but as a student of the massive Soviet armed buildup, the greatest in the history of the world, during the last 12 years. I propose to send a copy of my remarks to every Senator and Congressman and to all members of the Cabinet because the building of 100 megaton weapons, properly protected, could in itself stop a nuclear war. I am also opposed to building a single 2½ billion dollar aircraft carrier that can be destroyed 200 miles away by submarines or missile ships and because we have 13 and don't need half that number. It is unfair to the American people and to our economic situation to waste billions of dollars on weapons that would be almost useless in a nuclear war.

The American people are entitled to adequate defense in the next 4 years which military experts believe will be the most crucial. Time is running out. God Bless America.●

YONKERS SPORTS HALL OF FAME

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 10, 1981, two outstanding members of the Yonkers, N.Y. community will be inducted into the Yonkers Sports Hall of Fame.

The two inductees are Nick Tremark, who set collegiate batting records at Manhattan College and was a member of the Brooklyn Dodgers, and Stanley J. Bielat, who won the National Public Links Golf Championship in 1950.

The athletic achievements and accomplishments of these two constituents are deservedly being acclaimed by all sports fans in the city of Yonkers and environs. Because they have brought much prestige and honor to themselves as well as to their community, I would like to share the highlights of their careers with my colleagues:

STANLEY J. BIELAT

Stanley J. Bielat was born in Yonkers at 52 Mulberry Street on January 11, 1913 and attended the St. Casimir's School and Saunders Trades School. His first introduction to golf was at the age of twelve when he brought lunch to his brother, Anthony, a caddy at the Dunwoodie Golf Course. He followed in his brother's footsteps, becoming a caddy and at the same time, a self taught golfer, analyzing players, their strokes and techniques. At the age of fourteen he was hitting 75 scores on a regular basis. He became so proficient at the game that he won the Dunwoodie Golf Course and the Winged Foot Golf Course Caddy Championships and in 1930 finished second to the great Willie Turnesa when they both competed in the Westchester County Caddy Championship at the Oak Ridge Golf Course.

From 1941-45 he served with the U.S. Army as Staff Sergeant in the Medical Department in Saipan, taking time to compete in the All Pacific Army Golf Tournament, reaching the quarter final round. At the age of 35 his game began to fall into place and he won the Yonkers City Golf Championship in 1948. In 1949 he qualified for the National Public Links Championship in Los Angeles. The following year he reached his highest potential when he stunned the golfing world by not only qualifying for the 36th National Public Links Championship in Louisville, Kentucky, but by topping 210 of the country's leading public links champions to win the national title. On his return to Yonkers he was given a city-wide parade up South Broadway with Mayor Kris Kristensen serving as Grand Marshal. That same year he was voted "Yonkers Sports Personality of the Year". He also garnered the Westchester County Public Links crown on the Sprain Lake Course.

In 1958 he won the coveted Doc Rosen Memorial Trophy at the Dunwoodie Golf Club, emblematic of the public links championship of Yonkers, and repeated five years later. In 1962 he was crowned Yonkers Public Links Champion for the second time. Illness forced him to forego competitive golf for the next decade but he came back in 1977 to win the public links championship of Eastchester at the Leewood Country Club and repeated in 1978. In 1979 he captured the Westchester County Senior Public Links title in Maple Moor, White Plains for golfers 66-71 years of age and during the same year won the Red Klein Memorial Public Links Tournament in Mohansic.

Through the years he has represented the metropolitan area in National Public Links competition in Los Angeles, Louisville, Milwaukee, Seattle, Dallas, Honolulu, Buffalo, Detroit, Sacramento and Hershey, Pennsylvania. He also won national recognition when he defeated one of the world's leading professionals and winner of the British Open, Tony Lema, who was touring the United States.

He still plays golf several days a week, mostly at the Sprain Lake Course, and his idol since boyhood, still remains the immortal Ben Hogan.

NICK TREMARK

Nick Tremark was born in Yonkers on October 15, 1912, attended School No. 2 and had his first baseball experience at the age of 15 with the Cook Post American Legion team which won the New York State Championship at Yankee Stadium. He was a star outfielder with Yonkers High School in 1929 and 1930 and played with the Bruins, Chippewas and Seventh Warders in the Yonkers Baseball League, winning the batting championship in 1933. He played freshman and varsity baseball at Manhattan College, serving as captain during his senior year. His stellar play at Manhattan earned him all Metropolitan, all Eastern and Number One College Player of Eastern Colleges honors.

He graduated from Manhattan in 1934 and was immediately signed by the Brooklyn Dodgers and played under Casey Stengel for three years. Stengel adopted him as "his boy" and used his 5 and 4¾ inch outfielder, the shortest player in the major leagues at that time, mainly as a pinch hitter. In fact, in his first appearance at the plate which took place at the Polo Grounds, he singled off Hal Shumacher, the ace twirler of the New York Giants. Some of his run scoring hits were off baseball's greatest pitchers—Paul Derringer, Dizzy Dean, Lon Warnecke, Hugh Mulcahey and Roy Parmalee.

During and after his tenure with the Dodgers, he was farmed out to various International League, American Association, Southern League and Class AA and A teams where he performed brilliantly at bat and in the field. He batted .333 with Reading; was voted the second Most Valuable Player in the New York-Pennsylvania League while batting .379 with Allentown, driving in 108 runs and stealing 25 bases; batting .363 with Hartford where he finished second to Tommy Holmes who later led the major leagues in batting; hit .315 for Wilkes-Barre; played with Little Rock and Louisville and retired in 1940.

In 1943, he joined the U.S. Navy and won fame as the player-manager of the Pensacola Naval Air Base Team which included the immortal Ted Williams and Bob Kennedy of the Chicago White Sox. Nick also played with the Sampson, New York Recruit Training Base and played and managed the team at the Norfolk Naval Training Base. After his separation from service in 1946, he played with the outstanding semi-professional ball clubs in the metropolitan area—the Mount Vernon Scarlets, Springfield Greys, Bushwicks and Yonkers Leaguers.

In 1956, his family moved to Harlingen, Texas to enter the restaurant business. In his leisure moments, he completed his teacher certification and for fifteen years taught in Texas Public Schools and at the Marine Military Academy, a private educational institution.

In 1967, he retired from teaching and turned his attention to tennis where he has won over 75 trophies. For two years, he has been ranked No. 1 in the State of Texas in singles and doubles play in the 65 year and older division.●

AFTER OCTOBER 1—THE AFTERMATH

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues another dramatization of the impact of the budget cuts enacted last June by Congress. In an effort to focus attention on the real impact of these cuts, one of the most hard hit of the programs directly benefiting the truly needy—as we have heard them referred to—is the aid to families with dependent children program.

This program, which provides cash assistance to dependent children and their families—most often the poor, single parent—was reduced by some $1 billion in the Budget Reconciliation Act for fiscal year 1982. Eligibility requirements were tightened and benefits eliminated to childless women in the first 5 months of pregnancy, to students over 17—except for 18-year-olds in their last year of vocational high school—to strikers or their dependent children.

The impact upon my own city of New York has been devastating. Approximately 10 percent of the current AFDC caseload—about 25,000 families—are likely to have their benefits reduced or completely eliminated. The Community Service Society of New York City also notes that net family income will be reduced for all recipients with earnings from employment and additional paperwork will be required for the entire caseload.

There is no guarantee that New York State will expand our own State and local-funded home relief program in order to compensate the city for its loss in Federal AFDC funds. In the absence of assured Federal funding at current service levels, it seems likely that, once again, those who are least able to help themselves, will be faced with a year of continued poverty and despair.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the promise of this Government to serve those who need it most will not wane any further when the real impact of the precipitous budget cuts are felt and pledge to work to oppose any further reductions in these vital human service programs.●

TWO FEDERAL AGENCIES OPPOSE NORTHERN TIER PROJECT

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, contrary to recent comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Northern Tier Pipeline Co. has not received Federal approval to construct its proposed crude oil port and pipeline.

In fact, two Federal agencies, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service, have issued reports that are highly critical of the project and that recommend denial of permits for the oil port and key segments of the pipeline.

The agencies said that the project, which is supposed to transport crude oil from the west coast to the Midwest, poses "unacceptable environmental hazards" and that there is no way to mitigate predicted impacts on the marine resources of Washington State.

These recommendations have been sent to the Army Corps of Engineers, which is still weighing Northern Tier's applications for permits required to build the oil port and segments of the oil pipeline that will lie on the floor of Puget Sound.

The corps has not yet made its decision. Neither has the State of Washington but, after reviewing the record of months of contested case hearings before the State energy facility site evaluation council, an administrative law judge has recommended that the State also deny Northern Tier permission to proceed.

The following are summaries of the opinions of the two Federal agencies.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE: DENY NORTHERN TIER PERMITS

Throughout our evaluation of this project, we have been cognizant of the intent of the original Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA). Although PURPA does require federal agencies to act expeditiously, it specifically did not guarantee the issuance of any federal permits, nor did it circumvent a thorough analysis of the risks and benefits of the project by federal agencies.

It is the responsibility of the federal agencies to analyze the potential benefits from a project relative to the potential risks. It is therefore important to remember that this is not an energy production project. This project will not create one drop of oil nor will it increase our nation's energy independence.

Risk analyses (of submarine sections of the pipeline) by the Northern Tier Pipeline Company show a 30 percent chance of a leak during the next 20 years, a leak which could release up to 25,000 barrels (one million gallons) of crude oil. Considering the complex geological and hydrological processes in Puget Sound, we are concerned that even this high risk factor may be low.

The average annual fishery value for salmon which migrate through the Strait of Juan de Fuca is over $190 million. Migratory birds are affected by direct, lethal oiling as well as by reduced productivity through long-term ingestion of oil or through contamination of the eggs by slightly oiled adults. Seabirds and waterfowl number in the hundreds of thousands at times during the year within the area surrounding the proposed pipeline route, and over 40,000 breed on Protection Island alone, which is 0.6 mile from the proposed route. Shellfish are most vulnerable to direct damage by oil spills during the larval stage, during the spring and summer. Average annual production of all shell fish in Puget Sound and the Straits north or Tacoma Narrows is over 13 million pounds, valued at over $9 million.

These resources are not Washington State's alone. The anadromous fish using the Strait comprise a large portion of the ocean fishery off Washington, California, Oregon, Alaska and Canada. Several stocks are the subject of treaties with Canada. The migratory birds using the Strait range from Wrangell Island, USSR, to California and are the subject of treaties between the United States and Great Britain, Mexico, Japan and the USSR.

We have been unable to develop permit conditions (for the submarine pipeline segments) that would mitigate the predicted impacts to the resources of Puget Sound and Strait of Juan de Fuca. We must request denial of this permit to protect the natural, economic and aesthetic resources of the Strait and Puget Sound.

By company estimates, there is approximately a 30 percent chance of a major tanker accident (defined as a total loss of ship and contents) over the 20-year life of the project. Total tanker loss could result in 2.4 million barrels (100 million gallons) of crude oil being spilled. In addition, there would be chronic spills due to minor operational problems and the possibility of major spills resulting from anchor dragging the submarine pipeline to the nearby tank farm.

Since complex circulation patterns could spread this oil throughout the Strait and Puget Sound, the resources at risk are the same as noted above. Of particular concern is the effect on Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge. Studies have demonstrated that 50 percent of oil spilled at Port Angeles could accumulate at Dungeness Spit. We do not believe the Spit can be protected from a major spill at Port Angeles, nor from chronic spills during the unfavorable weather conditions common to the Straits.

Again, although we have tried, we have been unable to develop permit conditions to mitigate the losses of the resources at risk from this project. Due to the potential for severe damage and the significance of anadromous fish, migratory birds and shellfish resources of the Strait, we must recommend that the permit (for an oil port) be denied.

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE: UNACCEPTABLE ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD

We cannot support issuance of permits for the Northern Tier Pipeline Project as presently proposed. While NTPC has adequately addressed some of our concerns, the majority remain unresolved or at best obscured by conflicting and/or largely ambiguous information. Furthermore, and irrespective of the deficiencies in the information provided by the applicant, we find that the project entails substantial risks to the marine environment of the Strait of Juan de Fuca and its adjacent waters.

Specifically, we are concerned about the excessively high risk of a major oil spill occurring during the life of the project, the environmental and economic impacts which could result from such an oil spill, and the potential for harassment of marine mammals as a result of project construction activity or of a major oil spill.

In order to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed facility on the region's marine environment, an illustrative oil spill scenario was prepared that corresponds to the type of incident that NTPC concedes has about one chance in three of occurring over the nominal, 20-year life of the facility. In our opinion, the consequences of an oil spill of the kind described in the scenario are so severe that the risk of incurring such damage constitutes an unacceptable environmental hazard.

NTPC has not presented information which indicates that the consequences of a major spill could be reduced.

A significant potential does exist for the NTPC project to adversely impact Indian Treaty fishing. Potential impacts associated with a major oil spill could prevent one or more of the Treaty tribes dependent upon such fisheries from realizing a moderate standard of living for some period of time.

We recommend that permits for the construction of the NTPC proposal be denied. We believe that alternatives to the NTPC proposal exist which do not involve substantial risk to the marine and anadromous fisheries resources of Puget Sound. Notwithstanding the discussions herein, we believe considerable gaps exist in the information provided by NTPC. Filling of these information gaps with new and/or more information could alleviate some of our identified concerns. It is our understanding, however, that NTPC has declined to further address most of the issues.●

TRIBUTE TO MURRAY AND MIRIAM JACKSON ON THEIR GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on October 17, Murray and Miriam Jackson of New Rochelle, N.Y., will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary. On this happy occasion, I would like to share with my colleagues a brief recognition of their contributions to their community, State, and to the Nation.

Dr. Murray Jackson is a native New Rochellian and has been a practicing physician in New Rochelle for 50 years. He is a general practitioner much loved by his patients and friends. He is also an avid yachtsman, a member of the New Rochelle Waterfront Commission for many years, and serves on the utilization review boards for local nursing homes.

Mrs. Jackson has long been an active and effective member of her community. She has served as vice chairperson of the Democratic Party in Westchester County and acting chairperson from June 1974 to September 1975. In 1976, she was a Democratic city leader in New Rochelle. She now serves on the Westchester County Mental Health Board and the New Rochelle Planning Council for the Aging.

In addition, since 1975 she has served as the chairperson of my advisory committee on aging. She will be my delegate to the White House Conference on Aging later this year. She previously served on the board of directors of the National Council on the Aging here in Washington.

Dr. and Mrs. Jackson have opened up their home and hearts to young people in their community and both work tirelessly to improve and enrich the lives of older Americans. They have made extraordinary contributions to their community that deserve our recognition and commendation. I want to join their many friends and family in offering my warmest congratulations on their golden wedding anniversary.●

DR. MALCOLM TODD HONORED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Malcolm C. Todd, the American Medical Association's 129th president, from 1974 to 1975, has been a national figure in medicine for over 20 years. But it is Malcolm Todd's strong personal commitment to the less fortunate members of our society that has played a major role in his life. He will be honored this next Wednesday in Long Beach, not for his achievements in the field of medicine, but rather for his work as the founding chairman of the board of the Long Beach Community Development Services Corporation. Under his guidance, an organization was developed and trained to assist the poor, and those not able to help themselves, to receive assistance from a variety of local and Federal sources.

Dr. Todd, one of America's leading experts on health manpower, has practiced continuously in Long Beach since the end of World War II as a general surgeon specializing in stomach and colon surgery and in gastroenterology.

In 1938 Todd received his medical degree from Northwestern University. With the commencement of World War II, he joined the Army Medical Corps and served in Europe as chief of surgical services at several military general hospitals. While overseas he met his future wife, Ruth Schlake, whom he married on June 12, 1945, in England. They settled in Long Beach, where Dr. Todd was medical director of the Texaco Refinery and also maintained a private practice.

During the ensuing years Todd's excellence as a surgeon made him the recipient of numerous honors, and with this recognition added responsibilities. He was a California delegate to the AMA's House of Delegates from 1959 to 1973. In 1967 and 1968 he was president of the California Medical Association. From 1970 till 1972 Dr. Todd represented his country in Geneva as the U.S. delegate to the World Health Organization. In addition, Dr. Todd has been a member of the National Advisory Committee on Health Manpower; the California State Health Planning Council; and the board of trustees of California Blue Cross. Dr. Todd also is a fellow at the American College of Surgeons; the International College of Surgeons; and the American College of Gastroenterology; as well as a regent of the Uniformed Services Health Sciences University.

One of Malcolm Todd's greatest contributions of our society has been his continuing advocacy of the social side of medicine, the physican-patient relationship.

My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Dr. Todd, his wife Ruth, and their son Malcolm, the very best in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN PURCHIO

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the coming retirement of John Purchio, an outstanding Judge of the Superior Court of Alameda County, Calif. This fine, intelligent, and compassionate man has served on the highest trial court in our State for over 20 years.

John was born in New York on May 16, 1915, the son of Vincenzo and Rachel Purchio. He received his B.S. and LL.B. degrees from Fordham University. He was admitted to practice in New York in 1946 and was subsequently admitted to the California Bar in 1948. During his career in public service he has served as a Hayward City councilman, mayor of Hayward and a member of the California State Highway Commission. He has served as a member of the Judges Association, on the legislative committees of the State bar and on the National Conference of Juvenile Court Judges.

John Purchio is a highly respected member of the judiciary. He served almost 15 years as the presiding judge of the Juvenile Court of Alameda County. Judge Purchio views his work with the youth of our area as the highest calling that a judge can undertake. His many years of work with the boys clubs give further testimony to his interest in and commitment to the youth of our Nation.

John is a long time close friend and I know he will be sorely missed on the bench in Alameda County. But, if I am any judge of Judge Purchio, we will be hearing from and seeing a great deal of John in his retirement years. I know he will continue to be an involved, concerned, and contributing member of our community.

I would like to personally thank John for all his years on the bench. He has served us well.●

GAS MILEAGE: WE CAN DO BETTER

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, gasoline prices have been declining slightly for several months and people have almost forgotten the long lines at the pumps. They have even gotten used to the present higher level of prices.

We went through a similar period of stabilization in the mid-1970's that was followed by a period of scarcity and higher prices. I fear that we will go through another period of scarcity and higher prices in the 1980's.

True, our auto manufacturers are now more committed to the need to develop more fuel-efficient cars. However, they are having a hard time catching up to our foreign competitors. While we are bringing on line our new wave of low mileage cars that will get 30 to 40 miles per gallon, Volkswagen is talking about a car which will achieve 75 miles per gallon.

What is truly frustrating is the availability of resources which continue to be unused by the auto manufacturers. For example, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has tremendous resources and skills which could be of considerable use.

While NASA is commonly thought of as a "Space" agency, it has a long history of assistance to aviation that goes back to the 1920's. Unlike the auto industry, America's aviation industry manufactures and markets the vast majority of planes sold throughout the world. Part of that success is due to NASA's innovations.

The National Automotive Research Act, which I introduced, would allow the full benefit of NASA's expertise to be used to design fuel-efficient cars by our auto industry at great benefit to our citizens and our balance of trade.

The October issue of the magazine "Discover" has an interesting article which discusses the importance of aerodynamics and fuel efficiency. This is just one of the many areas where NASA's aviation work could have great benefit.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the article, "Taking the Drag Out of Driving," by Natalie Angier. I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

TAKING THE DRAG OUT OF DRIVING

When Detroit's finned dinosaurs roamed the earth in vast numbers a generation ago, the notion of aerodynamics was for the birds. Cars were fashioned to slide by not on the streamlined "grease" of their bodies but on the cheap and abundant fuel that powered their V-8 engines. Gasoline was going for 25 cents a gallon, and fuel economy was seldom mentioned; the aim of automobile manufacturers was to create dreamboats that would appeal to the subliminal fixations of the car buying public. Designers of one brand, for example, adorned their car hoods with a ring pierced by an object that looked suspiciously like a flying phallus, while other stylists conjured up projectile-like bumper guards and spoke fondly of the bosoms on their bumpers.

But in this age of scarce resources, bauble and bosoms are banal, and the auto companies are shaping up. In addition to building smaller and lighter cars with more efficient engines, Detroit has turned to the long-neglected aerodynamics engineer for help in squeezing even more miles from a gallon of gas. Wind tunnel test facilities in Michigan, Georgia, and Maryland are blowing at full speed, as aerodynamics experts seek ways to mold car bodies into streamlined shapes that will meet less energy-depleting wind resistance on the road. The aeorodynamic touch has been apparent for the past two years, but in scientific as well as looks, this fall's line will be notably sleeker.

Cars have less trim, lower windshields and fewer angles. General Motor's slick new J series provides starting fuel efficiency that is partly attributable to aerodynamic design; Chrysler's K series is so aerodynamically—and fuel—efficient that it could help boost the company back to fiscal solvency. Ford's 1983 Thunderbird is reported to be 30 per cent more aerodynamically efficient than the 1978 model.

Even bigger changes lie ahead, for auto aerodynamics is still a fledgling field. As Gary Romberg, Chrysler's manager of aerodynamics, told correspondent Chris Redman, "Our aerodynamic technology is around the 1930s level compared with that of the aerospace industry." Yet the enthusiasm for aerodynamics is growing, and the field could very well enter the 21st century before the rest of the auto business. Says Shawn Buckley, an aerodynamics expert and consultant for Standard Oil of California: "Aerodynamic principles were ignored for so long in Detroit. What they labeled aerodynamic in the past was really laughable. Nobody ignores aerodynamics now. They can't afford to."

The motivating force behind the rediscovery of aerodynamics is the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards, decreed by Congress, which require a continual improvement in the average gas-mileage efficiency of each U.S. company's cars. For 1985 models, for example, that average must rise from the current minimum of 22.0 miles per gallon to 27.5. Consumers are demanding even greater fuel efficiency, and improvement costs money. Industry experts estimate that the price of raising fuel economy by one-tenth of a mile per gallon is about $100 million per company when the emphasis is put, as it is now, on engine redesign and newer, lighter materials. A 10 per cent improvement in aerodynamic efficiency, on the other hand, translates into a 3 per cent increase in gas mileage, and the cost of this improvement is relatively inexpensive. Says Donald Kopka, Ford Motor Company's design vice president, "Aerodynamic improvements have accounted for at least a one-mile-per-gallon increase in our corporate average since 1978, and the only out-of-pocket expense for these gains was about seven million dollars in wind tunnel testing. That's a gold mine."

For Detroit, tunnel vision is an attribute. Ethereal as it may seem, air is a fluid, and behaves in accordance with the laws of fluid mechanics, exerting pressure against—and moving turbulently around—anything that passes through it. Together, pressure and turbulence constitute resistance to movement, or drag. The pressure acts against the direction of motion; turbulence creates eddies, or vacuum pockets, along the surface and at the rear of an object, which tend to pull it backwards. All moving objects are affected by drag, and cars and trucks, with their angles, indentations, and protuberances, are particularly susceptible.

In their search for ways in which to reduce drag, automobile engineers must deal with the effects of dynamic air pressure (which varies with velocity and temperature), the speed of the vehicle, the car's frontal area (the largest cross section, viewed head-on), and the coefficient of drag, or CD. A numerical description of aerodynamic effectiveness, CD is based roughly on the ratio of the amount of wind resistance an object encounters to that encountered by a flat plate of the same size; the lower the number, the greater the efficiency. The average CD for an American car five years ago was about 0.55. Today it is 0.45. The U.S. car with the lowest CD, 0.34, is Ford's new Mercury LN7. Its European counterpart in the low-drag competition is Porsche model 924 Weissach edition, with a CD of 0.33. Specially designed land-speed-record cars have CDs as low as 0.15.

One reason drag is such a drag is that it increases fourfold for every doubling in velocity of the vehicle, while the horsepower required to overcome it is eight times as great. By contrast, only twice the horsepower may be required to counteract the other major force contributing to the car's inertia—its weight, or "rolling resistance." A typical mid-sized family sedan traveling at 55 miles per hour uses roughly 65 per cent of its horsepower simply to overcome drag. That is why driving at high speeds uses up so much more gas than driving the same distance at low speeds.

Car designers cannot influence dynamic air pressure or the speed at which the car will be driven, but they can control the frontal area and the CD. The design of the frontal area, after all, is generally dictated by the purpose of the vehicle itself, or, as Chrysler's Romberg says, "It's a function of the people package." Cars that need carry only a driver and no luggage can be given a long, cigar-like shape that presents a greatly reduced frontal area. But most cars carry several passengers and luggage, and this limits the extent to which the frontal area can be squeezed into a more aerodynamic profile.

The CD can be cut down by subtle modifications in the basic body shape that will result in a more efficient flow of air over the surface. However, the seemingly logical "eyeball" changes—rounding out an edge or removing a large hood adornment—are not enough. Says Arthur Lewry, executive engineer of aerodynamics at Ford: "Sometimes the cars that look sporty and aerodynamic actually have more drag than a boxier model. You can't tell just by looking at a car when different surfaces are going to compete with each other and create turbulence."

To locate a car's aerodynamic trouble spots, engineers rely chiefly on wind tunnels, in which they test clay and metal models—three-eighths- and full-sized prototypes—as well as the actual production cars. As long ago as the early thirties, Chrysler performed extensive wind tunnel tests on the famous Airflow model, the nation's first scientifically designed aerodynamic car made for mass production. The car met little air resistance on the road, but buyer resistance stopped it cold.

Nowadays, all the big manufacturers are testing in tunnels for drag. Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors all rent time in university and aircraft-industry wind tunnels. GM has its own tunnel, a giant steel-and-concrete loop 926 feet long and, at its largest cross section, 64 feet wide and 48 feet high. The test section, where the vehicles are placed, is narrower than the rest of the tunnel. This neck in the passageway generates a sharp increase in the wind velocity as the air swoops through it. The air is normally pushed by an enormous six-bladed fan at 50 miles per hour (through the neck region) for full-scale models, 150 miles per hour for three-eighths scale models. Air temperature is kept at about 70 degrees Fahrenheit by heat exchangers.

The nerve center of the GM facility is a 48,000-pound balance installed beneath a turntable on which the car sits. The balance measures the loads (lift, drag, and side forces) generated by air flow on the test vehicles and, according to GM engineers, is so sensitive that it can detect the presence of a fifty-cent piece placed on the hood of the car. Readings are analyzed by computers located in a control room.

The balance can give a good picture of the total force acting on the vehicle. To determine the precise turbulence areas, engineers aim laser beams, blow colored smoke, fasten bits of yarn to the body, and splash the front with dye. If the laser beams bend, the smoke curls, the yarn turfs flutter, or the dye spills irregularly, turbulence is the villain. To correct the trouble, the engineers may add a lip here, trim off a tenth of an inch of fender there, recess a door handle, move a side mirror, or redesign a rain gutter—and try again.

Although car designers stress that they look at the car body as an "interactive whole," some areas of the car admittedly produce more problems than others. The underside, for example, is an aerodynamic nightmare of exposed parts that can account for as much as 20 per cent of drag. Racing car designers solve the problem by using large front air dams—shutters attached below the bumper, almost touching the ground—to push the flow of air over and around the car. But family cars are not designed for racing or being driven on smooth tracks. Says Ford's Lewry, "Imagine driving over a driveway or a pothole with only an inch clearance in the front." An obvious solution is to enclose the underside area, but Detroit has yet to work out a cost-effective way of preventing a consequent heat buildup from the engine exhaust system.

The rear of the car presents another trouble spot. The air that has been rushing over, around, and under the car needs to be "dumped" off behind without creating a large vacuum pocket. The ideal rear should have a long, tapering tail that would allow the air to glide off it without separating, but parking space is dear, garages are too short, and such a tail is obviously impractical. The fastback design of recent years is a good compromise, because its sliced-off rear simulates a tail and guides the rushing air along in a relatively streamlined fashion.

Another drag is posed by the frames around windows. Designers have discovered that they can greatly improve the CD by making windows fit flush with the sides of a car. But they are just discovering ways to design such a window that can be built economically with today's manufacturing technology.

The window problem clearly demonstrates one of the greatest challenges facing aerodynamic designers today. They may know the shape and specifications that make for aerodynamic perfection, but they cannot produce them efficiently on assembly lines. It is one thing to admire the sleek and costly sports cars, hand-built by Italian car companies like Ferrari and Lamborghini, but high price is the penalty that must be paid for specialized, labor-intensive production techniques. Detroit clearly cannot compete in that fashion. Says Lewry, "We've got to be able to stamp out not one or two of a dozen, but thousands of them."

The latest research car from Volkswagen, the ARVW, is a case in point. It has an extraordinary drag coefficient of 0.15, thanks to a long, 196.9-inch body, an absolute minimum number of vents, and hinged wheel pants that cover the turbulence-generating tires almost entirely. Because of its superb aerodynamic styling, the ARVW delivers 39 miles per gallon at a steady 55 miles per hour. The ARVW uses a standard engine, and, according to its designers, is really not exotic, just perfectly streamlined. Similarly, General Motors' experimental "Aero X," an aerodynamic derivative of the basic X-body (of which the Citation and Phoenix models are good examples), has a drag coefficient of 0.285—a 40 per cent improvement over the X-body's 0.45.

But mass production of these cars is another matter, cost considerations and limitations in technology stand in the way. Such cars as the ARVW require expensive, lightweight materials. They need to be shaped in ways that defy present mass-production techniques, and they may not be marketable in any case.

Aerodynamic experts argue that huge gains can be made, nevertheless, within the bounds of existing technology. Before Chrysler Corporation's compact K cars went into final production, for example, aerodynamics specialists put the car through 320 hours of wind tunnel testing and managed to reduce wind drag by more than 20 percent. A short air dam on the front improved the flow of cooling air to the radiator. The hood and grille shapes were changed, the headlamps subtly contoured, and the roof support pillars and roof trailing edge reshaped.

Ford's 1983 Thunderbird will incorporate modified versions of stylistic details that were developed for one of its experimental cars, the Probe: the grille opening is reduced, and much of the cooling air is taken in below the bumper to avoid turbulence on the hood; headlamps are concealed and windshield wipers hidden to assure uninterrupted air flow over the body; flush wheelcovers lower the turbulence at ground level; and a deck-lid "kicker"—a slight rise where the trunk lid meets the tail—reduces the wake by forcing the air to leave the deck parallel with the ground. The one-of-a-kind Probe's coefficient of drag is 0.25, whereas the assembly-line Thunderbird's is 0.35.

Looking down the road, designers hope to lower Detroit's average CD from 0.45 to about 0.35 by the mideighties. They expect major improvements in boxy station wagons as well as slick two-seaters, through imaginative use of new techniques. One major challenge is posed by the fact that wind resistance changes in relation to the angle at which a car hits the air. Designers may yet develop a suspension mechanism that will change the car's alignment up or down as it picks up speed—somewhat the same way swing-wing aircraft pilots alter the wing shape as they move from subsonic to supersonic speeds. Designers might also be able to get around the difficulties of large front air dams by developing retractable baffles that can be lowered for more efficient freeway driving but raised for rough driving conditions.

Other details will change as well. Mud flaps, rain gutters, and side trim may go the way of the running board. Wheels will get narrower. Side mirrors will be integrated into the body surface. Auto companies are even urging state governments to drop requirements for front-end license plates, which create turbulence.

Aerodynamic changes will come faster and be more precise when computer-aided design techniques are refined. So far, the complexities of the air flow patterns and turbulence regions that surround a moving automobile are not well enough understood to be summed up in a comprehensive computer program. Aerodynamicists use computer graphics to analyze parts of the car—the front bumper, say—but they must still rely on expensive wind tunnel testing to get the complete picture. That will change as scientists unravel the puzzles of turbulent flow and learn to predict and compensate for the effects of powerful side winds, passing trucks, and other such complicating factors.

Finally, production and manufacturing technology will have to change radically. So, too, will people's sense of what a car should look like. Says Fred Heylor, technical representative for Porsche: "We may never get away from thinking a car has to have four wheels, but we might get a more aerodynamic shape with only three. Some of those way-out experimental cars with low drag look quite amusing to us now." Considering the stiff prices at the gasoline pumps, those way-out cars are looking better and better.●

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL ESSAY WINNER

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 6, 1981

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, Michael Bernstein, one of my constituents from New City, N.Y. is a source of pride to our 26th Congressional District and our Nation.

Michael Bernstein is a senior at Clarkstown High School North, New City, N.Y., and was 1 of but 33 American youths declared winners of the 1981 Presidential Essay and Poster Contest. The contest was sponsored by the National School Boards Association and was open to elementary and high school students throughout the Nation. Michael received the citation from Mrs. Reagan at a White House reception on September 23.

This was not the first recognition of Michael's writing ability. In his sophomore year, he was a winner of the New York State High School Arts Essay Contest and his essay was posted in the State capitol. In his junior year, Michael was admitted to the National High School Institute's summer journalism program at Northwestern University.

Michael Bernstein is a member of the National Honor Society and of Mu Alpha Theta, the mathematics honor society. He is also editor in chief of the Ram's Horn, the high school newspaper. He has received a National Merit Letter of Commendation, the Wrightman Community Service Award and the Zindell Community Service Award.

After school Michael puts in 20 hours a week as a computer operator. His long-range goal is admission to the bar and specialization in international law.

Michael lives with his father, Sidney Bernstein, assistant to the president of Matthew Bender & Co., publishers of law and tax treatises, in New City in our 26th Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, to enable my colleagues to share Michael's thoughts, I am inserting the full text of his Presidential Inaugural Essay at this point into the RECORD:

INAUGURATION: AN AMERICAN BEGINNING

(By Michael Bernstein)

The inauguration of a president has great importance in American government, and therefore in American society.

The inauguration marks the beginning of a new plan, and the institution of new ideas with the aim of keeping America the most powerful and respected nation in the world.

In a time in which many Americans are losing hope, the inauguration brings a new spirit to the people. It gives the country a new vigor and a will to succeed.

The United States has great resources, both human and natural. What the nation needs are creative ideas which will inspire the people to make the most of what they have.

Besides giving the country a new spirit, the inauguration and the transfer of power represent something which is special to our nation. In many lands, the people do not have the opportunity to choose new leadership for their country. Sometimes we take our right to select our own leadership lightly, but it is something which distinguishes us from many nations and many people around the world.

The advantages of being able to select our leaders are countless. America has had a history of great leadership. This is partially because these leaders have been accountable to the American people. Men such as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Roosevelt have, in reality, been reflections upon the American people of their times.

The inauguration shows that, once again, the people are speaking out; they're saying what they want done and who they think is most capable of carrying out their wishes.

Historically, they have made choices which have guided America to its present greatness.

The inauguration day is a national holiday of rejoicing. It is a day in which Americans celebrate the institution of a new president, but more importantly we celebrate our right to choose our leaders and, in a way, our ability to govern ourselves.

With every new president there come new policies, new programs, and new ideas; but the one thing that remains is that these policies, programs, and ideas are a reflection of the wants and needs of every voting citizen in America.

It is often said that with every right there comes a responsibility. With our right to choose our leaders comes an important responsibility to continue to select those capable leaders who can guide America and her people. The inauguration of a new president represents our acceptance of this important responsibility.●