

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SOME THOUGHTS ON UKRAINIAN
INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 24, 1980

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that this Congress takes time to honor the memory of freedom in the former nation of Ukraine. When the Soviet war machine is grinding the rights and freedoms of yet another sovereign nation under the treads of its tanks we should remember the long road of aggression on which the Soviet Communist empire is based.

The Ukraine issued its Proclamation of Independence on January 22, 1918. A year later a formal Act of Union was proclaimed. For 3½ years Ukraine enjoyed the freedoms of a Western democracy. An elected Parliament, called the Central Rada, governed the nation from the capital in Kiev. The nation had close diplomatic ties to England, France, and other countries. The people of Ukraine pursued their own destinies and their own religion, the Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic Churches.

The life of this sovereign nation was extinguished as the armies of the Bolshevik regime swept into its cities and towns. Submerged under a puppet government, known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the people of this valiant nation began their years of oppression and tyranny under the dictators of the Kremlin. It is a sad commentary on the West that Ukraine was destroyed without any nation coming to its aid. It is sadder still that one nation after another has been infiltrated, invaded, or co-opted while the West has stood aside.

Under harsh Soviet rule the Ukrainians suffered through political purges, famines, and horrible persecution by secret police and political commissars. Today over 47 million people suffer under Soviet domination in Ukraine. They have no assurances of civil or political rights. Another 2 million Ukrainians live in the United States. These descendants from a proud Ukraine heritage carry on the beacon of liberty that joins with those of other captive nations in a common desire to see their native lands free again.

The ordeal of Ukraine, like the ongoing oppression in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Eastern Europe, Cuba, and many other nations leading up to Afghanistan is a monument to the hateful nature of communism. They are also monuments to the neglect of the

Western nations who refused to take a stand in the face of Communist aggression. At the end of World War II, during the revolt of Hungary, and the rebellion of Czechoslovakia, the West had its chances to come to the aid of these nations, but the weak willed preached appeasement and millions of lives were condemned to communism. Today the Soviet state stretches like a colossus over the globe with client states doing its bidding in the Third World and its own armies and navies growing bolder in challenging America and other free nations. In remembering the fate of the Ukraine we should remember lost opportunities to stand up for freedom. We should take this time to renew our resolve to fight communism and to free the captive people under Soviet rule. We should once again understand the nature of communism and tell the world: "Never again will a nation fall to its tyranny, never again will a people be oppressed." Finally we should state to the world that our struggle with Soviet aggression will not cease until the captives are free, until Ukraine is free.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE MEANY

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1980

● Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of George Meany. The loss of George Meany is more than the loss of a single man. It is the loss of an American institution.

George Meany lived a long and productive life as one of American labor's most influential leaders. From 1934 when he was elected president of the New York State Federation of Labor, to 1955 when he became president of the AFL-CIO, he achieved a reputation as a powerful advocate of labor rights and a formidable adversary to the unfair treatment of American workers.

Part of Meany's success can be attributed to the fact that he realized the need for organized and consolidated action on the part of the American workers. The merger of the AFL-CIO, Meany's greatest achievement, allowed for unity of purpose and action among union members. Also of great importance, Meany strongly believed and stated that "human freedom and human dignity have always come before the dollar * * *". Maintaining these convictions, Meany worked tirelessly to bring the unions together in a common front so as to

better represent the interests of the individual worker and mankind in general.

As a devoted humanitarian Meany pressed for the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act with its strong anti-discrimination-in-employment clause. This law is a landmark, providing equal opportunities among all working men and women. Meany's ardent support of it demonstrated to the world that organized labor would stand up for the basic rights of all Americans.

George Meany was a true public servant. He will be remembered as a man of great courage and wisdom. His leadership will never be forgotten.●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE MEANY

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1980

● Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a truly great American, George Meany.

Although we honor many of our fellow countrymen on the House floor, few have achieved his stature. George Meany's place in history was assured by the work he did in forging the country's most powerful labor organization, the AFL-CIO. He was a leader and a champion of the civil rights movement and a stalwart defender of American democracy.

I was privileged to know George Meany as a powerful friend and ally in working for progressive legislation. He possessed a deep appreciation of the legislative and political processes. He used his knowledge and expertise to promote the enactment of a broad range of legislation, not only to assist union members but to provide help for millions of disadvantaged Americans who do not have the power to influence events in Washington. George Meany was a critical force in passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, culminating an effort which had gone on for years and which certainly would have foundered without the effective and persistent aid of George Meany and the AFL-CIO.

George Meany was controversial in the opinion of some—he believed strongly in freedom of speech and practiced that belief to the fullest. He fiercely defended the rights of American workers to have higher wages, shorter hours, safer working conditions, and the benefits necessary to insure a secure and satisfying life. The voice of George Meany will be sorely missed.

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

Although his dedication to the labor movement consumed much of his time and energy, Mr. Meany was always a devoted husband and father. He and his wife, Eugenia, had been married for 60 years when she passed away last year. They raised three daughters and had several grandchildren.

I join with George Meany's family in mourning the passing of this fine man. ●

SCHOOL PRAYER

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the eloquent Dr. PHILIP M. CRANE, recently delivered a most eloquent statement on voluntary school prayer, and the need for all of us to sign discharge petition No. 7, so as to allow the House to vote on this important issue.

By allowing the States to make their own rules regarding voluntary school prayer, we simply adhere to what the Founding Fathers intended. Too often, the Supreme Court has ruled in clear violation of that intention. In the important area of voluntary school prayer, we owe it to our Creator, our children, and the country as a whole to do so.

I pray that we listen to PHIL CRANE, who is unsurpassed in this House as a constitutional scholar.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP M. CRANE ON SCHOOL PRAYER

It is a great honor today to appear with so many revered religious leaders and my respected colleague, Senator Jesse Helms, to announce our efforts to restore voluntary prayers to America's classrooms.

Senator Helms deserves enormous credit for using his skill as a legislator to attach his amendment to S. 450. This amendment removes from the jurisdiction of the federal courts, including the Supreme Court, any consideration of the issue of voluntary school prayer. This means that decisions about classroom prayer will be made at the community, church, and state level, rather than at the national level.

Unfortunately, however, Senator Helm's herculean efforts will all go for naught unless we accomplish what this group has banded together to achieve. The House will never even vote on S. 450 unless we bring it to the floor with a discharge petition. Already S. 450 has languished in the House Judiciary Committee for nine months without consideration. A discharge petition, when signed by 218 Congressmen, will bring the legislation directly to the floor for a vote without further delays in committee. Discharge petition number 7, which I filed on October 25th, will accomplish this purpose. Between today and the day we vote to restore voluntary school prayer is one major hurdle: the signatures of 218 of my House colleagues. This coalition will organize to clear that hurdle.

My own cooperation with this Committee is motivated by my deep commitment to three basic principles: the need to return to fundamental principles in education, the need to preserve basic Constitutional func-

tions, and the need to reaffirm our moral and religious heritage.

EDUCATION

Our destiny lies in the hands of this nation's youth. We cannot overstate the importance of education. Education is preparation for life—and preparing for life means more than just knowing how to make money or construct buildings. Preparing for life means building integrity and honesty, a sense of lasting values, and a strong willingness and capacity to serve. Education must have its roots in many of the same fundamental principles found in the Declaration of Independence—a faith in the Creator, an awareness that He has endowed all men with the unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and a recognition of those steps necessary to preserve these rights. Voluntary classroom prayer may be one of the most critical aspects of the educational process.

We need to return to some of these fundamental values. When I was a young man in the public schools on the south side of Chicago, we opened every class with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. We learned a pride and respect for our land. We also learned our responsibility to the "Republic for which it stands." After the flag salute, we had a prayer. We learned that this is "one nation under God." All the philosophizing and intellectualizing in the world about the principles of freedom can not match the indelible impression these experiences of my youth had upon my development and later determination to serve this nation.

At the conclusion of this conference, I will leave to return to my duties in the House. As we gather in the House chamber at 3 p.m. today to deliberate upon the issues that shape our times, we will pause for a moment to bow our heads in prayer. In this moment of reflection and silence, our nation's lawmakers will humbly admit to their own need for guidance and direction from the Creator. Yet schools around the nation gathering to educate the youth that will one day take my place and the place of my colleagues at the head of our nation will be forbidden to seek the same guidance and direction. This inconsistency is inexplicable.

CONSTITUTION

At stake with S. 450 is even more than school prayer. The interpretation of our nation's most sacred document is at stake.

The First Amendment to the Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Based on this language, the Supreme Court in 1962 ruled that voluntary prayers in public schools were illegal. In other words, the Supreme Court in 1962 interpreted the First Amendment to prohibit any state from doing anything touching upon religion. This interpretation conflicts with the history of the Constitutional Convention itself.

The Convention did not intend to abridge the authority of the states to set their own policy with respect to religious and moral questions. During the Convention, the New Hampshire delegation proposed that the First Amendment read: "Congress shall make no laws touching religion." That language was rejected. Instead, the current language was accepted. The "establishment" language was intended clearly to prohibit only the creation of a national religion.

In fact, the record leaves no doubt. When the First Amendment was approved by Congress in 1789, five states had established religions. Other states had already refused to establish state religions. A major purpose of the amendment, as James Madison argued,

was to assure that the federal government has no power to disturb these local decisions.

The Framers of the Constitution also recognized that the Federal Judiciary could move beyond its role of settling specific disputes to enunciating broad legislative policies. Accordingly, they incorporated a provision into the Constitution, Article 3, Section 2, giving Congress power to restrict federal court jurisdiction. Thus, Congress, in which "all legislative powers" are vested under Article I, can prevent the Judiciary from usurping the legislative province.

The Founding Fathers also realized that Supreme Court pronouncements would apply nationwide. Sensitive moral questions should not be settled on a national level. Each community and locality should be free to translate its own values into policy. Thus, Article 3, Section 2, provided a check on court intrusions into questions better reserved for local decision-making.

This provision has been used on occasion to protect some of the prerogatives of Congress or localities. For instance, the Norris-LaGuardia act restricted federal court jurisdiction over labor disputes. In fact, the Supreme Court itself in the case of *Ex Parte McCordle* upheld the power of Congress to limit federal court jurisdiction.

Current conditions call once again for the use of the Article 3 power. The Supreme Court has deprived states and localities of the freedom to reaffirm fundamental values in voluntary classroom prayers. By ruling against school prayer, the Court has extinguished the right of communities to decide for themselves whether educational curriculum should contain a reverent affirmation that we are indeed "one nation under God." Finally, we are moving to allow communities and churches, rather than federal courts, to make prayer decisions.

In simple terms, the Framers gave us Article 3, Section 2, to prevent nonrepresentative institutions, the courts, from overpowering the popular will. With polls showing over 75% of all Americans favoring a restoration of voluntary school prayer, Article 3 should be invoked to fill the purpose for which it was drafted.

HERITAGE

A steadfast reliance upon the Creator was one of the profound principles which gave birth to this nation. Our Declaration of Independence proclaims without hesitation: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." This affirmation began the struggle.

Later during the Constitutional Convention of 1787, which in four months drew up the world's most inspired form of government, the Congress was at one time about to adjourn in confusion. The attempt to form a lasting union had apparently failed. At this crucial moment, 81-year-old Benjamin Franklin arose, and is reported to have said, "In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayers in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard and they were generously answered . . . I have lived a long time and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men." Franklin proposed that the Congress adjourn for two days to seek divine guidance. When they returned, they began each session with prayer.

George Washington carried on this tradition of reliance on Divinity: "No people can be found to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of

men more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency."

Finally, Abraham Lincoln solemnly stated his own feelings, which best served to summarize all I have tried to convey: "God rules this world . . . I am a full believer that God knows what He wants a man to do—that which pleases Him. It is never well with a man who heeds it not . . . Without the assistance of that Divine Being, I cannot succeed, with that assistance I cannot fail."●

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE MEANY

HON. WILLIAM L. CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1980

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my colleagues in tribute to a great American, George Meany. Mr. Meany's list of achievements span a wide range of subjects, but his most notable contribution to our society remains his selfless commitment to improving life for the working American. George Meany had unsurpassed faith in the ability of the working American and believed in the right of working Americans to share in the wealth produced by their labor. George Meany will be forever remembered for merging the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. But, the father of the AFL-CIO was also an important part of the civil rights movement. George Meany helped to fight for passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He was determined that both men and women, regardless of race, should be able to share equally in the fruits of organized labor.

Labor stands as a monument to the industrious efforts and integrity of George Meany. He spearheaded the campaign for decent wages and safe working conditions. Through him, labor's voice was heard throughout our country and around the world. A man of great courage and wisdom, he told the truth as he saw it, regardless of popular opinion. George Meany guided and nurtured the labor movement as a father would a son. A man of tremendous vision, George Meany dreamed of a better America and made his dreams a reality. When George Meany died last week, America lost one of her greatest leaders. But, through organized labor, the spirit and ideals of George Meany will live with us forever.●

THE CARTER DOCTRINE: WEAKNESS IS STRENGTH

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, President Carter appeared on "Meet the Press" and unveiled his

new approach to national defense and foreign affairs. A few days later, in his State of the Union address, he fleshed out the Carter doctrine: Weakness Is Strength.

An editorial in the Wall Street Journal on January 21 pointed out quite clearly that Mr. Carter has yet to create a credible response to Soviet aggression. We need more than rhetoric. We need concrete steps to fashion a sufficient conventional force and presence in the Middle East and elsewhere. Otherwise our choices in the face of continued aggression are two: Acquiesce or resort to nuclear war. Neither of those are palatable choices. To avoid them, President Carter's new "strong" rhetoric needs to be taken with a grain of salt. And Congress must take the lead in adding muscle to America's defense posture.

I would like to share the Wall Street Journal's editorial, "Weakness Is Strength," with my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 21, 1980]

WEAKNESS IS STRENGTH

President Carter kicked off a two-week media blitz with his appearance on "Meet the Press" yesterday. It appears that he will campaign for reelection on the stirring slogan, weakness is strength.

To those of us who have been calling for a stronger defense posture, it is of course gratifying to have Mr. Carter warning of the seriousness of the Soviet danger in the wake of the invasion of Afghanistan. It is helpful that the defense budget is going up instead of down, that aircraft carriers have been moved into the Indian Ocean and that the administration is negotiating for naval support facilities in the area. But in repeatedly citing these actions as evidence of his administration's vigilance, Mr. Carter does violence to the history of the last three years.

With the exception of the effort to reinvigorate the NATO alliance, which really was in large part a Carter administration initiative, the steps toward a stronger defense were anything but the result of Mr. Carter's leadership. Rather, each of them had to be wrung out of him by the pressure of events and public opinion. Mr. Carter is the President who took office calling for a \$5 billion cut in defense spending, the President who in fact reduced the increases planned by the outgoing administration, the President who congratulated himself on riding the nation of an "inordinate fear of Communism," the President who canceled the B1 bomber, shelved the neutron bomb and vetoed the nuclear carrier, the President who slowed the Tomahawk cruise missile and MX-ICBM programs to facilitate negotiating the now-moribund strategic arms treaty.

It is important to recognize this for reasons that transcend partisan politics. Any politician running for reelection is entitled to puff his own record, and we have known some who have campaigned against their own record and won. But this particular issue is so vastly important that it is essential that the nation not be confused about what has happened and is happening to it.

The President recognizes the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan as a "radical departure"—the first direct invasion by Soviet troops outside their sphere of influence as codified at the Yalta Conference. Given this, we have to open our minds anew to the possibility of what they might do.

When we see their divisions move complete with air defense and chemical warfare capabilities not needed in Afghanistan, we have to ask whether they will really stop. When we hear reports of troop movements in Eastern Europe, we have to wonder about Marshal Tito's illness. When they stage a press conference with a defected NATO secretary saying the West plans "aggressive war," we need to remember that in an all-out European war their SS-20 could preempt our reinforcement capabilities. They may very well not exercise any of these frightening options, but at least it reminds us of the possibilities we have allowed to arise.

Which brings us to the second reason to be clear about the Carter administration's record, which is to help in assessing whether it is seriously determined to rectify the military imbalance. The steps cited by Mr. Carter are inadequate. Substantial further increases in defense spending are necessary. A greater presence in the Middle East—for example, basing conventionally armed B-52s in Egypt and helicopter-borne troops in Turkey. To avoid being pushed into an even more dangerous corner, to avoid being confronted with the choice of war or surrender, we need to think in larger terms.

So it is scarcely comforting to have Mr. Carter proclaiming "we have not been weak." In fact we have been weak, and this weakness has invited the current Soviet boldness. We devoutly hope that Mr. Carter is starting to understand this, but we should have thought that any real understanding would start with some faint recognition that our past policies have something to do with our present predicament.●

CONGRESSMAN DON FUQUA RECEIVES NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS LEGISLATIVE AWARD

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, America still leads the world in innovative technology, but there are troublesome signs of decline. West Germany, Japan, South Korea, and other countries are giving more competition to our high technology markets. The number of patents granted to U.S. citizens has dropped in recent years. Spending on research and development, which peaked at 3 percent of gross national product in 1964, was only 2.2 percent last year. There has been a great deal of congressional activity during the past year on innovation and productivity. Under the leadership of my colleague, Hon. Don Fuqua, chairman of the Committee on Science and Technology, the committee has had a significant role in studying and finding solutions to America's innovation and productivity problem. In recognition of DON FUQUA's fine leadership, the National Society of Professional Engineers awarded him its "Legislative Recognition Award."

I ask that Chairman FUQUA's acceptance speech be printed in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF HON. DON FUQUA BEFORE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

I want to sincerely thank the Society of Professional Engineers for this award. It is an honor to receive recognition from a profession whose work is so intimately tied to and so significantly affected by our work at the Committee on Science and Technology.

Although this honor today has been given for "legislative Recognition", I would like to take this opportunity to talk about another kind of "recognition", the recognition in government of the increasing role the engineering community must play in public policy formulation.

We live in a technologically sophisticated society where economic stability, national security and the general welfare depend upon diverse and innovative technology. This technology has, in the past, propelled America to agricultural supremacy, space distinction, communications superiority and an overall prominence in world trade.

However, global competition has heightened in many areas as several nations have matured technologically. American products no longer dominate the world marketplace in many fields, and as a nation we are registering large trade deficits in several of our low and medium technology manufactured items.

Although it seems incongruous that America can continue to capture Nobel Prizes in diverse areas of scientific research and yet find itself frequently superseded in world export markets—this is nevertheless the case. It is disturbing to realize that much of our frontier science is not evolving into technologically innovative processes or products. You as engineers are our technologists and a great deal of responsibility rests on you to help promote a more appropriate environment in which technological innovation can consistently become the natural outgrowth of our research disciplines. You, perhaps more than other groups, understand the impediments and inhibitors to this evolution. These impediments are numerous and sometimes subtle. They encompass diverse functions such as taxation, patent policy, regulatory procedures and even rudimentary communication of information. As a cadre of technical professionals you can help clarify the problems and suggest alternatives for resolution.

Science and Technology are separate and distinct fields but are also related and interdependent. Although we often think of science as the precursor of technology, we should not overlook the fact that technological advances have provided scientists with more precise and efficient means with which to further probe and define the unknowns. Significant technological advances have also emerged independent of scientific research, fashioned and perfected by tireless inventors.

New technology is also a key to industrial innovation and this innovation in turn is a major factor in the country's economic well-being. Engineers are a very important link in this process. They bring science to flower in the marketplace through technological application.

In response to deep concerns voiced by government, business and industry, that although our science prevails our technology falters, the Science Committee is currently formulating legislation which will create an independent agency to promote technology for the national welfare. As it is presently conceived, the agency would have seven main branches for (1) small business, (2) institutional and manpower development, (3) technology policy and analysis, (4) intergovernmental technology, (5) engineering and national (problem focused) programs, (6)

National Bureau of Standards, and (7) Patent and Trademark Office and National Technical Information Service. The agency would have programs transferred from NSF in Engineering and Applied Science and from the Department of Commerce in areas that fall within the purview of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology.

This agency could become a focal point for reviewing input from the engineering profession on the numerous factors that favorably as well as unfavorably affect our climate for technological innovation.

We will be particularly interested in the response from the engineering community concerning the concept of a separate organization in government for fostering technology development.

In reading through NSPE's recent pamphlet on their "legislative agenda", I was particularly pleased to see that the Society supports a national materials policy similar to that proposed in the Materials Policy, Research, and Development Act reported out of the Science Committee and recently passed by the House. I hope the Senate will consider this bill in the near future. It seems to me that the collective influence of the engineering community could provide considerable support to the development of reasonable and balanced goals for the use of our present raw materials and for research programs to ensure a continuous supply of basic materials needed for industry and the economy.

At the dawn of the nineteenth century, Thomas Malthus said that the geometric rate of population increase was a far greater power than the arithmetic rate of subsistence increase. Although his theory may have been correct, he failed to consider the ingenuity and creativity of man in meeting that challenge to survival. We have not only proved him wrong for almost two hundred years, but have in the process continuously improved the lot of mankind in general. We have accomplished this to a great degree through scientific and technological advances. Today this challenge is greater than ever before and we will need your help and guidance to prevail.

Thank you again. I hope to continuously prove worthy of this distinguished recognition.

OLYMPIC BOYCOTT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have recently inserted several articles into the RECORD, along with my own views on the U.S. proposed boycott of the 1980 summer Olympic games in Moscow. As the Senate prepares to consider the resolution which would cancel our participation in these games, I wish to direct the Members to another very pertinent and well-expressed editorial broadcast over Chicago's WBBM radio 78.

The editorial very properly points out that we, as a nation, should support the President in his attempt to achieve a very important foreign policy objective, and recognize that the Soviet Union's aggressive actions in Afghanistan represents yet another breach of international law. The edito-

rial follows for the Members' attention:

OLYMPIC BOYCOTT

WBBM agrees with President Carter that the United States should consider a boycott of the summer Olympic Games in Moscow because of Russia's recent aggression in Afghanistan.

We say this with regret, because we do not like to see sports used as a political tool. Realistically, though, politics has run in tandem with athletics since the start of the Olympics. We recall the 1936 games held in Nazi Germany, and the massacre of Israeli athletes in Munich, for example.

Quite simply, the Russians have invaded Afghanistan. It would be hypocritical for us to stand by them in the Olympics while their brothers are invading another country.

Russia wants the Olympics badly. This is the perfect opportunity for them to exhibit the best aspects of their system. So great is their desire for the summer games to run smoothly that they already have begun to arrest their dissidents.

A U.S. boycott of the games will hurt Russia politically, economically and domestically. And, finally, we will be putting the world on notice that no nation, not even Russia, can act irresponsibly without retribution.

Now there are alternatives to boycotting the Olympics. The Games could be moved elsewhere; they could be divided and held at several sites; or, more feasibly, the twelfth Olympiad could be postponed until 1981.

We don't want to destroy the Olympics. In spite of some shortcomings, the Games do bring diverse nations together in a common interest. Yet, we repeat, the United States must stand up to Russian aggression.

A boycott may be the only effective answer. President Carter needs leverage to deal with the Russians. We hope that if the time comes, our athletes, out of patriotism and honor, will give the President the support he needs.

That's our opinion. We'd like to hear yours.

"THE CAPTURED 50"—A SONG ABOUT HOSTAGES IN IRAN

HON. RICHARD T. SCHULZE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently been contacted by a very talented song writer and personal friend of mine, Mr. Ervin Litkei, who along with his lovely wife Andrea has written a very timely song on the crisis in Iran.

The song appropriately titled "The Captured 50" represents, I believe, the true sentiments of the American people and vividly captures the frustrations we all share as this seemingly unending crisis in Tehran nears the end of the 12th week.

Additionally, I would like to mention that Ervin Litkei, a native of Hungary who emigrated to the United States shortly after World War II, is not a new song composer but is an individual who has gained national recognition by penning marches in tribute to all U.S. Presidents. These marches were incorporated within an album marketed by RCA Records during our Bicentennial celebration and provided, I

feel, a lasting tribute to our former Chief Executives.

When asked to explain the genesis of this recording, Ervin responded:

I was sure that I would not write anymore, at least so I thought. However, after the Iranian takeover of our Embassy and the holding of Americans as hostages I went to the piano to vent my anger and fury over this unprecedented situation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD the lyrics of this fine composition and add my own sentiments in support of this important message.

We must all remember that freedom is a precious thing and that once lost can never be regained—we must fight tirelessly for the freedom of the 50 hostages in Iran.

The lyrics of this composition follow:

THE CAPTURED 50

(Lyric by Andrea and Ervin Litkel and music by Ervin Litkel)

No! We won't let you down,
Captured fifty sons,
Our martyrs in Iran.
No! You won't die.
Our nation is behind you,
The whole world is beside you,
Americans, Americans unite.
Under freedom's banner,
March and swear that never
Will a native son a hostage be.
No! We won't let you down,
Captured fifty sons,
Our martyrs in Iran.
No! We will fight.
You are not alone, hold on!
If we must then watch us come
Fighting mad we'll get you out
Of Iran, Iran. ●

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL PROTESTS CZECHOSLOVAK HARASSMENT OF TRIAL OBSERVER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members to a recent press release from Amnesty International, which reports on the actions of the Czechoslovak Government in its treatment of an Austrian lawyer, Henry Goldmann. Mr. Goldmann was in Czechoslovakia to observe the appeal trial of the six dissidents arrested in Prague for their human rights activities.

The announcement of the conviction of these six human rights activists in October and the subsequent rejection of their appeal on December 20, 1979, is further evidence of the Prague government's continued suppression of dissent and denial of basic rights to its citizens. I believe it is important for the United States to continue to publicize and object to such reprisals which are so pervasive in the Communist nations. Therefore, I wish to insert the press release at this time:

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL PROTESTS CZECHOSLOVAK HARASSMENT OF TRIAL OBSERVER

Amnesty International today (Tuesday, January 8, 1980) protested to the Czechoslovak authorities over the harassment of a lawyer it had sent to try to observe hearing of appeals by six imprisoned human rights activists in Prague.

Austrian lawyer Henry Goldmann was barred from the hearing, detained for four and a half hours and expelled from the country. At the hearing, on December 20, the Supreme Court rejected the appeals of the six and upheld sentences on them ranging up to five years.

The six, including internationally-known playwright Vaclav Havel, were members of the unofficial Committee for the Defence of the Unjustly Persecuted (VONS). They had issued statements on cases in which they believed other Czechoslovak citizens had been denied their rights. All six were convicted of subversion on October 23. Mr. Goldmann, who went to Prague for their trial, was prevented from entering the courtroom but was able to interview people present at the trial.

The incidents which prompted today's protest occurred when he returned to Prague for the hearing of their appeals in December. He was one of three lawyers detained when they attempted to attend the hearing. The others were John Platts-Mills of the United Kingdom and Elisabeth Guyot of France.

Amnesty International, in a letter sent to Czechoslovak judicial authorities today, pointed out that Mr. Goldmann had been granted an entry visa after explaining the purpose of his visit, and that the Procurator General had advance notice of his arrival. When he was barred from the hearing, he went to the Justice Ministry, where he was directed to a particular office at the Supreme Court. After he went back to the Court Building, however, he was taken to Police Headquarters, and was told that his attempt to observe the trial was "interference in internal affairs." After being detained at the headquarters, he was driven to the border with the Federal Republic of Germany.

The protest letter said Amnesty International believed Mr. Goldmann's exclusion from the hearing was incompatible with provisions for public trials in both the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, to which Czechoslovakia is a party, as well as with the Czechoslovak Code of Criminal Procedure.

The letter rejected any suggestion that it was interference in a country's internal affairs for a lawyer to request an opportunity to attend a trial purported to be open to the public.

It pointed out that this was the second time an Amnesty International representative had been harassed while attempting to observe a trial in Czechoslovakia. Austrian lawyer Wolfgang Aigner had been detained for five hours when he tried to attend the trial of Petr Cibulka and three other people in October 1978.

The six people whose appeals were rejected in the December hearing were: Petr Uhl, an engineer, sentenced to five years; Vaclav Havel, four-and-a-half years; Vaclav Benda, philosopher and mathematician, four years; Otta Bednarova and Jiri Dienstbier, journalists, three years; and Dana Nemcova, psychologist, who received a two-year suspended sentence.

Amnesty International had appealed to the Czechoslovak authorities in October, expressing the belief that the six had not had a fair trial and were in fact sentenced for exercising their right to freedom of expression. ●

QUAYLE INTRODUCES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROMOTE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY IN GOVERNMENT

HON. DAN QUAYLE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. Speaker, today for the 20th time in 2 years Congress has received from the executive branch a Federal budget that is not balanced and calls for a deficit of nearly \$16 billion for fiscal year 1981. If we pile this on top of the other 20 deficits we find the Federal debt has escalated more than \$420 billion.

Thomas Jefferson, our third President, stated that:

Of all the perils facing the Nation, public debt is the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

There is no question that the runaway inflation, which reached 13.2 percent in 1979, remains the No. 1 domestic problem facing our Nation. Inflation is made in Washington, and it exists in large part because of excessive spending by the Federal Government.

As working families continue to struggle with inflation, taxes continue to grow. Taxes consume nearly 40 percent of the average worker's income. The standard of living of a majority of families remains stagnant or has declined because of rising prices and inflationary pressures.

Mr. Speaker, public opinion polls in my Indiana Fourth District and across the Nation reveal that more than 80 percent favor a balanced budget requirement for the Federal Government.

While I introduced a proposed constitutional amendment during the 1st session of the 96th Congress, I am today introducing a refined proposal which would reform the procedures by which the Federal Government establishes tax and spending policy.

This measure is the same amendment as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee's Constitutional Subcommittee on December 19, 1979.

A constitutional amendment is necessary at this time to bring about and to mandate a permanent measure of fiscal responsibility. It is obvious from the history of budget deficits that the Budget Control Act of 1974 which set up the present complicated system of first and second resolutions, targets, goals, et cetera, has not broken the red ink spending habits of the Congress.

Briefly, the resolution I have sponsored today provides, first, that spending cannot exceed revenues; and second, no increased tax revenues will be allowed unless specifically voted by Congress. Revenues cannot grow at a faster rate than national income.

Without tying the spending level to an arbitrary percentage of the gross national product, this amendment sets

limits on both spending and taxation. This combines the two approaches most often mentioned for limiting Federal spending.

I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Judiciary, which last year held hearings on the various balanced budget proposals, will give favorable consideration in the near future to this resolution which has won bipartisan support in the other body. ●

A SATIRE ON OVERREGULATIONS

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I recently came across an article which was excerpted from a speech made by Mr. Monte Throdahl, a senior vice president for Monsanto, at a conference on toxics control in Washington, D.C.

To me, it points up some of the real problems we have with overregulation today. If we are not careful, this little satire may become a reality in the very near future. In any event, it is so well written that I wanted to share it with my colleagues today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY MR. THRODAHL

This is the story of the U.S. pencil industry. Remember, we are looking back from our vantage point of 1990. It's strange to think that, back in 1970, just anyone could use a pencil any way they wanted to.

You see, it all started when the Occupational Safety & Health Act carcinogen policy went into effect. The graphite in the pencil leads always contained a residue of crystalline silica. And there was at least one animal test and an in-vitro test indicating that crystalline silica produced tumors, so the material became regulated as a carcinogen. There was no alternate for pencils, so exposure had to come down almost to zero. Workers were put into protective clothing, and that solved the problem initially.

But then the Environmental Protection Agency, acting under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts which soon had their own carcinogen policies, required drastic reductions in emissions and effluents. The control technology was quite expensive, and only the largest manufacturers could afford it. This caused a flurry of antitrust suits in the early '80s when there were only three pencil makers left in the country. One of the three was split into smaller companies, but they soon went out of business since they were unable to afford increasingly stringent workplace and pollution control requirements. Then foreign pencil manufacturers began to threaten to dominate the pencil market, and our government, in an abrupt about-face, allowed a merger of the two remaining companies to meet overseas competition.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission then became concerned with what the newspaper headlines were calling the "pencil problem." Rubber erasers could be chewed off and choke small children. The sharp points of pencils could also be dangerous. There were residual solvents in the paint used on pencils, and pencil-chewing seemed to be a more widespread habit than

anyone has realized. Printing a legend on each pencil that said: "This Pencil Could be Hazardous To Your Health" did not seem to affect consumer pencil habits, a Harvard study indicated. In fact, the study found additional potentially harmful uses, such as stirring coffee. This led FDA to declare that harmful substances could be dissolved out of the pencil into the coffee, and thus pencils violated food additive laws, including the Delaney amendment.

Trying to salvage its business, the pencil company began making pencils without paint, without erasers, and with only soft leads so they would not hold a sharp point. But consumers were outraged, and sales declined.

Then someone invented a machine that could measure crystalline silica below the part-per-trillion level, and workplace, air emission, water effluent, and waste disposal regulations required that the best practicable technology be used to reach this low level. The pencil company was threatened with financial ruin because of the large sums needed to purchase new control equipment. There were those that wanted to ban pencils entirely under the Toxic Substances Control Act, but the government decided that pencils were necessary, particularly since they were used to write new regulations. Besides, the Senators from the state where the pencil company was located declared that pencils were as American as baseball, and should not be replaced with ball-point pens.

So the government bailed out the pencil company with a large, guaranteed loan—called a Chrysler loan in those days. But, of course, that was only a temporary measure, and to protect the pencil business, the government eventually nationalized it.

It is comforting to know, after all, that society is being protected against a danger that was so obvious we didn't even notice it for many, many years. There are still those who complain about paying \$17 for a pencil, but you really can't put a price tag on health or safety. ●

REMEMBERING DR. KING

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, 51 years ago this month Martin Luther King, Jr., was born, and 12 years ago this spring he was taken from us. He died at a time when much of what he was doing seemed out of fashion. But as we enter the eighties we see more clearly than ever how right, how honorable, and how good what he taught and did was.

I hope that eventually no American will think of Dr. King as a black spokesman for black causes. He was an American spokesman for principles many Americans found too easy to forget. When he said that no man in America is free unless all Americans are free, he spoke the undeniable truth: It was not a black or a white issue, but a moral imperative.

I remember the night Dr. King was slain. I was 24 years old, attending Tulane University. A black friend, who was in the graduate history program with me, phoned me right after the shooting to tell me of it. Our shared

shock and grief brought my friend and me closer together. It was a small bit of hopeful light on an otherwise dark night.

At the time, I prayed that Rev. Dr. King's message would not die with him. I do not believe it has. It is more real to more people in this country today than it ever was before.

The 12 years that Rev. Dr. King was an outspoken public fighter for civil rights and human brotherhood, moved the country ahead by a century. He did the work of generations, this one man whose life ended so soon and so tragically. We honor him now, and I hope we will be true to his legacy for all time. ●

PRESIDENT FORD CRITICIZES ADMINISTRATION ATTEMPTS TO "REWRITE HISTORY"

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last week in a speech before a Republican gathering in Rochester, N.Y., former President Gerald Ford was critical of those in the Carter administration who are attempting to "rewrite the history" of his administration.

He pointed out that it has been the Carter administration which has reduced proposed defense budgets for the years 1979 through 1983 by \$57 billion from the recommendations of the Ford administration.

Former President Ford points out that genuine bipartisanship is a two-way street that requires an honest respect for the facts.

As one who served in Congress for over two decades with former President Ford, I can testify to his long dedication to the principles of bipartisanship in foreign policy. He was inspired in his belief in this tradition by former Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a resident of Mr. Ford's congressional district who he admired and respected.

One of the fundamental ingredients of successful bipartisanship, Mr. Ford indicated in his speech, is a willingness to "admit your mistakes and do not falsely blame others." Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse that advice and commend the text of Mr. Ford's speech on foreign affairs to my colleagues.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GERALD R. FORD

"Now let me turn to foreign policy and related programs. From the outset of my political career in 1949 as a freshman member of Congress, I believed in a bipartisan foreign policy. As a Republican, I consistently supported Democratic Presidents Truman and Johnson as they sought to implement foreign policy decisions in our national interest. Since leaving the White House three years ago, President Carter has asked for my direct assistance on a number of foreign policy issues. I responded affirmatively on the Panama Canal Treaty, the sale of military aircraft to Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, the lifting of the Arms sale embargo

to Turkey and the recognition of the People's Republic of China. From the first day the American hostages were seized in Iran I have urged national unity and supported the President's efforts to resolve the crisis. So far I have refrained from any criticism as the Carter Administration seeks a solution to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The crisis is too grave, the threat to peace is too real.

However, the President and his advisors must recognize that cooperation is a two-way street. I have and will continue to give bi-partisan support when our national security is challenged. Having been there, I know how important it is for a President to have bi-partisan support when Oval Office decisions are made affecting our nation's future. I will not, however, tolerate inaccurate or misleading partisan statements by the Carter Administration. In recent weeks the White House has been guilty of these untrue partisan attacks. The Carter Administration can't have it both ways—one day asking for Republican help and the next day blaming us for their weaknesses in defense and indecision in foreign policy.

While the Carter Administration foreign policy slides from crisis to crisis, the White House tries to rewrite history by blaming previous Republican Administrations for current Carter weaknesses and failures. In an attempt to hide deliberately from responsibility for their foreign and military policy failures, the White House, through National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski is clearly falsifying the record for partisan political purposes. Such Carter Administration propaganda, to cover up the current mess, comes with illgrace at the very time the President is calling for national unity and bi-partisan support in foreign policy.

Let me cite the facts. On January 15, 1980, Mr. Brzezinski, the Assistant to President Carter for National Security Affairs said in an interview published in the Wall Street Journal, "After eight years of sustained Republican neglect for the requirements of defense, the President reversed the trend and in three successive years increased defense spending."

The truth is—the Ford Administration in fiscal years 1976, 1977, and 1978 in budget authority and in fiscal years 1977 and 1978 in outlays (expenditures) reversed the downward trend in defense spending, despite annual reductions by a Democratic majority in the U.S. Congress.

The record shows President Carter in the 1976 Presidential campaign promised to reduce defense spending by \$7 Billion dollars. Unfortunately, he lived up to those naive promises. Within the first few months after taking office in January, 1977, he cut the (or my) military budget by approximately \$2 billion.

The Carter Administration reduced my proposed budgets for 1979 through 1983 (a six year period) by \$57 billion, an average cut of \$9.5 billion per year. Carter slashed our strategic program \$24 billion (26.9 percent), general purpose forces were cut \$25 billion (7.3 percent) and research and development was reduced by \$10 billion (12.6 percent). President Carter cut my planned Navy budget over the six year period by almost \$26 billion (41 percent of the total). Ford budget approved a five year Navy shipbuilding plan of 157 new ships by 1982, an average of 31 per year. President Carter in his first two years in office slashed this program 54 percent.

The Ford Administration approved a plan to deploy the MX Missile by FY 1984. Tragically, the Carter Administration held back on the MX. Consequently, its deployment date will be delayed at least four years at a time when our Minuteman missiles will be

come increasingly vulnerable to Soviet strategic strength.

President Carter in 1977 cancelled the B-1 bomber program, of 244 modern aircraft with no replacement to take its place. The aging B-52's, now 25 years old, are not adequate for the decade of the 80s.

The Trident submarine procurement under Carter was cut back and the initial operational deployment was delayed by two years.

A legendary New York statesman—Al Smith—used to say—"Let's look at the record." In this case the facts expose the Carter White House to a partisan distortion of history. Mr. Brzezinski, who should know better, is guilty of outright misrepresentation.

During his 1976 Presidential debates, candidate Carter repeated his campaign pledge to reduce military budgets by at least \$7 billion. I challenged him during the debates to justify his commitment to irresponsible cuts in defense spending programs. Now with the Soviet Union stronger militarily and more aggressive worldwide, in 1980 it would be interesting to see and hear in a debate, President Carter's alibies for his cutbacks in U.S. military programs and funding during his three years in office.

In the 1976 Presidential campaign and during his first 2½ years in office, Mr. Carter naively misread Soviet military and diplomatic intentions. In the last three years the Russians have beefed up their Pacific fleet and now use the Camranh Bay Navy base in Vietnam. There is a continuing build up of Soviet naval strength in Cuba which has followed the introduction of a Russian combat brigade on Cuban soil in the last two years. The Soviet Union has now moved into Afghanistan with the obvious target the vast oil reserves in the Middle East. Their Warsaw Pact military forces, augmented by the S.S. 20 missile and Backfire Bomber, are stronger not weaker.

Yes, the United States faces the most serious confrontation since the end of World War II and the American People are ready to follow strong leadership in this hour of crisis. My advice to the President and his staff—admit your mistakes and don't falsely blame others. 221 million Americans—Democrats, Republicans and Independents will join together to save this blessed land."●

ASSURING WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT'S WATER DELIVERY TO NORTHERN VIRGINIA

HON. JOSEPH L. FISHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a secure safe supply of water is the lifeline of any community. Two communities in my district are concerned that their access to water is not assured. I am introducing legislation today to clear up any uncertainty about the right of Arlington County and Falls Church to an uninterrupted supply of water.

The Washington Aqueduct, under the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, has been authorized since 1926 to sell water to Arlington County, Va., and since 1947 to Falls Church, Va. Included in the authorization is a clause that allows the Secretary of the Army to

"revoke at any time any permit for the use of said water that may have been granted" when there is not enough to serve the needs of the Federal Government. The District Engineer of the Corps of Engineers told me in a 1977 letter that it is unlikely that the corps would have to stop supplying water to the Virginia communities and that it has no intention of exercising its authority to discontinue service.

Despite these disclaimers, the Arlington County Board has asked that the clause pertaining to revocation of the water supply permits be deleted. Agreeing with them that the letter of the law is more reassuring than a letter of assurance, I am introducing a bill to secure the right of Arlington and Falls Church to their water supply. The bill simply rescinds the authority of the Secretary of the Army to revoke unilaterally the water permits for northern Virginia communities. This proposal is not controversial and I urge my colleagues to support it.●

POLITICS AND OIL

HON. MICKEY EDWARDS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have maintained that Government policies are the chief cause of our Nation's energy crisis. I was very happy to read a recent article in the St. Louis Post Dispatch which documents this point very well. The author researched his subject very thoroughly, interviewing more than 150 industry executives, government officials, consumer representatives, and academic experts in Oklahoma, Texas, Washington, and New York. He discovered that almost everyone agrees our current energy policies just aren't working. His findings make an impressive case for drastic modification or repeal of many of our energy regulations.

The article reaches five conclusions: First, price controls on domestic oil have caused imports to be more profitable; second, frozen profit margins depress investment in needed refinery equipment; third, the entitlements program subsidizes imports; fourth, the buy/sell program gives small refiners no incentive to look for secure supplies; and fifth, the allocation program restricts competition and creates avoidable shortages.

The author states that these "conclusions are more than just the industry line. They are echoed by nearly every Government official directly involved in the administration of the regulation program. Industry and Government officials are in accord that the incredibly convoluted web of regulations has made an oil company's political savvy the most important determinant of its competitive position."

The fact that such a prominent and respected newspaper would publish such an article is a strong indication of how discredited our current energy policies are. I commend this article to my colleagues.

OIL INDUSTRY ILLS LAID TO U.S. BUNGLING
(By Jon Sawyer)

Federal regulation of the oil industry has increased American dependence on foreign oil. It, more than any other single factor, contributed to the creation of gasoline-line chaos out of a slight shortfall in world oil supplies in the spring. It has made the notion of free enterprise in oil a sham.

These conclusions are more than just the industry line. They are echoed by nearly every government official directly involved in the administration of the regulation program. Industry and government officials are in accord that the incredibly convoluted web of regulations has made an oil company's political savvy the most important determinant of its competitive position.

These officials cited the following items as some of the recent results of government regulation:

Price controls, a short-term government effort to combat inflation, remained in effect for crude oil and petroleum products long after being dismantled for the rest of the economy. The controls made foreign production more profitable than domestic and discouraged critically needed investment in refinery modernization.

Regulatory amendments that were supposed to promote competition subsidized oil imports and funneled crude oil to inefficient refineries that lacked the equipment necessary to make products, such as gasoline, that were most in demand.

Allocation regulations, also imposed as a short-term expedient, distorted the market in times of surplus and created havoc during this year's shortage.

As director of the Office of Competition at the Department of Energy, William C. Lane Jr. shares the concerns of many critics about the implications for competition in an industry dominated by a handful of giant companies. He has no doubt that government regulation has made the problems worse.

"Everybody," he says, "from the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee to the Federal Trade Commission to the Department of Justice to the House Antitrust Subcommittee who has looked at this issue from the competitive point of view has said that pricing-allocation regulations don't work in this industry. Period."

Government regulation of the oil industry was not a phenomenon of the 1970s. State agencies had restricted production for 40 years. At the federal level, the Mandatory Oil Import Control Program had restricted imports to 12 percent of domestic supplies since 1959.

As a result of the control program, according to a 1970 report by a Cabinet task force appointed by President Richard M. Nixon, American consumers were paying \$5 billion a year to subsidize high-cost production and inefficient refineries.

"The present system," the task force concluded, "has spawned a host of special arrangements and exceptions for purposes essentially unrelated to the national security, has imposed high costs and inefficiencies on consumers and the economy and has led to undue government intervention in the market and consequent competitive distortions."

The recommendations of the task force

were ignored as the Nixon administration moved toward wage and price controls in the summer of 1971. Between 1973 and 1975, as controls ended for the rest of the economy, they continued for "old" oil produced from existing fields. The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975 extended the controls to new oil as well.

Price controls on petroleum products also had their origin in the 1971 program, with subsequent adjustments establishing the "base" as the price in effect on May 15, 1973.

"If a guy was in a price war on that particular day," an Energy Department regulator said, "he was theoretically locked into it ever since."

As the system of price controls evolved, refiners could pass through only documented increases in raw material and operating costs. Despite inflation, profit margins essentially were frozen at their 1973 level. If a company invested to improve or expand its refinery, price increases could only reflect the direct costs of the investment; no additional profit was allowed.

The controls discouraged refinery investment at a time when it was critically needed to cope with dramatic shifts in the qualities of crude oil available and the types of products required.

On the supply side, refineries have had to adjust to an increasing proportion of "heavy" crude oils that require more sophisticated equipment to process into products such as gasoline, heating oil and aviation fuel that come from what is termed the lighter end of the barrel. The proportion of sour, or high-sulfur, crudes also has increased, requiring more elaborate refining to meet environmental standards.

On the demand side, while total gasoline use is expected to peak in the early 1980s, the mix of gasolines required will change as leaded grades are phased out. As an additive used to raise the octane rating of gasoline, lead is a substitute for more severe "cracking" at the refinery. If demand for unleaded gasoline is to be met, according to industry and Energy Department reports, substantial investments in refinery equipment are required.

The industry was making the required investments until the advent of price controls, said Joe Moore, president of Bonner & Moore Associates, a consulting firm in Houston that has specialized in studies of the lead phase-out.

"Once the controls were put on," he said, "the industry stopped doing what it was supposed to do."

The result, Moore said, was a shortage of unleaded grades that forced several major companies into product allocation even before January's shutdown of Iranian production.

"The system wasn't set up to deal with inflation," said Edwin Mampe, the DOE's director of price regulations. "If price controls are set up for the long term, they've got to be adequate to handle inflation. Otherwise, you bankrupt people."

To Art Williams, manager of the Shell Oil Co.'s Wood River refinery, the cause-and-effect relationship of controls to curtailed investment is painfully direct. Williams says: "If you know someone with \$500 million who'd like to invest in a risk venture with government controls that say he can get no return on his money, send him around."

Whether price controls on crude oil have had a similar effect on domestic exploration and production is the subject of a trillion-dollar debate in Congress over President Jimmy Carter's proposed "windfall profits" tax on the additional revenues that the oil

industry may or may not reap from decontrol.

What is not in doubt is that the controls gave an extraordinary cost advantage to refineries with access to domestic crude oil and that the federal government, in its attempts to redress that imbalance, ended up subsidizing oil imports and inefficient refineries.

By August 1974, independent refiners who did not have access to domestic crude were paying as much as \$7 a barrel more than their competitors for oil. Recognizing that this was a "peculiar form of competition," as one DOE official put it, the government instituted a program called "entitlements" to equalize crude-oil costs for all refineries.

Under the program, refiners with more than the national average of price-controlled oil write checks each month to refiners with less than the national average. The checks can be large.

By summer, the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana had paid over \$1 billion to its competitors. In practice, the program made refiners indifferent as to the source of their crude oil supplies.

Edd Grigsby, the Phillips Petroleum Co. specialist in government regulations, characterized the entitlements program as "the heart of the current energy policy, which is to subsidize imports and penalize those companies that elected to spend money in years past to develop domestic sources of crude oil."

Because entitlements are based on averages, refineries owned by major oil companies with access to lower-cost foreign oil have a big advantage. In July, for example, the weighted-average cost of all imports was \$23.09 a barrel, and that was the figure used in computing entitlements. Yet the actual prices paid for foreign oil ranged from \$18 to \$45.

That cost spread has occasioned a divisive debate in the industry this fall and has led several companies to petition the DOE for relief.

"If this continues, the Exxons are going to get bigger and we're going to get smaller," said E. William Cole, vice president of the Union Oil Co. of California.

The original entitlements program was biased in favor of those refineries having a processing capacity of less than 175,000 barrels a day. The intent was to promote competition by giving a cost advantage to small refineries that did not have the economies of scale enjoyed by their giant competitors.

With the help of Joseph Califano, then a Washington attorney and later secretary of health, education and welfare in the Carter administration, a group of small Western refineries persuaded Congress to exempt entirely from the entitlements program small refiners with access to domestic crude.

The first four months of the exemption produced a \$164 million windfall for the 56 refineries affected. With that record as evidence, the Federal Energy Administration—which had opposed the exemption all along—struck the best deal it could with Congress, spreading the total benefit of the exemption to all small refiners, not just those with domestic crude oil.

Under the revised program instituted in April 1976, government subsidies to small refiners averaged \$2 for every barrel processed. Over the next three years, or until the bias was cut in half in June, 40 inefficient refineries—"bias babies"—were opened.

Almost none of the subsidized refineries had the equipment necessary to produce gasoline. According to conservative govern-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS
BEFORE WE FOLLOW YOU INTO
WAR, TELL US WHY

ment estimates, the bias cost the country 50,000 barrels of gasoline a day during spring's shortage.

"People here knew what the likely results (of the bias) would be," said Douglas McIver, director of the entitlements program. "It was totally predictable."

The entitlements program and the small-refiner bias were offshoots of the allocation program that began as a federal response to spot shortages in the summer of 1973 and was codified into law by the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act later that year. Other parts of the program, also intended to promote competition, had equally unintended effects.

The mandatory crude oil buy/sell program originally was intended to assure equal access to crude oil supplies during the Arab oil embargo of 1973-74. It required the 15 largest refiners to make crude oil available, at their own acquisition costs, to small refiners whose supplies had been cut off.

Use of the program declined after the embargo as the independent refiners bought cheaper oil that was available on the foreign spot market. When spot prices shot up again last year, however, the independents demanded and won a share of the major refiners oil.

From the major refiners perspective, the program was an invitation to disaster: It encouraged independents to seek the cheapest source of crude, no matter how insecure.

"The buy/sell program gave small refiners no incentive to look for secure supplies," said Roy Murdock of the Mobil Oil Corp. "So when things got tight, they lost a great deal more crude than they should have."

A Mobil study found that small refiners, representing 25 percent of the industry, accounted for half of the shortage in the spring.

A gasoline allocation system that imposed 1972 supplier-purchaser relationships on an industry undergoing a transformation to self-service operations brought further distortions. For most of the time the regulations were in effect, gasoline was in surplus and their main effect was to give a windfall to jobbers, middlemen of the industry.

As described by Alan T. Lockard, a DOE official responsible for allocations, the program undercut the large refiners' control over their own marketing by assigning new service stations to jobbers who in turn got allocations from the refiners.

"The jobbers loved it," Lockard said. "The system let people double, quadruple, quintuple their volume, with the refiner-suppliers standing by helpless."

"Some people who figured out the system are now huge marketers," said Edd Grigsby of Phillips. "They're the true entrepreneurs."

When the shortage hit, the distortions of the allocation program came home to consumers who discovered that an emergency change in the regulation's base period had put the gas in rural areas with small populations.

By early this year, even President Jimmy Carter, who had campaigned against decontrol, was saying that regulations haven't worked in the oil industry. In March, his administration implemented the gasoline "tilt" rule that all but decontrolled the price of gasoline, and in April he announced the phased decontrol of crude oil over the next two years.

At the same time, however, the President unveiled an energy plan—including the windfall profits tax, an energy security fund and an energy mobilization board—that promises to enmesh the federal government in the oil business more deeply than ever before. ●

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we learned one lesson from the war in Vietnam, I hope we learned how wasteful and how unnecessary it all was.

When Chinese Premier Deng Xiaoping was wined, dined, and loved here in the United States last year, I wondered what the quadriplegic Vietnam veteran thought—he, who was told that he was fighting to hold the Communist Chinese at bay in Vietnam.

As the drums of war sound again, let us know, this time, what our young people are being asked to fight and die for.

I submit to my colleagues in Congress, the following column, by the Washington Post's William Greider:

BEFORE WE FOLLOW YOU INTO WAR, TELL US WHY

(By William Greider)

The smell of war returns to Washington and this time I am listening seriously. I am thinking about August 1914, and the slide of accidental events which led to World War I. I am wondering if the American people fully grasp the preparations that policy makers and politicians are now espousing.

What time is it? The time is late. What is the situation? The situation is grave.

What is required? A major effort.

This somber counsel comes from Dr. Henry Kissinger, interviewed the other day in *The Wall Street Journal*. I know Kissinger is brilliant but sometimes I wish there were a little button in his neck which ordinary citizens could push for a free translation of what exactly he said.

What must we avoid? We must avoid ad hoc decisions.

How should we think? We should think through how it all fits together.

Then what must we obtain? National resolve behind carrying through whatever it is.

Kissinger's pale shadow, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, offered his own historic declaration. The "Post-Vietnam Era" is over, he announced in one of those semi-anonymous background briefings. As I listen to the war talk, the language of deployment and escalation, moves and countermoves, I can see that he has a point.

But I also wonder, in this steamy winter of crisis, if the government is recreating another "pre-Vietnam era"—a season of strategic steps which lead in time to another swamp.

Ordinary citizens, far away from the policy storms of Washington, may begin with simpler questions about Afghanistan. Where exactly is Afghanistan? What do they have in Afghanistan that we want? What are we supposed to do to get it back from the Russians?

Nothing. The short answer is nothing. Afghanistan is a nothing country with nothing we really want and we aren't going to do anything to get it back.

We are not talking about Afghanistan, citizens. We are talking about a new domino theory, born again for the Eighties. It is

popularly known as the "Arc of Crisis," but *Time* magazine calls it the "Crescent of Crisis," which is more poetic than dominoes.

Why must we struggle over Afghanistan? Because Pakistan is next and then Iran and Arabia and soon the Russians will be boasting themselves in the cafes of Paris and the tearooms of London. Our world will be swallowed up by Red aggression if we and our ally, Red China, do not resist.

These are serious arguments, serious perceptions of danger. Still, I am compelled to note that these global thinkers—Kissinger and Brzezinski included—made the same arguments 20 years ago in another part of Asia. Only then we were told to struggle in Indochina against our enemy, Red China, who would swallow up Asia if we failed to act. It was better to fight in the streets of Saigon than the streets of San Francisco, as I recall.

I recognize that in the present climate these sentiments sound exceedingly wimpy, know-nothing, even craven. This is the hour for rallying and anyone who interrupts with simple-minded questions about the location of Afghanistan is automatically dismissed from the dialogue. It is also possible that the gunpowder I smell is merely a whiff of talc—a powderpuff crisis for the voters of 1980. But I keep thinking back to that news story about the first casualty in Vietnam, a boy from Tennessee, as I remember it. They went around to interview his family. His father did not know where Vietnam was.

Did we learn anything from Vietnam? My main feeling of dread about the present situation is that the government and its auxiliary policy makers are in danger of repeating the same fundamental errors which led to the ruined strategy in Indochina. I am not talking about errors of diplomacy or military tactics—though those were abundant. I am talking about errors of democratic leadership.

The Middle East is different from Indochina and so are the current events of crisis, but I do not hear the plain talk that citizens need if they are going to sign on for "national resolve," as Kissinger calls it. What I hear is the same kind of elliptical rhetoric which preceded Vietnam, heavy in portent and falling in precision. It sounds strong but lacks definition. It describes the consequences of inaction in the gravest terms but it evades the consequences of commitment.

Thus, for example, our Republican statesmen who are running for president, who depict themselves as knights stalwart, of democracy, scurry away from the question of the draft. No point alarming folks in an election year by suggesting that their sons and daughters might go to Oman or Pakistan or wherever.

Likewise, none of those who are proposing U.S. deployment of troops in the Middle East are talking about what this might mean, down the road a ways. The idea is to signal the Soviets of our "national resolve" but nobody has spelled out exactly what we are resolving to do, in the event that the Russians or someone else start shooting in the vicinity. Since war on one level or another has been a constant for 30 years in the Middle East, is it unreasonable to ask now, rather than later, what we are committing ourselves to do?

What I hear these days are essentially two different conversations. One is intense dialogue among the policy makers, full of prescriptions for action but too opaque for general understanding. The other, political rhetoric directed to the nation, is not much more than a rumble of patriotic thunder.

Everyone thrills to thunder. It's only later, when lightning strikes and the barn

burns down, that folks get angry. This is essentially what happened to public opinion during the Vietnam war and I see a present danger forming of the same disastrous dimension.

Jimmy Carter added his own bracing presidential thunder last week, which, again, was strong on portent and weak on precision. He warned the Russians that he might have to resume the military draft—maybe after the election, certainly not before. He did not explain, for instance, how Gen. Zia of Pakistan, once regarded as unstable and repressive, had suddenly become our new bulwark of freedom. Carter said we are sending arms and maybe troops to defend our "vital interests" in a troubled region, but he did not define how these new commitments in the Middle East will be more successful than the old ones in Southeast Asia.

My question really is about how leaders in a democracy prepare people for a dangerous struggle without losing the next election. President Johnson essentially lied in 1964 and everyone can agree now that the nation paid dearly for his deception. Among other lessons, Vietnam left some commandments which the "Arc of Crisis" commanders ought to honor, if not for themselves, for the country.

Tell the truth. Americans can take it. They are more comfortable knowing the truth of the situation than with a lot of gauzy rhetoric and vague warnings.

I am not talking about the deep secrets of war strategy or the names of spies. I mean an honest account of what events are propelling us toward war and what the possible consequences will be.

I do not think we have gotten that yet from the Carter administration or the presidential challengers who love to talk tough. My hunch, which I cannot prove, is that we do not yet know the full truth about events in Afghanistan or in Iran, for that matter.

If Americans learn later that they were deceived or conned, they will not feel as resolute as the national leaders about continuing the struggle.

Obey the laws and the Constitution. That does not seem like too much to ask of the U.S. government, but the great scandal of Vietnam which, no one would confront, including the Supreme Court, was the sleazy legal tricks used to justify the escalating military engagement and the suppression of citizen dissent.

This means, if the president wants to fight a war, he sends a declaration up to Capitol Hill and Congress votes on it. He does not segue into war by secret CIA armies or masked adventures by military advisers.

Tell us why. Why must we struggle for Afghanistan? The answer must be something more tangible and durable than the reasons supplied for Vietnam. That war was cast as a "war of honor" or a "test of strength" but it left the United States looking both weak and dishonored.

Forget the abstractions; give us concrete reasons. If the answer is oil, then some other tough questions must also be answered first. Why, for instance, do our European and Japanese allies seem so relaxed about Middle East oil supplies, so willing to let us do the nasty work? Isn't their oil at risk too? And, furthermore, what has the Carter administration done at home to insure emergency supplies of oil? The answer is not much, a modest scandal by itself.

Finally, there is a fundamental rule which I borrow from the Strom Thurmonds and Richard Russells and George Wallaces of American politics: If we get into a war, we should get in to win it.

Most Americans, outside the realm of policy theorists, instantly grasp the common sense of that rule. Only people who think war can be fine tuned and graduated into clever diplomatic signals will defend the gradual escalation of the Vietnam struggle.

War making was not invented in order to send signals to the Kremlin or anywhere else; war is meant for defeating an enemy force and capturing territory. If that's not the intended purpose, then don't send our boys to fight.

Simple as they sound, these are not easy rules for our leaders to follow. Each in its way poses a firebreak against careless adventure, against belligerent posturing which later slides into real bloodshed. And it makes diplomacy and war preparations much more complicated if a leader has to bring the general citizenry along with him on each step. But that is literally what global danger requires. Nobody ever said democracy was easier.●

PTA THRIFTSHOP OF LA HABRA

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we are privileged to be reminded of the tremendous potential for good that can be found among the constituency we represent. When these reminders do come to our attention, it must serve as an example and an object lesson to us all. I would like to share with each of you the following release from the PTA Thriftshop of La Habra.

This is a group of very fine civic-minded people who are actually out doing something for their less fortunate neighbors. This sort of activity is the highest expression of the Judeo-Christian ethic that so obviously motivated our Founding Fathers as they built this Government from which we benefit. One of the reasons that I am bringing this group to the attention of the House is that I believe that such work is the ideal way in which to help the poor and needy. The Government programs that have grown into what can best be described as a welfare industry help some people, but they serve to remove from most Americans the feeling of responsibility for the welfare of their neighbors. The attitude that the Government will take care of everyone, and that we do not share in the task beyond paying taxes has acted to alienate Americans from one another. If we return to the ethic that these people in La Habra exemplify, we will be returning to the standard of conduct that makes each of us willing to help his neighbor. It would be my hope that the example of these wonderful people would in some small way serve to spur others to similar action.

There is yet another consideration here, and that is the tremendous cost of the welfare industry. More volunteer activity by people on a community-by-community basis would not only

bring us all closer together, but it would enable us to cut back on the inefficient and impersonal welfare system that seems only to encourage dependence and fraud. Please take the good works of these friends of mine from La Habra to heart and learn the important lesson that they have to share with all of us.

I ask unanimous consent the the following material be inserted in the RECORD.

PTA THRIFTSHOP OF LA HABRA, INC.

(By Gerda Clerke)

The PTA Thriftshop is a nonprofit, tax-exempt, all volunteer organization. We have been in existence since 1958. We were started by the then existing 6 local PTAs. The original idea was to provide a store where low income families could clothe their children cheaply, and hopefully to help with the proceeds to cover "emergency welfare needs of children in our community", as our bylaws state. Some starting money was needed and the newly created Thriftshop borrowed from each of the participating PTAs \$50. This money was paid back within the first year of operation and we were also able to handle a few welfare needs.

The Thriftshop operates independently of PTA. We operate under our own bylaws and under our own Board. We do rely on our PTAs for volunteers and donated usable items. Each PTA is responsible for staffing the shop for 2 weeks on a rotating basis.

Our overhead expenses are relatively small. We do not buy any of our merchandise, we sell only donated items. We have no paid staff. We do have to pay rent, utilities, liability insurance, necessary office supplies, etc., and we pay Sales Tax.

Our profits have from the start gone toward student welfare needs (not recipients of federal welfare programs, but hardship cases). As our profits increased we started a scholarship program for needy and deserving High School Seniors. At first these awards totaled only a few hundred dollars per year. Within the last three years we have given our scholarships in excess of \$20,000, this current year in the amount of \$9,900. But the scholarships are not our top priority, they will be given out as funds permit. Our top priority is to take care of student welfare needs. Referrals come to us through school nurses and/or administrators, who screen each case carefully to determine actual need. In contrast to our scholarship program, which receives wide publicity, all needy cases are handled on a strictly confidential basis, with no publicity ever. Even our Board does not have access to names of people who have been helped.

The help we have been giving to needy students in our more than 20 years of operations has covered a wide range: thousands of dollars have covered cost of many eyeglasses, hearing aids, medical and dental costs, prescription costs, etc. It is impossible to break the cost of help down into percentages per category. We act according to need; one year this need might run into thousands of dollars, while in another year it might be under \$1,000. Also, every year we pay for many pairs of new shoes and new clothing for needy children.

Our PTAs have started two other social welfare programs: a Dental (started 1961) and a Medical Program (started 1973), in which area doctors volunteer to take 2 needy cases per year free of charge. Our Thriftshop is obligated under our bylaws to pay for all actual costs of treatment (lab fees, X-rays) etc. and for all prescriptions needed in treatment. These two programs

also operate under their own bylaws and officers. The Thriftshop has contributed toward the operating costs of these two organizations and also made larger donations toward the dental health and nutrition education efforts of the Dental Program.

Occasionally we have made contributions to other organizations working in the field of child welfare, *i.e.* in 1978 \$300 to "For Kids Sake" (child abuse) and this year \$500 to the Gary Center's Dental Clinic.

Our purpose is to help children. Our prices are considerably lower than those of other area Thriftshops. In other words an awful lot of volunteer effort and dedication goes into raising the money we spend on child welfare. Just a few practical examples to illustrate what the Thriftshop is all about:

Many years ago a Jr. Hi girl, very attractive, came to school always dressed in a real shabby man's jacket—it was all she had. Thriftshop volunteers took her on a shopping trip and outfitted her with everything from underwear to dresses, shoes, coat, etc. The change in the girl's morale and personality was unbelievable. Or: a kid contracted polio, despite immunizations; many operations were needed (insurance doesn't cover everything) and the parents could not handle everything. The Thriftshop was one of the community organizations helping out until Children's Hospital took over treatment; we also bought the needed orthopedic shoes for the child.

Or: father in prison, 3 children, 2 elementary age, 1 Jr. Hi. Mother works but doesn't make enough to make ends meet, and she makes a few dollars too many to qualify for welfare and food stamps. The mother goes to work in summer sandals which are falling apart, the only shoes she has. The children's shoes are in equally bad shape—and this was during the rainy season. We bought new shoes for the whole family and also supplied them with some badly needed clothing and other items.

Or: during one very hot summer a very poor family with a baby in the house and the refrigerator breaks down, and there isn't money for the repairman. We paid for the refrigerator repair.

Or: a child is constantly late for school. The child tries very hard, but the mother just wasn't cooperating in getting him up in the mornings. The school nurse asked if we would pay for an alarmclock for the child. We did and the problem was solved.

Or: a girl wants to be a cheerleader at her High School, but there is no money in the family to pay for luxuries like a cheer leader's uniform. We paid for it.

Sometimes we help in other ways or try to. One year one of our scholarship recipients came back after he had received his check, almost in tears: "My family is on welfare and food stamps and the social worker cancelled our food stamps because of the scholarship and I don't want to hurt my Mom." We called welfare and food stamp office and wrote many letters to Legislators, County Supervisor, HEW, etc. We have a stack of correspondence on this case. The boy's old High School and the High School District Office were very helpful with also writing letters to Legislators and Agencies. The sad news is that regulations are regulations. Welfare benefits are not affected by scholarships, but for food stamp purposes scholarships are considered family income! The only way around this is to give the scholarship to the college directly, so no cash goes into the hands of the recipient directly. A family tries to better themselves and get out of the welfare mess and they get penalized because they were honest enough to tell the Social Worker of the scholarship. The happy ending of this story

is that the sister of this boy received one of our scholarships this year and the girl told us proudly: "My family is no longer on welfare and food stamps." A case like this where you can help somebody who is also trying to help himself, makes us especially happy.

We could tell many more of such human interest stories, but the ones above might give some idea of what the PTA Thriftshop is all about. ●

SOVIET AGGRESSION IN AFGHANISTAN

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the brutal Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is a flagrant violation of the integrity of an independent nation and demonstrates a callous disdain for world opinion.

We cannot be surprised at this illegal act in view of Soviet behavior since the Second World War. The Soviet Union has never worried about legal technicalities when it has seized an opportunity to expand its influence. We must, however, recognize that the invasion of Afghanistan represents a new departure in Soviet foreign policy. Such overt military action has not been undertaken outside of the Eastern bloc. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the United States, its allies, and all countries which treasure their independence to make it clear to the Soviet Union that the costs it will incur for this invasion are too great. The Soviet must never again feel that they have more to gain than to lose by such an undertaking.

The recent vote in the United Nations was a heartening demonstration of the world's outrage. The overwhelming majority of nations condemned Soviet actions in Afghanistan. The Soviet Union was no doubt taken aback by its sudden isolation in the international community.

Verbal condemnations, however, are obviously not enough to change Soviet behavior. Stronger measures are called for, and I wholeheartedly support the measures announced by President Carter on January 4. Taken in concert, I believe they will have a punitive effect on the Soviet Union, particularly if we have the support of our allies.

Deferring consideration of SALT II will not be perceived by the Soviet Union as being a serious blow in view of Soviet doubts that the treaty would have been ratified soon in any event. It was an appropriate move, however, because we cannot possibly maintain a "business as usual" attitude in the face of aggression. I still believe that the SALT II Treaty is in the best long-range interests of both countries, and I hope the treaty will be considered at a more propitious time.

Reducing our trade will hamper Soviet efforts to satisfy the growing consumer demands within the U.S.S.R. Limiting the transfer of high technol-

ogy items will hinder the growth of certain industries, while the curtailment of Soviet fishing in U.S. waters will cost the Soviets 3 percent of their annual fish catch.

The grain embargo demonstrates an important truth in today's world. Responding to an outside threat demands sacrifice. I agree with the President that the American farmers should not be forced to bear the entire burden of punishing the Soviet Union. Increased Government assistance to farmers is necessary to distribute the costs more evenly among all Americans. This expense will be borne by all taxpayers and consumers in this time of crisis.

The claim has been made by many of my colleagues that the suspension of grain sales to the Soviet Union will hurt the United States more than it will hurt the Russians. We should not minimize the cost to ourselves, but neither should we minimize the cost to the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. relies on us for about two-thirds of its grain imports. The Kremlin commitment to build up the country's meat supplies cannot be realized without U.S. grain. The Soviet Union is far from being a consumer-oriented society, but no nation wants to risk the kind of instability that can come from consumer dissatisfaction. The Soviet Union remembers all too well the food riots in Poland a few years ago which led to a change in that country's leadership.

The Kremlin does not have to answer to public opinion as do governments in free societies. Its disregard of human rights within the Soviet Union, as evidenced by the suppression of dissenters such as Andrei Sakharov, is aimed at maintaining a disciplined, if silent, public.

The Soviet leaders can prevent their people from knowing the truth about their motives and activities in Afghanistan. Moving the Olympic games from Moscow, however, would bring home to the people of the Soviet Union the outrage with which the rest of the world regards Soviet aggression. The people will have to question the wisdom of their leaders when their country is denied the prestige of hosting the Olympic games.

The Soviet Union has made no pretense about the political nature of the Olympics. Just as Hitler sought to demonstrate through the 1936 Olympics the superiority of the "aryan" race, the Soviet Union has sought to prove the superiority of the Communist political system. The world cannot confer legitimacy upon a government which commits illegal acts. I join with the President and my colleagues in Congress in urging the removal of the Olympics from Moscow. If they cannot be moved in time, the games should be postponed or canceled.

Much of what I have so far discussed has been criticized as being more symbol than substance. Taken together, I believe these actions will have a profound effect on the Soviet Union. We must, however, also evaluate what our military response ought to be.

The geographical location of Afghanistan means that the Soviets can present a greater threat to our vital interests in the Middle East. We must make it clear that intervention in the affairs of Afghanistan's neighbors will not be tolerated.

The United States must be ready to respond to any threat to its vital interests. We must be prepared. Readiness, however, does not mean merely increasing the military budget.

This crisis must not be used as a cover for more waste in our defense budget and indiscriminate spending in the name of national security. The Congress still has a responsibility to scrutinize the proposed increases and determine where the money will be best spent to truly enhance our security. It is in this time of crisis, more than ever, that we must use our resources wisely.

I will support all efforts to defend our Nation and our allies from outside threats. There can be no ambiguity in the position of the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. There must be no misunderstanding of either country's intentions. No miscalculation can be made which would lead to greater confrontation and ultimately nuclear holocaust. This time of crisis calls for firmness and clarity in our relations. ●

WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I heard from a country banker down in east Texas. Jon Ruff is president of the First State Bank in Hallsville and was writing me about an article written by Bill Simon that he had read in the Wall Street Journal.

Bill Simon wrote an excellent article, and he ended up with this question about Congress, "Do they understand and are they committed to the fundamental principles and ideals that gave us the abundance and freedom that is America?"

Jon lives in a small town so he works 12 hours a day to make a living. He cannot understand the actions of politicians in Congress.

He does understand the sound logic of Bill Simon. When Bill was Secretary of the Treasury, he talked more commonsense than anybody in Washington. Since the Democrats controlled Congress, they were not listening.

At this time we have before us a windfall profits tax bill. This bill will tax American oil companies over 70 percent and will put a zero-percent tax on OPEC companies. Six years ago we were importing \$3 billion of foreign oil, but this year America will import \$80 billion in oil.

Let us see what Bill Simon said in the Wall Street Journal last week about "Free Enterprise and the Pols." Here is Simon's statement about the windfall profits tax.

In the first place, it's not a tax on profits. Its assessment does not even include a calculation of profits.

It's not in any sense of the word a "windfall." By every reckoning that I have seen—intermediate term or long-term, profit margins, return-on-equity, return-on-debt and equity, etc.—the oil industry's profits lie somewhere in the middle of the spectrum of American industry.

It is really nothing more than a penalty assessment on the future productive and creative endeavors of an industry whose hands have already been effectively tied by a cornucopia of federal and state regulations; regulations that have produced a triple header of knocking the industry out of the ring of world-wide competition, preventing the production of even one drop of incremental oil or gas, and compelling this great nation to kow-tow to a bunch of desert sheiks. There is no economic or financial justification for this madness—only political.

No, these pandering morons on the Potomac see the political benefit in "punishing" the oil companies. The pols and the press have already succeeded in deflecting the true blame for our energy crisis from Washington to the industry. Those "leaders" know that there are critical re-election votes in this shabby act of dishonesty but, after all, no one should be surprised because they only have one over-riding concern and that is their own re-election. So, in the process, few understand that it's not the "oil companies" we are punishing—it is the American people. ●

NASA'S FUTURE

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1980

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, Science magazine last month published a provocative article that cogently describes the problems the National Aeronautics and Space Administration faces in trying to chart a path for its future. So that all of our colleagues may have an opportunity to read this excellent article, I would insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

UNCERTAINTIES MARK SPACE PROGRAM OF THE 1980's

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

(NOTE.—Problems with the space shuttle, described in Science on 23 November, have seriously weakened other programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The following article describes the agency's attempts in light of these problems to chart a path for its future, and a related article (p. 1288) outlines the special troubles ahead for planetary exploration.)

"What we see is a classic case of a program and agency in search of a mission." Nine years ago, then-Senator Walter Mondale used these words to describe the struggles of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to win approval for the space shuttle. Today, as the shuttle nears completion despite technical road-

blocks, the words still ring true: NASA is in the midst of an identity crisis. Having successfully placed a man on the moon at the end of the last decade, NASA remains bewitched by the question, what next?

There is a growing realization that the shuttle was approved as the workhorse of the space program in the 1980's with little thought as to what work it would actually perform. Although its capabilities have been limited by design changes, its potential is still great enough to produce confusion and squabbling among NASA's constituents and planners. President Carter was asked almost immediately after his inauguration to step in and chart the agency's path, but to date he has refused to do so, and produced only an ordering of priorities without any commitments.

Lacking an outside mandate, NASA has repeatedly had its budget chopped by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Space enthusiasts on NASA's authorizing subcommittees have been unable to put back projects desired neither by the executive nor by NASA's legion of fiscal watchdogs and space critics. Although the agency's technical competence and morale is said to depend in part on a continuous string of new projects leading to space launches, no new projects were approved last year; with major cost overruns on the shuttle, NASA's new program requests for fiscal 1981 might all be rejected.

Cutbacks have been particularly severe in NASA's most basic scientific research—planetary exploration, whose slice of the NASA pie has been hovering around 5 percent for several years. Angelo Guastaferrro, the program's director, notes that "we've had 22 planetary encounters in the last 10 years. We'll be fortunate if we can achieve seven or eight in the next 10." The only planetary encounter authorized at present is the Galileo orbiter and probe of Jupiter, which will not reach its destination until 1986 or later, given delays brought on by problems with the shuttle. The Pioneer and Voyager programs to orbit Venus, Jupiter, and Saturn will all have ended by fall 1981. Sam Dallas, a project manager of NASA's proposed imaging radar orbit of Venus, fears that during this 5-year hiatus in planetary encounters, "scientists and engineers will be forced into other areas, with talent lost to private industry or defense. It will hurt future recruiting, too, as graduate students look elsewhere for thesis topics." Larry Colin, deputy director of space sciences at NASA's Ames Research Center, says "We've got nothing to talk about but wishes and dreams. We'll see a grand-scale exodus from the field, with some of our best talent flying to the four winds."

The scientists are especially chagrined because, to the extent the hiatus is stretched out by the shuttle's inadequacies, it was all foreseen as early as 1975. Then the National Academy of Sciences' (NAS) space sciences board, at the urging of Gerald Wasserburg of Caltech, recommended that "NASA maintain direct launch capability" (other than the shuttle) adequate for planetary programs, until the shuttle became fully operational. The advice was rejected, and the program is reaping the consequences now. Also, to the extent that the shuttle has eaten up money that would otherwise be available for divisions such as space science or applications, managers there have become embittered. The NAS space science board wrote in 1971, "It is clear that space science and applications by themselves are insufficient to justify the cost of developing the shuttle." As uncertainty grows concerning the uses to which the shuttle may actually be put, this assessment seems borne out. There can at least be no dispute that the shuttle expense has set the chronology

of anticipated science missions back by at least 5 years, and forced the outright cancellations of missions such as a lunar polar orbiter or a rendezvous with Haley's comet in 1986.

John Naugle, formerly, NASA's top scientist and now an agency consultant, claims that the cutbacks, combined with the absence of a strong White House space policy, "have had a devastating effect on the morale of the agency." In contrast to the heady days when NASA's employees were a almost spiritually motivated by the single purpose of reaching the moon before the Soviets, the agency is now in philosophical and motivational disarray.

Into what they claim is this breach of aggressive space leadership have stepped two senators who still share its passion, Senators Adlai Stevenson (D-Ill.) and Harrison Schmitt (R-N.M.), both of the subcommittee on science, technology, and space. Schmitt, who sprang into the Senate from his stint as an Apollo astronaut, comes by his space enthusiasm naturally; Stevenson's accrues largely from his position as subcommittee chairman. Both have introduced national legislation, cosponsored by 20 other senators, that would commit the United States to pursuit of specific goals in space. Stevenson's bill, the less ambitious of the two, orders continued research in communications and solar power satellites (Science, 23 November), stepped-up planetary exploration, and creation of a permanent office to operate so-called microwaves to survey land and water for government, private, and foreign clients. Schmitt's bill commits NASA not only to a program of remote sensing and satellite communications, but also to a space station or solar power satellite by the year 2000, and to additional manned planetary exploration (presumably to Mars) by 2010. Shrewdly, neither sponsor has attached a price tag to these goals.

Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, backs the legislation, and suggests dire consequences if it is not enacted: "We are doubtful that a coherent program can survive without a formal, long-term commitment; in the absence of such a commitment, if decisions were to be taken sporadically, each considered within the context of a single annual budget cycle, the losses to science could be substantial and of national proportions."

So far, his clarion call has fallen on deaf ears, and the legislation has moved nowhere. As a first step, Stevenson and Schmitt have agreed to work out a compromise, but with Stevenson's retirement from the senate next year, any momentum gained by then could slip away. Over in the House, where the committee often seems composed of would-be astronauts, and the chairman sits in the midst of smiling astronaut photos and plastic rockets enclosed in glass, the bills have not even been introduced. Concerted opposition from the White House and a lack of public support contribute to disinterest. White House science adviser Frank Press, expressing the official Carter policy in a statement that brings him toe to toe with Handler, told the Senate subcommittee that "it is more appropriate, I believe, that priorities be set depending on the promise of the science and technology available and the budget situation at a given time, rather than overspecifying now what the future needs will be."

This sentiment was not well received by the bills' sponsors. "I sense that this administration has as its objective reorganization, study, and restudy, and that is one of the reasons it is such a small achiever," Stevenson responded tartly. Schmitt added, "I can't tell from this [Carter's policy] where this country is headed in space, Frank. I just can't see it in there. Right now, the

people that are going to have to carry out a space policy won't get anything out of this document other than a statement 'we're going to continue to look at it and then maybe we'll make some decision.'"

But Press knows that the senators have not got enough support to mount a serious threat to the President's deliberate non-policy. In the era of limits, space is perceived as well within the outer reaches of the earth's atmosphere; fiscal pressures fall particularly heavy on such high-visibility basic research. There is a tendency to approach each new space project leading to a launch as a new federal program, notes Guastafiero. And the programs are not small. The lead time to develop a technological base for the more complicated planetary missions has become stretched and the cost has gone up, to a point where planetary encounters currently may require 10 years of planning and development, costing as much as \$500 million. Since flaws in the spacecraft obviously are beyond repair, the risks attendant to such large expense can be enormous. The \$95 million Seasat, launched into orbit last June to monitor ocean conditions, operated for 99 days before an avoidable electrical short ended its life 9 months too soon. With no huge manned program such as the Apollo behind which to hide, such failures in space science and applications achieve notoriety.

Thus, the task facing NASA becomes one of almost continuous salesmanship, both public and congressional, at which it has done especially poorly since Apollo ended. The agency, for example, spends enormous sums for public relations and on the graphic illustrations and simulations of space that one encounters everywhere throughout NASA's installations. But sales efforts work better with some programs than with others. Where as Earth-orbiting satellites with direct and useful applications may be easy to sell, planetary exploration is really only large-scale, short-duration basic research. As such, it shares the vulnerability of all basic research. Charles Hall, who directed the recent Pioneer probe of Saturn from NASA's Ames Research Center, explains, "I can point to no immediate, tangible benefits from planetary exploration that are easy to get a hold of. You have to be honest with yourself. Some of the statements about applications will be hard to prove in the long run; controlling weather on Earth, for example, is obviously not possible." Hall adds that the studies of ozone on Venus are an exception to this generalization, but that such exceptions are few.

Knowing this to be an obstacle, NASA's officials rarely attempt to sell the programs purely basic research. Noel Hinners, formerly NASA's top scientist and currently director of the National Air and Space Museum, notes that "even scientists don't understand that a lot of the space program is not being done just for science. If you were competing for all of the science money, you would never spend a billion dollars to do a Viking planetary program; it's not a pure kind of science trade-off." Instead, the engineers and scientists mention other values, few of them quantifiable in a benefit-cost analysis of the type fashionable at OMB.

The most prominent non-scientific goal that NASA used to crow about, for example, was technological and psychological dominance over the Soviets; this polemic fell victim, however, to the agency's clear, decisive 1969 victory and is rarely mentioned anymore. So officials such as Naugle now invoke the "basic need for challenging things to keep a society like ours healthy." As soon becomes evident with this sort of thing, many of the agency's directors suffer from what might be described as the intrinsic inarticulateness of men who climb mountains.

"We explore the planets for more than just science," says Tom Young, the associate director at Ames. "The primary reason is new knowledge, but there is also the need to explore new frontiers and the stimulation of national pride and prestige. But I don't want to sound like Madison Avenue." Perhaps feeling some inadequacies, the agency has recently recruited James Michener, the novelist; Norman Cousins, the longtime editor of Saturday Review; Ray Bradbury, the science fiction writer; and Jacques Cousteau, the underwater explorer—committed and eloquent space buffs all—to testify before congressional committees and the public about the value of its million-dollar science projects.

But even if the agency has learned how to sell, it still may not know what. The confusion stems in part from the fact that technical capabilities in space have outpaced the national ability to spend, so the choices are many and the decisions difficult. Compounding the problem is the inherent unwillingness of the agency's engineers to be practical. Bruce Murray, director of the Jet Propulsion Lab (JPL) in Pasadena, likes to say that "NASA has the only federal charter for institutionalized imagination." Unfortunately, the same imagination that results in impressive breakthroughs may also result in absurd ideas. Hinners notes "the agency is often pulled along by the dreamers, obsessed with the fascination of building these unusual things. The engineering gets done before one considers adequately the use to which it would be put." The shuttle is an example of this, he says. "To often, it is very late in the game that scientists are called in to see how they would use what is being built." The process only exacerbates scientist-engineer differences and leads to internal squabbling over what the agency ought to be doing.

The problem as it relates to NASA's lack of success at selling itself is twofold: One, the agency fails to present a unified, identifiable theme, and two, the agency's wild ideas have a way of bubbling to the top at almost exactly the wrong moments, demonstrating an embarrassing lack of restraint. The agency is still living down the classic example, which occurred as long ago as 1969. In the midst of clamor for more attention to domestic troubles, a special commission led by Vice President Spiro Agnew produced a report that suggested building a 50-man space station, a manned base on the moon, a shuttlecraft that would run in between, and a manned flight to Mars by 1985. Reaction was so extreme that even today the agency is chary of discussing its badly desired unmanned mission to return a rock sample from Mars, a mission that would itself cost at least \$1 billion. Sam Dallas attributes the Agnew proposal to "simple greed, following the Apollo success."

It is not clear, however, that the agency and its constituents have taken his sentiment to heart: Many observers consider the contemporary example of the Agnew proposals to be the highly discussed solar power satellite, which may cost more than \$100 billion. Peter Glaser, an executive of Arthur D. Little, Inc., who holds a patent on the concept, explains that it was conceived as a competitor to the fast breeder reactor for power generation. He would like to see a pilot solar satellite plan completed by the mid-1980's, a prototype by the mid 1990's and construction shortly after the year 2000. The project would require—at the least—severe modifications of the soon to be completed shuttle. "Of course, we already know that the Soviets, the Japanese, and the British may be interested in building this if we don't," Glaser says.

Other thoughts prevail in Congress. Representative George Brown (D-Calif.), chair-

man of the House subcommittee on science research, and technology cautions that "the program could totally devour all the effort, capital, and technology available to move forward in near space." Others feel it might devour the credibility of the agency's enthusiasts, and which much smaller proposals depend.

A particularly sharp critic of the proposal, and of the space community's other grand-scale ideas is Senator William Proxmire (D-Wis.), chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that must approve NASA's budget. Proxmire's views are more extreme than those of the members of his subcommittee, but his sentiments about NASA and its ideas are clearly shared by many. "I think the agency has its priorities wrong, much of the time," he told Science in an interview. The space telescope, a darling of the space astronomers that is currently nearing completion, "could have been built 5 to 10 years from now just as easily as today. The end of the universe will be there for a long time, and considering that light from outside the galaxy has already been traveling millions of years to get here, a few more years will not hurt. Every federal program is under great pressures, and NASA's are no different; as a spending priority, space pales in relation to education, transportation, or health. It's been a kind of fad, this intense competition with the Soviet Union. Then, when a huge bureaucracy was constructed to get us to the moon, it conceived of the shuttle just to save some jobs. I'd like to see it oriented in the most practical direction possible, probably in earth applications, and work that will increase productivity. Then we hear about the proposals for a Beverly Hills in the sky [Gerard O'Neill's space station]; to build anything like that would cost trillions of dollars."

Agency employees surveyed at three of NASA's centers almost uniformly derided such views as parochial. Fiscally conservative congressmen and budget planners at OMB were labeled nothing more than "bean counters." A common line, in which even new NASA employees are well tutored, is that NASA's budget has plenty of room for growth because HEW and several of the larger agencies spend the equivalent of its annual budget every week. Murray of JPL asserts that "the interest of the people in space exploration is enormous. The Washington process is a cynical one, and out of touch. It's just not popular to vote for imaginative things. Neither OMB nor Congress has a cubbyhole for imagination."

The only way to circumvent such thinking, Murray continues, is for the President to speak out vigorously on behalf of the space program. "The President's the only one that can testify to its viability. Carter believes in space exploration—the only problem is that he doesn't project this," Murray says. "As a southern preacher, he thinks we have to suffer for a better future, and he doesn't articulate the exciting opportunities. His policy is nothing more than a utilitarian program 8 years too late—it's the Republican space program. You can see that it was written by staff people. It lacks fire and pizzazz; what he doesn't realize is that the country's mood has changed."

Without more concerted attention at the top, Murray and his sympathizers are planning what any disaffected interest group would do in similar circumstances: to aggressively enlist grass-roots public support and to build a special-interest lobby on space to garner more federal funds. Lou Friedman, an advanced mission planner at JPL, is contemplating a 6-month's leave of absence to get the ball rolling. "I don't know that we want to influence legislation," he says, "at least not directly."

This might run afoul of proscriptions on political involvement by government employees. "What we'd like to do is increase the public's general level of interest." One idea he mentions is to broadcast the Galileo encounter with Jupiter as a miniseries on television, and ask viewers to nominate which of the planet's poles or moons they would like it to visit. "Out of ten to 20 encounters with the moons, we could give one or two to the public," he says. "Now I know that scientists may cry, 'oh Jesus, they picked the wrong one,' but I think it's important that space be considered a public program in the truest sense." Friedman says he is uncertain where the sponsorship would come from and leaves that as detail to be worked out along the way.

Some might consider this an extreme reaction on the scientists' side, but there is widespread interest in building up a base of support that will insulate the agency from the vicissitudes of the annual budget authorization process. Several space scientists suggest the best way for this to happen would merely be for the agency to develop an integrated program of small-scale projects, and to forego large shuttle-type expenditures. More money would then be available for earth-orbiting satellites, and planetary exploration, too. NASA has labeled the 1980's "A Decade to Learn." The question is, how painful a lesson will it be? ●

PRESIDENT CARTER'S SPEECH UPLIFTING

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, President Carter's state of the Union speech is a timely and most welcome announcement that this country will no longer tolerate Soviet expansionism.

As one who has seen the true horrors of war at first hand, I have repeatedly warned that this country is taking grave risks with our national security by permitting the military to be ravaged by time, inflation, and a policy of not caring. The recent Russian occupation of Afghanistan is living proof that the Soviets mean business. President Carter understands this, I understand this, and it is hoped that the Congress will now recognize the severity of the threat facing this country.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I will support an administrative budgetary request for an improved military. I believe that we must do everything possible to start building new ships for our weakened Navy, new tanks to match the large number of Russian tanks, and a new bomber to replace the aging B-52's.

I also urge the Congress not to take a myopic view of our defense policy. While it is true that Europe lies uppermost in the minds of many people and while it is true that the huge oil reserves of the Middle East are of vital importance to us, let us not forget Asia. In recent years, I have seen an erosion of military capabilities in the

Pacific. This policy is dangerous and must be reversed.

President Carter is right in warning aggressors that we will no longer tolerate direct military threats to our security or the security of our friends. It is hoped that the leaders of Iran are listening to the President. The fate of the 50 hostages have not left the minds of Americans and there is no doubt that the Iranians face greater dangers from the Russians than from the Western nations. We want action on the hostages now and it is to their best interests that the Iranian Government respond favorably to the President's request for their immediate release. I believe that the mood of my colleagues in the Congress is unanimously behind the President on this matter and we will support any reasonable call he makes for action to secure their release.

One issue the President requested in his statement was the reinstatement of registration for a draft. This registration proposal was not supported by the administration last year and the Congress failed to pass it. In the weeks to come, my committee will most certainly be reviewing this matter and I am sure, will favorably act on it. It is my sincere hope that should this drastic action be necessary for the defense of freedom, that the American youth who will be affected will speak out in support of a willingness to defend our country should the need arise.

President Carter is also to be lauded for his stance on energy. This country can no longer depend on foreign oil to the extent that we now do. I have joined many of my colleagues in a call for a concerted drive to develop alternative energy sources. I stand behind the President in his call for action on this crucial matter. I understand that many are reluctant to expend the vast resources that this will require. But unless we act now, future generations will look back in time and wonder why we failed to provide the leadership that is required now.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Americans face hard challenges in the months ahead. This will require a careful analysis of our priorities. I am convinced that Americans are ready and willing to do whatever is needed to keep our country strong. President Carter deserves our fullest support in this endeavor and it is rewarding to know that the White House is in good hands.

Thank you. ●

DECriminalIZATION OF MARIHUANA

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a variety of alarming medical and social

problems associated with the use of marihuana have been highlighted by recent Senate judiciary hearings on "decriminalization".

I bring to my colleagues attention an editorial from the January 20, 1980, Washington Star arguing that "Decriminalization," as included within the proposed new uniform Federal criminal code, would be unwise.

This editorial, along with one from the Christian Science Monitor of January 21, 1980, as the panel topic, are as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 20, 1980]

WRONG GESTURE, WRONG TIME

Two days of hearings before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee last week should raise a warning flag against the Senate's misguided and untimely push to "decriminalize" marijuana.

The critical issue is a proposal in the new uniform federal criminal code that would reduce possession of one ounce or less of marijuana from a misdemeanor to an "infraction," comparable to overparking. Other proposed changes would reduce the fine and eliminate imprisonment altogether for possession of one to five ounces.

The latter measure, while debatable, is less important than the former. Professional psychologist contended in the hearings that severe criminal penalties may injure youthful pot-users more than the drug itself. Their counsel is not to be dismissed lightly. And indeed the wisdom of imprisonment for consensual offenses is under intense debate today, and not only in connection with drug use.

But again, the crucial issue is the lifting of criminal sanctions against marijuana altogether. Here the social and medical evidence seems to us conclusive. It would be a mistake.

When reputable witnesses tell a Senate subcommittee that perhaps 10 per cent of U.S. high school seniors are "large" users of marijuana, meaning three to five joints a day, the country has an epidemic on its hands.

Probably that epidemic will be more successfully attacked in the long run by drug-abuse education and by parental concern and surveillance, than by federal law. But decriminalization is not a mere reform. It is a gesture of social policy—a signal that would surely be invoked to support the complacent contention that pot is a harmless pleasure to be freed everywhere of the stigma of criminality.

The measures under consideration now reflect the relaxed—but medically ignorant—climate of a few years ago when decriminalization was the fashionable cry. The Senate redrafted the law two years ago in response to that cry, relying on Judiciary Committee hearings of three years earlier. In the intervening years, the medical consensus on marijuana has changed, and it continues to change.

Among the findings put to the subcommittee last week, consider the following:

Habitual use (and perhaps only occasional use) is hazardous to human reproductive systems, male and female. It lowers testosterone levels in males, with uncertain effects at puberty when so many children first experiment with it. It lowers hormonal levels in women, causing infertility and perhaps even the risk of fetal deformity for those of child-bearing age.

Marijuana's active agent THC (tetrahydrocannabinol) has an affinity for fatty tissues, where traces of it linger, with possibly dangerous effects on cell division, for weeks. The brain is especially vulner-

able. Some experiments indicate EEGs of habitual users are those of persons six to eight years younger.

The drug is irritating to the respiratory system, and possibly a more powerful carcinogen than nicotine. And the insult to lung tissues may not be entirely reversible.

These findings are controversial, of course. We know that kids aren't always deterred from silly pleasures even by proven medical dangers. But we also know that medical evidence of the harmfulness of marijuana is accumulating, that it isn't the innocuous drug some decriminalization advocates were so confidently advertising a few years ago, and that its use—perhaps in part because of the decriminalization propaganda—is swiftly increasing among young people even as the evidence of danger accumulates.

This is hardly the time for Congress to transmit the signal that would be implicit in decriminalization. We are aware of the social and legal pressures underlying this misguided initiative—including the harsh penalties that give the anti-marijuana cause a bad name in some jurisdictions. Degrees of punishment, or alternatives to punishment, may be appropriate for discussion; but that isn't the issue here.

The point is that federal marijuana decriminalization would be the wrong gesture at the wrong time, signaling a slack society's abdication to the responsibility to deal, sternly and intelligently, with a menace to the health and discipline of its children.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 21, 1980]

DRUG ALERT

Americans lulled into going along with the view that "pot" and "coke" are acceptable and largely harmless forms of recreation in 1980 may be in for a rude shock. All-too-routine news headlines over the past few days, in fact, ought to alert everyone to the distressing impact drug dependency in all its forms is having on many segments of society. In Tokyo, for instance, former Beatles star Paul McCartney is questioned in connection with a half pound of marijuana which narcotics agents say he brought into Japan. In Memphis, a respected doctor is found guilty of overprescribing "uppers" and "downers" and an assortment of other pills to another one-time rock idol, Elvis Presley. And in Boston, a prominent suburban physician and former state mental health commissioner is fined for failing to report drugs he prescribed to David Kennedy, son of the late Senator Robert Kennedy.

Testimony by researchers before a Senate judiciary subcommittee last week, however, offers encouraging evidence that at least some congressmen and drug experts are deciding such widely used drugs as marijuana need to be taken more seriously. Some former proponents of decriminalizing marijuana appear to be waking up to the dangers and destructive influence of so-called "head shops" with their drug paraphernalia and encouragement of drug abuse.

In this testimony researchers and public health officials not only underscored the disturbing extent of marijuana use, particularly among teen-agers. They disclosed that far from being a "harmless giggle" (as one rock star called it) marijuana is a "major and serious public health hazard." Dr. Robert DuPont, president of the Institute for Behavior and Health and a former director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse, was one testifier who explained that the growth of marijuana use and new medical research had led him to reverse his previous position in support of dropping criminal

penalties for the use of small amounts of marijuana.

Although marijuana smoking among high-school students leveled off last year, the number of youngsters reporting daily use of the drug nearly doubled between 1975 and 1978. Moreover, new statistics from the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research indicate that cocaine use among high-school students is on the increase.

The potential health costs of such drug habits, of course, are only a small part of the problem. Organized crime feeds off the estimated \$50 billion it receives annually from illicit narcotics. Law-enforcement officials in Florida, in particular, are struggling with limited success to contain the smuggling of vast amounts of cocaine and marijuana from Cuba and Colombia, trafficking which has led to street violence and killings between warring crime factions.

Federal law-enforcement officials have improved their coordination of enforcement efforts and are focusing primarily on apprehending the organizers and financiers of the smuggling racket, rather than the users. But similar coordination in Congress in formulating a continuing and comprehensive narcotics policy would be helped by a proposal put forward by Senator DeConcini to create a Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. The House already has such a committee. But the Senate's oversight of the various aspects of narcotics abuse is spread out over at least five standing committees.

More federal money and manpower might help curtail the drug-related killings and other violent crimes that have prompted Florida officials to ask for more outside assistance. But greater public alertness to the potential dangers of drug abuse to society and individuals remains the foremost need. ●

A SALUTE TO INTERNS

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, each Member of the Congress, during the course of the session, has the opportunity to provide a learning experience in the operations of the legislative system for students throughout the United States. I am uniquely honored this year to have five outstanding students from Nashville, Tenn. These young people, with their zest for learning and their drive to assist our office in legislative research, should be recognized for their outstanding contribution to our congressional operations. Hailing from Nashville, Tenn., are Nancy Graves, Katie Groos, and Joanna McIntosh, students at Harpeth Hall School. Lisa Halprin and Bill Beck are students at the University School in Nashville. These five Tennesseans will take their experiences in the Nation's Capital home to Tennessee.

Interns are more than useful in congressional operations. They are essential in providing a link to the constituency we serve. The Congress is lucky to have these young people all year round to provide fresh ideas and the necessary enthusiasm to accomplish unreachable goals. ●

A MIG PILOT CHOOSES FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker on January 14, I called attention to a Reader's Digest account of the heroic escape of Soviet Mig-25 pilot Viktor Belenko to the West.

Today, I would like to introduce a portion of that article into the RECORD. I would like to make some personal observations. Now, while the Soviet Union is consolidating the subjugation of the people of Afghanistan, continuing its pincer movement to assure them control of the Gulf of Hormuz, policymakers are lamenting the end of détente. Détente, of course, never really existed, except as figments of hyperactive imaginations.

Viktor Belenko's story reveals the nature of Soviet society in that all activities are utterly subordinate to the construction of the Soviet military machine. We ought to keep that somber fact in mind as we try to formulate policies to protect the security of our Nation.

The article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, January 1980]

A MIG PILOT CHOOSES FREEDOM BLACK CROWS, WHITE CROWS

The Soviet Union maintains a military auxiliary, the Voluntary Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force and Navy—or DOSAAF, from its Russian acronym. Among other functions, it provides young volunteers with military instruction preparatory to their entry into the armed services. The branch in Omsk offered flight training and by finding a job there Viktor reasoned, he could learn to fly, through DOSAAF.

Omsk was an important center of armament production. When Viktor arrived in June 1965, the factories manufacturing tanks, armored vehicles, artillery and aircraft engines were producing around the clock. Jobs were plentiful; the problem was finding a place to live. So a relative steered Viktor to the repair garage of the Omsk airport, which maintained a dormitory and cafeteria for its employees.

The garage, a cavernous brick hall, was cold and dark. A dozen mechanics worked under the supervision of senior mechanic Igor Andronovich Yakov, a husky man with huge hands calloused by 40 years of labor.

The dominant subject of conversation among the men was when, where and how to drink. About 11:30 the first morning, a master welder shoved some money at Viktor and, in a patronizing tone, said, "Kid, go buy some juice."

"I don't want anything to drink."

"I didn't ask what you want. I told you to buy vodka."

"No! I won't."

Brandishing a wrench, the welder approached Viktor.

"Enough" Yakov shouted. "All of you!"

Wielding a wrench of his own, Yakov grabbed Viktor by the arm and, jerking him away, announced, "The young man and I will buy the vodka."

They walked four or five minutes before Yakov spoke, "You realize they would have killed you."

"Maybe I would have killed some of them first."

"And in your grave, would you have been proud? Listen to me, young one; I know. In a socialist society do not be a white crow among black crows, else you will be pecked to death."

In time, Viktor came to like and sympathize with the mechanics. Most were competent craftsmen capable of fulfilling their daily quotas in half a day. Never, however, did they exceed their quotas, for that would have gained them nothing except higher quotas. The exhortations, slogans and promises of the Party were as irrelevant to their lives as the baying of some forlorn wolf on the faraway steppes. They subsisted in a swamp, looking forward only to the "little pink" which vodka put into their day.

Viktor's observations of the worker's life intensified his resolve to escape into flying. He excelled in the nightly DOSAAF classes taught by nonsense retired pilots. When he actually began to fly at summer camp, he knew his destiny lay in the sky. His instructors sensed it too.

In the spring of 1967, a colonel came to solicit applications for the Soviet Air Defense Command flight-training program conducted at Armavir in the Caucasus. The Mother Country required a new generation of fighter pilots. Only the best would be chosen; their training would be arduous. But for those who succeeded the rewards would be great.

The DOSAAF chief helped Viktor prepare an application and forwarded it with an ardent endorsement. Two weeks later the chief informed him he had been accepted.

WHY DOESN'T ANYTHING WORK?

A spirit of high expectancy and camaraderie pervaded the throng of young men Belenko joined in Armavir. They had traveled from all reaches of the Soviet Union, more than 4000 of them, lured and united by the hope that they would be chosen to fly. No one told them that only 360 would be selected.

Physicians inspected, pressed, probed, X-rayed and listened to Belenko for five days; then one stamped his records "Fit for Flight Training Without Restrictions." For him, the written examinations assessing basic knowledge of the sciences and Party theory were easy. When the names of the first 180 successful candidates were posted, his was there.

The would not meet for a long while, however. After basic military training, the cadets were transferred to an air base on the other side of Armavir to begin 15 months of academic studies. Classes ran from 7:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m., six days a week. On Sunday mornings they swabbed, swept or dusted all crannies of the barracks; then a political officer treated them to a two-hour lecture on current world events.

The political officers, to make their points intelligible, had to disclose some facts, and Belenko's analysis of these facts plunged him into ever-deepening doubts. To demonstrate the inherent injustice and totalitarian nature of American society, a political officer declared that the Communist Party was terribly persecuted in the United States. Wait a minute! You mean they have a Communist Party in the United States; they allow it? Why, that would be like our allowing a Capitalist Party in the Soviet Union!

To dramatize the poverty, hunger and unemployment of contemporary America, the political officers showed 1930s films of Depression breadlines, current Soviet television films of New York slums and of workers eating sandwiches or hot dogs for lunch. The narrative explained that this was all the Americans could afford for "dinner."

If they are starving and prefer communism, why don't they come over here? But wait a minute. Who owns all those cars I see?

The West, especially the United States, was depicted as being in the throes of death. Yet no week passed without warning of the dreadful threat posed by the encircling Dark Forces of the West and their plots "to kidnap our Mother Country." This ubiquitous threat justified every sacrifice of material and human resources necessary to build Soviet armed forces into the mightiest in the world.

If they are so weak, why are they such a threat?

Belenko's disquietude receded before the prospect of flight. He and some other cadets were transferred to an air base eight miles outside Grozny near the Caspian Sea. Soon Belenko was managing the L-29 jet trainer more easily and surely than he had the prop plane in which he had learned. Alone in the cockpit, he was serenely free and unbound; he was where he knew he belonged.

After six months of basic flight training, the schedule stipulated that the cadets would study the MiG-17 for two months back at Armavir before the final phase of training. But the two months stretched into four because an emergency had sprung up in the countryside—harvest was nearing. Each weekend and sometimes two or three more days a week, officers and men alike were packed into buses and trucks to join the battle of the harvest.

Belenko despaired at the acres and acres of apples—tens of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands of apples—rotting because nobody had arranged for them to be picked in time. He remembered how once in Rubtsovsk he had paid a whole ruble to buy one apple on the black market.

Why doesn't anything work? Why doesn't anything change?

AN ARCHITECTURAL MARVEL

In July 1971 Belenko passed his final flight examinations, and for the first time learned of all the benefits and perquisites bestowed on a Soviet pilot. To him they were breathtaking.

Whereas the average Soviet doctor or scientist was paid 120 to 130 rubles a month, he would earn 300. The typical young Soviet couple waited seven to eight years for an apartment, and the majority of Soviet dwellings still were without indoor plumbing. As a pilot Belenko was guaranteed an apartment with bath and kitchen. Food constituted the largest item in most Soviet budgets; meat and fresh vegetables frequently were unavailable; shopping was arduous and time-consuming. Pilots were entitled to four excellent free meals a day, seven days a week.

Most cadets married shortly before or after graduation, and in late August Belenko attended one of the weddings. At the party afterward he met a 20-year-old nursing student, Ludmilla Petrovna. She was blond, pretty, sensuous and, to Belenko, ideal. Their physical attraction was instant and mutual.

Their backgrounds, however, were dissimilar. Her father managed a large factory in Magadan, in the Far East; her mother ran a brewery. Both had high Party connections in Moscow. She had never wanted for anything and was accustomed to restaurants, theaters and to spending money as she pleased. She shared none of Viktor's interests in literature, athletics or the romance of flying. But the physical magnetism between them was powerful, and even though they had seen each other only seven or eight times, they married after he was commissioned in October.

Belenko never had thought of himself as other than a fighter pilot, but when the Party commission released the assignments of the new officers, he had been appointed a MiG-17 instructor in Salsk, 100 miles north of Armavir—to him, the worst duty conceivable.

Nevertheless, Belenko shared the elation of all the other newly arrived officers when they were handed keys to their apartments in a building that had been completed and certified for occupancy only a month before. Eagerly and expectantly Belenko unlocked the door. The floor, built with green lumber, was already warped and wavy. Plaster was peeling off the walls. The kitchen window was broken, and no water came from the faucet. The bathtub leaked; the toilet did not flush. None of the electrical outlets worked.

Already gathered in the halls were other officers who had found comparable conditions in their apartments.

This is outrageous. The Party must correct this.

Belenko and another lieutenant confronted the first Party representative they could find, a young political officer quartered in the building. He was cynical, yet truthful. The building had not been inspected. The military builders sold substantial quantities of allotted materials on the black market, then bribed the chairman of the acceptance commission and took the whole group to dinner. There the acceptance papers were drunkenly signed without any commission member's ever having been inside the building. What was done could not now be undone.

During the day Belenko studied psychology, methodology of flight instruction and political education. At night he mastered the building trade. He relaid the floor, replastered the walls, caulked the bathtub, repaired the toilet, replaced the faucets and rewired the electrical sockets.

Then one night he was awakened by a loud boom followed by crunching noises. The building was splitting. A seam about a foot wide opened from the living room out into the world, and a much more gaping hole exposed his bedroom to his neighbor's living room. An army of workers was marshaled to save the building. They wrapped it in steel belts as if hooping a barrel and inserted steel beams through the interior. The beam running through Belenko's living room looked odd, but he found it useful for chinning and other exercises.

The emergency measures proved effective for a while. But after three weeks or so the center of the building started to sag and kept sagging until the whole edifice assumed the configuration of a canoe.

THE DAM BURSTS

Ludmilla abhorred Salsk and the life of a military wife, and Belenko understood her feelings. Salsk, which under the tsars had been a place of exile, was a dingy city set on treeless flatlands. Dust intruded everywhere except when rain turned it to mud. There was no officer's club at the base, or any other facility that wives might enjoy. Belenko could only ask that she bear up in hope of eventual transfer.

On the chance that they could duplicate the happiness of their wedding trip, he proposed that during his next leave they vacation in Leningrad. About a week before they were to depart, he discovered that she had bought a ring for 140 rubles, spending most of the money he had saved for the trip. He vented his rage, and she announced her intention of divorcing him and returning to her parents.

He dissuaded her by reasoning that they were experiencing the kind of crisis that besets all young married couples. Soon she

became pregnant. A child, he thought, would reunite them emotionally. And for a while after the birth of their son, Dmitri, in January 1973, they did share parental joy. But the necessity of caring for him confined Ludmilla and, instead of lessening the tensions, the baby exacerbated them. The marriage deteriorated into sullen hostility.

In the autumn of 1975 Belenko requested a transfer to a combat unit, preferably a MiG-25 squadron. The squadron commander, deputy regimental commander and regimental commander all tried to dissuade him from "forsaking duty" or "acting like a test pilot." But the transfer request was submitted precisely as military regulations authorized, and each had no choice except to forward it until the matter reached the school commandant, Maj. Gen. Dmitri Vasilyevich Golodnikov.

He understood, even admired Belenko's motives. He himself would prefer to be with combat forces in Germany or the Far East, where one might "see some action." But the overriding desire of every officer must be to serve the Party, and the Party needed him here. "I am not proposing that you spend the rest of your career as an instructor," General Golodnikov said. "I will be retiring in a couple of years, and I have friends. When I leave, I shall see that they help you."

Belenko understood the invitation to sell himself to the system. Yet it only reinforced his determination. When he said no a second time, Golodnikov abruptly dropped the mask of reason and affability.

"You are defying me! Your request is denied."

Belenko stood up and stared straight into the general's eyes. "I have something to say. I will stay in this school. I will work harder to follow every rule and regulation, to teach the students to fly, to enforce discipline in our regiment and school, to combat drunkenness, the theft of alcohol, the forgeries, embezzlement and corruption that exist everywhere in our school. To do that, it will be necessary to dismiss certain officers and commanders who are aiding these practices. And to do that, it will be necessary for me to write a letter to the minister of defense, in accordance with the Manual of Discipline, proving what is going on in our school."

"You may not do that." "Why not? It's strictly in accordance with regulations. Let me tell you some of the things I will say. I will talk first about the death of Lieutenant Lubach and his student. The investigating commission said it was an accident. It was murder. You said that many of our young instructors are not qualified. But why do you certify them as qualified? Why did you send Lieutenant Lubach's records to a combat squadron and have them returned so it would look as though he had experience in a combat squadron when you knew he couldn't fly? Why did you let him take that student up and kill himself and the student?"

Belenko went on, citing case after case of official corruption, theft and fraud.

Golodnikov, who had avoided Belenko's stare, now glared at him with sheer hatred. "Enough! This is pure blackmail." Golodnikov pressed a buzzer, and an aide appeared. "Tell Colonel Malenkov to report to me immediately."

Shortly, Malenkov, the chief of the hospital, came in. "It is clear to me that this officer is insane. I am sure that is what examination will find," Golodnikov announced.

For the next three days, Belenko, clad in a ragged robe, was locked alone in a hospital room. Nobody spoke to him. On the third morning he was led into Malenkov's office.

"Golodnikov is not a bad fellow," Malenkov said. "You drove him into a corner. If I

tell him you were temporarily fatigued from overwork, that you will pursue this no further, I'm sure it all will be forgotten. Why don't we do that?"

"I will tell the truth."

Malenkov sighed. "Oh, Viktor Ivanovich, now you drive me into a corner. I will have to tell the truth, too, and try to help you."

The hospital chief arranged for Belenko to be examined by a friend, an incorruptible psychiatrist. After three hours of questioning, the psychiatrist gripped Belenko's hand hard. "Good luck, Lieutenant. Don't worry."

Four days later Belenko learned the results of the examination entirely by chance from an Armavir classmate who was visiting the base with an inspection team. When he offered congratulations, Belenko asked what he meant.

"Haven't you been told? You're going to a MiG-25 squadron in the Far East. The general gave you a recommendation. Said you're such an outstanding pilot you belong in our most modern aircraft." ●

SALUTE TO THE JAYCEES

HON. TENNYSON GUYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, citizens all over our country have been paying tribute to a fine organization, the National Jaycees, on this, the 60th anniversary of their founding.

Within my own district, the Piqua Jaycees are observing their own 32d birthday. These splendid young men from all walks of life, irrespective of race, creed, or color, have been manifesting youthful leadership, high ideals, participation in community as well as national programs, and establishing a commendable record for tomorrow's generations to emulate.

The Jaycees have sponsored sports, leadership training, public speaking, community enrichment, and idea creativeness which has produced patriotic, humanitarian, and social service in multiple ways.

At a time when our country is besieged with enormous problems at home: inflation, energy shortages, crime, problems of our aging, handicapped, family support, and myriad others in growing magnitude, we need the refreshment of youthful faith, the zest of youthful enthusiasm, the vigor of youthful willingness, and the indefatigable belief that the future belongs to those who are prepared for it. These high qualities find their truest embodiment within the Jaycees organization.

I am proud to represent not only the Piqua area Jaycees, but also want to salute and recognize the many other chapters that join to help solve today's problems, and move on to meet tomorrow's challenge. Our troubled world can well use their services.

Our leaders here at the Capitol would do well to look to these young Americans and bespeak our pride in their achievement. ●

**INTELLIGENCE REFORM ACT OF
1980**

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Intelligence Reform Act of 1980 to modify the Hughes-Ryan amendment and provide our intelligence agencies with the flexibility they will need in conducting operations that will best protect the vital interests of our Nation. The bill which has been introduced on the Senate side by Senator MOYNIHAN, will have the effect of repealing the Hughes-Ryan amendment of 1974 which requires the President to approve in detail most CIA plans for covert operations and calls for eight Senate and House committees—which amounts to about 180 Members and about an equal number of staff—to be informed of any covert operations in advance or soon after they get underway.

The bill which I am introducing today provides that the intelligence agencies will have to come before only two committees, the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. This will not only improve the capabilities of our own CIA, but it will also provide other free world intelligence services with the confidence that they can share critical information with our CIA without fear that this information will be disseminated to nearly 200 people and possibly leaked in the process.

The Intelligence Reform Act of 1980 would also relieve the CIA from fully complying with the Freedom of Information Act, because at the present time, myriads of personnel are required to work on retrieving and reclassifying information on innumerable FIA inquiries which for the most part cannot be filled. These personnel could be more effectively utilized. And some of these inquiries, such as ones from foreigners and Communist governments, which the CIA must presently try to answer, should not even be considered.

The third and final provision of this bill would impose criminal penalties on those individuals who expose the identities of intelligence personnel. This provision is absolutely necessary to protect the lives of our intelligence agents and to prevent another incident like the murder of Richard Welch in Athens, Greece, which was caused by a leak somewhere in our system. In order to improve the capabilities of the CIA in the intelligence-gathering sphere, we are going to have to insure our agents that we will do everything possible to conceal their identities while they are conducting their activities; otherwise, no sensible person would want to work in some of these extremely critical operations.

This bill is a beginning in the process of strengthening our intelligence-

gathering capabilities which have been so weakened over the past several years because of many alleged abuses by the agencies. I do not wish to convey that there were no misdeeds by the CIA or that the Congress should not be concerned about agency operations, but I think the "let us air all of the CIA's covert operations" attitude which has pervaded the thinking of many House and Senate Members over the past decade has to stop if this Nation is going to survive.

It is difficult to say that one or another thing would not have happened if the hands of our agencies had not been bound, but I think it is safe to say that if our covert operations had not been so emasculated in the past that perhaps the administration would have been more aware of the growing dissent in Iran and possible Soviet plans for expanded influence in the Middle East. Advance notice of some of these situations would provide the American President with much more flexibility in how to respond to these threats and could possibly preclude these tense situations from advancing to a full crisis state.

I think it is quite apparent to all Americans that our country's vital interests are now endangered around the globe by hostile forces, the most prominent being the Soviet Union. It is time that we do all that is necessary to protect those interests and the freedom of our citizens. The Intelligence Reform Act of 1980 is just one step in the process to help strengthen our ability to protect and guard those vital interests. I hope that my colleagues in the House will give their wholehearted support to this legislation which has a great deal of bipartisan support in the Senate. Time is a critical factor in this process, and we need to act now.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL NELSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was not present to vote on rollcall No. 6 on Friday. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on House Resolution 529, to provide for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 204, to grant MFN trade status to the products of the People's Republic of China.●

WORKPLACE FACILITIES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, 1 out of every 10 workers in private industry each year suffers the effects of an accident or disease incurred while working. Oftentimes these prove to be

fatal. Furthermore, it should be noted that in many instances the concentration of industries with hazardous conditions in certain geographic areas, or their presence as the only industry in a community, gives workers, in effect, no opportunity to choose a safer job. Thus these workers are at the mercy of the safety measures provided by their employer.

Among the various industries through out this Nation, catastrophic explosions claim the lives of an inordinate amount of workers. Investigations into these explosions have revealed that quite frequently they are set off by some type of cutting, welding, or brazing. Failure to abide by proper safety precautions, such as making absolutely sure that all combustible substances in the area have been removed before welding, cutting, or brazing, more often than not result in tragedy.

At this time, I would like to provide for my colleagues, information on some recent explosions in the workplace which have claimed the lives of workers.

On October 4, 1979, two workers were killed in an explosion that occurred at an oil tank battery west of Dix, Ill. The two men, ages 28 and 36, were employees of a subcontracting firm hired to clean oil storage tanks for an oil pipeline company.

On November 7, 1979, a 31-year-old employee died of injuries received during an October 17, 1979, explosion at an oil refinery in Sulphur, La.

On November 7, 1979, an explosion at a paper mill south of De Ridder, La., killed two employees, ages 35 and 44. According to information from the investigation, the workers were welding in the boiler area of the paper mill when a fire started that resulted in the explosion.

On November 20, 1979, a 22-year-old employee was killed and another severely burned when a series of fuel tank explosions occurred at a phosphate plant about 15 miles southwest of Barton, Fla. It is suspected that the explosion was set off by an acetylene blowtorch which was being used to remove pipes from the top of a 50,000-gallon fuel oil tank.

The above examples are intended to demonstrate the serious consequences that can result from hazardous work environments. However, occupational hazards can be controlled by closely monitoring and modifying the work environment. For instance, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) has promulgated a comprehensive set of standards concerning welding, cutting, and brazing in the worksite. But OSHA cannot guarantee that the employer will abide by its standards. While it can conduct spot inspections and issue fines for violations, this serves primarily as a deterrent mechanism against potential violators. But not all people are equally deterred by the threat of fine or imprisonment. Thus willful and criminal violations continue to occur

on the part of some employers. While these employers, who as evidence indicates represent a distinct minority, pose the gravest threat to worker safety, lesser violations also endanger the lives of workers. Therefore, it is vital that employers take the initiative in providing a safe work environment. It cannot be overemphasized that the primary responsibility for worker safety has always and continues to reside with the employer. ●

SOVIET A-PLANT ASSEMBLY LINE MOVING

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I pointed out to my colleagues that the Soviet Union nuclear program is moving ahead while our own program is still floundering under the Carter administration. I am afraid that this year's budget requests by the administration will simply confirm our fears that they are decimating the nuclear energy development program.

The Soviet officials told us about their plans to build a nuclear powerplant in the Ukraine when we visited Moscow in the spring of 1978. Although the timetable for constructing this plant has suffered some slippage, a recent article in *Engineering News-Record* has confirmed that the Soviets are back on track with their Volgodonsk construction. The plant, called *Atomash*, is equivalent to a multibillion-dollar facility in the United States although this country has nothing like it on the drawing boards. Although the Soviets have had some problems in meeting their schedule, there is no doubt that they remain serious about a strong nuclear program and I am including the article from *Engineering News-Record* which I trust my colleagues will find informative:

SOVIET A-PLANT ASSEMBLY LINE MOVING

The Soviet Union is spending about \$650,000 a day to put up a vast plant at Volgodonsk, in the Ukraine, that will be the world's first designed to turn out nuclear power steam supply systems on an assembly line basis.

The fabrication and assembly plant for pressure vessels, steam condensers, piping and other large components to produce eight standardized 1,000-Mw pressurized water nuclear plants a year is a key to the Soviets' atomic power expansion program and their plans for exporting reactors.

The concept is similar to the one Westinghouse tried with its Offshore Power Systems (OPS) subsidiary in Jacksonville, Fla., which was intended to fabricate standardized 1,150-Mw plants on barges for floating stations (*ENR* 11/24/77 p. 22). While a considerable amount of money was spent, the idea fizzled when OPS' only customer, Public Service Electric and Gas Co. in New Jersey, canceled its order last year.

The Soviets, on the other hand, are moving ahead. Originally, they had hoped to double the current 10,000 Mw of nuclear capacity (from 28 mostly small plants) by 1985, allowing them to export oil by then.

Delays in completing the fabrication complex may force a slow-down, however, and require them to continue importing large nuclear components from their Eastern bloc allies to achieve expansion goals. And it is unlikely they will ever be exporting oil.

ATOMIC MACHINERY

Dubbed *Atomash*, from the Russian words for atomic machinery, the plant is expected to cost a total of around \$1 billion when it is finished in 1985. At present it has been under construction for seven years and is two years behind the original schedule.

But the Soviets have made a substantial start, as a recent visit by *Engineering News-Record* revealed. The main building, steel and aluminum panel structure measuring 2,514 x 1,289 ft and up to 131 ft high, is structurally complete.

Some 65,000 tons of steel were used in the building, which is to house two parallel halls for the production of nuclear reactor vessels and steam generators. Concrete piles were sunk 60 to 72 ft to support the frame.

The main building already houses dozens of large machine tools, furnaces and overhead cranes capable of handling steel components of up to 180 tons each. More than 20 cranes, including one rated at 1,340 tons, are either already in use or being assembled on rails. Many of the heaviest pieces of equipment are being purchased from western Europe.

Also under assembly is a 15,000-ton hydraulic press, supplied by Japan's *Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries*, which will stamp out steel dishes 1 ft thick for the bases of pressure vessels.

The main building also contains an X-ray section with walls 9½ ft thick where welds will be tested by scanners.

Elsewhere on the 1,600-acre site, building number two, 1,640 x 984 ft, is under construction. More than half the steel is up and some panels have been placed. Of the five other major buildings, two are almost complete.

TRANSPORTING MODULES

The overall plan for *Atomash* also calls for building new mooring facilities on the nearby *Tsimlyanskoye* reservoir, to which the finished powerplant components will be shipped by heavy-duty trucks. They are then to be transported by water via the Don or Volga rivers to the European parts of the country.

The Soviet press and some foreign specialists working at the site have recently complained of a shortage of 3,500 workers and also of shortages of cement, lumber and steel at the site. *Socialist Industry* newspaper also says that the heating system in the main building is not yet operating, which threatens the operation of delicate machine tools there. Foreign specialists say that to receive deliveries, the huge end-doors of the plant must be opened, admitting blasts of frigid air.

In spite of the problems, the Ministry of Power is now trying to assemble *Atomash's* first 1,000-Mw reactor by 1982 to test the machinery already installed. While the Soviets are vague about production schedules, some sources, say *Atomash* will only reach its eight-a-year capacity in 1990, however. ●

HE HAD A DREAM

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, January 15, 1980, marked the

51st anniversary of the birthdate of Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King was perhaps more than any single man; the voice and the instrument of the second American revolution—a revolution in attitudes in America and throughout the world. He preached brotherhood and nonviolence to a divided land seething with violence—and he had a dream.

He had a dream that one day there would truly be liberty and justice for all. And he had a dream that one day everyone would realize that the progress of America is reflected in the progress of the people within it.

Nearly 11 years have passed since Dr. King's tragic assassination in Memphis. But, Dr. King did not die; for he left this world a legacy. He left us with a new direction, he articulated our goals; and, perhaps most importantly, he crystallized in a movement the ideas of millions of individual Americans.

By commemorating Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthdate, we commemorate his struggle to achieve equality and justice for all Americans, whether blacks in the South, Hispanics in the West, or whites in Appalachia.

Dr. King had a dream, and some of my colleagues in the 96th Congress have attempted since 1968 to honor this great man by enacting into law legislation which would make the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a full national public holiday. We have failed to do so. However, in the words of Representative *PARREN J. MITCHELL*, "Without the spirit to struggle, we will not have the power to prevail." We will not lighten our spirit, nor lessen the struggle to see Dr. King's birthdate a public holiday. ●

REGULATIONS AND STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. DOUGLAS APPLIGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. APPLIGATE. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the 2d session of the 96th Congress, we are faced with many of the same problems that concerned us during the first session. Among the more obvious ones, such as energy, the economy, and foreign affairs, we continue to be plagued by the ever increasing strangulation of bureaucratic regulations. The promulgation of many of these overly stringent and senseless regulations has reached epidemic proportions and warrants the immediate attention of this Congress.

It is often said that "the squeaky wheel gets oiled first," and if we, as Members of Congress, were to try to decide which agency's rules and regulations were most deserving of our oversight, the decision would clearly be in favor of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, for it is this agency that had led the way in adding costs to consumer goods, and in my own dis-

tract, the 18th of Ohio, is the primary reason for literally thousands of layoffs in our coal fields.

A prime example of the type of authoritarian attitude being displayed by the EPA concerns their review of each State's State implementation plan (SIP), which fully describes a respective State's intent for fully complying with the Clean Air Act. During debate of the 1977 amendments to that act, it was voted that each State must submit and have approved by the EPA an SIP for its nonattainment areas, or those areas which exceed the national ambient air quality standards for each pollutant. This was to be done by July 1, 1979, over 6 months ago. Should this procedure not be completed in any one State, the 1977 amendments provided that no major stationary source in the respective State should be constructed or modified in any nonattainment area. Additional sanctions, such as withholding certain Federal highways from noncomplying States could also be imposed.

While Ohio's SIP revisions have not been formulated, let alone approved, let me assure my colleagues that my State is not alone. As a matter of fact, only five States SIP's have been accepted to date. Therefore, the construction and economic sanctions I described above are in effect for 45 States. The ironic side of this issue is that legislation was introduced last year, which I and 130 other Members cosponsored, that would have helped eliminate this problem. H.R. 1150, sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman WATKINS, would postpone for 1 year, until June 30, 1980, the date which SIP's had to be submitted and approved. However, no floor action was taken on H.R. 1150 and it sits today in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

One end result of this ban on construction permits in Ohio and in other industrial States is that steel producing facilities are being stifled in their growth and production. As a member of the executive committee of the Congressional Steel Caucus, let me say that America's basic steel industry is now reasonably healthy after experiencing some very difficult times in recent years. However, if these conditions are to continue, action must be taken on this issue.

I do not believe it is too late for such action and call upon members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to resume consideration of H.R. 1150 with the purpose of extending the SIP compliance deadline until the end of calendar year 1980. In my judgment, this would add reasonableness and commonsense to the current laws without lessening the quality of our air.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bolster that proposal, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the perspective of the steel industry as presented by the Ohio Steel Group, an association of steel producers located in

or near the State of Ohio. The perspective follows:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF STEEL INDUSTRY PERSPECTIVE

Ohio cities are now subject to a construction ban under the Clean Air Act because Ohio's revised air pollution laws aren't approved by United States EPA. The EPA has threatened to reject at least part of Ohio's proposed plan to control particulate emissions, especially from the steel industry. Therefore, the construction ban is likely to continue.

The Ohio steel industry believes that U.S. EPA's threatened rejection is both unlawful and improper.

U.S. EPA's position is a reversal of its policy expressed last summer which would have found Ohio's proposed regulation changes to be approvable.

That U.S. EPA reversal involves the meaning of "Reasonably Available Control Technology" (RACT) and the claim by U.S. EPA that Ohio's proposal improperly relaxes existing law. Both U.S. EPA positions are wrong.

U.S. EPA has announced that it is attempting to impose on the steel industry nationally uniform pollution control technology requirements which were required in consent orders entered to settle specific enforcement actions involving specific steel plants. EPA's position violates EPA's own definition of "RACT," which allows each state great flexibility to determine what controls are reasonable and necessary at existing factories in its state.

Ohio's proposed regulations are a tightening, not a relaxation, of existing law. Nevertheless, a relaxation would be lawful and proper under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1977.

The Ohio steel industry supports Ohio EPA's efforts to adopt revisions to its particulate regulations where Ohio exercises its proper responsibility in setting "RACT". The Ohio steel industry totally opposes U.S. EPA's attempted mandate of unnecessary, extremely expensive and perhaps unworkable controls on all steel manufacturing facilities in Ohio and elsewhere. The attainment of clean air does not require U.S. EPA's extreme policy. ●

ACHIEVEMENT IN RAILROAD RELOCATION

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lincoln, Nebr., offers an outstanding example of how Government and the rail industry can cooperate to effectively alleviate traffic and safety problems.

In 1973 Lincoln was selected as one of 19 sites across the country for a demonstration project financed under the Federal-Aid Highways Act—Public Law 93-87. The act called for the Federal Government to fund 95 percent of project costs for relieving environmental, social, and economic problems associated with rail crossings. Gov. Charles Thone, then representing the First Congressional District of Nebras-

ka, was instrumental as a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee in securing a demonstration project for Lincoln. His efforts were supported in the Senate by Roman Hruska and Carl Curtis. Their leadership deserves praise.

Recently one phase of Lincoln's demonstration project was completed, as Burlington Northern lines that cross West O and West P Streets were eliminated. Ultimately, Rock Island, Union Pacific, and Burlington Northern lines in the city will be relocated and consolidated to run through the same corridor, the exact location of which has yet to be determined. The entire project is expected to be finished by 1985 at a cost of \$35 million. The people of Lincoln undoubtedly will benefit from this relocation of rail lines away from major traffic arteries in the central city.

The State legislature has long recognized the need for relocation of rail lines away from the city traffic. Nebraska was a pioneer in forming local government units—railroad transportation safety districts—to utilize local money and available Federal aid to ease traffic tieups caused by rail crossings and to improve safety with more effective signals and upgraded grade crossings.

I believe Lincoln's success shows the effectiveness of Government and industry working together for the public good. ●

NICARAGUA—PART IX: THE ROLE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the private sector of Nicaragua has kept a high profile during the past months of civil strife in that Central American nation. Its role has been one of active involvement in the revolutionary process. Businessmen were among those who denounced the Somoza regime in the strongest of terms. Countrywide strikes called for and coordinated by the private sector brought the regime to the brink of dissolution on more than one occasion. Under the aegis of the Broad Opposition Front, a coalition formed in September of 1978 as a locus of anti-Somoza sentiment, key businessmen worked hand in hand with clergymen and other civic leaders in an attempt to negotiate the transition to a new government. Both reprisals and general combat caused some of the private sector to sustain catastrophic losses during the war. Such a record would entitle any group to lay claim to a central place in postrevolutionary Nicaragua.

We members of the congressional mission to Nicaragua put the problems of the private sector high on our list

of priorities. We returned from the mission convinced that the problems fall into two main categories. First and more immediate is the war-related destruction of the economic environment. Offices, plants, and equipment accounting for more than 25 percent of the industrial base have been ruined. Complete repair of the damage could cost between \$400 million and \$600 million, at least by rough estimates. Countless commercial opportunities have been lost, with the vital agricultural sector hit especially hard. Cotton and coffee exports, which together bring in more than half of all foreign exchange, have declined sharply, and production of beans, corn, and poultry, all in demand for domestic consumption, is off from one-quarter to three-quarters. Worse still may be what the future holds, for it is not entirely apparent to anyone where the capital to reconstruct and reactivate the economy will be raised.

The second category of problem, while less palpable, is every bit as serious as the war-related destruction just described. Business confidence is low because the private sector is uncertain of the Government's intentions toward it. Mr. Alfonso Robelo, an entrepreneur who is also a member of the ruling junta, has himself characterized the prevailing attitude of businessmen as one of tremendous caution. Expropriation of the holdings of Mr. Somoza and his associates has fueled misgivings, as have the Government's takeover of natural resources and its strict control of banks and insurance companies. Businessmen wonder whether they may become victims of abuse in the policy of expropriation, or whether their industries may eventually be treated as, for example, mining has been treated. Aggravating matters further is the common notion that some elements of the Sandinista movement favor immediate and total State management of the economy.

The physical needs of the private sector are well known. An executive with a large American company in Nicaragua said that he was staggered by the "magnitude of the investment and aid" the private sector would require. The Association of the American Chambers of Commerce in Latin America, noting the necessity of American imports for the smooth functioning of the Nicaraguan economy, testified that "there is an urgent need for more rapid disbursements now to restore and support credits for the private sector." It added that insufficient credits for imports "would cripple the Nicaraguan agricultural and industrial sector most of all" since the Nicaraguan public sector was not so dependent on imports.

A more sobering assessment has come from the government itself. Mr. Robelo has stated that a lack of help might compel the Government to change its policy toward the private sector, imposing restrictions on it so that the nation could survive on domestic resources alone. Perhaps the

elementary nature of the private sector's needs says the most. Agriculture must have fertilizer, seed, chemicals, tractors, pumps, motors, hand tools, and spare parts. Industry must have oilseeds, tallow, plastic bags, tinplate, artificial and synthetic fibers, plastics, trucks, trailers, construction materials, various kinds of machinery and equipment, and spare parts.

The psychological needs of a business community whose confidence is low are less easily defined. It is evident that deeds are more important than words to such a community, but words should never be discounted. Junta member Sergio Ramirez reminded us that the Government had never said that it would nationalize business. Rather than taking advantage of the private sector's troubles, he asserted, the Government was seeking funds for recapitalization. He remarked that the Government approved of President Carter's supplemental request, 60 percent of which would be destined for the private sector. Mr. Bayardo Arce expressed similar thoughts at our meeting with the directorate of the Sandinista movement. He explained that he and his colleagues were in touch with business leaders to see how best to bolster the private sector with extensions of credit and controls on foreign exchange. When asked for a concrete example of the Government's aiding business, he cited attempts to hold down wage increases that the private sector could not afford to pay.

Yet another significant statement of moderate intent was made shortly after the congressional mission left Nicaragua. In an address to an international conference of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, Mr. Daniel Ortega avowed that the revolution was not opposed to private enterprise provided that the latter did not shirk its responsibility to help rebuild the nation. Mr. Ortega, a member of both the ruling junta and the Sandinista directorate, is known for his fiery, leftist rhetoric.

Nearly everyone in Nicaragua, whether in government or out, seems to believe that the private sector has a major role to play in reconstructing a shattered country. The society can neither duplicate its skills nor do without the results of its activities. The private sector itself insists upon securing its rightful place in the postrevolutionary era. The businessmen with whom we spoke were clear on that point, and they asked us for a tangible, forceful sign of our support. We were told time and again that the President's supplemental request was just such a sign.

In my opinion, the existence of a strong and vibrant business community signifies political pluralism and individual freedom in Nicaragua. By passing the President's bill we help the private sector flourish. If we defeat the bill, however, we abandon an important, pro-democratic group to an uncertain fate.

NOTE.—Previous statements in this series appeared on November 27, November 29, December 3, December 4, December 11, December 14, December 20, and January 22.

THE PIONEER COMES THROUGH

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, the Pacific Northwest lay crippled under sheets of snow and ice. Sudden storms whipped off the Pacific coast and up the Columbia River Gorge, paralyzing towns and cities between Portland, Oreg. and Walla Walla, Wash.

These communities would have been totally cut off from the rest of the State and country if it had not been for one trustworthy link that kept the lifeline open through the Columbia Gorge: the Amtrak Pioneer.

Not so long ago, this passenger train was among those proposed for elimination from the nationwide Amtrak system. The Pioneer runs between Salt Lake City and Portland once a day in each direction. When snow, freak ice storms and silver thaws—events that are not infrequent in this part of Oregon—make State and Federal highways impassable, the only remaining passenger link through the Columbia Gorge is the Pioneer.

Former Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams was ready to call the Pioneer a dinosaur just a few months ago. That assessment proved to be at odds with figures showing a dramatic increase in Pioneer's popularity. Based on those figures, Congress granted the Pioneer a 3-year reprieve. I have no doubt that even better days are ahead for the Pioneer. And I know several Oregonians who are thankful the Pioneer's wheels were still turning 2 weeks ago.

The train responded to distress calls from stranded communities by shipping in food and transporting the sick. In the absence of ambulances, the Pioneer transported a woman from Cascade Locks to Hood River for hospitalization. It answered another emergency in the case of an ill woman in the upriver city of The Dalles who needed medical treatment in Portland. The Pioneer also hauled grocery supplies and made special stops to pick up stranded travelers along the gorge.

With highways buried under snow drifts ranging from 5 feet in Hood River to 14 feet at Multnomah Falls, trucks did not have a prayer of making their usual runs.

Unless Congress had saved the Pioneer from forced extinction last fall, those communities would have felt far more than the pinch of cold winter storms. Amtrak was their only sustaining link.

Legislation should not require examples such as this to justify the value of a service. In judging Amtrak's worth-

ness, the trade-off in situations such as the Oregon ice storm never lines up neatly with the profit margin; rather, the difference between service and no service in this case came down to lives saved or lives lost. I, for one, am thankful Congress listened to the arguments I and others presented to save this train.

January 1980 proved the wisdom of that decision. Oregonians from Portland to Pendleton look upon the Pioneer as something more than an alternative to the automobile; in troubled times, they know it can be a lifesaver. Two weeks ago, when nothing else was moving along the frozen Columbia Gorge, the Pioneer proved the aptness of its name. It came through. ●

PROJECT PEACOCK

HON. RONALD M. MOTT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been quick to point out the shortcomings of commercial television programming, I am pleased to have the opportunity to compliment the industry for a change. It is reassuring to see one of the major television networks, the National Broadcasting Co., break new ground in the important area of children's programming.

Mr. Fred Silverman, president of NBC, recently announced plans for a new prime-time project designed especially for children. "Project Peacock" will be a series of 20 prime-time children's entertainment specials. The programs will range from 1 to 2 hours in length, and will be aired on a bi-weekly basis. The series, scheduled for the 1981 season, will cover a wide range of topics. Mr. Silverman plans to draw on the creative skills of the best talent in the entertainment industry. And he pledges to make the "Project Peacock" series an outstanding, high-quality blend of entertainment and education that will appeal to viewers of all ages.

The network's program initiative is most encouraging. By recognizing the need for top-quality, meaningful programs for our youth, hopefully NBC will set an example for other networks and stations in demonstrating that quality and audience appeal need not be mutually exclusive goals in commercial broadcasting. Mr. Silverman has set an ambitious standard of achievement for NBC, and I wish him and his associates every success with "Project Peacock." ●

ATLANTIC TUNAS CONVENTION ACT (H.R. 6310)

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr.

Speaker, the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) was signed on May 14, 1966, and subsequently entered into full force and effect on March 21, 1969, upon receiving the required ratifications of seven of the parties to the Convention. Parties to the Convention now comprise 19 member countries as follows: the United States, Canada, Brazil, Cuba, France, Cape Verde, Portugal, Spain, Ghana, the Ivory Coast, Morocco, Senegal, South Africa, Gabon, Japan, Korea, Benin, the Soviet Union, and Angola.

The Convention was a response to the increasing exploitation of tuna resources of the Atlantic Ocean by a large number of nations of Europe, Africa, the Americas, and Asia. It further indicated the concern of the fishery experts of the ratifying nations over the danger of overfishing and the decline of productivity levels of stocks of tunas and tuna-like fishes.

The Convention provided for the establishment of a commission with each one of the contracting parties represented on the Commission by not more than three delegates. The Commission, which is required to meet once every 2 years, is charged with the responsibility of conducting research "on the abundance of tuna and tuna-like fishes, biometry and ecology of the fishes, the oceanography of their environment, and the effects of natural and human factors upon their abundance."

Those species of tuna that have been identified as being covered by the convention are the bluefin, southern bluefin, yellowfin, albacore, bigeye, Atlantic little tuna, blackfin and skipjack.

Those species of tuna-like fishes covered by the convention are the Atlantic bonito, frigate mackerel, bullet mackerel, Atlantic sailfish, black marlin, Atlantic blue marlin, Atlantic white marlin, longbill spearfish, Mediterranean spearfish and the broadbill swordfish.

Within the Commission is a council consisting of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission, together with representatives from not less than four and not more than eight of the contracting parties. The council meets at least once between biennial meetings of the Commission.

The Commission is also empowered, on the basis of scientific information, to make recommendations to maintain the population of Atlantic tunas "at levels which will permit the maximum sustainable catch." Each recommendation shall become effective 6 months after adoption by the Commission, but any nation may file a formal objection to the recommendation and thus exempt itself from the effect of the recommendation. If a majority of the contracting nations file an objection to the recommendation, then the Commission's recommendation is deemed null and void. The enforcement of the Commission's recommendations are the responsibility of each contracting nation. Thus far, the Commission has

taken regulatory action with regard to two species of tunas. The recommendations call for a ban on the taking of bluefin tuna weighing less than 6.4 kilograms. Also the recommendations restrict each nation's catch of bluefin to recent levels. The regulation, which calls for a ban on the taking of bigeye tuna weighing less than 3.2 kilograms, will not come into effect probably until early next year.

Although the United States ratified the Convention in 1967, it did not possess the statutory authority to carry out its provisions or implement the conservation measures recommended by the Commission until August 5, 1975, the effective date of the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975—Public Law 94-70. Section 10 of Public Law 94-70 authorized to be appropriated for the transitional quarter of 1976 and fiscal year 1977 such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes and provisions of the act, including necessary travel expenses for the U.S. Commissioners and the U.S. share of the joint expenses of the Commission. Public Law 95-33 extended the authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1978, 1979, and 1980.

The United States has played a leading role in bringing the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas into being, and has actively participated in the Commission's work. We have a strong interest in international tuna conservation and it is most important that we continue our involvement with the Atlantic Tunas Commission. To accomplish this purpose, the legislation would extend the funding authorization under the act for an additional 3 years, 1981, 1982, and 1983.

The estimated cost of administering the act during the extension period will be approximately \$700,000 per year. Of this amount, approximately \$50,000 will be used to meet the U.S. share of the contributions to the Commission; the remainder will be used by the Department of Commerce for research. ●

A TRIBUTE TO LONI HANCOCK

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, whereas, on Saturday, January 19, 1980, a testimonial dinner was being held to thank former council member Loni Hancock for her years of dedicated service to the Berkeley community, and

Whereas at this time we have the opportunity to recall and appreciate the many contributions Ms. Hancock has made to improve the quality of life in Berkeley during her 8-year tenure on the Berkeley City Council, and

Whereas Ms. Hancock's accomplishments are so numerous that we can mention but a few, her leadership in

areas of environmental and social concern led to the successful adoption of many important and forward looking policies such as the neighborhood preservation ordinance which mandates strict demolition controls and extensive down zoning; the landmarks preservation ordinance which conserves Berkeley's architectural heritage; measure Y which insures acquisition and development of open space for parks in underserved areas of Berkeley; the hazardous biological research ordinance which regulates private laboratories doing recombinant DNA research and the smoking pollution control ordinance which regulates smoking in public places. She was key to the passage of the city's model affirmative action plan and job-sharing program. She consistently encouraged the formation and council funding of community-based social service agencies many of which became models on the national level. She believed deeply in the benefits derived from people's participation in making the decisions that shape the communities they live in. This belief led to her support of the fair representation ordinance which allows each council member to appoint a representative to each city board and commission. Her recognition of the need for public scrutiny and participation in the city's budget process resulted in the formation of the Citizen's Budget Committee. Her active interest in the economic well being of the city led to the formation of the Economic Development Commission. As an advocate of cooperative endeavors she helped make the dream of Savo Island cooperative housing a reality, and

Whereas Loni Hancock's past and present endeavors to improve the quality of life have brought her respect and recognition both in Berkeley and nationally,

Whereas Saturday, January 19, 1980, was proclaimed "Loni Hancock Day," in the city of Berkeley in recognition of the extraordinary services she has performed for the city. I commend and congratulate Ms. Hancock on her numerous achievements and contributions to our community, and share this information with my colleagues.●

MRS. CHARLIE MAE HAYNES TO BE HONORED

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 10, 1980, the Third Baptist Church in San Francisco will honor Mrs. Charlie Mae Haynes for her years of dedicated work for the church and for the community which it serves.

Mrs. Haynes is the widow of the late Rev. F. D. Haynes, Sr., who served as

pastor of the Third Baptist Church for many years.

Mrs. Haynes was born in Calvert, Tex., and moved to Los Angeles in the early 1930's. In 1945, she moved to San Francisco and has been a tireless worker for the city ever since. Mrs. Haynes is, by background, a social worker and has worked in the Child Welfare Division of the San Francisco Department of Social Services for many years. She is a former member of the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District.

She has also served as: Member, President's Advisory Board, San Francisco State University; member, Board of Directors, Volunteer Bureau; member, Board of Directors, San Francisco Council of Churches; member, Citizen's Committee, 6th Army; president, Church Women United; and vice president—Women's Missionary Union, Third Baptist Church.

Mrs. Haynes is also a very active worker with the National Baptist Convention where she serves as assistant supervisor in the oratorical contest, assistant coordinator for Young People's Leaders Division, and cochairman of the National Baptist Retirement Fund.

It is my pleasure to share with my colleagues this acknowledgement of Charlie Mae Haynes' fine contribution to the city of San Francisco. I join with the congregation of the Third Baptist Church and Mrs. Haynes, many friends in commending her on this special day.●

MRS. GOLDEN'S ABRIDGED ARTICLE

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. MOORHEAD of California. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has not turned a deaf ear to proponents of alternative energy resources. Although we may not always agree on the means, I believe there will be continued progress in providing the private sector with the necessary incentives to gradually lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

Dorothy M. Golden, of Burbank, Calif., has been tireless in her efforts to alert us to the advantages of methanol and other alternatives to oil as the following autobiographical sketch indicates:

MRS. GOLDEN'S ABRIDGED ARTICLE

It was during the summer of 1973 that I decided to fight back.

It was then that OPEC, the foreign cartel, had declared an oil embargo on the United States.

In those days no one had to look for a scapegoat. We knew full well that thirteen small Arab nations had simply ganged up on the big United States.

What provoked me was that although the embargo just about wrecked the economy of our country—in 1974 we would experience a severe recession—none of our leaders in

Congress or the White House were yelling, "You gangsters can't do that to us!" I wondered why our elected representatives, our editors, our TV commentators couldn't see how vulnerable we had become.

Although I had no scientific background on such matters, I began asking questions. For the American Consumers Council I had been writing a series of informative reports about what one housewife thought could be done to stop inflation and what consumers could do to get their elected representatives to keep the promises they made on the eve of their election.

These reports were passed along by Council members to their local newspapers and to friends in every part of the country. Eventually my thoughts began to appear in 35 newspapers across the country in a column called "The Straight Goods".

I began inquiring about the oil shortage as gas prices were beginning to zoom upward. Where were we to go for help? No two economists could agree on the solution to untying the OPEC noose from our throats. If one person can make a difference, perhaps I could somehow be that person.

I pushed hard my search for a substitute fuel. In November of 1974 I came across the report of a study made by the Chemical engineers of Texas A and M University. This announcement hidden in the middle of our thick Los Angeles Times stated that methanol can be made from coal at a price competitive with gasoline and what was more important, methanol has significant advantages over gasoline as a fuel for internal combustion engines. The engineers went on:

"Included is the fact that methanol burns cleaner, a \$100 billion consideration in itself, but its biggest present asset is that using it as automobile fuel, and producing it from coal, would make the United States, Europe and Japan independent of oil-producing states for their energy needs."

In addition to being able to operate efficiently in our motor vehicles—without requiring changes in internal combustion engines, the mix of fuel could be as high as 30% less oil to import from OPEC!

Scientists from MIT and from Stanford University confirmed that the technology of extracting methanol from coal had been developed as far back as 1910 * * * that no further experimentation was needed to use this clean-burning fuel substitute for gasoline. The plastics and plywood industries use alcohol in their manufacturing process. Race car drivers use it to obtain greater speed from racing cars.

Executive Engineer Farno Green of General Motors, to the consternation of the oil companies, said:

"The United States could stop importing oil and still produce enough new fuel to run 100 million cars a year, if only it would apply its technological skills to converting agricultural wastes into usable energy."

During the fall of 1976 I received a news clipping from friends in Omaha stating that farmers in Holdridge, Nebraska were making their own alcohol stills and producing methanol from corn husks and, in combination with gasoline, were selling it as fast as they could distill it—for 53 cents a gallon!

And then, like dominoes falling in a row, I began to hear from readers of STRAIGHT GOODS that Princeton, New Jersey; Baytown, Texas; Ft. Lewis, Washington; Wilsonville, Alabama and Toledo, Ohio were building pilot synthetic oil plants.

I went on to tell readers about countries all over the world—Turkey, India, South Africa, Scotland, Morocco, Yugoslavia, South Korea, Spain and China who were tapping coal to produce methanol and hydrogen fuels. Later Brazil was to make it mandatory for all their cars to use either a forty

per cent blend of methanol (made out of sugar cane) with gasoline, or one hundred per cent methanol once a minor adjustment was made to the motors of those cars using pure alcohol.

People were beginning to understand that methanol meant alcohol, and alcohol could be made out of all sorts of renewable products. Cars could be driven with it in combination with gasoline or solely on alcohol.

Gasoline-alcohol blends are now exempt from federal excise tax. This will lower the cost of gasohol by several cents a gallon. Also gasohol is now exempt from the Clean Air Act's prohibition on the sale of new additives in gasoline. Gasohol may now be sold in blends containing ten percent alcohol fuel.

I learned that what stirred my imagination on November 22, 1974 when I first read of the study made by the Texas A and M University engineers that clean-burning methanol, made from organic wastes or natural gas or coal, once more confirmed that it could be produced at a cost even more competitive than gasoline.

It appeared that some independent entrepreneur in Long Island, New York had come across the same report I had read:

"Engines with carbon deposits were cleaned up by running them on alcohol. It was also found that engines run cooler on a mixture of methanol and water, a mixture that actually increases power over that produced by burning pure methanol."

Further disclosure was the fact that United International Research of Hauppauge, Long Island has come up with a blend of 25% alcohol and water and unleaded gas which has a potential of saving 75 million gallons of gasoline a day. This new, improved gasohol fuel is called hydrofuel and costs about ten cents a gallon to make!

Who, I wondered, could I get to break this story wide open. If hydrofuel had a catch which made it impractical, the public deserved to know about it now—not in 1995. And if there was no catch to it, and we could manufacture a synthetic fuel from limitless, renewable resources, disclosure of this otherwise well kept industrial secret would without a doubt crack OPEC wide apart, and reverse the inflationary spiral driving the U.S.A. into the worst depression of all time.

Eventually I became reconciled to the reality I could expect no help from the mass media. Still I persisted. Each time I found another way to alert a part of the public to the potential of alcohol fuels I did something about it.

On the other hand, the Nebraska experiment, originated by the Holdridge farmers, was spreading to more and more mid-western states. Alcohol fuel was actually being sold commercially under the name of gasohol—how about that!

My contacts in Omaha, Harriet and Millard Speler, wrote that their neighbors have been using gasohol and were very pleased with its performance.

We firmly believed we had found a way to tell everyone we could reach in Washington that farmers like the idea of competing with the oil industry, that they would like nothing better than to stop buying energy from the oil companies at high prices and then have to worry about the prices they were going to have to charge for their crops.

In the early days of the automobile, Henry Ford and other automotive magnates had asked Thomas Edison to research what the best fuel would be for motoring. Edison's findings were summed up in one word—Methanol. Edison, the innovator, the great inventor, listed three reasons why methanol should be the nation's motoring fuel. First, it did not pollute the air; second it left no dirty carbon deposits in cylinder

heads and a motor could be driven for fifty years without wearing out. Edison never got around to explaining his third reason for the value of methanol.

My opponents wanted to hear no more of that kind of research. Once and for all they let me know there would be no more debating with me—methanol was out!

But why? Because it was too expensive to make! And until "gasoline is sold for as high as 85 cents no way will we invest our stockholders' money in that fuel." The day that reason came in the mail, gasoline in my neighborhood was selling for 90.9 cents a gallon.

While Congress and the President were bickering, the CIA was again caught napping. A revolution took place in OPEC's second largest oil producing country—Iran. The shock waves hit California first. The nightmare I had dreaded and warned against—since the embargo of 1973—had reappeared.

Again there were long waiting lines at gas stations. "No more gas" signs hung out sometimes after only one hour of dispensing. Gasoline was skyrocketing to over a dollar a gallon. Resort towns deserted; tourist business ruined; recreational vehicle companies and related businesses closing their doors. Depression—panic—even violence at the gas pumps.

Here we go again!
Maybe it's time now that I quit and forget all about methanol and gasohol and hydro-fuel and solar energy and just concentrate on being a wife and a mother. And focus all the anger inside of me on housework?

Then on the morning of July 13th, 1979, I pick up the morning paper from our front lawn. My eye catches an item hidden away on the second page, at the very bottom. It is a small one paragraph announcement—instead of being on the front page in the screaming headlines it deserves. I read:

"The U.S. Senate today voted to provide \$22 billion in federal loan guarantees to support the production of gasohol, a mixture of gasoline and alcohol as an alternative automobile fuel. The amount was raised from \$11 billion by amendment—82 to 10."

Is this really the beginning of the end of the long years of fighting, probing, telephoning, debating, xeroxing hundreds and hundreds of pages of validated data, never backing away altogether—never letting migraines, or a husband's constant call for another kind of joint venture stand in the way.

Members of Congress stop bickering with one another and at long last they had joined together to fight OPEC.

Maybe it would be better to put my typewriter away, have the telephone disconnected and retire to easier pastures?

Well, not exactly . . . maybe not until "The Gasohol Lady" can drive her 1976 Nova down to the local gas station and "fill er up" with a choice of methanol, ethanol, gasohol, dieselhol, or 10 cents a gallon hydrofuel.●

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN DISCUSSES THE NEED FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AS A PRECONDITION TO MINORITY OPPORTUNITIES

HON. JACK KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to place in the RECORD an extremely important article

written by my friend and colleague BUDD BROWN. Congressman BROWN, as ranking member of the Joint Economic Committee, has been a leading proponent of increasing economic growth through the stimulation of the supply side of our economy. This article, which appeared in the Washington Post, shows the importance of economic growth to all members of this society, especially minority citizens.

Minorities in this country have been harmed the most by the sad shape of the economy in the past few years. Our present policies of high taxes, overregulation, and massive Government deficits have resulted in a slow or no-growth economy that is beset by double-digit inflation. And though the cost to all of us has been great, it has been truly devastating to minorities.

To make the American dream a reality for all our citizens, we must embark on a new course of economic growth that increases the rewards to work, saving, and investment.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1980]
MAJOR HOPE FOR MINORITY JOBS: ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By Clarence Brown)

The relationship between white and minority unemployment has troubled political, economic and social observers for decades. The crude and cruel rule of thumb is that whatever the white unemployment rate, the minority unemployment rate will be approximately double. Unfortunately, this has been generally true since employment figures were first categorized by race.

The recession that is slowly gripping the economy is expected to increase overall unemployment to 8 or 9 percent. Granting these estimates, the misery of unemployment will be even more severe for minority workers as their unemployment approaches 20 percent.

Since the mid-1960s, a similar relationship, though not as tight, has developed between white and minority teenage workers. We enter this recession with minority teenage unemployment near 35 percent (50 percent in some central cities).

There are many reasons given for the spread between white and minority unemployment rates. Discrimination, no doubt, is at the heart of the problem. Much has been done not only to lessen the effects of discrimination, but also to improve the American psyche regarding racial matters. However, the problem of discrimination, because it requires a change of attitude as well as behavior, will be present for a long time to come. Consequently, the beneficial effects on minority employment of the elimination of discrimination will be insufficient in the short run to offer much hope of dramatic improvement.

The effect of the minimum wage on young workers, especially minority teen-agers, has been well documented. But, though a youthful differential in the minimum wage laws would be particularly beneficial to minority teen-agers and would help close the gap between white and minority unemployment rates, the simple political fact is that such a change is not foreseeable in the short run.

What hope is there, then, for lessening the differential?

The hope is economic growth.

Supply-side economics has received increasing support from economists and increasing interest from the press and politicians lately. The reasoning behind this ap-

proach is simple: if the economy is being hurt by inflation—that is, too much money chasing too few goods—then the solution should be an increase in the supply of goods. Furthermore, if production is stimulated, the problem of unemployment is simultaneously attacked. Suppliside economics reasonably requests that policy-makers reduce the tax and unnecessary regulatory burdens that impair additional efforts to save, invest and work—the three linchpins of economic growth.

Now, there is nothing more obvious than saying that the way to reduce unemployment is to stimulate economic growth. What is not obvious is that economic growth has a more substantial impact on reducing black unemployment than on white unemployment, a fact confirmed by a study just completed, at my request, by the National Commission on Manpower Policy. Thus, if this country entered into a prolonged period of economic growth at a rate substantially higher than its current abysmal 2 to 3 percent per year, then the differential between white and minority unemployment rates would be reduced substantially.

In conjunction with this finding, Dr. Ida-bell Sawhill, director of the commission, testified at a recent Joint Economic Committee hearing on minority employment opportunities that, in the latter years of the recovery just ended, minority teen-age employment increased three times as fast as white teen-age employment, that minority teen-agers were getting one out of every five new jobs during this period—an amazing development considering that this small portion of the minority work force faces the most severe barriers to employment.

This study does not disregard the need for training programs to aid the structurally unemployed. Though we have spent \$90 billion on manpower programs over the past 15 years, we have failed to direct money to private-sector employers for on-the-job training and employment of these individuals and have concentrated instead on the public sector. We need a more balanced approach.

The present recovery is, unfortunately, being brought to an end by insufficient, outdated government economic policies that rely on the old shibboleths of trying to stimulate demand by increasing government spending and, consequently, government tax revenues. The result is that marginal tax rates on individuals and businesses have gone through the roof. This means that the rate of return on additional saving, working and investing has been lowered. Output and hopes of full employment are being strangled. Combined with the misguided monetary policy of the Fed under its former chairman, G. William Miller, demand-side economics has left a legacy of the highest inflation rate in 30 years, negative productivity growth, the weakest dollar ever, falling real income for our workers and unemployment rates for minorities at disgraceful levels.

It could have been different if we had done more than pay lip service to economic growth in recent years; if we had realized that inflation, though good for government revenues, is deadly to economic growth; if we had realized that our economic problems were the result of our misdirected economic policies and had not spent the past three years placing the blame on greedy American workers and employers. And it could have been different, in social terms as well as economic, if we had realized that sustained economic growth can do much to lessen the discrepancies between the different racial groups in this country in their employment and income opportunities. ●

COL. BERNARD K. OLSON

HON. ALVIN BALDUS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. BALDUS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to rise today to extend my congratulations and appreciation to a member of my constituency who has served his country's military with distinction for over 35 years. This man is Col. Bernard K. Olson of Rice Lake, Wis., who recently ended his military career after 35 years of service to the U.S. Army.

Colonel Olson has earned the respect and esteem of many people for the quality of his leadership and standards of excellence in his dedicated service to his country and fellow citizens.

During this span of years which began in 1943, Colonel Olson was twice distinguished with the Legion of Merit Medal, the second highest peace time decoration the Army can bestow, and was awarded the Armed Forces Commendation Medal, and the Meritorious Service Medal.

Colonel Olson has had a wide and varied military career both on active duty and in the reserves. He saw service in World War II and Korea. Upon his departure from Korea, Colonel Olson was awarded the Armed Forces Commendation Medal for meritorious service.

Prior to being called up in 1950, Colonel Olson started a musical radio program over station WJMC in Rice Lake, Wis. This weekly show has been heard on Sunday evenings for over 29 years and is used to promote the Army Reserve. For his work in this public affairs area, Colonel Olson was awarded his first Legion of Merit Medal in September 1972.

Because of the length of his service, Colonel Olson was transferred to the Retired Reserves recently. His Milwaukee unit held a retirement banquet in his honor and presented him with a silver snifter inscribed with the dates of his service. The Army command also conferred the Meritorious Service Medal on Colonel Olson for his many years of service to the unit. Shortly thereafter, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, U.S. Army, Washington, D.C., awarded him a second Legion of Merit Medal for his 8 years of service with that office. Thus, unless a military emergency should develop in which the Government would see fit to recall the Army Retired Reserve, the military career of Colonel Olson has come to a close.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to afford this national recognition to Colonel Olson. His insight, leadership, and dedication have enriched his community, State, and Nation. We do, indeed, salute a distinguished officer—Col. Bernard K. Olson. ●

INNOVATIVE PRESCHOOL PROGRAM FOR SPINA BIFIDA CHILDREN

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, the introduction of a new preschool educational program in my district located at the Warbasse Cooperative Nursery on 2785 West 5th Street. This is Brooklyn's first preschool educational program for children with spina bifida, a crippling disease which afflicts newborns. Spina bifida is a congenital defect that interferes with the development of the spinal cord.

An important step forward in public education has been the mainstreaming of handicapped children. The Warbasse Cooperative Nursery program will bring 15 children into the regular nursery.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the parents in the area and Marcia Kepeca, director of the Warbasse Nursery, for working so hard to create this program in cooperation with the Spina Bifida Association of Greater New York. Funding was provided by the disabled children's program of New York State and the Harriet Annenberg Foundation.

It is my sincere hope that this will be the first of many such preschool nursery programs. I respectfully request that the following article which appeared in the Monday, January 21, 1980, issue of the Brooklyn Bay News be placed in the RECORD:

[From the Bay News January 21, 1980]

AID FOR DISABLED

Spina bifida is the single most commoncrippler of the new born. Affecting 12,000 children yearly, it interferes with development of the spinal cord resulting in paralysis.

New York's first educational program designed for children with spina bifida began recently at the Warbasse Cooperative Nursery, 2785 West 5th Street.

The unique features of the Warbasse pilot program is that it "mainstreams" 15 children with spina bifida into groups of children already attending school. Children 29 months or older attend five mornings from 9:00 to 12 noon. Younger children enter the toddler program from 10:00 to 12 noon two mornings per week. Each group has a licensed teacher and several aides depending on the number of children involved. A physical therapist is present two days a week and a psychologist is available for consultation.

Marcia Kepeca, director of the Warbasse Nursery, said, "We believe that children with handicapping conditions are first and foremost children... and that is that focus of the program."

The Spina Bifida Association of Greater New York sponsored the search that led to creation of the Warbasse program. Funding has been obtained from the Disabled Children's Program of New York State and the Harriet Annenberg Foundation. ●

TELEVISION FAIRNESS FOR NEW JERSEY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey is only one of two States currently without a commercial VHF television station. Residents of my State must rely on those UHF stations assigned to New Jersey or on the commercial VHF stations in New York or Pennsylvania for their news and public affairs programming.

This is an unconscionable situation for a major State, a State of 8 million people, the State that ranks eighth in both population and productivity.

Accordingly, in a determined effort to alleviate these conditions and in light of the unprecedented decision by the Federal Communications Commission divesting RKO General, Inc., of three of its broadcast licenses, including one in New York City, I recently took the initiative in calling upon Chairman Charles Ferris of the FCC on behalf of my State and the people of New Jersey. In my letter of January 25, I urged Commissioner Ferris "to give full consideration to relocating," channel 9, RKO's commercial television license in New York to the State of New Jersey.

The current situation presents a prime opportunity to provide the residents of New Jersey with a VHF television station that we so dearly need, yet so sadly lack. This occasion also enables the FCC to take clear and decisive action regarding a problem with which they have grappled for years, although to little avail.

The absence of a commercial television station in New Jersey has been an issue for decades. Our people know it, our State's image and economy has suffered because of it, and even the FCC has recognized it.

In 1976, the Commission publicly concluded that the State of New Jersey did not have adequate locally oriented television broadcast service. In fact, late last year, Commissioner Joseph Fogarty stated:

We are still inclined to the same finding, and I fear that those observing our seemingly endless quest for a remedy may be getting the impression that they are witnessing a regulatory shell game.

Despite the FCC's efforts to increase the amount of New Jersey coverage by the New York City and Philadelphia commercial stations, the results have been less than satisfactory. Just a few short months ago, Chairman Ferris reiterated that he was going to—

demonstrate the concern of the FCC to assist all the residents of New Jersey who are not deprived of what I believe to be sufficient local news or public affairs programming.

It is obvious that while a greater physical presence in New Jersey of out-of-State stations is of some help, it

is not enough. It is equally evident that an increase of State UHF stations will not adequately meet the demand of the 8 million strong viewing market in New Jersey. It is now clear that only a statewide commercial VHF television station is capable of serving New Jersey and servicing its people in a credible, comprehensive and complete manner.

For New Jersey has long been the "forgotten" State in an era when television has become our national, and most essential, media. Its residents have continually sought to receive equitable broadcast representation, and are keenly aware of the absence of fair and just coverage of their State.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that New York is more than adequately served by a plethora of stations, the transfer of this one license to New Jersey is squarely in keeping with our Nation's cherished concept and time-honored tradition of a balanced reportage.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support my efforts in this direction so as to assure all of our citizens of equal access to the media outlets and communication channels of our society. ●

OBSERVATIONS ON H.R. 4788: THE WATER POLICY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1979

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I draw my colleague's attention to the following:

THE PRESIDENT'S GOALS FOR WATER PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

On June 6, 1978, the President sent a water policy message to Congress in which he announced a number of water policy initiatives designed to:

(1) Improve the planning and management of Federal water resource programs to prevent waste and to permit cost-effective, safe and environmentally sound water projects to move forward expeditiously.

(2) Provide a new, national emphasis on water conservation.

(3) Enhance Federal-State cooperation and improved water resources planning.

(4) Increase attention to environmental quality.

Since that time, the Administration has proposed to Congress specific legislative initiatives in the areas of cost sharing, independent review of project plans, and new Federal grant programs to improve State planning for water conservation and management. The President has also instituted, administratively, improvements in the Principles and Standards under which water projects are planned, as well as improved procedures for benefit and cost estimates.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF H.R. 4788

H.R. 4788 reflects neither the letter nor the spirit of the President's reform initiatives. Rather it continues a long tradition of:

(1) Prematurely authorizing projects which still are in the study stage or are under review within the Executive Branch.

(2) Authorizing projects and other activi-

ties which are clear departures from established Federal Policy and accepted management principles and for which no rationale or justification has been developed other than the accommodation of some special interest.

Collectively, these actions undermine the orderly and consistent implementation of the Federal water program.

BUDGETARY IMPACTS

The dollar amount of the objectionable items authorized in this Bill is about \$2.5 billion. To the extent that these unsound or premature initiatives are actually funded and implemented, special interests benefit not only at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers but also, often to the detriment of the Nation's natural resources. Because of inflation and the fact that these authorizations serve as precedent for future authorizations, the potential budgetary implications are, in fact, far in excess of \$2.5 billion.

Some have argued that the Administration should not be concerned with the authorization of unsound activities since their actual implementation can be prevented through the budgetary and appropriations process. Unfortunately, actual experience in water resource programs does not support such a view. All too frequently the same special interests that, in the past, were successful in obtaining authorization were, sooner or later, also successful in obtaining funding for implementation.

SPECIFIC CATEGORIES OF OBJECTIONS TO H.R. 4788

Cost Sharing.—The President's cost sharing proposals call for consistent State involvement in the financing of water projects. H.R. 4788 ignores the President's proposals for generic cost sharing reform. Not only does the Bill ignore the President's recommendations for cost sharing reforms, it also, in the case of projects with an implementation cost of about \$90 million, specifically reduces currently applicable non-Federal cost sharing requirements. In doing so, the Bill moves further away from consistency in cost sharing—and from the principle that local beneficiaries pay appropriate shares of the costs of projects from which they derive significant local benefits—in favor of accommodation to particular special interests. Not only is this ad hoc application of special cost sharing rules a poor management practice, it is not equitable to treat one geographic area more favorably in this respect than others are treated within the same Bill.

Single Purpose Water Supply Initiatives.—The provision of municipal and industrial water supply historically has been a local and State responsibility. Corps of Engineers involvement in water supply has been, with very few exceptions, limited to provision of water supply storage in multiple purpose reservoirs so that the best use can be made of limited reservoir sites. The cost of this storage is fully reimbursable by local project sponsors under the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958.

H.R. 4788 contains several new authorities for the Corps of Engineers in the area of municipal and industrial water supply. They range from a generic study authority for single purpose water supply projects, after a study resolution has been adopted by one of the Public Works Committees, to the authorization of study, or study and construction, of a number of municipal water supply facilities including conveyance, pumping, distribution, treatment and filtration facilities. We have identified specific costs of over \$170 million (unadjusted for inflation) for these new authorities on the nine projects in the Bill. But clearly, the budgetary outlays could easily amount to billions,

should these precedents lead to a number of other Federally-financed projects. (The Bill's repayment provisions over 50 years for Federal investments in construction do not reduce the strain on the Federal budget during the decade or more when the Federal budget must handle the outlays with no repayments yet coming in; in addition, repayments would be made at subsidized interest rates.)

In spite of the potential Federal outlays for these single purpose water supply projects, there is no systematic rationale for their selection and inclusion in the Bill. The Administration, in contrast, has underway an intergovernmental study, chaired by the Department of the Army, to investigate the institutional and financial problems surrounding urban water supply, and to lay out alternative approaches to their solution, including options for a greater Federal role. This study, scheduled for completion this spring, should provide a rational basis for appropriate actions at all levels of government in this vital water problem area.

The argument that inclusion of arbitrarily selected projects in the Bill represents "demonstrations" of a Federal role in the growing problem of urban water supply/conveyance/distribution/treatment facilities is spurious. There is no need to "demonstrate" that the Corps of Engineers can construct such facilities. Local entities, public and private, have been building them for years. The issue is what the Federal role in meeting such local needs should be—and that issue needs more analysis and discussion before precedent-setting actions are taken.

Other Projects Authorized Without Benefit of Any Study, on the Basis of Incomplete Studies or Incompletely Reviewed Studies.—H.R. 4788 authorizes 54 other projects with a currently estimated cost in excess of \$1.3 billion, for which no report has been transmitted to the Congress.

The reasons for the absence of a report vary—in some cases no studies have been undertaken; others have incomplete studies; others have completed studies which are now at various stages of review within the Executive Branch.

By its requirements for individual project authorization, Congress shares with the Administration a recognition of the economic, environmental and social significance of a particular solution to a water problem. By prematurely authorizing these projects, Congress would preempt the orderly progress of a project from the study stage to implementation. Such orderly process is absolutely necessary to insure that only cost effective and environmentally acceptable projects are built.

OTHER PRECEDENT-SETTING PROVISIONS

The Bill contains numerous provisions which would involve the Corps of Engineers in new missions which have heretofore not been Federal responsibilities. There has been no adequate justification for assumption of these responsibilities by the Federal Government. One significant provision would vastly expand the applicability of the National Dam Inspection Act to thousands of very small dams with minimum hazard potential and would put the Army in the business of restoring unsafe dams owned by State or local public entities. There is no evidence that the Federal Government needs to or ought to assume this local responsibility.

The current Federal program is to inspect all high-hazard dams as well as certain others, and appropriately leaves with States and local entities, public and private, the responsibility for repair of the dams they own.

The Bill would also provide precedents for new Army missions: remedial work to correct the effects of landslides unrelated to water projects; acquisition of land not contiguous to water projects for purposes of recreation; and treatment of local storm drainage problems as flood control projects to be funded in large part at Federal expense. Such expansion in the Federal role—and the future budgetary strains created by that expansion—have simply not been sufficiently justified.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 4788 in its present form could result in Federal expenditures of about \$2.5 billion unadjusted for inflation in future years for specific projects and activities to which the Administration has strong substantive or procedural objections. The Bill, moreover, would provide strong precedents for new Federal responsibilities costing billions of dollars more.

By adding premature, inappropriate, or unjustified projects to the multi-billion dollar backlog of already-authorized work, H.R. 4788 only inhibits the orderly solution of the Nation's water problems. The Federal water program budgets, like the budget for other Federal programs, is limited. If unsound projects are actually funded, budgetary resources are diverted from more worthwhile water projects; even if unsound projects are never funded, alternative solutions to the real problems are delayed or prevented by the false expectations and/or legal impediments created by authorizations on the books. In either case, the Nation as a whole suffers. It is for this reason, ultimately, that the Administration is anxious to work with Congress to put together a water project authorization Bill that does permit timely progress in solving the Nation's water problems.

(These observations address the Bill as reported out of Committee in October 1979. A Committee amendment adopted on January 22, 1980, adds more than 20 additional provisions which are objectionable on essentially the same bases as the objections cited herein.) ●

RICHARD BARNET ON THE DRIFT TO GLOBAL CONFRONTATION

HON. JOHN CONYERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in the world are ominous, defy easy solutions, yet beg for intellectual clarity, historical perspective, and appropriate policy responses.

They will force us to define, more responsibly and precisely than we have during the past two decades, what the abiding interests of the United States and the West are, and how these interests can best be safeguarded and advanced. Yet in the early stages of these multiple foreign policy crises, there has been a singular absence of broad, varied debate on the nature of the crisis, and on reasonable alternatives in dealing with world events. In fact, part of the danger in the present situation is the pervasive tendency in and out of Washington to simply follow the President's lead—understandable in the light of our system of government and culture, but, neverthe-

less, profoundly deficient from the standpoint of policy.

The President's state of the Union address spelled out a variety of military actions that suggest our past experience in Vietnam, Iran, and in other parts of the world—that indiscriminate military assistance to shaky regimes and new outpourings of defense dollars are costly, dangerous, and counterproductive—has largely been forgotten. Yet there are few voices today challenging these policies and an extremely narrow range of alternatives that are being discussed.

Before we plunge headlong into a new round of military action and costly defense mobilization, we should at least pause to consider the potentially grave consequences this will have for our society and economy. Already, as a result of the President's new foreign policies, the 1981 budget registers a major retrenchment on domestic programs and a severe squeeze on the Federal Government's fiscal ability to maintain and expand worthwhile and necessary programs at home.

One of the few, and most distinguished, voices to challenge the President's foreign-policy direction is Richard J. Barnet, a leading student of international affairs during the past two decades. Barnet was a member of the State Department Policy Planning Group in the early sixties. He is the author of major books, "Roots of War, Global Reach," and most recently, "The Giants: Russia and America." Barnet furnishes in the article reprinted below a badly needed historical perspective and alternative policy analysis, that I urge my colleagues to read and consider. The article was first published in the Washington Post, January 20, 1980.

The Barnet article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 20, 1980]

WE NEED NEW RULES, NOT MILITARY RISKS OR NUCLEAR BLUFFS

(By Richard J. Barnet)

The 1980s have begun with the brutal Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the collapse of détente and the distinct possibility of direct U.S. Soviet confrontation in the coming weeks in Pakistan or Iran. The world seems closer to a major war than at any time since the 1930s. The informal, de facto rules of the Cold War have broken down.

For a generation, the United States conducted military interventions in Iran, Guatemala, Lebanon, the Dominican Republic, Vietnam, Cambodia and elsewhere. The Soviets invaded Hungary and Czechoslovakia, but outside the area occupied at the end of World War II by the Red Army Soviet military expansionism was contained. The United States was free to dispatch its forces around the world outside the Soviet bloc without courting a risk of nuclear war; the Soviet Union, as the Cuban missile crisis showed, was not. In the past five years, however, Cuban troops backed by the Soviet Union intervened in Angola and Ethiopia, without American response.

This operational code of the Cold War was based on shared perceptions of power. With the invasion of Afghanistan, the Soviets have demonstrated that the old rules no longer apply. Their willingness to send their

military forces outside the Soviet bloc and to brook the predictable consequences is particularly disturbing because it lends credence to the fear that old Russian imperial ambitions in the whole strategic area have been revived.

Henry Kissinger's structure of peace, fragile as it was, is collapsing. This fundamental question now facing the United States is what can take its place.

The urge to "punish" the Soviet Union for naked aggression is understandable, and the impulse to do it with symbolic military measures is predictable. But the military responses now being planned show a basic lack of understanding of the dimensions of the present crisis and a failure to take a hard look at the consequences of planned military moves.

There is rapidly developing in this country a political myth in the tradition of the "Yalta sellout" and "Who lost China?" slogans of the 1940s, a myth that holds that military weakness is behind our current predicament. Yet the United States does not lack the airborne divisions, planes and ships to launch a military operation against Iran right now. And even tripling such forces cannot rescue the hostages.

In Vietnam the mismatch between military power and the political problems we were seeking to solve was the heart of the tragedy. Now we appear ready to bring back the Green Berets in modern dress, another military fix. Once again we will assign to the armed forces impossible missions, and once again the prestige and power of the United States will suffer. But this time the war is already regional and threatens to involve more than a billion people.

The military options are all unpromising. The instability of the region is causing the U.S. to resort to the very policies that have promoted the instability.

We forget that the shah fell not because he lacked arms—he sold and gave him \$20 billion worth—but because he was a corrupt, brutal and hated ruler. The arms served to catalyze public discontent and to symbolize U.S. responsibility for maintaining his tyranny.

In the same way, arming a brutal unpopular government in Pakistan will strain the fragile bonds that keep that collection of nationalities together and will exacerbate the separatist movement of the Baluchis and Pashtoons, all of which plays into the Russians' hands. Arming Afghan guerrillas or Pakistanis to fight in Afghanistan would be both cynical and foolish; the fighting might serve to keep the battle in the public eye but it could not liberate Afghanistan from the Soviet army. In the process a good many Pakistanis and Afghans would die and the Russians could be provoked into a Cambodia-style incursion against the rebel "sanctuaries." A revived India-Pakistan war is a likely consequence.

A Chinese "punitive" invasion of Indochina would no doubt distress the Russians, but the only lesson they would learn from it is that a general South Asian war was inevitable. Establishing U.S. bases in regimes as politically vulnerable as Sadat's Egypt or Saudi Arabia is crackpot realpolitik.

There is only one real military option to counter further Soviet aggression, and that is to keep raising the risk of nuclear war and to make it ever more "credible." By definition, that means basing national security policy on bluff, for there is nothing the Soviets could do in the Middle East that would be as destructive to the vital interests of the United States as a nuclear war. A nuclear strategy is an exercise in controlled recklessness. It is based on the expectation that the Soviets will back down in a confrontation or that the consequences of a nuclear war can

be limited. Both are increasingly dubious propositions. In a world brimming with armaments, bluffs are likely to be called.

The most dangerous aspect of the reviving political myth of American weakness is the notion that it was a shift in the nuclear balance that emboldened the Russians to act in Afghanistan. The United States has the nuclear arsenal to destroy the Soviet Union utterly and the Soviets know it.

Far from looking weak militarily, the United States looked as if it had abandoned detente and was prepared to resume the quest for massive military superiority. SALT was already as good as dead. The United States had already announced a commitment to a major escalation of the military budget. The decision to emplace in Europe the cruise missile and Pershings, a new strategic nuclear weapons system as far as the Soviets were concerned, had been made and Brezhnev's October offer to negotiate a reduction in European-based nuclear weapons had been dismissed. The motives in Washington may have all been defensive, but they did not look defensive in Moscow. As they looked out from the Kremlin, Soviet leaders saw West Germany moving closer to acquisition of nuclear weapons and a U.S.-Chinese military alliance taking shape. The U.S. military programs of the 1980s would restore an overwhelming nuclear superiority to the United States unless matched at a fantastic cost.

The stakes are much too high to base policy on a view that the Soviets have fixed intentions. Whether the Soviet motivations were "offensive" or "defensive" matters less than whether it is possible to restore a structure of peace that can inhibit further military moves by the Soviet Union.

The great danger of the 1980s is that the possibilities for miscalculation have increased enormously. If President Carter appears a vacillating and uncertain leader, the Soviets appear mercurial and unpredictable. With President Brezhnev about to leave, it is not clear who is in charge. A "tough" policy is needed, but mindless military escalation is not the route. A policy that can impress friends and adversaries is one rooted in a clear view of vital interests, a realistic awareness of what can and cannot be achieved, and a steadiness of direction.

The ambiguity of policy and intentions in both capitals is creating a moment of extreme danger and, like the Cuban missile crisis, a time of opportunity as well. Because the old ground rules have broken down, de facto rules about what the superpowers can and cannot do must be put into place. The new rules will either be forged in the crucible of confrontation or they will be arrived at by explicit agreement.

If we are to slow down the drift to war, new principles governing superpower behavior must be negotiated. They should be simple and explicit.

For example, both superpowers could agree not to deploy their forces in any country in which they are not now located. Such a freeze on bases and troop deployments would outlaw future Vietnams, Dominican Republics, Czechoslovakias and Afghanistans. Proxy armies, as in Angola and Ethiopia, would be expressly prohibited. Such an agreement would clearly be in the U.S. interest since, unlike the first postwar generation, the Soviets now have more opportunities for military intervention than does the United States.

Why would the Soviets agree? No one knows for sure that they would. However, their record of military intervention has not been spectacularly successful. In Egypt, Sudan and Somalia, they lost control and made enemies of the countries on which they had lavished military aid. Pacifying Af-

ghanistan will not be all that easy and the price already paid has been an overwhelming vote of condemnation by the Third World nations. The stated goal of their diplomacy has been to establish the principle of equality with the United States in military relations. Clear ground rules that inhibit both superpowers equally are in their interest as well as in ours. If there is a structure of peace that protects legitimate Soviet interests, then there is a good chance that they would renounce unilateral military and paramilitary action.

The United States should work for a neutralized Afghanistan, with borders guaranteed by all the states in the region and with Soviet troops withdrawn. The analogy would be Austria—from which Soviet troops also withdrew—militarily neutral but with an internal political system closer to that of the Soviet bloc. (Austria, of course, in economic and political terms is part of the West.) It would be foolish to underestimate the difficulties, but it is a realistic goal as part of a larger process for the restoration of a less dangerous U.S.-Soviet relationship.

Neither superpower can control internal political events in the Third World. An agreement that reflected such an understanding of our historical moment is absolutely crucial to the avoidance of war. The failure to grasp the power of liberation ideologies is the fundamental weak point of the official view in Washington, and, it seems, in Moscow, too.

In one sense we are at the "end of ideology." Neither "communism" nor "capitalism" remains a credible philosophical system for organizing society in the contemporary world. There is growing suspicion of all ready-made systems. The existing models are too much beset by internal contradictions and failures. They mean too many things.

There is panic and violence in the world—not, as at other historical moments, because of a fanatic belief that one system or another has a monopoly on truth, but because of widespread feelings that on one in charge knows what to do. The failure of both "socialist" and "capitalist" regimes to bring liberation or dignity to billions of people has unleashed a profound spiritual reaction—a radical rejection of the dominant international culture.

The popular impulse is not so much to build a "nation" in the 19th century sense of the word as to restore a sense of cultural and religious autonomy and to achieve and identify which—as in the case of the Kurds, for example—may be transnational. But the transforming impact of popular passions is real, and in the corridors of power it is hopelessly misunderstood. The official American worldview ignored Islam in Iran until the mobs were in the streets. The Russians have been more aware of popular passion as a major political force of our time, but they too are so bound by the traditional geopolitical view of the world that their only response is to try to crush it.

Given the realities of world power and the parallel reflex responses in Washington and Moscow, there is no way out of the national security dilemma as it is now being defined. Unless we change the conceptual framework, we are doomed to a series of military moves and countermoves that cannot be kept under control. But the United States does have an historic opportunity to help build a new world consensus to contain aggression. It can do that only by identifying more with the concerns of the weak states where the world's majority lives.

To build a world consensus we need new ground rules that will be equally applicable to everybody. To curb proliferation, the U.S.-Soviet competition in nuclear weapons must come to a halt. To build a new world majority for reestablishing the minimum in-

ternational order necessary to survive the rest of the century, the poor countries must have a significantly greater stake in that order.

The principal security problem for the United States in the 1980s is mounting instability everywhere; the Russians are just a part of the problem. Making new military alliances with weak, illegitimate governments creates more instability. The escalating disorder in the world requires a clearer relationship with the Soviets, not a breakoff in relations. We need more emphasis on human rights, not less; only legitimate governments, not repressive juntas, can keep order over the long run. We need accommodation with the developing countries on economic issues. We dare not let our obsession with the Soviet Union define our global security policy.

A few years ago these were the stated views of the Carter administration. Now, that effort to develop rational security policies appropriate for the 1980s is being abandoned, and we march to catastrophe under the banner of an obsolete *realpolitik*. If we could learn that uncontrollable forces of liberation are on the move in the world and that they need not be our enemies, we could help to create a political climate in which aggression can be contained.●

A MESSAGE OF HOPE FROM EXILE IN SIBERIA

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues a message I have just received from my Fourth Congressional District's prisoner of conscience, Ida Nudel.

Written in English on a postcard, Ida's message was sent from the remote village of Krivosheino, where she is in exile on a charge of malicious hooliganism. Ida's crime? Displaying from the balcony of her Moscow apartment a banner demanding a visa to Israel. Ida Nudel has been seeking to emigrate to Israel for nearly a decade, but, although her husband and her sister were granted permission to emigrate to Israel, Ida Nudel has been refused, in flagrant violation of the Helsinki accords on human rights.

Although living under the most primitive conditions and under constant harassment, Ida Nudel's indomitable spirit has never flagged. Last May, at the suggestion of Lynn Singer, president of the Long Island Committee for Soviet Jewry, I adopted Ida as my Fourth District's prisoner of conscience. Since then, each week, I have been writing letters of encouragement to Ida, and, each week, writing to Soviet authorities demanding they permit her to emigrate to Israel.

Until receiving Ida's postcard, I had no indication my weekly messages were getting through. But listen to what Ida wrote on December 28, 1979:

Dear Norman! Thank you very much for your letters of June 1, 8, 15, 22. I am sorry my poor English doesn't permit me to express properly how deeply I was moved. Your letters were great support for my soul. I know that you and many are very anxious

and very persistent) in obtaining freedom for me and for so many in situation such as my(mine) and even worst. I am very thankful for that! I ask you very much, in spite of things not going as we dream, don't give up, be stubborn and you will succeed. My best wishes for you and all your family for 1980 year. Cordially, Ida.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot express adequately the tremendous lift in spirit I received from Ida Nudel's postcard. It is the most heartening thing that has happened to me in a long time. For 9 months, I have been writing weekly letters of encouragement to Ida, and her first word to me is an offer of encouragement. What a courageous spirit. What magnificent determination and perseverance.

Mr. Speaker, in response, I assured Ida that I will never let up in my efforts to free her until she arrives safely in Israel, as did the previous prisoner of conscience from my Fourth Congressional District, Hillel Butman. Furthermore, I promised Ida that I would bring her message to the attention of my colleagues. I am doing so here in asking that you join with me in demanding that Soviet leaders, from Leonid Brezhnev on down, reverse their grim persecution and oppression and grant freedom to those, like Ida, whose only desire is to practice their religion in the country of their choosing.

Mr. Speaker, in these days of growing world tension, we must redouble our efforts in the cause of human rights. We must lend our support and encouragement to those, like Ida Nudel who are struggling for their freedom. Her courage, determination, and perseverance in the face of adversity should inspire every one of us to do our utmost for her and her fellow victims of persecution and intolerance. Our voices are heard—even behind the walls of the Kremlin. Let us join in renewed demands for freedom for Ida Nudel and thousands of other Soviet Jews being oppressed in the Soviet Union.●

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON SMALL BUSINESS SUPPORTS LEGISLATIVE VETO

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have concern for the opportunities of the Nation's small business were most pleased when, in April 1978, President Carter called for a White House Conference on Small Business. In doing so, he recognized that small business means a great deal to our national economy in terms of productivity and growth. The President emphasized the need to develop a broad new legislative and policy agenda for small business, and he ordered this Conference to develop that agenda. He also insisted that the Conference must

reach the Nation's grassroots in developing this agenda, and he assured participants that their views would have a significant impact on public policy.

The Conference did reach the grassroots. A series of 57 open forums were held throughout the Nation, initially involving over 30,000 people. Thousands of recommendations emerged from these forums, and they were then fashioned by a series of 10 regional conferences into over 300 issue statements which were used as a working agenda at the recently completed national conference. The 1,500 delegates at this final conference were asked to use these statements to recommend a final 15 that the White House said would be the basis of Federal policy for the next quarter century. President Carter called this process "participatory democracy at its finest," and I wholeheartedly agree.

At the national conference the delegates continued to voice the concerns expressed over and over during earlier phases of the process. One of the most frequently heard concerns was the need for regulatory reform. Of the hundreds of recommendations the delegates reviewed, they voted as one of their top 15 recommendations that Congress take a greater role in overseeing the regulatory process including instituting a legislative veto over rules and regulations. Specifically, the conference recommended that:

Congress shall exercise line-item veto over regulations within a specified time through congressional oversight committees, with one-house floor vote.

This action places the President in an interesting situation. He has expressed opposition to the legislative veto concept, in the past. He recently vetoed a bill because he claimed it contained a legislative veto, although his accompanying statement failed to explain why he has previously signed 40 bills during his term in office containing 52 legislative veto provisions.

Nonetheless, the President has chosen to disagree publicly with Congress on the issue of legislative veto. He has not heeded the broad base of support for legislative veto that exists in the Congress. He has not recognized the fact that Congress has continually endorsed the legislative veto mechanism. He has not realized the significance of the fact that the Levitas legislative veto bill, H.R. 1776, currently has more than 230 cosponsors, well over a majority of the membership of the House.

So far the President has not realized tide of significance of all of this in maintaining his public opposition to legislative veto. Now, however, he is faced with the recommendations of his own grassroots Conference on Small Business. His own White House Conference has overwhelmingly endorsed the legislative veto. The legislative veto survived an arduous process to become one of the major policy recommendations of his own Conference.

The Conference delegates were told that the President was serious in his commitment to use the recommendations that emerged from the process—all of them. The question is: Can the President now choose to ignore one of his Conference's top priorities? Can he ignore the results of participatory democracy at its finest? I believe not. I hope his administration will now join with the Congress and implement the legislative veto proposals.

The legislative veto will put elected officials back in control of the rule-making process. This is as it should be. Rules are laws, and the Constitution vests lawmaking authority in the hands of elected officials. What we have now is a situation where unelected bureaucrats write far more of our laws than does the elected Congress. Bureaucrats currently write 18 regulations for every law Congress passes, and there is no comprehensive mechanism for reviewing their work before it is imposed upon our citizens. The existing system of government by regulation violates the fundamental principle of representative democracy.

The legislative veto can correct this problem. It will give Congress the authority to review, and veto if necessary, proposed regulations before they can go into effect. It is a simple, yet effective, mechanism to insure that elected officials have the final words over all of our laws. The 1,500 delegates to the White House Conference on Small Business understood the need for the legislative veto and recommended to the President that it be implemented. I hope he will view this recommendation in the spirit he promised when he called the Conference together. The delegates have spoken. Now it is up to the President. ●

PHIL PORTNOY HUMANITARIAN AWARDS

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, the Phil Portnoy Association of Union, N.J., represents the grassroots people of America who are dedicated to their community and to helping our fellow citizens cope with unforeseen tragedies. This sense of community service is one of the great strengths of this Nation and of the American people.

It thrives in Union, N.J., where the Phil Portnoy Association has encouraged individuals to contribute their time and talents to helping others meet the burdens of life and overcoming the disappointments caused by crippling accidents, fires, and other tragic circumstances.

The Phil Portnoy Association annually honors individuals who have demonstrated compassion, leadership, and

dedication to helping others. On February 2, 1980, the Phil Portnoy Association will give its humanitarian awards to two outstanding citizens of Union, Mrs. Rhoda Fried and Mrs. Lucille Longo. Their contributions and efforts are impressive and deserving of this honor.

Rhoda Fried has served as a member of township of Union Board of Education for 5 years, and is now its president. I should note that the public school system in Union is more than meeting expectations for quality education. Recently, the results of the nationwide California aptitude tests revealed that students in the Union public school system achieved a rather extraordinary rating in competition with students all over the Nation. This is a credit to the Union Board of Education, Mrs. Fried, the administration, faculty, students, and their parents.

Over the past decade, Mrs. Fried has unselfishly given her time, talent, and energies to benefit thousands of public school children as a member of the PTA at the elementary, junior high school, and high school levels. As anyone involved in education recognizes, it is a tremendous responsibility and a time-consuming one, but the rewards in terms of stimulating children to learn and to develop their potential are great.

In the meantime, Mrs. Fried has raised funds to help accident victims; those unfortunate citizens whose families cannot finance the extraordinary costs of rehabilitation and treatment of serious injuries. As treasurer of the Phil Portnoy Humanitarian Association, Mrs. Fried was instrumental in persuading businessmen, and professional and working people in Union to contribute to helping others.

I congratulate Mrs. Fried and her family on receiving the Phil Portnoy Association Humanitarian Award.

Likewise, the association and the community of Union Township deeply appreciate the valuable contributions of Mrs. Lucille Longo. It takes hard workers to do the nitty-gritty jobs of raising funds for charities and of interesting our fellow citizens in public service. Mrs. Longo has done an outstanding job in all respects.

Raising funds for charitable causes is always difficult. But equally important, Mrs. Longo personally followed through to implement programs of assistance to those in need. For 7 years she was in charge of delivering food baskets to the needy on Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter. Hundreds of poor families whose meager incomes could not provide them with a decent holiday dinner are grateful to Mrs. Longo and her volunteers for their thoughtfulness and concern.

Mrs. Longo also recognized that children need healthy recreation pursuits as well as food. Her service as a member of the Union Township Recreation Commission provided the support needed to expand and continue many of Union's recreation programs for the young.

Over a period of 8 years, Mrs. Longo served as secretary for the Phil Portnoy Association, enabling its members to reach out to help those whose lives were shattered by tragic circumstances. I congratulate Mrs. Longo, her husband, Charles, and their daughter, Cheryl.

In every respect, Mrs. Longo and Mrs. Fried exemplify the humanitarian instincts of the Phil Portnoy Association. It is highly respected for its charity and concern for the victims of accidents, and Phil Portnoy, himself, knows from his own experience that with help from others and personal courage, the handicapped can lead fruitful and meaningful lives in the service of their fellow citizens and their community. ●

STATEMENT ON INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 6247, TAX TREATMENT OF THE COMMUNITY INCOME OF SEPARATED SPOUSES

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1980, I introduced H.R. 6247, legislation which is badly needed to cure a grievous injustice under present law in the case of married individuals, residing in community property States, who live apart and file separate tax returns. In this situation, each spouse is required to report the one-half of community income attributable to the income and earnings of the other spouse, whether or not such income is in fact received. H.R. 6247 will correct this problem by amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide that separated spouses will be taxed only on the real economic income earned or received by each, and not on a share of community income not actually received.

Typically, the worst cases under present law have involved an unsupported wife who does not know, and has no way of knowing, the financial status and affairs of the community or even the whereabouts of her husband. In many cases, no return has been filed or tax paid by the absent husband. In this situation, the wife has no control over her statutory income tax liability and no means to compel her husband to divulge information for tax filing purposes concerning the community's assets, liabilities, or income. As a practical matter, the wife filing separately can neither prepare a return showing the community income nor pay the tax on such income, despite her legal requirement to do so. In many cases, the final result of imposing a tax liability on the separated wife for the one-half of the community earnings of the husband is to create an uncollectible deficiency.

Despite the availability in most community property States of a suit for

separation of property—or a suit against the husband's heirs after the community is dissolved by death—the wife is, as a practical matter, helpless if the husband cannot be located for service of process. Further, while the wife may be relieved of certain obligations to creditors and others under a State exemption statute if she renounces the community, such renunciation does not relieve her of liability for Federal income taxes due on the one-half of community income attributed to her for tax purposes.

Both the Tax Court and the U.S. Supreme Court have invited Congress to amend the Internal Revenue Code to dissolve the community for tax purposes where in fact, the separated spouse receives no financial benefit from the community earnings of the other separated spouse. The tax-reporting dilemma of separate spouses, resident in community property States, was first brought to the attention of the Congress in July 1977 by the General Accounting Office in a letter report to the Joint Committee on Taxation. The GAO recommended that, where certain conditions exist, the separated spouse who does not receive the one-half of community income be relieved of tax liability with respect to such income. The four conditions specified by the GAO were: First, a separate return had been filed by an individual who is married; second, there is omitted from the gross income reported on the separate return, community income derived from income earned by the other spouse or derived from community property; third, the married individual filing the separate return lives separate and apart from the other spouse for the entire taxable year; and fourth, the individual filing the separate return established that he or she has not received, directly or indirectly, any of the community income omitted from gross income.

These four conditions are incorporated in the bill's new section 66 of the IRC which refers to section 879(a) for the applicable tax computation rules. That is, where these four conditions are present, the community income of separated spouses, both citizens or residents of the United States, will be treated in the same way as the community income of a U.S. citizen or resident who is married to a nonresident alien individual. This means that the community income which is earned income will be taxable to the spouse who has rendered the personal services. Community income which is business income, including a partner's distributive share of partnership income, will be taxable to the spouse who exercises substantially all of the management and control of the trade or business. Community income derived from the separate property of one spouse will be taxable to that spouse.

This legislation would improve the equity of our Federal tax laws for separated spouses and I am hopeful that

this bill will receive the support and expeditious consideration that it deserves. ●

INTELLIGENCE REFORM ACT OF 1980

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to eliminate three problems which have hurt the ability of the United States to conduct aggressive, effective intelligence operations.

The bill would: Provide that the CIA report covert activities only to the House and Senate intelligence committees, instead of to the eight congressional committees which receive that information now; change the law so that foreign agents would no longer have access to information relative to the operation of our Government through the Freedom of Information Act; and make it a Federal crime to reveal the identity of undercover agents or informants of the CIA, intelligence agencies of the Department of Defense, or the foreign counterintelligence or counter-terrorism components of the FBI.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I feel it is vital that we level with the American people about the state of our intelligence agencies. The truth is that the CIA and our other intelligence agencies have nearly been put out of business in recent years. It is time that we tell the American people just how serious the political attacks on our intelligence operations have been. And it is time for us to stress, again and again, that an effective intelligence operation is vital and essential to maintaining a strong America.

Intelligence activities may not be a nice business, but unfortunately, the game in which we are players is not a nice game. That we allow foreign agents access to important information relative to our Government through the Freedom of Information Act is unthinkable and must be changed. To allow those who reveal the identity of intelligence agents to go free while their victims lose their lives can no longer be tolerated.

The last section of my bill is directed at those who have set out to identify CIA personnel and agents in a deliberate attempt to damage the United States even if it endangers lives. The bill would make such actions punishable by up to 10 years imprisonment, a fine of up to \$50,000, or both.

Another bill, which I introduced earlier, would repeal the current requirement that a court order be obtained before electronic surveillance of foreign agents can be conducted. To restrict the FBI's use of electronic sur-

veillance of foreign agents in our country spying on us when we are being told that there are already more Soviet agents in this country than we can keep track of is a condition that must be changed.

Only last night, on nationwide television, the American people heard Arkady Shevchenko, former Under Secretary of the United Nations, estimate that half—roughly 300—of the Soviet employees on the United Nation's staff are spies. Mr. Shevchenko gave this information to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of which I am a member, last week, and I am glad that the information has now been made public so that the people of our country can better understand the Soviet threat.

H.R. 6316

A bill to improve the intelligence system of the United States, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Intelligence Reform Act of 1980.

Sec. 2. Section 662(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. No. 2422(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"No funds appropriated under the authority of this chapter or any other Act may be expended by or on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency for a special activity, unless and until—

"(1) the President finds that the activity is important to the national security of the United States and reports, as soon as possible, a description and scope of the activity to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States House of Representatives and to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States, or

"(2) the National Security Council determines that the activity does not involve substantial resources or risks and falls within a category of special activities which category shall have been found by the President to be important to the national security of the United States and which finding shall have been reported to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States Senate.

"For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'special activity' means an activity conducted abroad in support of national foreign policy objectives which is designed to further official United States programs and policies abroad and which is planned and executed so that the role of the United States Government is not apparent or acknowledged publicly, and functions in support of such an activity, but not including diplomatic activity or the collection or production of intelligence or related support functions."

Sec. 3. Section 6 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. Sec. 403g) is amended to read as follows:

"In the interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States and in order to further implement the proviso of Section 403(d)(3) of this title that the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure, the Agency shall be exempted from the provisions of any law which require the publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or number of personnel employed

by the Agency. In furtherance of the responsibility of the Director of Central Intelligence to protect intelligence sources and methods, information in files maintained by an intelligence agency or component of the United States Government shall also be exempted from the provisions of any law which require the publication or disclosure, or the search or review in connection therewith, if such files have been specifically designated by the Director of Central Intelligence to be concerned with: The design, function, deployment, exploitation or utilization of scientific or technical systems for the collection of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence information; Special activities and foreign intelligence or counterintelligence operations; Investigations conducted to determine the suitability of potential foreign intelligence or counterintelligence sources; Intelligence and security liaison arrangements or information exchanges with foreign governments or their intelligence or security services; *Provided*, That requests by American citizens and permanent resident aliens for information concerning themselves, made pursuant to Sections 552 and 552a of Title 5, shall be processed in accordance with those Sections. The provisions of this Section shall not be superseded except by a provision of law which is enacted after the date of this Amendment and which specifically repeals or modifies the provisions of this Section."

SEC. 4. The National Security Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE V—PROTECTION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

"PROTECTION OF IDENTITIES OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES UNDERCOVER INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS, AGENTS, INFORMANTS, AND SOURCES

"Sec. 501. (a) Whoever, having or having had authorized access to classified information that—

"(1) identifies as an officer or employee of an intelligence agency, or as a member of the Armed Forces assigned to duty with an intelligence agency, any individual (A) who in fact is such an officer, employee, or member, (B) whose identity as such an officer, employee, or member is classified information, and (C) who is serving outside the United States or has within the last five years served outside the United States;

"(2) identifies as being or having been an agency of, or informant or source of operational assistance to, an intelligence agency any individual (A) who in fact is or has been such an agent, informant, or source, and (B) whose identity as such an agent, informant, or source is classified information, intentionally discloses to any individual not authorized to receive classified information any information that identifies an individual described in paragraph (1) or (2) as such an officer, employee, or member or as such an agent, informant, or source, knowing or having reason to know that the information disclosed so identifies such individual and that the United States is taking affirmative measures to conceal such individual's intelligence relationship to the United States, shall be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(b) Whoever with the intent to impair or impede the foreign intelligence activities of the United States discloses to any individual not authorized to receive classified information any information that—

"(1) identifies as an officer or employee of an intelligence agency, or as a member of the Armed Forces assigned to duty with an intelligence agency, any individual (A) who in fact is such an officer, employee, or member, (B) whose identity as such an officer,

employee, or member is classified information, and (C) who is serving outside the United States or has within the last five years served outside the United States; or

"(2) identifies as being or having been an agent of, or informant or source of operational assistance to, an intelligence agency any individual (A) who in fact is or has been such an agent, informant, or source, and (B) whose identity as such an agent, informant, or source is classified information, knowing or having reason to know that the information disclosed so identifies such individual and that the United States is taking affirmative measures to conceal such individual's intelligence relationship to the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"DEFENSES AND EXCEPTIONS

"Sec. 502. (a) It is a defense to a prosecution under section 501 that before the commission of the offense with which the defendant is charged, the United States had publicly acknowledged or revealed the intelligence relationship to the United States of the individual the disclosure of whose intelligence relationship to the United States is the basis for the prosecution.

"(b)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), no person other than a person committing an offense under section 501 shall be subject to prosecution under such section by virtue of section 2 or 4 of title 18, United States Code, or shall be subject to prosecution for conspiracy to commit an offense under such section.

"(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of a person who acted with the intent to impair or impede the foreign intelligence activities of the United States.

"(c) In any prosecution under section 501(b), proof of intentional disclosure of information described in such section, or inferences derived from proof of such disclosure, shall not alone constitute proof of intent to impair or impede the foreign intelligence activities of the United States.

"(d) It shall not be an offense under section 501 to transmit information described in such section directly to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States House of Representatives and to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the United States Senate.

"EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION

"Sec. 503. There is jurisdiction over an offense under section 501 committed outside the United States if the individual committing the offense is a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act).

"PROVIDING INFORMATION TO CONGRESS

"Sec. 504. Nothing in this title shall be construed as authority to withhold information from Congress or from a committee of either House of Congress.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 505. For the purposes of this title: "(1) The term 'classified information' means information or material designated and clearly marked or clearly represented, pursuant to the provisions of a statute or Executive order (or a regulation or order issued pursuant to a statute or Executive order), as requiring a specific degree of protection against unauthorized disclosure for reasons of national security.

"(2) The term 'authorized', when used with respect to access to classified information, means having authority, right, or permission pursuant to the provisions of a statute, Executive order, directive of the head of any department or agency engaged in for-

ign intelligence or counterintelligence activities, order of a United States district court, or provisions of any Rule of the House of Representatives or resolution of the Senate which assigns responsibility within the respective House of Congress for the oversight of intelligence activities.

"(3) The term 'disclose' means to communicate, provide, impart, transmit, transfer, convey, publish, or otherwise make available.

"(4) The term 'intelligence agency' means the Central Intelligence Agency, any intelligence component of the Department of Defense of any foreign counterintelligence or counterterrorism component of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(5) The term 'informant' means any individual who furnishes or has furnished information to an intelligence agency in the course of a confidential relationship protecting the identity of such individual from public disclosure.

"(6) The terms 'officer' and 'employee' have the meanings given such terms by sections 2104 and 2105, respectively, of title 5, United States Code.

"(7) The term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

"(8) The term 'United States' when used in a geographic sense, means all areas under the territorial sovereignty of the United States and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(b) The table of contents at the beginning of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE V—PROTECTION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

"Sec. 501. Protection of identities of certain United States Undercover intelligence officers, agents, informants, and sources.

"Sec. 502. Defenses and exceptions.

"Sec. 503. Extraterritorial jurisdiction.

"Sec. 504. Providing information to Congress.

"Sec. 505. Definitions." ●

VISITING RUSSIA

HON. GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Speaker, last April, I had the distinct honor of visiting the Soviet Union as a member of a special selected delegation of House leaders. At the invitation of the Supreme Soviet, 17 of us made the trip to continue and hopefully broaden the ongoing dialog between our two countries. The talks were successful beyond any of our expectations, particularly in the area of human rights and treatment of Soviet dissidents. Within days, political prisoners were being freed from Russian jails; dissidents were being exchanged for Soviet spies held in this country, and predictions were made that 1979 would see a record number of Soviet Jews permitted to leave the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but contrast the warm optimism our delegation and many others felt last spring with the chilling pessimism of the current season. In the last few weeks, Russian troops have conducted an unprecedented invasion of defenseless

Afghanistan, trade and cultural exchange agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union have been canceled, and many observers have proclaimed a new "cold war" is upon us.

I, for one, would like to think the deteriorating relationship between our two countries will not spill over into the area of human rights and the treatment of Soviet Jews. I would like to feel there is hope for continued progress to end the suffering of these people at the hands of their Soviet oppressors. And I am buoyed that, amid the bad news of recent days, there are good signs as well.

For one thing, despite rising world tensions, 1979 did turn out to be a record year for emigration of Soviet Jews. More than 51,000 Jews were permitted to leave the U.S.S.R. from January to December. And I am not convinced that 1980, despite its shaky start, will not turn out to be a better year still.

One thing is certain. We in the United States cannot let up now. We cannot afford the luxury of inaction. In the 1980's, it is all the more important that we continue to speak out on the plight of Soviet Jews. It is all the more imperative that we work to end the unjust treatment of people like imprisoned human rights activist Anatoly Shcharansky and just-exiled physicist Andrei Sakharov and, of course, Ida Nudel. It is all the more necessary that we bring to world attention the harassment of countless other Soviet Jews, denied the right to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. as guaranteed by the Helsinki accords.

To be sure, the next few months will not be easy ones. There will be setbacks. There will be defeats. But the burden of the Soviet Jews is truly a burden which we all bear and one which we all must seek to alleviate.

Our own "cockeyed optimist," the late Hubert H. Humphrey, said that, even the worst of times: "Life's unfairness is not irrevocable; we can help balance the scales * * * I really believe that is true. So long as we continue to speak out, there is hope for the future. So long as we continue to decry the mistreatment of Soviet Jews, we will continue to make progress. So long as we continue to work for a change in the attitude of Soviet leaders, there will be victories as well as defeats. The important thing is not to let up, not to let the events of recent weeks weaken our resolve or sap our spirit.

We can take heart in one thing. We have decency and justice firmly on our side. And they can be powerful allies indeed. ●

THE YEAR OF THE COAST: 1980

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, 1980 has been designated the "Year of the

Coast." As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Oceanography, I intend to be in the forefront of this national effort to shed more light on the value of our coastal resources and on the very great pressures that threaten their continued vitality.

This past Friday, in my weekly report to the people which I am today submitting for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I discussed the reasons why a national program to save our coastlines is so imperative at this time, as well as the legislative remedies our subcommittee intends to pursue.

I would urge my colleagues to focus on the specific issues involved, and to consider ways in which they and their constituents can assist in this national campaign.

The article follows:

WEEKLY REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

(By Representative Gerry E. Studds)

THE YEAR OF THE COAST: 1980

The population growth in the coastal regions of this country over the past few decades has been staggering. Today as we enter the 1980's, nearly four out of every five Americans live within 100 miles of the oceans or the Great Lakes. By the end of this decade, nearly 75 percent of the American people will reside within 50 miles of the sea.

Residents of Southeastern Massachusetts—one of the fastest growing areas on the East Coast—do not need to be told of the great pressures this unprecedented growth has placed on our coastal environment. The tremendous economic incentive to develop our region and similar regions of the country has in many instances led us to build unwisely in areas far too fragile to accept such construction; to virtually eliminate public access to thousands of beautiful beaches; and to randomly construct massive energy facilities in the coastal zone. In our haste, we as a nation have damaged or destroyed over 40 percent of our wetlands, and continue to do so at a rate of 300,000 acres per year.

We are only now beginning to recognize the consequences of our actions, and what we are learning is not pleasant. It has only been in the last ten years, for example, that we have come to understand the extraordinary importance of wetlands in the chain of life. We now know, for instance, that most of the top value fish in the Atlantic and Gulf waters are directly dependent in some stage of their lives upon these areas. It is particularly sobering to recognize that man himself is a part of that same chain.

I do not mean to suggest that we have lost forever the battle to develop the coastal regions of our country in a careful and deliberate manner. I am suggesting, however, that we are well on the way toward such a defeat. It is imperative that we begin today to carefully evaluate our actions over the past few decades and to decide the wisest course for the future.

The coming year will present us with a unique opportunity to begin this effort. 1980 has been proclaimed "The Year of the Coast" by a number of major environmental groups and by the President of the United States. This designation will be the theme for a great many activities—both here in Washington and locally around the country—designed to increase public awareness of the value of our coastal resources and the great threat they face today.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography, I intend to be in the very

forefront of this effort. Legislatively, we will focus on four primary areas: The Coastal Zone Management program; the protection of undeveloped barrier islands; the development of ocean thermal energy; and the protection of fisheries habitats.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

Any comprehensive review of the state of our coastlines must begin with a careful review of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), which still stands today—eight years after its enactment—as the only comprehensive tool which the Federal Government has to manage our coastal resources.

In passing the CZMA in 1972, the Congress recognized that it was in the national interest to protect and preserve our coasts. It recognized as well that individual states had neither the funding nor the expertise to develop and implement wise management policies for these areas. Consequently, it approved a program which offered both. It was thought at the time—an era when conservation issues were preeminent—that states would recognize it was in their own best interest to participate. As a result, participation was made strictly voluntary, and it was decided that individual states—with their unique coastal resources—should not be forced to comply with specific federal guidelines on development.

Eight years later it is clear that the program is not fully working the way the Congress intended. Regional hearings we have held recently in Washington and in Detroit, Seattle, San Francisco and New Orleans have shown us that the results achieved and the protections provided have varied greatly from state to state. In general, however, these protections have not relieved the tremendous pressures which unchecked development and growth have placed upon our coastal areas.

In this the Year of the Coast, we will have a special chance to broaden and strengthen this act so that it does provide more uniform protections for our shorelines. We must guarantee through the CZM program that no matter where they are located, our wetlands, beaches, dunes and barrier islands will not be destroyed or irreparably harmed. We need to restore some measure of predictability and direction to the CZM program so that those involved in planning coastal development will restrict development in our most fragile areas and permit it only in those areas where it is appropriate and where it poses the least threat to our environment. Later this year we expect to introduce legislation revamping the CZM program. To a large extent we will use the information we have gathered in our national hearings—including two to be held soon in Boston and Atlantic City—as the basis for these changes.

This legislation will be crucial to the success or failure of the Year of the Coast because the CZM program encompasses so many different types of safeguards for our coasts, including flood protection in hazardous areas, the Coastal Energy Impact Program, and protections from perhaps the most controversial of all coastal issues—offshore oil drilling.

The CZM Act, for example, gives the governor of a state the responsibility to review an oil company's drilling plans prior to any offshore drilling operations. If a governor determines that these plans are not consistent with the policies of his state's CZM program, then he has the authority to prevent any drilling activities whatsoever. Provisions of the CZM Act like this are crucial to the survival of our coasts. We must make sure that the Act is working—and working well—if we are to have any chance of managing our coastal resources in an effective manner.

BARRIER ISLANDS

We are only now beginning to understand the importance to our environment of barrier islands and beaches. These long, finger-like pieces of land protect estuaries and sounds—which are among the richest and most productive ecosystems known to man—from natural disruptions like storms and hurricanes and from man-made disasters like coastal oil spills. They are unique components of the coastal zone and as such merit special attention and protection.

Any permanent development on these islands and beaches is both unwise and hazardous because of the tremendous physical changes they are constantly experiencing.

Land considered safe today for building may well be covered with water within a few years, the result of the great natural forces at work in these areas. They are as well extremely vulnerable to ocean storms, which periodically hasten these natural changes—as was apparent in New England during the blizzard of 1978.

Unfortunately, the dynamic and fragile character of our barrier islands has not yet been sufficiently recognized by the Federal Government, which has instead encouraged and assisted the development of these islands. In fact, a recent study by the Department of the Interior found that "over three fiscal years, the permit granting and licensing agencies committed nearly half a billion dollars to barrier island development projects." The study goes on to conclude that "this action results from a general lack of knowledge and understanding of barrier islands as unique resources warranting special attention and a lack of appreciation of the need for protection."

It is particularly disturbing that the Federal Government has not only encouraged the development of these islands, but has spent millions of valuable taxpayer dollars redeveloping areas clearly not suited for development in the first place. As a result of these policies, barrier islands have become urbanized at a rate twice that of the nation as a whole. Already 14 percent of our island space is considered urban as opposed to only three percent of the mainland.

The Year of the Coast offers us an opportunity to change these policies and to alert the public at large to the tremendous importance of these areas. I have recently cosponsored the Barrier Islands National Parks Bill which would provide funds for the purchase of undeveloped islands for inclusion in a system of National Parks.

OCEAN THERMAL ENERGY

One of the most promising new technologies which could help the United States become independent of imported oil during the 1990's is ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC), a process which uses the temperature difference between warm, surface waters and cold, deeper waters to generate electricity. While this process would not be practical in the cold waters of New England, large OTEC platforms could be located near the coasts of Hawaii, Puerto Rico and other areas with warm waters, and the electricity they produce could be delivered to shore by submerged cables.

While the technology involved in producing ocean thermal energy on such a large scale still needs additional engineering and demonstration, it is clear that OTEC could become one of the major new types of electrical generating plants being built in the 1990's. The construction of these facilities could relieve us of one of the greatest pressures now being placed on our coastal environment: the need for electric utility companies to find sites near water to build their traditional oil, coal, or nuclear power plants. The emergence of OTEC is a viable alterna-

tive energy source would reduce the need to allocate space in already crowded coastal areas for the construction of such plants.

While some local environmental disruption may still be caused by the huge volume of water which must be pumped through an operating OTEC plant, all indications are that the overall impact upon the environment would be far less severe than the problems caused by the power plants on which we now rely.

Because of the great potential for ocean thermal energy, I have cosponsored legislation to speed up the construction of large scale demonstration plants. I have also written and introduced legislation to remove some of the legal and financial barriers to the prompt commercial construction of OTEC plants. This legislation has been referred to our Oceanography Subcommittee—where we will begin public hearings on it next week. I believe our effort to develop renewable energy alternatives from the sea is an important and vital part of what we can accomplish during the Year of the Coast.

FISHERIES HABITAT PROTECTION

The Fisheries Conservation and Management Act (FCMA)—the act which established the 200 mile fishing limit—has made significant progress in restoring the vitality of our domestic fisheries. Since its inception in 1977, landings by American fishermen have increased significantly, while foreign fishing within our waters has dropped dramatically. Fisheries management plans are now being developed across the country by Regional Councils comprised in part by working fishermen.

Unfortunately, much remains to be done before we can rest assured that the future of the fishing industry will always be as bright as it is today. The law establishing the 200 mile limit was important because it gave us a tool with which to manage the harvest we reap from the sea. Equally important, however, are safeguards that will allow our commercial and recreational fisheries to continue to regenerate in sufficient number. Wetlands, estuaries, harbors and bays provide the habitats for most of our fisheries during various stages of their development. The absence of these habitats would lead to a dramatic if not total decline in the fish population. Ironically, there is no requirement that federal agencies protect these important areas. One of our major efforts during the Year of the Coast will be to guarantee the protection of these fish habitats.

Our subcommittee staff is currently studying various proposals to safeguard these areas, and I am hopeful that we will soon be prepared to introduce legislation that will bring this about. The continued viability of our fishing industry depends upon it.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

To a large extent it will be the success we have in increasing public awareness of the issues involved that will ultimately determine the success of the Year of the Coast. This will be our single greatest challenge in the year ahead.

Below are a few ideas for Year of the Coast activities in which all citizens can participate.

Review implementation of local, state and federal laws aimed at controlling shoreline development, protecting or improving water quality, protecting wetlands, etc. Consult with your local Conservation Commission.

Invite a coastal speaker to address an organization to which you belong, or offer to provide a speaker to civic organizations, schools, etc.

Ask local radio stations to designate coast appreciation days with public service announcements, interviews, and debates on coastal issues.

Organize a Bike Ride along the coast with stops along the way for events that draw attention to coastal issues.

Urge the schools and your children to attend or run Year of the Coast programs and to schedule PTA meetings about coastal concerns.

Organize a marshland restoration project or a beach cleanup project.

Sponsor harbor festivals, in coastal communities, emphasizing such themes as waterfront revitalization, historic appreciation and preservation.

Set up tours of wetlands, tidepools, beaches, islands and other coastal areas during all seasons of the year, emphasizing awareness of ecological processes and coastal geology. ●

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL CINDERELLA-PRINCE CHARMING BALL

HON. JOHN G. FARY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. FARY. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, I would like to bring to your attention a very commendable activity organized by the Adult Culture Group of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America: their annual Cinderella-Prince Charming Ball. I commend the organizers of this function because, what could be more beneficial than teaching young people the social graces that will help them throughout their lives? I think the Cinderella-Prince Charming Ball is a good way for adults and young people to mingle and get to know one another benefiting both generations by closing the gap between them while preserving a tradition of elegance.

The following is a brief history of the Cinderella-Prince Charming Ball that was prepared by the PRCUA Adult Culture Group's historian, Regina Ocwieja, for the program of the eighth annual ball which took place recently:

The Cinderella-Prince Charming Ball was organized in 1972 by Regina Ocwieja, then Director of District 8 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America. The concept and idea was presented to the P.R.C.U.A. Adult Culture Group for discussion and acceptance. On November 18, 1972, the First Cinderella-Prince Charming Ball was held and chaired by Regina Ocwieja. The idea is original, as is the title, chosen because the Ball is for the young people in High School whose life is just budding, and whose evenings are supervised, with a time limit usually set by the parents. Also, this is a romantic age, where Fairy Tales are just now being put aside and are still fresh in the memory of the young people. The Ball is a very glamorous dream for the young people to realize.

The purpose of the Ball is to teach the young people social graces, have them become the guests of honor, be honored by the Adults, and to give monetary awards from the Scholarship Fund to the Candidates, Cinderella, Prince Charming, and First Runners Up.

Under the Youth Program of the Women's Department of the P.R.C.U.A. the

Teens and the Adults are participants in the Polish Ethnic Dancing School Program. We have a Teen School Director, Emily Skrzypliec, a Dance Instructor and Choreographer, Micheline Bindowski Bencik subsidized by the Women's Department of the P.R.C.U.A. The Teens respond and perform upon the requisition of the Women's Department of the P.R.C.U.A. at all times, participating and entertaining at various Civic, Church, and Social Organizations whenever our services are requested.

The Adults are members of various P.R.C.U.A. Societies, and devote themselves to the specific purpose of promoting Polish Culture and promoting the welfare of the young people who are a branch of their group. In 1978, the young people organized their own society, "Wesoly Lud". ("Happy People").

THE JET NOISE BILL

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, we in the House will soon be called to vote on the conference report on H.R. 2440. Unfortunately most of the provisions in this bill have to do with jet noise standards and have never been considered by this House. As our Members seek to inform themselves about this legislation, they may find the following statements informative. The first is an editorial from the Washington Post dated December 30, 1979. The second is an editorial from the Sacramento Bee dated January 14, 1980. The third is a statement of position from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. And fourth is a statement of position by the California State Department of Transportation. I submit these for inclusion in the RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues at this point:

NOISE IN THE SKY

The last time we looked in on the effort in Congress to weaken aircraft noise standards, things were not promising. The Senate had passed a bill to prolong the time during which airlines can continue to fly noisier-than-necessary planes, and the possibility seemed strong that the House would agree. But something happened to the bill on its way to the House floor, and the noise standards seem much safer now than they did just two weeks ago.

Twice within the period, proponents of relaxing the standards scaled down their legislation in attempts to make it acceptable to the House and the Carter administration. Finally, they withdrew it from consideration, fearing it would be defeated in a House vote. What remains of this effort to keep noisy airplanes in the air longer—and this will be on the House calendar when it returns in January—is a bill that is fortunately only a shadow of its former self.

The Senate had voted to exempt from the noise requirements that begin to take effect in 1981 almost all two- and three-engine jets and to authorize waivers of those requirements for some four-engine jets. Through a bit of parliamentary maneuvering, this proposal went directly to a conference committee without ever having been debated on the House floor.

The conference's first effort at a "compromise" was a bill to exempt two-engine planes and permit waivers for some three-engine planes, but to leave the rules as they now are for the biggest jets. When anti-noise congressmen and Secretary of Transportation Neil Goldschmidt set out to rally opposition to it, the bill's sponsors reconvened the conference committee. Their second compromise proposal limited the exemptions to some, but not all, two-engine planes. That was the version finally withdrawn after a rule permitting it to come up in the House before adjournment was approved by only three votes.

An argument can (and no doubt will) be made that the House should accept this last proposal because the Senate and the airlines have given up so much of what they wanted. They are now prepared to settle for a minor breach in the noise standards, having started out seeking a huge breakthrough. But that misses the point of what has been going on. The opposition to this legislation rests on the belief that anti-pollution standards once set should not be relaxed except for overwhelming economic or technical reasons. Proponents of weakening the noise standards couldn't make that case to the satisfaction of a majority in the House for the three- and four-engine planes, and it seems unlikely they can make it for the smaller ones, either.

Rather than regard what remains of the Senate's original bill as a "compromise," members of the House should examine it on its merits. Before even so limited a relaxation of standards is passed, its proponents should be forced to prove that overwhelming reasons exist to delay the time at which those who live near airports begin to get some relief from noise in the sky.

QUIETING THE JETS

Even though a U.S. Senate effort to critically weaken the federal rules designed to reduce the noise of jet airplanes around airports by 1985 has been unsuccessful, a compromise measure that was approved by the House-Senate conference committee should be given the closest scrutiny when it comes before the House later this month.

The Senate passed a bill in May exempting older, four-engine jets from the anti-noise rules in exchange for a promise by the airlines to buy newer, quieter airplanes later. However, because it was unacceptable to some House conferees who had strong support in their chamber, and because the Carter administration threatened to veto it, the measure was changed considerably—and for the better—in the conference committee.

According to the compromise, three- and four-engine jets still will have to meet the federal anti-noise standards that go into effect in 1985. Then airlines must either replace them with newer, quieter airplanes or reduce the noise of the older jets by refitting the engines. Two-engine jets with more than 100 seats will be exempt from the 1985 regulations until 1986. Then they will have to be replaced by quieter aircraft, or their engines modified. Airlines flying two-engine jets with fewer than 100 seats would be given three more years to comply with the 1985 anti-noise standards.

Parts of that compromise may be necessary for some aircraft under circumstances where it would cripple an airline financially to convert its equipment by 1985. However, where such hardship can't be demonstrated, the nation will be better off if the 1985 anti-noise regulations are left intact.

Since, in the long run, the cost of jet aircraft noise abatement will be paid by the airline passengers anyway, the choice is between the additional cost of an airline ticket

and the sometimes intolerable noise suffered by those who live near airports.

When the measure approved by the conference committee goes to the House for a floor vote later this month, it should be therefore considered strictly on its merits, not merely as "something better" than the original, unacceptable Senate bill. Before any of the 1985 anti-noise standards are relaxed, even in a limited way, it is not too much to ask that the proponents of such action be forced to prove that persuasive reasons exist to postpone the time when those who live near airports get some relief from jet aircraft noise.

NEW YORK, January 16, 1980.

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Cannon House Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MINETA: Thanks to the effort of many parties, significant concessions have been won in the House-Senate noise bill conference. They are not enough.

Full implementation of the present Federal Aviation Administration/Department of Transportation fleet noise rule still represents a distinct advantage over the proposed legislation in terms of quiet to our communities.

As now written, the bill could allow the continued operation of most two-engine aircraft into metropolitan airports until 1988. This is bad news for airport neighbors around LaGuardia and Newark International where there is a heavy concentration of these aircraft.

The conference report urging the FAA to consider exempting four-engine aircraft when retrofit or replacement would cause hardship for "smaller" carriers is a threat to anticipated noise improvement around Kennedy International and Newark International.

The Port Authority continues to oppose the legislation. Our Aviation Department has prepared the enclosed analysis of the legislation's impact around the New York/New Jersey airports. It speaks for itself.

We urge you to work for the defeat of this still-retrograde measure.

Sincerely,

ALAN SAGNER,
Chairman.

SACRAMENTO, CAL., Jan. 21, 1980.

NORMAN Y. MINETA,
House of Representatives, Capitol Hill, D.C.

The Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979, amended by the conference report accompanying H.R. 2440, has come a long way toward eliminating California's objections concerning certain waivers of quieter aircraft engine deadlines, we realize that a great deal of compromise has gone into the conference report and that many positions have changed substantially; however, we believe there are still two provisions in the report which are unacceptable, first, noncomplying two-engine aircraft would be able to fly up to seven years beyond cutoff dates in current regulations. While noise levels at airports might decline after 1985, this bill will add noise at California airports during the coming five years. For those who live under the approach and takeoff areas at airports five years is a lifetime.

The other unacceptable provision in the report would eliminate the opportunity for the purchaser of a home, in an area found to be impacted by airport noise, to sue the airport for relief by the mere publication of notice of the existence of a noise exposure map in a newspaper somewhere in the same county. This elimination of the constitutional rights of homeowners cannot be supported.

With elimination of these two provisions,

we believe this legislation would be acceptable to this department and to those California citizens now suffering unacceptable levels of airport noise.

ADRIANA GIANTURCO,
Director of Transportation. ●

UKRAINIAN PROCLAMATION

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 62d anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukraine and the 61st anniversary of the Act of Union which united all Ukrainian lands into one independent and sovereign state. Unfortunately, this independence was short lived. Despite the fact that the Bolshevik government recognized the Ukraine as a sovereign nation, it soon undertook a military attack against the infant state. For 3½ years, the Ukrainians fought to preserve their freedom, but after being completely overpowered, they were forced to submit to Soviet imperialism. Since that time, the history of the Soviet-dominated Ukraine has not been happy. It is replete with acts of inhumanity and of blatant abuses of human rights that continue to this day.

Liberty and self-determination are among the most cherished possessions of a people. The world is the lesser when people such as the Ukrainians are denied their fundamental rights. That is why free people throughout the world must grieve at the lack of liberty in the Ukraine.

But the flame of liberty, once ignited, is not easily extinguished. It continues to warm the hearts and souls of true Ukrainian patriots. Even today Ukrainians who love their native land are persecuted by their overlords who seek to russify them. These descendants of the patriots of 1918 continue to hope for freedom, and all of us should share in their hope.

It is fitting that we recognize the anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. It may no longer exist as a free nation, but it lives in the hearts of all true Ukrainians, and indeed, all free people. ●

FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, following is a copy of the Executive Communication No. 3078 from the Department of Commerce in explanation of a draft bill which was introduced in the form of H.R. 6311, to establish a program for the further development of the U.S. fishing indus-

try, with particular emphasis on new and nontraditional fisheries, and to promote the optimum utilization of the Nation's fishery resources, and for other purposes.

The communication follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., December 20, 1979.
Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are six copies of a draft bill "To establish a program for the further development of the United States fishing industry, with particular emphasis on new and non-traditional fisheries, and to promote the optimum utilization of the Nation's fishery resources, and for other purposes."

Together with a statement of purpose and need in support thereof, and a section-by-section analysis.

We have been advised by the Office of Management and Budget that there is no objection to the submission of our bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the Administration's program and further that enactment of this legislation would be in accordance with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

LUTHER HODGES, Jr.,

Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Enclosures.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

In November 1978, a Fisheries Development Task Force was established within the Department of Commerce to determine the appropriate role of the Federal Government in providing assistance to the domestic fishing industry to promote the development of U.S. fisheries. The Task Force concluded that there was a legitimate basis for a targeted program of Federal cost-sharing assistance to the industries in the fisheries sector primarily with respect to new and non-traditional fisheries and, as a result, a new Federal policy was formulated and announced in May 1979. The purpose of this policy is to promote the further development and strengthening of the United States fishing industry.

The policy statement carried with it the Administration's commitment to provide the financial resources necessary for its implementation. It specified that the Administration would propose new legislation to provide funds for fisheries development activities and to specify criteria and guidelines for the use of those funds for fiscal years 1981-84.

The expressed purpose of this draft bill is to support fisheries development activities in a cooperative effort with the U.S. fishing industry, with emphasis on activities related to new and non-traditional fisheries. The legislation establishes a Federal fisheries development program with stated goals and objectives, and provides Federal grant and contract authority for fishery development projects. Significant cost-sharing would be required of the industry and state and local governments.

Funds for fisheries development under the draft bill will continue to be provided through the Saltonstall-Kennedy (S-K) Act of 1954. A maximum annual ceiling is added on the amount of funds transferred to the Secretary of Commerce in annual appropriation acts with receipts not transferred being returned to the General Fund of the Treasury.

One other area related to fisheries development is addressed in this draft bill. Assets of the Fisheries Loan Fund (Section 742(c))

of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956), which will otherwise terminate on September 30, 1980, would be placed in the fishing vessel portion of the Federal Ship Financing Fund (Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936). This would provide funds to guarantee loans to fishing vessels to be used in developing fisheries.

This draft bill satisfies the commitment made by the Administration to provide funds for fisheries development activities. The bill and regulations which will be promulgated thereunder also satisfy the Administration commitment to specify criteria and guidelines for the use of fisheries development funds.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The following is a short section-by-section description of the bill.

SECTION 2—FINDINGS, PURPOSE, AND POLICY

As set forth in this Section, the basic purposes and policies of the legislation are:

(1) consistent with the purpose and policies of the FCMA, to encourage growth and development of the U.S. fishing industry through a coordinated program involving Federal, State and local Governments, and the fishing industry;

(2) to assure achievement of domestic harvesting goals with respect to optimum yield and to promote more effective utilization of fish resources harvested by U.S. fishermen in the Fishery Conservation Zone, the territorial sea, the Great Lakes, inland waters, and on the high seas, for the benefit of the U.S. commercial and recreational fishing industries and the U.S. consumer;

(3) to concentrate efforts on removal of impediments to development of fisheries not fully utilized by U.S. fishermen; and

(4) to expand the availability and awareness of safe, wholesome fish and fish products to United States consumers.

SECTION 3—DEFINITIONS

This Section defines a number of terms used in the bill. Where appropriate, definitions are referred to below in the discussion of substantive sections.

TITLE I—FISHERY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

SECTION 101—FISHERY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

This Section establishes a fishery development program to further industry growth and development with emphasis on the new and non-traditional fisheries, to foster stability and efficiency, and to help satisfy consumer demands for safe, wholesome, and nutritious fish and fish products.

SECTION 102—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

This Section authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research, investigations, information gathering and dissemination, and other activities to carry out the fisheries development program. Specific types of activity to achieve the three program goals set forth in Section 101 are described. This Section includes new authority to provide financial and technical assistance to private nonprofit industry export development organizations which would not actually engage in foreign trade or commerce.

SECTION 103—CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

This Section provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall, as deemed appropriate, (1) consult and coordinate with Federal, State and local Government agencies, the U.S. fishing industry, consumer representatives, and others; and (2) establish regional committees of Federal personnel for the purpose of coordination. The establishment of such regional committees was explicitly promised by the fisheries development poli-

cy statement. In addition, the bill directs Secretaries of other Departments to cooperate with the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the policies and purposes of the Act. It may be appropriate, in some circumstances, if such cooperation involves major expenditures of funds to make arrangements for reimbursement of the other Departments.

SECTION 104—GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

This Section authorizes the Secretary to make grants, and to enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other arrangements on a cost-sharing basis to provide financial assistance to Federal or State agencies, persons (including corporations, partnerships and other associations organized under the laws of the U.S.), and other organizations, for the planning or implementation of comprehensive programs for development of fisheries in a region or appropriate area, or for the planning or implementation of other fishery development projects which are identified as appropriate for Federal involvement. Terms and conditions are to be established for the submission, evaluation, and review of programs and projects. The Secretary must insure that there is significant cost-sharing on the part of the applicants before approving the use of Federal funds. Proposals may be for more than one year, although funding will be provided only for one-year periods with option to renew. This Section would permit contracts with foreign organizations, if such contracts were considered advisable. This authority is included to permit the United States or domestic groups to contract with foreign organizations to provide services such as training of U.S. fishermen, or to demonstrate new harvesting or processing methods or techniques.

SECTION 105—REGULATIONS

This Section directs the Secretary to promulgate rules and regulations necessary and appropriate to carry out the Act.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SECTION 201—EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS

This Section provides that this bill is not intended to affect authority for fishery research and development in other applicable law, and that the authority in this bill is not to be construed to conflict with the FCMA or other conservation and management laws or with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, or other laws concerning food safety and consumer protection.

SECTION 202—FISHERY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM REPORT

This Section requires the Secretary to submit a fisheries development program report to Congress along with the annual report submitted under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

SECTION 303—FUNDS FROM FISHERIES LOAN FUND

This Section transfers to the Federal Ship Financing Fund established under Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act funds remaining in the Fisheries Loan Fund on September 30, 1980, the date on which that fund is set to terminate under provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act. After the transfer, the Federal Ship Financing Fund will be available, to guarantee obligations of vessels engaged in developing fisheries which might not otherwise meet the economic soundness criteria of Title XI. The Secretary is directed to promulgate regulations specifying conditions under which fishing vessels will qualify for guarantees under this program and only 20 percent of the total guarantees made for fishing vessels under Title XI can go to vessels in developing fisheries. Fur-

thermore, it must be shown that reasonable financial assistance is not available before Federal assistance would be approved.

SECTION 204—AMENDMENT TO SALTONSTALL-KENNEDY ACT

This section places an annual limit on the amount of funds transferred to the Secretary of Commerce under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act and provides that receipts in the Fund that are not transferred should be returned to the General Fund of the Treasury.●

WHY AMERICA SHOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE 1980 MOSCOW OLYMPICS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 years before the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, I joined with my colleagues in calling for the removal of the 1980 Olympic games from Moscow. Continued Soviet human rights violations and the blatant disregard for the Helsinki agreement propelled me to support the relocation of the games. The question then, as now, is not whether the games should or should not be politicized. The brute fact is that the games are political and have been so for a long time. In 1936, when the Nazis hosted the games and exploited them on behalf of their propaganda effort, the United States did not boycott and even cooperated with the Nazi request to remove two American Jewish athletes from competition.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has caused a public debate on the Moscow Olympics to resurface. I would like to share with my colleagues, the reflections of Rabbi Ralph P. Kingsley of Temple Sinai in North Miami Beach whose recent sermon so eloquently addressed this question.

The article follows:

WHY AMERICA SHOULD NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE 1980 OLYMPICS

Had I the patience, I could look through my sermon files going back several years and find the sermon in which I said—the U.S. should not attend the Moscow Olympics. Exactly when that was or what the context, I must admit I don't remember.

Probably the sermon in question had to do with some Soviet Jewry related theme. But it really doesn't matter. What does matter is that I would repeat the sentiment. I do not believe the U.S. Olympic team should go to Moscow. I repeat it with a little more confidence in the possibility of its fruition than I did then, for I believe the sentiment in this country is rapidly shifting—in fact, has already shifted—in that direction. Which, by the way, is also irrelevant, for right or wrong ought not as a matter of principle, depend on the shifting winds of the political climate.

But, of course, we are not dealing only with principle, but also with practical politics. The conditions are optimum when the principle involved and the pragmatics chance to come together. And that, it seems to me, is where we are, which is why I believe we ought not waste the opportunity.

One more preliminary word, by way of clarification. I don't think anyone objects to Soviet athletes participating in Olympic games. They certainly should not be disadvantaged. Nor should American athletes, or Israelis—as indeed the latter have been over recent years. Our concern is not the participants, but the place, and the message which the place conveys. To go to Moscow, symbol of the nation which for all of these recent years has mocked and laughed at the very principles and values that we Americans (not to speak of we Jews) have held to be most precious—human dignity, freedom, integrity—would be hypocritical for us indeed.

To put the entire matter into focus, let me direct our attention to three specific questions:

1. The matter of politicizing the Olympics.
2. The moral stance of America.
3. The question of Soviet Jews and the effect of the Olympics on them.

There are those who have argued that the Olympics should be above politics. "We ought not politicize the Olympics," they say. I couldn't agree more. Precisely because the Olympics should be removed from the political arena, is the reason the games should be removed from Russia.

The fact is, the Olympics have been used for political purposes. Hitler used the 1936 Olympics to show off his Aryan race and to build support for his nation by showing it as peace loving at the very time when Jews were being excluded from social and athletic clubs, from citizenship, and were being clubbed and sent to Detention Camps, precursors of the infamous Auschwitz, Dachau, Mauthausen, etc. To the world, seeing Hitler's smiling face on the newsreel clips and hearing the voices cheering in the Munich Stadium, it seemed that all was well, in Germany—even when Jesse Owens was being snubbed. But then, he was only a Black Man—so what difference did it make? The conditions in Moscow today are not at all dissimilar. And we Jews, of course, are still at the center of things. So what else is new?

During the War Years, it was the political climate which forced cancellation of the games in 1940 and 1944.

More recently, I do not need to remind you of the tragedy of 1972, again in Munich, and the shameful continuation of those games as if nothing had happened after the murder of all but one of the Israeli athletes. It was, incidentally, the same Avery Brundage, Hitler's great admirer, who was in charge back in 1936, who so ordered the continuation after a brief memorial service.

1976 was also not without its political tensions.

Yes, I agree. Politics has no place in sports. But the reality is that it is present. The Olympics have been used. The question therefore is a new one. How do we deal with it? Certainly not by making believe it does not exist.

The Soviet Union wants nothing more than to place her best face before the world and to give the millions of watchers—and remember, the games will be beamed via Satellite throughout the world, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th (wherever it is)—the impression that Russia is really a super place.

Never mind the oppression, the censorship, the jails and camps filled with political prisoners, the ideology of power and subversion, exported to any place which shows the seeds of rebellion. The world will be exposed only to the clean streets of Moscow, its tall buildings, and sunshine and the cheering crowds.

Refuseniks and other dissidents will have been rounded up and sent out of the city or put into prisons where they can't hold up placards saying "I want to go to Israel." "I

want to be a Jew." All the world will see is peace and tranquility, wondering how the reports of the betrayal of Helsinki and the reign of terror could really be true.

No indeed. There are few easier ways available to Moscow with which to achieve an enormous political gain. So let us not fall into that trap of on the one hand arguing that the game should be above politics, and on the other, providing the ideal environment for a nation to do its political thing.

There is then a second area of concern, and that is America, and its image on the world scene.

We are being challenged as we have not been challenged for a long time. Iran and Afghanistan are simply the most recent of a number of tests on the international scene. The world waits and watches.

I said several weeks ago that I thought one of the results of the 70's was that we in America had determined to seek responses other than force with which to conduct our international affairs—except as a last resort.

I believe the U.S. needs to make a statement to the Soviet Union and to the world. We have done so by withholding the grain sale and by placing SALT II on the back burner. Both actions, I must tell you, are painful. I believe in "Detente." I believe that we must continue to seek ways to reduce tensions between East and West. It is my fervent prayer that the course successive administrations—Republican and Democrat—have sought to chart will not have been in vain. If the arms race continues full speed ahead, I have great fear for the future of this planet.

But I also believe that lines must sometimes be drawn and statements made—in a dramatic way. Our refusal to participate in the Moscow Olympics on the grounds that it is unseemly to hold an international event in a nation that has thumbed its nose at international law, and the sensitivities of the community of nations, is not less than a moral obligation which is incumbent on our freedom loving nation. It behooves us to act out those principles which we preach—the more so since that kind of statement makes its impact in a non-threatening peaceful manner.

More than that, we ought to use all of our powers of persuasion to bring like minded nations with us—so that we can say, very loudly, that we reject Russian oppression, and the abuse of military power; that we will not be mocked or used; that there is a time when the truth needs to be told.

The one fear that I have is how our absence from Moscow, and our public protest to the point of backing away from Detente will affect Jews. The sad conclusion there is that it probably cannot get worse for them. Sharansky, whose birthday is on Monday, still sits in prison, as do Mendelevich and Slepak and Ida Nudel and the host of others who are P.O.C.'s. The Refuseniks who are not in jail are harassed and not given their visas anyway. Every report indicates that there will be a giant sweep soon that will remove them from the Olympic area lest they harm the tranquil atmosphere the Russians are trying to create. Perhaps it will be better for them if there were no Olympics or at least no TV cameras to give the wrong impression. The fear is not the cancellation of the Olympics. The fear has to do with what will happen to them if Detente truly fails, and we return to the era of the Cold War and the impenetrable Iron Curtain. Will we have any leverage left? But that is a far greater problem than the Olympics.

I believe that for America, or any freedom loving nation to send an Olympic team to Moscow, would make a mockery of everything the Olympics are said to represent—politically and morally—international coop-

eration, openness, equality, freedom, fairness, truth.

I believe further that we, as concerned Americans and as believing Jews, ought to do several things.

1. Write or cable our support to the President and to the Olympic Committee and newspapers, urging the withdrawal of our team from the Moscow Olympics, suggesting if you would that every effort be made to find another location so that those athletes who have prepared so long and hard not be penalized.

2. Let the Media, which is involved in millions of dollars of advertising, know that we will not watch the games in Moscow—and be party to the charade which the Russians will present to us.

3. Applaud and support those who like our own member, Mel Rachleff, have cancelled large Olympic contracts on moral grounds despite the personal economic loss involved.

4. And notwithstanding the recent setbacks, continue to raise voices calling for international agreements that disavow force, and threat, and which earnestly work for the achievement of the peace and security for which we all yearn so fervently. Perhaps the greatest danger of all is the danger of forgetting the horrors of war, and permitting appeals to our baser more jingoistic inclinations to get the better of us.

Let us pray that calm will prevail, that reasonableness will ultimately triumph, and our vision of justice, freedom and peace for all, may one day be achieved.

Amen.●

THE 1980 ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report from January 9, 1980, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE 1980 ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Prominent economic forecasters are sketching an outlook for 1980 that has moved from bad to worse.

The elements of most forecasts are well known to us by now. Inflation will continue to rage, dropping below the current 13 percent rate but staying in the double-digit range through the first half of 1980 and remaining close to that level in 1981. A recession, which most believe has already begun, will push the unemployment rate to about 8 percent by the end of the year, compared to 6 percent at present. There will be sharp declines in housing starts and new car sales, with the construction and automobile industries bearing the brunt of the turndown. The gross national product may fall approximately 1.5 percent, a shift that contrasts unfavorably with the rise of 0.5 percent in 1979.

The outlook is bleak, but forecasters warn of factors that could make things even worse. Among additional threats to the economy are shocks that might come in the year ahead due either to economic or military conflict arising from tensions in the Middle East or a breakdown in the world monetary system occasioned by flight from the dollar and soaring prices for oil and gold. On the positive side, it should be said that the economy is facing neither a depression nor an acceleration of inflation. Inflation will ease, though not substantially enough to cause real cheer, and unemployment will increase, though probably not enough to cause real pain.

Economic forecasting is a hazardous business, and revisions of forecasts by the economic experts have become routine. At the beginning of 1979, for example, virtually all forecasters thought that the year would be one of slow growth interrupted by a recession. They were right about the slow growth, but they predicted a recession that never came and projected less inflation and more unemployment than the economy manifested. The strength of the economy in 1979 repeatedly surprised the experts. A recession was always "just around the corner." There is still evidence of vigor in the economy: retail sales and corporate profits are good, the unemployment rate has recently inched down, and a record 97.6 million Americans are at work in civilian jobs. However, the accumulating signs now say that the long-expected recession is upon us. A key government index designed to show the turning points of economic trends plunged sharply in November. In addition, the housing industry is shaky, automobile sales are slumping, consumer confidence is slipping, and costs continue to rise without offsetting increases in productivity. The consensus view of the experts is that the economy will decline significantly in 1980. What to date has been only a forecast is now becoming a reality.

The major problem of economic policy in 1980 will be the difficulty of maintaining fiscal and monetary restraint over the period of time needed to quell inflation. The fear is that we will lapse into the practice of trying to "fine-tune" and stimulate the economy to pull it out of its slump. A part of the problem of policy will be the question of a tax cut. Some experts argue that with the persistence of double-digit inflation well into 1980, the plans for a big tax cut should be deferred. However, some of these experts see the possibility of marginal adjustments in taxes, including rollbacks in depreciation rates for business and measures to reduce the liability of taxpayers whom inflation pushes into higher brackets. Other experts think that a big, recession-fighting tax cut should be enacted in the spring of this year after the unemployment rate passes 7 percent. Some of these experts favor a tax cut in the range of \$20 billion to \$30 billion.

Although the immediate economic forecast is bleak, there are sound reasons for optimism in the years ahead. One reason is our realistic attitude toward the economy. We know that "quick-fix" solutions are ineffective and that long-term strategies are required to move the economy away from its cycle of boom and bust. Makers of policy can no longer persuade us that skillful management of the economy will consistently produce high employment and steady growth. Another reason for optimism is the existence of a group of bright, young economists whose influence is just beginning to be felt. These "supply-side" thinkers believe that the Government should tinker with the economy less. They contend that the Government should adopt sustained policies of moderate growth in the money supply, reduce spending and regulation, and encourage increases in the supply of goods and services by cutting taxes and offering incentives for saving and investment. Because of their work and its growing acceptance in Congress, there is a dawning realization that greater investment and improved productivity are the keys to economic efficiency and the fight against inflation. There is also a realization that the adversary relationships among Government, business, and labor must be ended. Still other reasons for optimism are the growth in the Nation's pool of talented workers (due in no small part to the entrance of women and older persons into the labor force), a stronger inclination in Congress to support regulatory

reform, the movement of Congress toward a national energy policy, and the feeling among the American people that energy must be conserved and alternative sources of energy developed.

The American economy will be strained and buffeted in 1980. I myself believe that 1980 will be a period of some retrenchment that will prepare use for renewed growth in the decade of the 1980's.●

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICANS ABROAD

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the House Export Task Force and as a member of the President's Export Council, I am growing increasingly concerned about the waste of a valuable resource in our attempt to bring the Nation's trade deficit into balance—I refer to American citizens living and working abroad.

It is apparent to me from my experience in talking and working with this group of citizens that America has unintentionally and unwittingly discriminated against this group because of the near absence of a political nexus with the Congress and the Executive.

Through the efforts of a personal friend of mine, Mr. Andy Sundberg, the director of the American Citizens Abroad, I have learned just what this group of people can accomplish in overseas markets. For the most part, they speak the language of the host country where they reside, they have personal friends and connections with leaders of business and industry in these nations, and perhaps most importantly, they are willing to actively promote American goods and services. Instead of insulating this valuable connection from our political sources we should refine and cultivate it.

This group of citizens is discriminated against by laws and regulations that make overseas Americans non-competitive in the markets of the world. The American Citizens Abroad has compiled these issues into printed form and submitted them to the President for his consideration. Over the next few weeks, I am going to insert excerpts from this document so that Members of Congress can have an insight into the problems that these citizens face. I believe that at the end of the series my colleagues will agree that remedial action must be taken. Today I insert part I of the preface to this report:

A COMPENDIUM OF ISSUES PREPARED BY AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Nearly a year ago, on December 18th, 1978, ACA prepared and sent to you a report identifying fifty issues that we felt needed to be addressed in your report to the Congress on discriminatory American laws and regulations that affect Americans living overseas. We were most pleased that your staff found our report of use, and that you took the trouble to acknowledge ACA's role in helping you pre-

pare the report that you submitted to the Congress on August 27th, 1979.

Earlier this year the Congress asked that you prepare an expanded version of this same report. This time the Congress asked that you address not only how our laws may be discriminating against our citizens abroad, but also the equally vital question of how our laws may be impeding the ability of American citizens to compete in the major markets of the world.

ACA has prepared a new report covering both of these perspectives on the overseas American situation. We are most pleased to send this new report to you with this letter, and we hope that you and your staff will find this report as useful as the first one.

We earnestly hope that in your new report you will not only address the specific issues that are raised, but that you will also lead us and the Congress toward more felicitous treatment of overseas Americans so that all Americans can better prosper. This will very much depend upon your willingness to address two fundamental questions. First, what basic guarantees do overseas Americans have concerning their retention of obligations, rights and benefits when they are resident outside of the United States. Secondly, what guarantees do overseas Americans have that American laws and regulations will not put them at a competitive disadvantage, with respect to citizens of other nationalities living outside of their country of citizenship.

We thank you for being willing to address these two critical questions of basic American policy because we are convinced that once they are addressed good speed will be evidenced in bringing the myriad individual issues into a proper conformity with these basic policy positions.

We wish to renew our offer to serve you and your staff in any appropriate manner to help in the preparation of your new report. We await your call.

Our kindest regards and thanks for your most kind consideration.

Most sincerely,

JOHN IGLEHART.
LARRY R. KOHLER.
DON V. W. PERSON.
ANDY SUNDBERG.
FRANCIS PRIBULA.

PREFACE

The oil crisis of 1974 was a major turning point in the history of the Free World. The sudden, brutal, increase in the price of petroleum which began then has been followed by successive price increases whose end is nowhere in sight.

Overnight, the international economic order was abruptly changed. Countries whose individual national economies had been structured so as to give general foreign trade equilibriums balancing imports with exports began, sooner or later, to understand that these old structures would no longer suffice. Much greater emphasis would henceforth need to be given to building exports at a very rapid and sustained rate to compensate for the huge new requirements to pay for the much more expensive fuel imports.

Different nations reacted differently to this new challenge. Take, for example, France. Soon after the oil crisis, leading French companies began to apply pressure to the French Government to evolve new policies for stimulating exports. In the summer of 1976, then Prime Minister Jacques Chirac created a special commission to study the problems confronting Frenchmen while they lived away from France. It was asked to identify programs that could be tried to encourage more French citizens to be willing to move abroad to strengthen the role of France around the world. This com-

mission was headed by a former Government Minister, Andre Bettancourt.

After a year's work, the Bettancourt Commission issued a series of recommendations, many of which were subsequently enacted. The overseas Frenchman was already being rather well protected abroad. He already had some subsidized French schools at his disposition, already had no taxation of his earned or unearned income, already had the right to elect six Members of the French Senate to represent uniquely his interests. But more was felt to be needed. And more was given. Social Security benefits were increased. The taxation of Frenchman who retained their domicile in France and were only temporarily abroad was lessened. More subsidies were granted to overseas French schools. The list was most impressive.

In West Germany similar studies were undertaken. The overseas German is not as well taken care of as the overseas Frenchman, but he still has some significant encouragements. While abroad the overseas German has subsidized schools for his children, no taxation of his earned or unearned income, the right to remain voluntarily in the Social Security system at home, the right to unimpeded transmission of German citizenship to his children born abroad, etc.

In Japan the Government recognized its responsibility toward overseas Japanese citizens. There was, of course, no taxation of Japanese citizens abroad. But there were new programs to subsidize Japanese schools abroad. Other concerns were studied and other incentives proposed.

In the post-1974 crisis environment, the United States took a most curious tack in a very different direction. It was decided that the overseas American was the recipient of too many special favors and these had to be reduced. Despite the fact that the overseas American was the only individual in the international marketplace carrying the full burden of his home country taxation on both his earned and unearned income this was felt to be not enough. Historically some exclusions from overseas earned income had been granted by more indulgent Congresses. Indeed, in 1926, the Congress decided that it would help the foreign trade interests of the United States to exclude from U.S. taxation all income earned overseas by Americans resident abroad. This principle prevailed until 1962 when with the excuse that a few movie stars were abusing this exclusion it was decided to place a ceiling on the amount that could be excluded from U.S. taxation. Since 1962, the existence of this exclusion in any form came to be looked upon as an unjustified loophole in American tax law.

Thus, in 1976, when the full force of the new international economic order was coming to be realized by our major competitors abroad, the United States chose to strike a blow at the big loophole enjoyed by Americans abroad. Suddenly, overnight, the average amount of tax that had to be paid by overseas Americans to the United States was tripled! No such augmentation in tax liability had ever been seen at home since the introduction of the progressive income tax system.

Naturally enough, the overseas American community was stunned and thrown into a turmoil. A number of major American companies realized that they could no longer remain competitive overseas if they employed Americans abroad. Many senior American executives went home. At the same time a tremendous amount of pressure was applied to the Executive Branch of the Government in Washington and to the Congress to reverse this astonishingly inappropriate policy. It was not easy to convince the Congress that action needed to be taken. For one thing, the Congress had been convinced by the Department of the Treasury that the

impact of the closing of the loophole would be small. To the general surprise of everyone, the actual impact of the change that was made was nearly ten times the estimate that the Treasury had given to the Congress.

No one likes to admit having made a mistake. And, as is so inevitable with ferreting out loopholes and closing them, there is a certain amount of temporary euphoria and gratuitous demagoguery which commits proud legislators and senior civil servants to positions which it is later very hard to abandon.

To the great dismay of the overseas American community, the newly-elected President Carter chose for his principal tax adviser the same person who had been the architect of the loophole closing fiasco of 1976. True to form, when the necessity of amending the 1976 changes became universally apparent, the Treasury Department came forward with very few positive suggestions. Eventually the Congress adopted a more generous new law, but for many Americans abroad this still left them in a situation that was less favorable than the one that they had enjoyed in 1976. And, it was readily apparent that overseas Americans were in a class by themselves as the only individuals who faced the problems of ubiquitous double taxation and at the same time had fewer home country benefits than anyone among their competitors abroad.

In 1978, a few of the wiser leaders of the Congress began to suspect that what the United States was doing to the overseas American might be very dangerous to the United States. After some reflection, the Congress decided that a close look should be taken at the present practices of the United States toward its overseas citizens to see if there were not some systematic manifestations of discrimination in American laws against those living abroad.

In 1979, the Congress began to realize that the treatment being given to overseas Americans might not only be discriminatory, but might also be creating economic harm, to the United States in making Americans non-competitive against citizens from other countries in the great markets of the world.●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of all meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an interim procedure until the computerization of this information becomes operational, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, January 29, 1980, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 30

- 9:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Criminal Justice Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Subcommittee on Child and Human Development of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on S. 105, to prohibit the intentional restraint of a child in violation of a valid State custody determination.
6226 Dirksen Building
- Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold joint hearing on the proposed Parental Kidnaping Prevention Act (See also Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice).
6226 Dirksen Building
- 9:30 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings in preparation for reporting the first concurrent resolution on the fiscal year 1981 Congressional budget.
6202 Dirksen Building
- *Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 219, to provide a Federal income tax deduction to taxpayers who make a charitable deduction whether or not they itemize their other deductions.
2221 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs
To hold joint oversight hearings with the Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services on the activities of the Department of Energy.
3302 Dirksen Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Financial Institutions Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on money market mutual funds, focusing on the impact of the growth of money market funds on regulated financial institutions and monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider committee budget and other pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building
- Environmental and Public Works
To hold an organizational meeting to consider committee budget and other administrative matters.
4200 Dirksen Building
- Foreign Relations
To hold open and closed hearings on the proposed arms sales to Morocco.
4221 Dirksen Building
- Labor and Human Resources
Aging Subcommittee
To hold joint oversight hearings with the Special Committee on Aging on regulations to implement the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978.
4232 Dirksen Building
- Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider proposed legislation requesting additional expenditures for fiscal year 1980 by the Committee for Inquiries and Investigations; proposed legislation to clarify the intent of the Senate whereby contributions are prohibited by all federal officers or employees or persons receiving any salary or compensation

from the U.S. to any other such officer, employee or person who is their employer; to reconsider S. Res. 294, to redefine Senatorial official office expenses; and other administrative business.

- 301 Russell Building
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2055, to establish a reservation for the confederated tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon.
5110 Dirksen Building
- Special on Aging
To hold joint oversight hearings with the Subcommittee on Aging of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources on regulations to implement the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978.
4232 Dirksen Building
- Joint Economic
To begin hearings on the state of the U.S. economy.
318 Russell Building
- 10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, and Supreme Court.
S-146, Capitol
- 2:00 p.m.
Armed Services
Procurement Policy and Reprogramming Subcommittee
To hold hearings on H.R. 5580, proposed North Atlantic Treaty Organization Mutual Support Act.
212 Russell Building

JANUARY 31

- 8:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume closed hearings to assess the political, military, economic, and social factors affecting world oil production and consumption over the next decade.
S-407, Capitol
- 9:30 a.m.
*Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Generally Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 219, to provide a Federal income tax deduction to taxpayers who make a charitable deduction whether or not they itemize their other deductions.
2221 Dirksen Building
- Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider S. 1790, proposed Privacy Protection Act.
457 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Maritime Commission, Marine Mammal Commission, and the U.S. Metric Board.
S-146, Capitol
- Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1928, proposed Fair Financial Information Practices Act, and S. 1929, proposed Privacy of Electronic Fund Transfers Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution and Resource
Protection Subcommittees
To resume joint markup of S. 1480, to
provide for the adequate and safe
treatment of hazardous substances
being released into the environment.
4200 Dirksen Building

Foreign Relations
Western Hemisphere Affairs Subcommit-
tee
To hold closed hearings on the situation
in El Salvador.
S-116, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW and Subcommittee
To review programs administered by the
Department of Health and Human
Services.
S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 1

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1981 for the
Health Services Administration.
S-128, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Economic Stabilization Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the im-
pact of high interest rates on infla-
tion.
5302 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To resume hearings on S. 2080, proposed
Public Buildings Act.
4200 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution and Resource
Protection Subcommittees
To continue joint markup of S. 1480, to
provide for the adequate and safe
treatment of hazardous substances
being released into the environment.
1318 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To continue hearings on the state of the
U.S. economy.
457 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary
and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings to re-
view programs administered by the Of-
fice of the Secretary of State.
S-146, Capitol

FEBRUARY 4

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
General Procurement Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the Soviet
Union's defense expenditures and pro-
grams, and on the defense aspects of
export licensing procedures.
1114 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Resource Protection Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2181, proposed
Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act;
H.R. 4084, proposed Suisun Marsh
Preservation and Restoration Act;
H.R. 4887, authorizing funds through
fiscal year 1983 for the San Francisco
Bay National Wildlife Refuge; H.R.
4889, authorizing funds through fiscal
year 1983 for the Great Dismal
Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in
the States of Virginia and North Caro-
lina; and S. 2115, to establish the
Bogue Chitto National Wildlife Refu-
ge in the States of Louisiana and
Mississippi.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume hearings on Amendment No.
398, proposed Monetary Policy Im-
provement Act to S. 85, and S. 85, 353,
and H.R. 7, bills to strengthen the
ability of the Federal Reserve Board
to conduct monetary policy, to pro-
mote greater equality, enhance the
safety and soundness of the banking
system, and improve the efficiency of
the Federal Reserve payments sys-
tems.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To review those items in the President's
budget for fiscal year 1981 which fall
within its legislative jurisdiction and
consider recommendations which it
will make thereon to the Budget Com-
mittee, to hear officials from the De-
partment of Energy.
3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1981 for the
Center for Disease Control.
S-128, Capitol

3:30 p.m.
Conferees
On H.R. 5235, to revise the pay provi-
sions of certain medical personnel in
the Armed Forces.
S-146, Capitol

FEBRUARY 5

8:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume closed hearings to assess the
political, military, economic, and social
factors affecting world oil production
and consumption over the next dec-
ade.
S-407, Capitol

9:30 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending
nominations and legislation.
2228 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Employment, Poverty and Migratory
Labor Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the activi-
ties of the Legal Services Corporation.
4232 Dirksen Building
Select on Small Business
To hold hearings on the impact on com-
munities and small businesses of the
decision of the U.S. Steel Corporation
to shut down several of its plants.
424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget es-
timates for fiscal year 1981 for the Na-
tional Institutes of Health.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary
and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To review those programs administered
by the Office of the Attorney General,
Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on Amendment
No. 398, proposed Monetary Policy Im-
provement Act to S. 85, and S. 85, 353,
and H.R. 7, bills to strengthen the
ability of the Federal Reserve Board
to conduct monetary policy, to pro-
mote greater equality, enhance the
safety and soundness of the banking
system, and improve the efficiency of

the Federal Reserve payments sys-
tems.
5302 Dirksen Building
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution and Resource
Protection Subcommittees
To resume joint markup of S. 1480, to
provide for the adequate and safe
treatment of hazardous substances re-
leased into the environment.
4200 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1998, to provide
for certain public lands to be held in
trust by the United States for the
Tule River Indian Tribe.
5110 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
To resume hearings on the state of the
U.S. economy.
2212 Rayburn Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed bud-
get estimates for fiscal year 1981 for
the National Institutes of Health.
S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 6

9:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcom-
mittee
To hold hearings on S. 1843 and H.R.
2977, proposed Domestic Violence Pre-
vention and Services Act.
6226 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine
current problems and programs of the
hearing impaired, and to explore fu-
ture technological developments de-
signed to handle their problems.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed bud-
get estimates for fiscal year 1981 for
the National Institutes of Health.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary
and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To review those programs administered
by the Office of the Secretary of Com-
merce.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearing on S. 2177, proposed
Emergency Home Purchase Assistance
Authority Amendments.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings to review those
items in the President's budget for fis-
cal year 1981 which fall within its leg-
islative jurisdiction and consider re-
commendations which it will make
thereon to the Budget Committee, to
hear officials from the Department of
Agriculture.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution and Resource
Protection Subcommittees.
To continue joint markup of S. 1480, to
provide for the adequate and safe
treatment of hazardous substances re-
leased into the environment.
4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To resume consideration of S. 262, to require that all Federal agencies conduct a regulatory analysis before issuing regulations and to require the use of less time-consuming procedures to decide cases.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Institutes of Health.

S-128, Capitol.

FEBRUARY 7

8:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume closed hearings to assess the political, military, economic, and social factors affecting world oil production and consumption over the next decade.

S-407, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

To resume hearings on S. 680, proposed Citizens' Right to Standing in Federal Courts Act.

2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary**Criminal Justice Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on S. 1482, to set forth certain pretrial, trial, and appellate procedures for criminal cases involving classified information.

357 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Judiciary.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To resume oversight hearings on the New York City federal loan guarantee program.

5302 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution and Resource Protection Subcommittees

To continue joint markup of S. 1480, to provide for the adequate and safe treatment of hazardous substances released into the environment.

4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 742, proposed Nuclear Waste Management Reorganization Act.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Health Resources Administration.

S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 8

10:00 a.m.

**Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee**

To resume hearings on S. 1928, proposed Fair Financial Information Practices Act, and S. 1929, proposed Privacy of Electronic Fund Transfers Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

**Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution and Resource Protection Subcommittees**

To continue joint markup of S. 1480, to provide for the adequate and safe treatment of hazardous substances released into the environment.

4200 Dirksen Building

10:30 a.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Scientific Activities Overseas, and Retirement Pay for Commissioned Officers.

S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 13

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings to review those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1981 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee, to hear officials from the Department of the Interior.

3110 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 18

2:00 p.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To review those programs administered by the Department of Education.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Communications Commission.

S-146, Capitol

FEBRUARY 19

8:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume closed hearings to assess the political, military, economic, and social factors affecting world oil production and consumption over the next decade.

S-407, Capitol

10:00 a.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for Elementary and Secondary Education and Impact Aid programs.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Commission on Civil Rights, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Legal Services Corporation.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to renew the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.

5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1938, proposed Federal Radiation Protection Management Act.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for Emergency School Aid, and Libraries and Learning Resources.

S-128, Capitol

Technology Assessment Board

Business meeting on pending Board business.

EF-100, Capitol

FEBRUARY 20

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings S. 1188, to revise the vocational rehabilitation programs administered by the Veterans' Administration.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for Vocational Education, Student Assistance programs, and Student Loan Insurance Fund.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, International Communications Agency, and the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Energy, and other pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1652, proposed Nutrition Labeling and Information Amendments of 1979 to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for Education for the Handicapped, Rehabilitation Services and Handicapped Research, and Special Institutions.

S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 21

8:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume closed hearings to assess the political, military, economic, and social factors affecting world oil production and consumption over the next decade.

S-407, Capitol

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on the Federal Government's efforts to assist Vietnam-era veterans in readjusting to society and finding employment opportunities.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

**Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for Higher and Continuing Education, Educational Activities Overseas, Higher Education Facilities Loan and Insurance, and College Housing Loans.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Small Business Administration.
S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for special projects of the Department of Education.
S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 22

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on a proposed amendment to establish standards for developing a cost ratio trigger for burden of proof in rate cases, to S. 1946, to provide railroads with more pricing rate flexibility and contract provisions.
235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
International Finance Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the U.S. embargo of grain and technology exports to the Soviet Union.
5302 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 25

10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the conduct of monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1280, proposed Energy Management Partnership Act.
3110 Dirksen Building
Labor and Human Resources
Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1652, proposed Nutrition Labeling and Information Amendments of 1979 to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for Human Development Services.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the administration of foreign affairs within the Department of State.
S-146, Capitol

FEBRUARY 26

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Health Care Financing Administration.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for international organizations and conferences within the Department of State.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue oversight hearings on the conduct of monetary policy.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on S. 1280, proposed Energy Management Partnership Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to increase the authority of the President and Congress in postal operations and to provide a sound financial base for the future of the Postal Service.
3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To consider those matters and programs which fall within the committee's jurisdiction with a view to submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2066, to convey certain land in Colorado to the Ute Mountain Ute Indian Tribe.
5110 Dirksen Building

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1981 from Disabled American Veterans.
318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for International Commissions of the Department of State, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.
S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Social Security Administration.
S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the International Trade Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine the scope of rental housing.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1934, proposed Municipal Solid Waste to Energy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation to increase the authority of the President and Congress in postal operations and to provide a sound financial

base for the future of the Postal Service.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Office of Inspector General, Office of Civil Rights, Policy Research, and Departmental Management.
S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 28

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on the recruitment and retention qualified health-care professionals to staff the Veterans' Administration health-care facilities.
412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Community Services Administration, and the Railroad Retirement Board.
Room S-128, Capitol

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Board for International Broadcasting, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Insurance Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1981 for the crime and riot-re-insurance program of the Federal Emergency Management Administration.
5302 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Conservation and Supply Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1934, proposed Municipal Solid Waste to Energy Act.
3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation to increase the authority of the President and Congress in postal operations and to provide a sound financial base for the future of the Postal Service.
3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor-HEW Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Services, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Occupation Safety and Health Review Commission, Mine Safety Review Commission, and the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home.
S-128, Capitol

FEBRUARY 29

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1981 for the Legal Services Corporation.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor-HEW Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for domestic programs of ACTION, National Labor Relations Board, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and the National Mediation Board.
 S-128, Capitol
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 Insurance Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1981 for the crime and riot-re-insurance program of the Federal Emergency Management Administration.
 5302 Dirksen Building

MARCH 3

10:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 To resume hearings on proposed legislation to renew the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act.
 5302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor-HEW Subcommittee
 To review those programs administered by the Department of Labor.
 S-128, Capitol

MARCH 4

8:00 a.m.
 Veterans' Affairs
 To resume hearings on the Federal Government's efforts to assist Vietnam-era veterans in readjusting to society and finding employment and education opportunities.
 412 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 Handicapped Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142).
 4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor-HEW Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for Public Service Jobs, Special Youth Programs, the Job Corps, and Jobs for the Elderly.
 1223 Dirksen Building

Energy and Natural Resources
 Business meeting, to resume consideration of proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Energy, and other pending calendar business.
 3110 Dirksen Building

11:30 a.m.
 Veterans' Affairs
 To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1981 from Veterans of Foreign Wars.
 318 Russell Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor-HEW Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for General Manpower Training programs, Private Sector Initiatives, State Employment Security Agencies.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 5

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor-HEW Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Labor-Management Services Administration, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the Mine Safety and Health Administration.
 1114 Dirksen Building.

Energy and Natural Resources
 Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Energy, and other pending calendar business.
 3110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 Labor-HEW Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Employment Standards Administration, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and President's Committee on Employment of Handicapped.
 1114 Dirksen Building

MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.
 Veterans' Affairs
 Business meeting, to consider those items in the President's budget for fiscal year 1981 which fall within its legislative jurisdiction and to consider recommendations which it will make thereon to the Budget Committee by March 15.
 412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
 Energy and Natural Resources
 Business meeting, to continue consideration of proposed authorizations for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Energy, and other pending calendar business.
 3110 Dirksen Building

*Select on Indian Affairs
 To hold hearings on S. 1507, to provide for the purchase of certain facilities, lands, and water rights in and around the San Luis Rey River, San Diego, California, to be held in trust for, and operated and maintained by certain boards of Mission Indians.
 5110 Dirksen Building

MARCH 7

10:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 International Finance Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on S. 864, 1499, 1663, 1744, bills to facilitate the formation of U.S. export trading companies to expand export participation by smaller U.S. companies.
 5302 Dirksen Building

MARCH 10

10:00 a.m.
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
 To resume hearings on S. 1928, proposed Fair Financial Information Practices Act, and S. 1929, proposed Privacy of Electronic Fund Transfers Act.
 5302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for general administration and legal activities of the Department of Justice.
 S-146, Capitol

MARCH 11

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.
 S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 1928, proposed Fair Financial Information Practices Act, and S. 1929, proposed Privacy of Electronic Fund Transfers Act.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
 Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 1699, proposed Energy Impact Assistance Act.
 3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
 Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on S. 2144, proposed Health Professions Educational Assistance and Nurse Training Act.
 4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice.
 S-146, Capitol

MARCH 12

10:00 a.m.
 Appropriations
 State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.
 S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
 Business meeting, to consider those matters and programs which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction with a view to submitting its views and budgetary recommendations to the Committee on the Budget by March 15.
 5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
 Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Federal Services Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 1699, proposed Energy Impact Assistance Act.
 3302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
 Health and Scientific Research Subcommittee
 To continue hearings on S. 2144, proposed Health Professions Educational Assistance and Nurse Training Act.
 4232 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
 Appropriations
 State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Federal Prison System, and Office of Justice Assistance, Research and Statistics, Department of Justice.
 S-146, Capitol

MARCH 13

9:00 a.m.
 Labor and Human Resources
 Child and Human Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to establish Commissions on National Youth Service and Volunteerism.
4232 Dirksen Building

MARCH 20

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to consider S. 1188, to revise the vocational rehabilitation programs administered by the Veterans' Administration.
412 Russell Building

MARCH 24

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Bureau of Census, general administration, and economic and statistical analysis, Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

MARCH 25

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Economic Development Administration, and Regional Planning Commissions, Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

MARCH 26

9:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1843 and H.R. 2977, proposed Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act; and proposed legislation to establish Commissions on National Youth Service and Volunteerism.
4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Industry and Trade Administration, Minority Business Development Agency, and the U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

S-146, Capitol

MARCH 27

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to receive legislative recommendations for fiscal year 1981 from AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans, Blinded Veterans, W.W.I. Veterans, and Military Order of the Purple Heart.
1202 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Patent and Trademark Office, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and science and technical research, Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1928, proposed Fair Financial Information Practices Act, and S. 1929, proposed Privacy of Electronic Fund Transfers Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

MARCH 28

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs
Consumer Affairs Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1928, proposed Fair Financial Information Practices Act, and S. 1929, proposed Privacy of Electronic Fund Transfers Act.
5302 Dirksen Building

MARCH 31

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

S-146, Capitol

APRIL 1

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1981 for the Department of Commerce.
S-146, Capitol

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs
To resume hearings on the Federal government's efforts to assist Vietnam-era veterans in readjusting to society, and the use of excepted appointments for disabled veterans.
412 Russell Building

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the development of children who benefit from adoption by facilitating their placement in adoptive homes.
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 1

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on issues Congress might consider which would affect youth in the coming decades.
4232 Dirksen Building

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Child and Human Development Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine issues affecting infant mortality, and preventable birth defects.
4232 Dirksen Building

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.

*Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Inspector General of the Veterans' Administration.
412 Russell Building