

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL  
INTRODUCES BILL TO CLARIFY  
GEOTHERMAL ENERGY TAX  
CREDITS

**HON. TONY P. HALL**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to clarify the definition of geothermal energy for tax credit purposes. I am pleased that my colleague, Congressman DON H. CLAUSEN, of California, is joining with me as the other original sponsor of this legislation.

Our bill basically contains three parts. The first would amend the definition of geothermal in the Energy Tax Act of 1978 to make it explicit that there is no temperature requirement for the geothermal tax credit for residences and commercial facilities. The second part would specify how the credit is to be determined when a residence or business has a system which uses both geothermal energy and another source not eligible for the credit. The final part of the bill makes it clear that the definition adjustments run with the life of the energy tax credits themselves, meaning that the changes would have a retroactive effect and would expire when the credits themselves expire.

The Energy Tax Act of 1978 provided for a tax credit of \$2,200 of the first \$10,000 spent for the installation of residential solar, wind, and geothermal energy equipment. A provision of the Crude Oil Windfall Profit Tax Act raised the maximum credit to \$4,000 or 40 percent of the first \$10,000 of eligible energy equipment. The Energy Tax Act also provided for a 10-percent tax credit for investment in solar, wind, and geothermal energy equipment used by businesses.

For tax purposes, the Energy Tax Act of 1978 defined geothermal energy in the following way:

The term "geothermal deposit" means a geothermal reservoir consisting of natural heat which is stored in rocks or in an aqueous liquid or vapor (whether or not under pressure).

The law set no temperature requirement in its definition of geothermal energy. Acting in good faith, many citizens invested in geothermal energy systems to tap shallow geothermal wells which they assumed would qualify for the credits.

The Internal Revenue Service proposed regulations to implement the tax credit provisions of the Energy

Tax Act of 1978. In its proposed regulations, the IRS decided to set an arbitrary temperature requirement for eligibility for the geothermal tax credits. I was among those who testified against this temperature requirement at an IRS public hearing in Washington on September 12, 1979.

Unfortunately, the IRS did not follow the recommendations that were made in opposition to a temperature requirement. In August 1980, the IRS issued final regulations concerning geothermal residential energy tax credits, and in January 1981, issued final regulations concerning geothermal commercial facility tax credits. For both sets of credits, the IRS required the geothermal source to have a temperature of more than 50° C. This means that citizens who installed geothermal systems that tap sources with a temperature below 50° C, would not qualify for the tax credits.

The Department of Energy and developers and users of geothermal energy have been opposed to the temperature limitation since the IRS regulations were proposed over 2 years ago. Most of the potential geothermal energy use in the eastern half of the United States would involve resources with a temperature of less than 50° C. The IRS limitation has the effect of eliminating a significant portion of the geothermal resources of the country.

The Miami Valley of Ohio is incredibly rich with underground rivers that make it an ideal place to utilize geothermal energy. These streams, which run below the Great Miami, the Stillwater, and the Mad Rivers, all converge on the center of Dayton, providing a nearly unlimited energy source for downtown buildings. Unlike the aquifers in some areas, Dayton's underground rivers are easy to tap because they are not blocked by bedrock. In addition, they are located at relatively shallow depths of 50 to 100 feet.

The 50° C. temperature requirement does not reflect congressional intent or scientific fact. Geothermal energy is the natural heat of the Earth. The heat in water, soil, or rock close to the surface of the Earth is derived from both solar and geothermal energy. Equipment that uses either solar or geothermal energy, or both, is eligible for the residential and business energy tax credits of the Energy Tax Act of 1978. Therefore, it should not matter whether the source of the heat in shallow water sources is geothermal or solar. Further, at depths of more than a few dozen feet, the heat is essentially entirely of geothermal origin.

I think it is important to point out that the technology is presently com-

mercially available to take advantage of geothermal sources with a temperature below that set by the IRS. We are not talking about some untested energy source that will take years to develop and then put on the market. The equipment is there right now—we only need to make it attractive and economical to use.

Energy from groundwater can be extracted through the use of currently marketed heat pumps, which operate according to the same basic principles at work in a refrigerator. The pump systems permit the temperature of the shallow geothermal water to be either raised or lowered for heating or cooling purposes.

Using groundwater, a heat pump system heats three to five times as efficiently as a fossil-fuel system, in terms of heat output per unit of energy put in. Although the heat pump is operated by electricity, the actual heating or cooling energy in a geothermal system is free and virtually unlimited.

According to the National Water Well Association, a groundwater heat pump system can pay for itself in 2 to 4 years, if a well is already in place. Even if a well must be drilled, the system will pay for itself in 4 to 8 years. The National Water Well Association further states that it is not aware of any groundwater heat pump system that has ever stopped running—even after more than 25 years of service.

Those of us who have been interested in promoting the more widespread application of geothermal energy had hoped that the IRS might be persuaded to change its position on the temperature requirement for the geothermal tax credits. The IRS has continued to hold the view that a minimum temperature rule is necessary in order to assure that energy from a geothermal source means energy derived from underground sources and not just heat associated with atmospheric temperature. In the opinion of the IRS, heat from low-temperature groundwater is solar heat, and not eligible for the geothermal tax credit. Since it is now unlikely that the IRS is going to change this view, my colleague from California and I are introducing a bill to clarify the definition of geothermal energy for tax credit purposes.

The IRS policy of disallowing the credit for systems which use both geothermal energy and another energy source also is inconsistent with the intent of Congress and ignores sound engineering practice in the use of geothermal energy.

Geothermal energy systems often include peaking systems fueled by fossil energy. The fossil energy will typically range from 3 percent or 4 percent to 20 percent of the annual total energy load. The extra wells, pipe, and pump capacity required for a geothermal system designed to be 100 percent geothermal on the few coldest days of the year would add too much to system cost to be attractive.

Geothermal resources in many instances may not be hot enough to fully satisfy a particular industrial process requirement, but by adding a few degrees to the heat from geothermal energy, it will often be possible to replace a large fraction of the oil or gas use in a plant or other facility. Further, many industrial processes involve several steps at different temperatures. Some of these steps can use geothermal heat, but others might require superheating. Under the IRS limitation, if such a system involved even a minimum addition of nongeothermal heat, the entire system would become ineligible for the tax credit. In effect, the IRS limitation encourages less efficient designs to take advantage of the tax credit. Certainly, this result is contrary to the intent of Congress in the Energy Tax Act of 1978.

In order to help rectify this problem, our bill specifies how the credit is to be determined when a residence or business has a system which uses both geothermal energy and another source not eligible for credit. Under the bill, all of the equipment comprising the system shall be eligible for the credit if, on a Btu basis, geothermal energy provides more than 80 percent of the energy in a typical year for which the system is designed. If less than 80 percent of the energy is supplied by geothermal energy, the credit shall apply to those portions of the system which produce, distribute or use energy which is more than 50 percent supplied by geothermal energy on an annual Btu basis.

It is important to emphasize that our bill does not create any new tax credits. It does not increase any present tax credits. What it does, instead, is make clear what the current law is and overturn the arbitrary restrictions imposed by the IRS. The objective of the technical corrections made by this bill is to make the present credits effective.

This legislation was drafted with the technical cooperation and assistance of the Department of Energy, which has publicly expressed its opposition to the IRS geothermal tax credit regulations. The Ohio Department of Energy also has taken the position that any Federal energy tax credits of this type should be applicable to all geothermal or hydrothermal sources regardless of their temperatures. The State of Ohio already has on the books a tax credit which is applicable

to a hydrothermal source of any temperature when it is used for heating or cooling.

We need to remove the bureaucratic roadblock by the IRS which is preventing incentives to more widespread use of available geothermal technology. We should make it attractive for more homes and businesses to take advantage of the geothermal resources of this Nation. Truly, the ground on which we stand holds part of the solution to our energy problems.

The gentleman from California and I urge our colleagues to cosponsor this bipartisan bill and to join with us in encouraging the House Ways and Means Committee to act favorably on it.

For the benefit of our colleagues, the full text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

**SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF GEOTHERMAL ENERGY.**

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—Paragraph (3) of section 613(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining geothermal deposit) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) **GEOTHERMAL ENERGY DEFINED.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘geothermal energy’ means the natural heat of the earth (at any temperature) which is stored in rocks, an aqueous liquid or vapor (whether or not under pressure), or any other medium. A geothermal well shall in no case be treated as a gas well for purposes of this section or section 613A, and this section shall not apply to any geothermal property which is located outside the United States or its possessions.”

(b) **CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF BUSINESS CREDIT AND RESIDENTIAL CREDIT TO GEOTHERMAL PROPERTY.**—

(1) Subparagraph (D) of section 44C(c)(7) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: “In the case of a system which uses both geothermal energy and an energy source not eligible for the credit under this section, all of the equipment comprising the system shall be eligible for the credit if, on a BTU basis, geothermal energy provides more than 80 percent of the energy in a typical year for which the system is designed. If less than 80 percent of the energy is supplied by geothermal energy, the credit shall apply to those portions of the system which produce, distribute, or use energy which is more than 50 percent supplied by geothermal energy (on an annual BTU basis).”

(2) Paragraph (3) of section 48(l) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

“(D) **APPLICATION OF CREDIT TO EQUIPMENT WHICH USES BOTH GEOTHERMAL ENERGY AND ANOTHER ENERGY SOURCE.**—In the case of a system which uses both geothermal energy and an energy source not eligible for the credit under this section, all of the equipment comprising the system shall be eligible for the credit if, on a BTU basis, geothermal energy provides more than 80 percent of the energy in a typical year for which the system is designed. If less than 80 percent of the energy is supplied by geothermal energy, the credit shall apply to those portions of the system which produce, distribute, or use energy which is more than 50

percent supplied by geothermal energy (on an annual BTU basis).”

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Clause (ii) of section 44C(c)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking out “any geothermal deposit” and inserting in lieu thereof “geothermal energy”.

(2) Clause (i) of section 44C(c)(5)(A) of such Code is amended by striking out “energy derived from the geothermal deposits” and inserting in lieu thereof “geothermal energy”.

(3) Clause (viii) of section 48(l)(3)(A) of such Code is amended by striking out “energy derived from a geothermal deposit” and inserting in lieu thereof “geothermal energy”.

(4) Clause (ii) of section 57(a)(11)(D) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(ii) all geothermal properties.”

(5) Subsection (c) of section 263 of such Code is amended by striking out “any geothermal deposit” and inserting in lieu thereof “geothermal energy”.

(6) Subparagraph (E) of section 465(c)(1) of such Code is amended by striking out “geothermal deposits” and inserting in lieu thereof “geothermal energy”.

(7) Paragraph (1) of section 613(c) of such Code is amended by striking out “geothermal deposit” and inserting in lieu thereof “geothermal well”.

(8) Subsection (e) of section 613 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking out “deposits” each place it appears in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof “properties”, and

(B) by striking out “DEPOSITS” in the subsection heading and inserting in lieu thereof “PROPERTIES”.

(9) Subsection (b) of section 614 of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking out “geothermal deposits” in the text and inserting in lieu thereof “geothermal wells”, and

(B) by striking out “GEOTHERMAL DEPOSITS” in the subsection heading and inserting in lieu thereof “GEOTHERMAL WELLS”.

(10) Paragraph (1) of section 614(c) of such Code is amended by striking out “oil and gas wells and geothermal deposits” each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof “oil, gas, and geothermal wells”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Any amendment made by this section shall take effect as if it had been included in the provisions of the Energy Tax Act of 1978 to which such amendment relates.●

**COMMEMORATION OF SAINT SAVA DAY**

**HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Saint Sava Day, June 28, which honors the founder of the Serbian Orthodox Church. Originally of noble ancestry, Sava migrated to Greece where he became a monk in the Eastern Orthodox Church. He later returned to Serbia to become the superior of the monastery of Studenitsa, which was the center of the emerging Serbian Orthodox Church.

Saint Sava countered Serbian King Stephen II's support of Roman Ca-



tholicism and eventually, in 1219, succeeded in establishing the independent Serbian Orthodox Church within the realm of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Saint Sava became the first orthodox archbishop of Serbia and initiated a cultural and ecclesiastical renaissance that included the establishment of schools and the beginnings of medieval Serbian literature.

Let us honor Saint Sava, a man who was a champion of Serbia's religious and cultural heritage. ●

## BILLIONS IN DAYS: FRENZY ON THE HILL

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, now that the reconciliation process is nearly over, the House should carefully consider whether it really wants to go through the process ever again. In the end, we were forced to vote on a 540-page document which few had seen and even fewer could understand, because there were scribbles in the margins, pages out of place and numerous drafting errors.

It is truly ironic that the budget process, originally designed to increase congressional accountability, has been subverted into a mechanism to strengthen the hands of the Office of Management and Budget and usurp the powers and responsibilities of the individual Congressman and the institution of Congress.

The pace during the reconciliation process was hectic and frantic. For weeks the respective committees labored to reconcile their spending levels with the budget resolution, and then at the last minute some of the committees found that all of their work was either ignored or discarded. At the last minute, there was scurrying all over Washington, as people tried to learn exactly what was happening.

In an article from the June 28 edition of the Washington Post, Bill Peterson performed a remarkable service by catching the mood and atmosphere on Capitol Hill during the later parts of that process. Reading this article should help convince my colleagues that we should not let this occur again in the future. The article is entitled "Billions in Days: Frenzy on the Hill".

The article follows:

### BILLIONS IN DAYS: FRENZY ON THE HILL (By Bill Peterson)

At 4:15 p.m. Wednesday, panic reigned in Room 2174 of the Rayburn House Office Building. Everyone was in a state of near exhaustion. For the fourth time in a week, the minority staff of the House Education and Labor Committee has been asked to rework its portion of Gramm-Latta II, the long-heralded Republican reconciliation bill.

Time was running out. The phone rang. It was Bill Pitts from the office of House GOP leader Robert H. Michel (R-Ill.). He needed to get the bill to the printer. "Give us 20 more minutes," minority staff director Charles Radcliffe told him.

Sandra Glover, Radcliffe's administrative assistant, was cutting and pasting at her desk. Beth Berman, another staffer, punched at a pocket calculator in one corner, revising budget figures. Four other aides frantically paged through huge stacks of paper.

Radcliffe sank into the couch, penciling changes in the bill. To meet complaints from Rep. Shirley Chisholm (D-N.Y.), he changed the words "educationally deprived" on page 69 to "children from low-income families"—to make sure the extra bucks don't head toward rich kids who happen to be doing poorly in school. Rep. Margaret M. Heckler (R-Mass.) was worried about programs for women, so Radcliffe added some words making it clear that provisions of the Women's Equity Act of 1978 would not be affected by the bill.

"You want to know how it's been the last couple weeks?" asked Jennifer Vance, another aide. "It's been like this constantly."

This was the congressional reconciliation process at work, a process that strained much of the behind-the-scenes machinery of Congress to a near breaking point last week as it rapidly attempted perhaps the most extensive changes in government since World War II. In doing so, it raised serious questions—from both Republicans and Democrats—about the resulting legislation, which few congressmen even had a chance to read before they voted.

The pressure was immense. "I've been here 20 years, through Adam Clayton Powell, OEO and all the rest," said Radcliffe, a large man with a high forehead and thinning red hair. "But I've never seen anything like this."

The stakes were monumental. The reconciliation package was the longest and broadest piece of legislation ever considered by Congress. "The very viability of Congress as an element of government," as well as the budgets of hundreds of federal programs, hung in the balance, said House Rules Committee chairman Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.).

"I'm in charge of a giant number factory here," James L. Blum said in his cluttered office in the old FBI building at 2nd and D Street SW. "It's like we have our own assembly line here. What we worry about is keeping the quality up."

"It's been a big season for our factory," he continued with a wry smile. "We've had a lot of demand for our products, and we've been moving them off the line in record time."

Blum, a tall, slender man, a jogger who hangs his blue running shorts and white mesh running shirt in his office window, is assistant director of budget analysis at the Congressional Budget Office. He and about three dozen other CBO analysts have worked days, nights, and almost every weekend since January on budget matters.

Their role in the reconciliation process has been critical. In a game where numbers are politics and politics is numbers, they set the baseline to measure everything by, in effect, the rules of the game.

In a game where numbers are everything, they then became the official scorekeepers, the people who separated the numbers from the rhetoric and decided who cut what where.

Their volume of production would impress any factory supervisor. CBO estimates it will use 8 million pages of computer printouts this year. That's an average of some 31,000 pages every working day, or enough to supply Congress with 400 million lines of numbers. It will take 25 tons of paper, enough to consume 425 trees.

As a group, the CBO scorekeepers are an impressive lot, serious, responsible people with master's degrees and PhDs in economics, business administration and public policy. They are accustomed to frenzy. Congress, after all, normally operates in spurts and stops, recessing often and long. What was unusual this year was the massiveness of the reconciliation process, a process few in Washington totally understand. It touched virtually every nook and cranny of government, and it did so under an incredibly tight timetable.

Since last month, when Congress approved overall budget-cutting targets, each House and Senate committee has had to decide exactly where to make these cuts. This was rife with political infighting, pitting Republicans against Democrats, pet program against pet program. Where did they turn for advice and numbers? The CBO number factory, of course.

"The people I relate to best are short-order cooks," said Bob Sunshine, 36, one of Blum's deputies. "We're working for the House. We're working for the Senate. We're working for 28 committees. We're working for the Republicans and Democrats. Everybody has an order, and everybody wants his order in an hour."

The tension over the budget cuts had been building for months, like a giant dust storm in the West, through the inauguration, David Stockman's black book, the battle over the first budget and all the skirmishing since.

When the committees finally got to work during the last month, Stockman was worried. He set up an operation headquarters in the second floor of the Old Executive Office Building. It was alternately called the "Rec (for reconciliation) Room" and the "War Room." Desk officers from the Office of Management and Budget were assigned there to monitor the work of each congressional committee. Each day they issued a report of about 50 pages on what had happened.

It may have looked rather simple to the distant, casual observer. Fourteen Republican-controlled Senate committees had reported cuts totaling \$39.6 billion; their Democratic-controlled House counterparts reported cuts of \$37.7 billion.

But blue smoke and mirrors were all over the place. The battle was over perception as much as reality. The Reagan administration cast it this way: You were either for the president and economic recovery, or you were against it. Cool deliberation took a back seat.

"I don't think most members comprehend the magnitude of what is going on here," California Rep. Leon Panetta, who headed the Democrats' reconciliation task force, said late one night. "It's unfortunate how much is decided on perceptions. The reality is most members aren't aware of the pieces, or the impact of what they are doing. This is a dangerous game we're playing. We have to be careful we aren't locking up the Congress for three years and throwing the key away."

Panetta candidly admitted he had not read the entire Democratic reconciliation package, and he doubted anyone else had

either. As for the Republican House substitute, known as Gramm-Latta II, as late as 4:45 p.m. Wednesday it was still only a collection of Xeroxed pieces of paper in the hands of Bill Pitts, House Minority Leader Michel's chief budget aide, and he was in a frenzy.

Pitts, whose father worked in Congress 41 years, had been working nonstop for weeks. "I never want to go through anything like this again," he complained wearily.

Republicans were in much better shape in the Senate. But even there it would have been virtually impossible to comprehend what was in the package. The bill ran 406 pages, the Senate Budget Committee Report on it 1,034 pages.

Pieces of the House bill had been floating around for days, and OMB, part of the executive branch, had issued what it called Gramm-Latta 1½ a couple days before. This version had angered many Republicans, including diehard Reagan supporters.

"We waited and waited for the package," said the House Education and Labor Committee's Radcliffe. "When it finally came, it was a combination of Stockman, the White House, and the Department of Education. I'm a great admirer of David Stockman. But what we got was good ideology, but poor legislation. It was completely useless. We all would have been fired if we had let it out."

Many of those most deeply involved in the reconciliation process are deeply distraught about it. There was simply too much to do in too short of a time. Congress simply didn't have time to do a good job. Substance gave way to symbolism.

"The old saying is if you want it bad you get it bad . . . It forces so much to be done in such a short time it can't all be good legislation, no matter how well everyone is motivated," said one respected Hill aide.

The normal checks and balances weren't allowed to work. There were few hearings, little public debate on specifics. Many lobbyists stayed away from the process. "This was so big they couldn't get a handle on it," said another key staff assistant.

"Normally this package would be 100 different bills, and Congress would spend months on each one," said still another staff member, looking at a stack of documents on his coffee table. "What you have here is a big horse pill and they want you to swallow it all at once."

At 11:50 a.m. Thursday, the Senate and House were in session, and the phones were ringing at the Congressional Budget Office. Richard Brandon, an aide to Sen. Lawton Chiles (D-Fla.), was trying to cut a deal with the Senate's Republican leadership to get more money for Cuban and Haitian refugees, most of whom live in Florida.

Brandon wanted to funnel several million dollars budgeted for state employment services into the refugee program. He was pushing hard. He told Chuck Seagraves, the top analyst in CBO's human resources division, that he needed numbers and needed them fast. Seagraves was trying to do a half dozen other things at the same time, but he said he would see what he could do.

"This is what we do here," Seagraves said, hanging up the phone. "These people are desperate. They want to make deals, and the only way they can make them is if they have the numbers. And they don't just want any numbers—they want numbers that prove their case."

Chiles, Brandon's boss, succeeded. Under a unanimous consent agreement, the Senate added \$54 million to the refugee program. It was a great victory, the senator's office said.

The employment service people will never know what happened to them.●

### THE GREAT CALENDAR GIVE-AWAY SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

**HON. DENNY SMITH**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I do not know about your constituents, but mine are becoming real believers in the fact that there is no free lunch—and no free calendars.

U.S. Capitol Historical Calendars are beautiful, informative, historical, colorful, and an absolute waste of taxpayer dollars. The great calendar giveaway is, in short, an outdated idea.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we are each allotted 2,500 calendars per year to distribute as we wish. At \$1 per calendar for printing and packaging alone, we find ourselves with a \$1 million gratuitous mistake.

While asking my colleagues to cosponsor my legislation to abolish this wasteful expenditure, I found that many Members were reluctant to end what has become a very popular "freebie." When I asked my constituents, on the other hand, how they felt about their tax dollars being spent in such an irresponsible fashion, I received the following responses:

The calendar is great, but I'll settle for a balanced budget and no calendar.

We're going to hang the calendar over the filing cabinet where we keep all our tax information and regulations so we can remember where our tax dollars are so worthily spent.

Anything you can do to eliminate unnecessary wasteful expenditures of tax dollars will have my complete support. I am looking forward to never receiving another Capitol Historical Calendar.

Abolishing this totally absurd Federal expense is one small step in the direction of fiscal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.●

### EXTENSION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

**HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, recently, I cosponsored the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Nothing else I have done in the Congress has given me so profound a sense of history.

There are those who say the act should not be extended; that it has achieved its purpose, and that responsibility for supervision of elections should be returned to the States.

I disagree.

Great progress has been made in the last decade and a half because of the Voting Rights Act. I see the success of the act of insuring the voting rights of minority citizens as a reason for retaining it, rather than allowing it to lapse. We have too often allowed progress to make us complacent, and then had to work harder to make up for the backsliding that complacency brings.

After the Civil War, the 15th amendment to the Constitution guaranteed suffrage to the freed black slaves, and Federal troops enforced the law. During that period, blacks were able to win local elections. When the troops were withdrawn, black voters were immediately disenfranchized, first through acts of terror and intimidation, and then through more subtle, legal obstacles to their right to vote.

These obstacles ranged from poll taxes and property requirements to literacy tests. Blacks might be asked: "How many bubbles in a bar of soap," or complex questions on the Constitution, the answers to which could be changed at the whim of the registrar. No literacy tests were ever given the registrars. We cannot and must not let this happen again.

The Voting Rights Act embodies our national commitment to government which is truly representative of all Americans. This commitment is even more important today than when the act was first adopted. At a time when the Government is turning away from the needs of the poor and underprivileged, we must be even more vigilant about guaranteeing the right of these same people to be heard at the ballot box.

The act requires voting districts in States which have large black populations and low numbers of black registered voters to submit election and voting procedure changes to the Justice Department for approval before enacting the changes. Since the act was passed in 1965, proposed electoral changes have been rejected by the Justice Department 800 times. That is why this oversight function is so important.

A compromise version of the act, being promoted by Southern conservatives, would remove the present oversight system. It would provide instead that Federal courts could order preclearance of election practices for a maximum of 4 years, only after a finding of a "pattern or practice" of voting rights abuses. In effect, this proposal would permit the violation of the voting rights of minorities to continue until a pattern emerged and had been documented and fully litigated through the court system.

This compromise would permit the Attorney General to institute such litigation, or to intervene in any private voting rights suit. However, the atti-



tude of the present administration toward minority rights and recent conduct of the Justice Department give good reason to be concerned about how this discretion would be exercised. A disturbing example of the influence of southern politicians upon the Justice Department came to light not long ago, when it was reported that language in a Justice Department brief was deleted after consultation with a U.S. Senator who considered it too strong and defamatory to the city of Mobile.

We have three alternatives: To extend the present act; to adopt an alternative which would appreciably weaken the act, or to let it lapse. The first alternative is the only one which is acceptable. That is why I have joined with my colleagues who are committed to the realization of the ideal of truly representative government, in calling for the extension of the Voting Rights Act.●

#### AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

**HON. CLAUDE PEPPER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a recent district court decision which further guarantees employees of State and local governments their right of protection against age discrimination.

In 1978 Congress took a significant step toward the eventual eradication of all remaining vestiges of age discrimination in employment by amending the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) and making it applicable to all Federal employees regardless of age and to non-Federal employees who are younger than age 70. It was the intent of Congress that the protections of the ADEA, as amended, be available to State and local employees. However, this was not tested in court until recently.

The first test came in a case involving a Calumet County, Wis., employee who was forced to retire at age 65 under the terms of the county pension fund. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) filed suit in the U.S. District Court of Eastern Wisconsin on behalf of the retired employee, arguing that the ADEA specifically prohibits any employee benefit plan from requiring or permitting involuntary retirement because of the age of the individual. That this protection is available to employees of State and local governments was clearly spelled out in the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1974, which amended the ADEA to "expand coverage of the Act to Federal, State, and local employees."

The district court decision in the Wisconsin case was handed down on June 12, 1981. It said that the ADEA may constitutionally be applied to Calumet County, thereby establishing a precedent that employees of State and local governments are protected against mandatory retirement before age 70, unless age is a bona fide occupational qualification. The outcome of this case is a clear victory for the thousands of middle-aged and older workers who face age discrimination in their jobs. But it also points up the gaps in the law which still allow various forms of age discrimination in employment to continue unchecked. Many groups, for example, still do not enjoy the protections of Federal law against this pervasive and highly destructive practice. Airline pilots, police officers, firefighters, and bus drivers are just a few of the unprotected categories of workers. Furthermore, the millions of Americans who are 70 years of age or older still do not enjoy this basic right.

Thus, while we celebrate the victory for State and local employees, we must be mindful that our work is not yet done. We cannot rest until we have eliminated all forms of age discrimination from our society. That is our goal and it is indeed one that is worth fighting for.●

#### NIOSH MOVE TO CINCINNATI: \$800 COST TO \$1 BENEFIT

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, moving one arm of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to Cincinnati as announced will save the taxpayers a definite \$19,568 a year, but they may have to spend up to \$16 million to do it.

NIOSH's Washington-based Division of Criteria Documentation and Standards Development presently is headed by Richard Lemen, who currently lives in Cincinnati, his official duty station.

So the Government pays him about \$1,630 each month in travel and living expenses—\$75 a day—to come to work in Washington, and it has paid him \$19,568 for doing that since May 1980.

NIOSH employees have totaled his expense vouchers from the day he came to Washington to assume responsibility as division director, through the present, and they assure me the count is accurate.

But now that plans are announced to move the division to Cincinnati, we can look forward to an end to that spending.

However, there is right now in Cincinnati no suitable place to house the division.

In discussion are ways to house the emigres once they arrive in Cincinnati. As related by NIOSH employees, they involve spending up to \$16 million for either new or renovated space in a larger consolidation, and other moving expenses. The amount is unclear. Those who plan the move did not touch on that question in their formal announcement. Somebody should touch on the question. Somebody should do an autopsy on it.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lemen would be freed of his relentless shuttling between there and here.

And I guess it solves the problem of perpetual per diem, but it looks like a curious, even fantastic, manifestation of economy in Government.

But there is more.

The division is one of the most active in meeting with other agencies, union representatives, trade associations, and so forth, most located in Washington, not Cincinnati.

NIOSH employees estimate division representatives would have to leave Cincinnati about 600 times a year on official travel to meet their responsibilities. Most of the travel would be to Washington.

At current air fares, the Cincinnati to Washington travel bill would be \$136,800 a year—tourist class.

If each trip requires an overnight stay, the per diem bill is \$45,000.

And the total is \$181,800 a year in added travel costs. But it would save \$19,568 and allow Mr. Lemen to enjoy the comforts of home.

The ratio is \$9.29 in costs to \$1 in savings.

To a mind untrained in occupational health or public administration, it seems like it would be cheaper to let the director keep coming to Washington, or to move him here and allow the Washington-based writers of criteria and standards to remain near those with whom they consult 600 times a year.

Mr. Lemen is not to blame for this situation, and his comfort is not the point of the move. I am sure there are other considerations, but those planning the move have not put them forward.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I am made more curious by each new report on the move and each attempt to fathom the costs and benefits of it. It is a matter about which all Members concerned with economy in Government and with occupational health and safety should be curious. The potential for abuse is equally large in either area.

Incidentally, based on what we know now, the Congress will have to be patient for things to come out even in Cincinnati under the \$16 million transfer plan.

The ratio is \$800 in estimated costs to \$1 in known savings.

Of course we can charge off the director's \$1,630 monthly commuting allowance and figure on amortizing the estimated \$16 million that way.

It will take 817 years.

Mr. Speaker, the savings will equal the costs in A.D. 2799.

It will never happen if we add the \$181,000 a year in increased travel costs.

But moving that division to Cincinnati is only part of the plan. The whole plan moves parts there and most of the agency to Atlanta under the wing of its parent, the Center for Disease Control. They will have to acquire office space in Atlanta too. There will be expenses of moving people, equipment, and records. There will be more travel out of Atlanta to Washington.

In fact, the unofficial estimate of travel costs from an Atlanta base is about \$325,000 a year, NIOSH employees say.

Moving NIOSH might or might not be good for occupational health, but it certainly will benefit the airlines.

If the movers cannot demonstrate the moves will make NIOSH measurably better at what it does, then Congress should ground these plans for a high-flying future.●

#### HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS DAY

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining my distinguished colleague on the New Jersey delegation, Mrs. FENWICK, and Mr. LANTOS, of California, himself a Hungarian American, to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 268, proclaiming October 23, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Day.

The story of the courage of the Hungarian nation in 1956 must not be forgotten. Though Hungarian freedom was not reestablished—though the Soviets continue their domination in Hungary—I believe, very strongly, that this rule is not a permanent thing. The echoes of the Hungarian uprising reverberate through Eastern Europe. They inspired Czechoslovakia in 1968. They inspire Poland today.

When a nation wishes to be free its desires cannot be suppressed forever. The Soviets may torture and murder the resistance fighters of Eastern Europe, but they cannot defeat the spirit of liberty. Whenever one uprising is crushed that spirit appears somewhere else. If Soviet tanks roll into Budapest, then we can be sure Prague will soon be touched by the unquenchable flame of freedom. The Soviets invade Prague; now Warsaw and Cracow resist them.

The Iron Curtain will crumble. Tyranny always produces its own downfall, because tyrants can advance only so far. Then free men and women rise up to meet these tyrants, and strike back at them.

Hungary lit the flame of resistance in 1956. Other nations in Eastern Europe now struggle to be free of tyranny. We hope and believe that struggle will be successful.

That is why I support Hungarian Freedom Fighters Day. Hungary did not suffer in vain. She will be restored to her liberty. In the spirit of her great patriot Kossuth, the Hungarians have uttered their ancient cry of resistance—"No, No, Never"—to the Soviet tyranny.●

#### MEMORIAL TO GENERAL MIHAILOVICH

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Richard Fellman, president of the National Committee of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich, has been instrumental in calling for an appropriate memorial to be constructed in Washington, D.C., to honor Gen. Draza Mihailovich, the man who saved their lives. I have introduced a bill in the House, H.R. 3526, authorizing the erection of a memorial in recognition of the role General Mihailovich played in saving the lives of approximately 500 U.S. airmen in Yugoslavia during World War II.

Major Fellman, one of the airmen that owes his life to the efforts of General Mihailovich and his Chetniks, spoke on the anniversary of that occasion. The following is the second part of his remarks:

The highlight of my stay, needless to say, was meeting our beloved "Chicha Draza." The first time I saw him, he was walking up a hill surrounded by a group of dancing children, and they were throwing flowers in his path. I couldn't believe my eyes; here was the Commander-in-Chief of an Allied army of over 300,000 men doing away with all the fancy protocol of his high office and dressed like any other soldier. It was then I understood why everyone spoke of him with such love and admiration. Practically every Serb I spoke to told me of the time "Chicha" Draza ate at his farmhouse, christened his baby or danced the kolo with him.

On that particular day, Gen. Mihailovich had come to greet us and assure us that he would give us every possible protection to insure our safety. After greeting each one of us personally, over 1,000 of his troops put on a review in our honor (I'm sure that many of you in the audience were there and remember that day well—it was June 30, 1944). Mind you, this was all done with the Germans just a few miles away.

After the review, the airmen gathered around the General and we all sat on the ground under a hugh tree. Speaking

through an interpreter, he told us how he had always admired the freedom-loving principles of America, and of his dream that someday his people could enjoy those same liberties. He then went on to tell us how disappointed he was that the allies had abandoned him; but then (without any bitterness) he asked only that we take the truth back to our homeland. And I'm proud to say that is exactly what we have been doing for the past 37 years.

With or without Allied support, he said he would continue to fight against any and all dictatorships (be they Nazi or Communist) that threatened his homeland! As I recall, his actual words on that day were: "I will continue to fight this curse of mankind no matter what form it comes in. If I am to die, then die I shall—sad because I have been deserted by those who profess to believe in democracy, but gratified that I have fought bravely and honestly and refused to compromise my cause." As he spoke these words, I could see there were tears in his eyes, and it wasn't until many years later (after I got to know Serbian history—about St. Sava and the battle of Kosovo) that I understood what he meant!

Having had the privilege of meeting Gen. Mihailovich, I always find it frustrating trying to find words adequate enough to describe him. I only wish you could have all been with me at a dinner in Los Angeles almost two years ago. It was given by the California Citizens Comm. to honor Gen. Mihailovich at the Los Angeles Hilton, and Dr. Edward Teller was the honorary chairman.

The guest speaker that night was my very close friend for over 35 years, David Martin. (David, as you know, wrote that remarkable book, "Patriot or Traitor—The Case of Gen. Mihailovich"). David may very well be the greatest living authority on Gen. Mihailovich. He has spent years on research, interviewed hundreds of people who knew him and feels that he knows Gen. Mihailovich as intimately as he does his own brother. This is in part what David had to say about Gen. Mihailovich that night:

"There is no one else about whom I am prepared to say this, but of all the great figures in World War II, Draza Mihailovich is about the only one who could qualify for sainthood!!!

"He was a warrior saint in the great tradition of the Serbian people. He was a man of exceptional simplicity; simplicity almost of a Mahatma Gandhi. He didn't live in pomp, but shared the hardships of his soldiers. He even carried his own knapsack. And the people revered him in a manner that no other national leader during World War II was revered, not even Winston Churchill or President Roosevelt. It was this man who was so completely committed to everything we believe in in America."

When David finished his speech, the entire audience was in tears and gave him a standing ovation. And with good cause, when you consider these remarkable statements came from a non-Serb, a distinguished author and an objective historian.

(In case you haven't already done so, I strongly recommend you read his book. He even has a few kind words to say about me.)

Before getting into the concluding part of my speech, I would like to make brief mention of one additional fact which is not too well known, and which is added reason for my great admiration for the Serbian people.

Beside being an American airman rescued by the Serbian people, I am also a Jew. It is a matter of documented history that Serbia



was one of the very few countries in Europe where anti-semitism did not exist. In the old kingdom of Serbia, and later in the kingdom of Yugoslavia, the Jews were, by law, equal members of the community, and enjoyed all the rights and privileges of other citizens. This is so very remarkable when you consider the persecution of the Jews in so many countries throughout the world and throughout history. (From my own personal experience I can remember the anti-semitism that existed in this country when I was growing up in N.Y.)

The historical goodwill between the Serbs and the Jews does not seem strange when you consider the many parallels in their histories: we both suffered cruel persecution, both have been driven from our homeland and today we are both dispersed throughout the world. (In dying for their freedom-loving principles, the Jews had Masada and the Serbs their Kosovo.)

During World War II so many Serbs risked their lives to save thousands of Jews from the Nazis. This is something I can never forget, and for what the Serbian people did for my people, I will always be grateful.

And now, I would like to tell you about a matter that is very dear to all our hearts—the erection of a memorial to General Draza Mihailovich in Washington, D.C.

Just as today we celebrate the 40th anniversary of Ravna Gora, just a few days ago on April 28, the American airmen celebrated the 35th anniversary of their first trip to Washington in 1946 to honor General Mihailovich. Ever since then we have been carrying on our fight to pay him the tribute he never received during his lifetime. We met with many disappointments, but never gave up hope. And after all these years, I feel we are finally on the verge of achieving our goal.

It is of great significance to note that never before in over 200 years of American history has a group of American veterans banded together for over 35 years to erect a memorial to a foreign leader. Also of equal significance is our insistence that the funds for the memorial come not from the Government, but, as it should, from the people themselves, those to whom Draza meant so much.

In addition to honoring Gen. Mihailovich, we American airmen see in this memorial a tribute to the wonderful Serbian people we lived with and the courageous Chetniks we fought with.

In the years to come, we hope people from all walks of life will come to Washington and gaze upon the Mihailovich monument, in it they will see all the things I have just spoken about and pay tribute to this great leader who gave his life rather than compromise his principles. If ever one person personified the Serbian tradition of "Bolje grob, nego rob," it was Draza Mihailovich.

It is also my fervent hope that in the future, countless generations of Serbian grandfathers will sit with their grandchildren beside the Mihailovich statue, and as they sit there and relate the stories of Kosovo, St. Sava and Tsar Lazar, they will add the name of "Chicha Draza" to proud Serbian heritage.

In conclusion, I would like to end on the thought that although Draza's enemies did everything they could to destroy his fame, they never could destroy the truth. They lined him up before a firing squad and pumped his body full of holes, but they never could and never will destroy his sacred memory. The glorious name of Draza

Mihailovich and his resistance at Ravna Gora will live forever in the hearts and minds of the Serbian people. Slava Chicha Drazi!!!

Thank you and God bless you.●

## THE TAX PROPHECY THAT HAS COME TRUE

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a famous Virginian once said:

When the Federal Government gets a strangle hold on the individual businessman, state lines will exist nowhere but on the maps. Its agents will everywhere supervise the commercial life of the states \* \* \* I am not willing by any voluntary act to give up revenue which the state of Virginia herself needs, nor to surrender that measure of states' rights which was, and the construction of the Federal courts have permitted, to remain.

Mr. Speaker those words were not spoken during the current debate on the Nation's tax policy, nor were they uttered during this year's gubernatorial race in Virginia. They were spoken by the grandfather of the senior Senator of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Mr. Richard E. Byrd who at the time these words were spoken was serving as Speaker of the House of Delegates. The speech was given on March 3, 1910 during the debate on whether or not Virginia would ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution.

I believe my colleagues would find Mr. Byrd's comments revealing and informative. I am inserting the full text of his remarks for my colleagues' information.

The text follows:

### THE TAX PROPHECY THAT'S COME TRUE!

(By Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.'s grandfather Richard E. Byrd, Speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates, on March 3, 1910)

"It (the 16th Amendment) means that the state must give up legitimate and long established source of revenue and yield it to the Federal Government.

"It means that the state actually invites the Federal government to invade its territory, to oust its jurisdiction and to establish Federal dominion within the innermost citadel of reserved rights of the Commonwealth.

"This amendment will do what even the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments did not do—it will extend the Federal power so as to reach the citizen in the ordinary business of life. A hand from Washington will be stretched out and placed upon every man's business; the eye of a Federal inspector will be in every man's counting house.

"The law will of necessity have inquisitorial features, it will provide penalties. It will create a complicated machinery.

"Under it businessmen will be hauled into courts distant from their homes.

"Heavy fines imposed by distant and unfamiliar tribunals will constantly menace the taxpayer.

"An army of Federal inspectors, spies and detectives will descend upon the state. They will compel men of business to show their books and disclose secrets of their affairs. They will dictate forms of bookkeeping. They will require statements and affidavits. On the one hand the inspector can blackmail the taxpayer and on the other, he can profit by selling his secret to his competitor.

"When the Federal government gets a strangle hold on the individual businessman, state lines will exist nowhere but on the maps. Its agents will everywhere supervise the commercial life of the states . . . I am not willing by any voluntary act to give up revenue which the State of Virginia herself needs, nor to surrender that measure of states' rights which was, and the construction of the Federal courts have permitted to remain."

Virginia did not ratify the sixteenth amendment!●

## BRIEF BY MR. LEE MARTIN OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently I have been in contact with Mr. Lee Martin, coordinator for the Center for Orientation programs in English at Vanderbilt University. I commend to my colleagues the following brief, supplied by Mr. Martin, regarding international education, compiled by the International Educational Exchange liaison group:

ENHANCING AMERICAN INFLUENCE ABROAD: INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

### A. NATIONAL INSTRUMENT FOR PEACE AND SECURITY

Few Americans today are untouched by events beyond the official borders of the United States. While from its birth this nation has played increasingly important roles in international commerce and politics, the degree to which America's destiny is now being shaped by external forces has never been greater. Consequently, Americans want to improve U.S. political and economic effectiveness abroad and enhance their national security.

One of the most cost-effective, proven instruments of such influence—international educational exchanges—directly serves America's national interests, and serves them well. To realize the vision of an American respected in the world, the new Administration could take no more practical, substantive step than to reverse the serious decline in recent years in federal support for international educational exchanges. Support of these programs symbolizes a national willingness to reinvest in the future. In a world of threatening forces and issues, those in government service, business, the news media as well as the general citizenry urgently need direct and personal international contacts and competencies possessed by far too few Americans.

The capacity of Americans to understand events in the world, to work and negotiate with people from other cultures and to achieve the necessary professional and job

skills relevant to foreign trade and commerce depends largely on appropriate education and experience. Today one in six Americans has a job thanks to international trade, and one of three acres produces for export. Given the twin challenges of reindustrialization and getting America back to work, knowledge about and access to international markets now constitute a major national opportunity, if not imperative. Where will business and industry recruit the cosmopolitan managers its international operations require if not from among those Americans and foreign nationals educated for their managerial tasks through study and experience abroad?

The members of the International Educational Exchange Liaison Group believe all the weapons in our arsenal will be insufficient if we continue to underinvest in the non-military aspects of our defense—political, economic, educational and cultural—which correct distorted images of America in the minds of men and women throughout much of the world. We will assure our place in a more manageable, more stable world through the exchange of information, knowledge and know how and, ultimately, help develop common social, economic and cultural aspirations. With such a commitment, we can shape rather than merely respond to international events. Of the resources employed in the pursuit of U.S. foreign policy objectives, few have been as quietly effective as the educational and cultural affairs components of American diplomacy.

#### THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION AGENCY: A SECOND LINE OF DEFENSE

The major official U.S. Government efforts to influence the perception of America in other nations are centered in the International Communication Agency (USICA), an agency created in 1978 by combining the U.S. Information Agency and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the State Department. USICA's programs vary widely, ranging from the short-term, quick response capability of Voice of America broadcasts to the longer term investment in educating the successor generations of other nations. The Fulbright Program, a major vehicle for the exchange of students, professors and researchers between the United States and the rest of the world, has, since 1946, sent 45,000 Americans to foreign countries and brought 85,000 foreign students, teachers and scholars to the United States.

A recent international crisis offers an example of the utility of federal support for exchanges. When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, Washington sought the guidance of those with first-hand knowledge of the area. Almost without exception the Americans with any direct experience in South Middle Asia were alumni of federally funded exchange programs. Yet the numbers of exchanges which build such expertise have been in decline for more than a decade so that, in real terms, the U.S. exchange program today is operating at only 60 percent of the 1965 level. Other federal programs containing substantial educational exchange components, have also declined in recent years in relation to growing needs. Among these are the international education research and exchanges activities of the Department of Education, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, the National Science Foundation and the National Endowments.

Cultural and informational programs of USICA total less than 0.05 percent of the U.S. federal budget. Should we really be sur-

prised, then, when other nations fail to get the essential message about the U.S. purpose and posture? As Americans, we seem persistently unwilling to foot the bill for international understanding. Proctor and Gamble's annual advertising budget is larger than USICA's information activities and yet we somehow expect the Agency to achieve results on a worldwide scale in "telling America's story" and enlightening our citizens at home through scholarly and cultural visits.

If the erosion of U.S. influence and power internationally is serious enough to necessitate a \$33 billion increase in defense spending, is not an equally substantial increased investment called for to provide an American "arsenal of ideas"?

#### UNITED STATES: UNCOMPETITIVE IN EXCHANGES

A 1979 survey of international communication, cultural and educational programs of the United States and six other countries, by the General Accounting Office, concluded: "By comparison with allies and adversaries, the U.S. Government investment in this field is low. In absolute terms, the United States is outspent by France and the Soviet Union and is nearly equalled by West Germany. . . . In proportion to GNP, the comparison becomes even more striking." Both our allies and our adversaries seem fully mindful of the political and economic advantages that accrue when Third World leaders are educated in their countries, are trained to utilize their technologies, and are participants in their social, political and cultural life. France and the Federal Republic of Germany commit 1 percent of their national budgets to educational, cultural and informational activities; the U.S. Government less than 0.1 percent. Helmut Schmidt has defined politics, commerce and cultural diplomacy as the "three pillars" of German policy. The Government of France asserts that "cultural relations are as important as politics and trade and perhaps more important" to key French interests. Japan and Britain officially sponsor more students to go abroad on grants than does the U.S., while Britain also brings in more foreign grantees than the U.S.

Soviet information/cultural expenditures are estimated to total some \$2 billion annually—at least four times U.S. investments in this area overall. Cuban teachers and advisors continue to inundate selected Third World nations, yet in 1977 one-third fewer opportunities were granted to young Africans to pursue their studies in the United States than were available to them in 1968. We sent only seven doctoral candidates to Africa last year, three to Nigeria. In that year, only 1,800 Africans studied in the United States under U.S. sponsorship. The Soviet figure was 24,000. In Latin America, the U.S.S.R. offered 4,650 study and training exchanges in 1978 while the United States Government offered far fewer than one-tenth that number in a hemisphere so close, so troubled, and so important to our socio-economic goals and strategic thinking. Clearly, we are not offering scholarships to poor and middle class students on a scale even marginally comparable to that of the Soviet Bloc. As a 1977 report of the House Committee on International Relations concluded: "Significantly, in Soviet-Third World cultural relations the Soviet leadership appears to have placed its greatest hopes for ultimate success in the academic exchange programs."

American ambassadors continue to oppose the nearly 50 percent decline over the past decade in invitations to emerging world

leaders and affirm the importance of the international visitor program to U.S. foreign relations. These as well as other exchanges assure that we have a "second line of defense," that despite the freezes and thaws of official foreign policy, America can communicate with others and serve its own and international interests effectively.

#### FEDERAL FUNDING AS A CATALYST FOR THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The monies needed to rebuild the educational and cultural exchange programs of the U.S. Government are not excessive, nor are advocates unmindful of the need to reduce costs, streamline programs and assure increased counterpart funds. In fact, federally sponsored exchanges stimulate and channel enormous private sector and foreign contributions in the overall service of America's foreign policy. There is a significant "multiplier effect" as revealed by the following examples chosen from a much larger sample:

The International Research and Exchanges Board which administers U.S.-U.S.S.R. and Eastern Bloc exchanges received 39 percent of its support from the private sector in 1979-80 in support of over 600 months of exchange participation. Similarly, another regionally specific organization, AMIDEAST, generated 28 percent of its support from non-U.S. government sources. AMIDEAST Cairo activities are sponsored by Mrs. Jihan Sadat and in Jordan the organization administers King Hussein's Royal Palace Scholarships for U.S. study.

The Institute of International Education, which has managed over 225,000 exchanges since 1919, assisted close to 6,700 exchanges in 1980 through over 200 programs sponsored by 125 governments, foundations, corporations, universities, binational agencies and organizations. An additional 2,000 foreign leaders and specialists were also assisted by IIE regional offices in Denver and Houston in their capacity as international host agencies. Less than one-fourth of the Institute's funds come from USICA.

The Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU) has trained over 2,500 Latin American and Caribbean professors in U.S. graduate programs since 1966. Roughly half the cost of these exchanges has been covered from non-U.S. government sources.

The exchange activities of the Experiment in International Living, which include international language and technical studies in addition to well known homestay programs, touched the lives of nearly a million people in 40 nations in 1980. It was able through modest ICA support to launch significant new cooperative ventures with the General Federation of Women's Clubs, United Nations Association, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire, and Boy Scouts of America involving hundreds of thousands of dollars of contributed voluntary time and resources.

More than three decades ago, in the absence of any national procedure for admitting, advising and assisting foreign students coming to the United States, university faculty and administrators began to band together voluntarily to develop professional know-how in this new field. Today 4,000 academic institutional and individual professionals serving foreign students are members of the National Association For Foreign Student Affairs.

The Prime Minister of Japan announced in May of 1981 a commitment to Youth For Understanding for \$250,000 per year in



scholarships for 100 U.S. high school students selected annually under the sponsorship of U.S. Senators for summer homestays in Japan. The Japanese government contribution to Youth For Understanding (which exchanges 7,000 students annually between the U.S. and 25 other countries) is about twice as large as the U.S. government contribution through USICA.

The Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) and its member universities and organizations send more than 5,000 students to study abroad each year, with more than 90 percent of the funding from other than federal sources. Minimal federal assistance would enable the U.S. to increase these basic programs tenfold.

Despite this heavy private sector and foreign support (approaching \$100 million), more generous government funding is essential to assure:

That the most essential strategic and scholarly exchanges are supported;

That a national standard for the conduct of exchanges is set;

That national coordination and leadership is provided for program planning and development; and

That the level of exchanges increases in line with the national interest.

#### CONCLUSION: EXPORTING AMERICAN IDEAS

The erosion of government support for exchange opportunities and our inability to build upon earlier long-standing and effective investments in exchanges is decidedly not in the national interest of the United States. The neglect of exchanges reinforces the view abroad that America wants to obtain the natural resources of others and consume them with abandon, without sharing one of its own natural resources—its educational system—with other peoples eager to learn and to improve the lot of their often beleaguered countries.

In an age of complex global negotiations, instant communication and nuclear confrontation, America needs every means available to it to build a secure future. USICA's programs and related international educational efforts have never been more vital to the national interest, in assuring "brainpower" as well as firepower. These programs represent vital instrumentalities with which to create a world more amenable to American values and national security.

Concretely, the International Educational Exchange Liaison Group urges significantly increased appropriation of these critical federal programs:

The International Communication Agency, especially the educational and cultural affairs sector.

The training program of the Agency for International Development which prepares foreign technicians, managers and educators.

In addition other federally supported programs contain important exchange and citizen education elements: Title VI of the Higher Education Act administered by the Department of Education and various international programs of the National Science Foundation and the Arts and Humanities Endowment. These programs should be sustained so that they assist and encourage private sector efforts. The ultimate objective of U.S. policies in the world—military, economic, cultural and political—are increased freedom, security and peace. Well conceived, funded and conducted educational and cultural exchanges will not assure these goals, but they can do much to create the conditions of understanding on which they depend. Exchanges reduce miscalculations

by others as to our purposes and improve the accuracy of U.S. perceptions of reality abroad.

By increasing its modest investment in educational and cultural exchange, the U.S. can reverse the decline of American influence abroad and extend American competence in world affairs. We must invest our energies, talents and resources to assure a level of influence and measure of respect commensurate with our actual power. This is the path of responsibility as well as prudence. Americans have always met such challenges.●

#### COOLIDGE QUOTES

### HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Ronald Reagan has brought Calvin Coolidge back to the forefront. As we celebrated the Fourth of July, we were also celebrating the anniversary of Calvin Coolidge's birthday.

Marvin Stone dedicated the editor's page of the U.S. News & World Report to reviewing famous quotations from President Calvin Coolidge.

He did not mention the one which always appealed to me the most. It seems that at a big dinner party a bubbly matron approached Calvin Coolidge and said, "I bet someone that I could get you to say three words." To which he replied, "You lose."

Let us quote some of the famous statements from Marvin Stone's page on "The Good Sense of 'Silent Cal.'"

Remember Coolidge in a better light. He was a man who understood his countrymen. He suffered few illusions. Some may poke fun at the conventional caricature of Coolidge, but it takes only a sampling of his statements to recognize his good sense. The following is from the record:

It has always seemed to me that commonsense is the real solvent for the nation's problems at all times—commonsense and hard work.

Americans have not fully realized their ideals. There are imperfections. But the ideal is right. It is everlastingly right. What our country needs is the moral power to hold to it.

The business of America is business.

There is no dignity quite so impressive, and no independence quite so important, as living within your means.

The only way I know to drive out evil from the country is by the constructive method of filling it with good. The country is better off tranquilly considering its blessings and merits, and earnestly striving to

secure more of them, than it would be in nursing hostile bitterness about its deficiencies and faults.

The meaning of America is not to be found in a life without toil. Freedom is not only bought with a great price; it is maintained by unrelenting effort.

The world has had enough of the curse of hatred and selfishness, of destruction and war. It has had enough of the wrong use of material power. For the healing of the nations there must be good will and charity, confidence and peace. The time has come for a more practical use of moral power, and more reliance on the principle that right makes its own might.

Industry, thrift, and self-control are not sought because they create wealth, but because they create character.

Prosperity is only an instrument to be used, not a deity to be worshiped.

People criticize me for harping on the obvious. Perhaps someday I'll write an article on The Importance of the Obvious. If all the folks in the United States would do the few simple things they know they ought to do, most of our big problems would take care of themselves.●

#### CARTHAGINIANS AT CBS

### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, often we hear and read of comparisons drawn between the United States and ancient Rome, comparisons selected to warn us against following the same paths and committing the same errors which would lead ultimately to national decline and fall.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I propose to you and our colleagues another historical comparison: the United States and ancient Carthage.

In the third century B.C., Carthage controlled a vast commercial empire and was the richest of Mediterranean cities. The Carthaginian army was substantial, and the Carthaginian navy was without question the most powerful of its time.

Following the Second Punic war with the Roman Empire, Carthage still maintained much of its own empire and vital commerce. However, a shortsighted and corrupt government increased the tax burden upon its people, and embezzled part of it to boot. At that point, the popular party

called upon the great leader, Hannibal, to come out of his retirement and save the empire.

In 196 B.C., Hannibal was elected to lead the Carthaginians, and he immediately shocked the establishment by, among other reforms, reducing taxes on the citizens and reigning in government expenditures. These policies so enraged the ruling oligarchy that they secretly conspired with Rome to have Hannibal deposed and forced to drink poison.

Given the current debate surrounding our Government's taxing and spending policies, these historical events conjure up their own sense of *deja vu*. However, Mr. Speaker, my main focus centers around what was happening to the Carthaginian national defenses at this time.

The leadership and opinion makers of Carthage had neglected all war-making capabilities and had allowed the defense establishment to shrink to a shadow of its former self. The people were assured that Rome was no real threat, and that the maintenance of superior arms was too costly to the national treasury. Mr. Speaker, we hear some of these same voices haunting our own Nation today, threatening to weaken our national resolve and security.

When Carthage suddenly found herself facing a third war with Rome, she had a small army, a smaller navy, no mercenaries, no allies. Rome now controlled the seas.

The delusory Carthaginian leadership resorted to a diplomacy of appeasement. From the best families, 300 children were sent to Rome as hostages.

Under the mutual assured destruction—MAD—doctrine, we have offered our entire population as hostage.

When this failed to placate their enemies, the Carthaginian leaders convinced the people that their only hope was in unilateral disarmament. Carthage surrendered her remaining ships, a great quantity of grain, and all her engines and weapons of war.

As always, the policy of appeasement failed. Further, the Roman consuls demanded that the population of Carthage should retire to 10 miles from the city, which was then to be burned to the ground.

When the people realized what their leaders had done to them, they lost their sanity. Parents tore limb from limb the leaders who had advised surrendering the child hostages; other citizens killed those who had counseled disarmament; still others dragged government officials through the streets and stoned them to death.

Then, the awakened citizens declared war on Rome. They sacrificed everything to prepare for war—even the women cut their hair to make ropes. But, Mr. Speaker, it was too late for Carthage. After 3 long years of

war, fighting for their land and liberty street by street, Carthage fell to Roman conquest. The population was reduced by 89 percent; survivors were sold as slaves; the city was pillaged and then completely destroyed, burning for 17 days; the soil was plowed and sown with salt.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson in all this is that we should be especially wary of those in America today who counsel our people that the Soviet Union poses no real threat; that our military establishment is evil; that our national defense expenditures rob the poor and strain the Treasury without cause; that we should unilaterally disarm or engage in so-called treaties that result in our effectual disarmament vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is more imperialistic than ancient Rome, and is bent on nothing short of complete world conquest.

Distressingly, much Carthage-like appeasement and foolishness has lately been emanating from parts of the major media in this Nation—a media which enjoys the trust and confidence of many Americans.

Specifically, CBS News recently broadcast to its numerous television affiliates a 5-hour series that challenged virtually every assumption made by the Reagan administration on the need for a stronger national defense to meet the growing Soviet threat. Further, Mr. Speaker, CBS has so far refused to allow even 1 hour of its air time for the presentation of evidence on the other side of this vital issue.

Mr. Speaker, today I am placing into the RECORD two news columns which examine the CBS series and reveal some exceptionally disturbing facts concerning its production and contents. As these articles demonstrate, Messrs. Rather and Cronkite and their bosses at CBS News are, through folly or design, misleading the American people, and are assisting our enemies in placing the United States into a Carthaginian straitjacket.

The columns follow:

[From News World, June 1981]

**CBS'S WALTER CRONKITE MAKES SOVIET DISINFORMATION A CINCH**  
(By Reed Irvine)

WASHINGTON.—Walter Cronkite gave an interview to Soviet Journalist Vitali Kobyshev in the spring of 1979 in which he was quoted as saying to the Russian: "I'd like readers to know that I consider myself a friend of your country, and I will do everything in my power to ensure mutual understanding between our people."

Perhaps that was what Cronkite thought he was doing in the final program in the CBS series on national defense that was aired on June 18. His contribution to the five-hour CBS series was to try to explain to the American audience what his friends, the Russians, are really thinking about nuclear war and national defense.

He started out with an interview of Gen. Mikhail Millstein, who was introduced by

Cronkite as "a leading officer in the Soviet Army for almost 40 years" and as affiliated with Soviet military intelligence.

#### DANGEROUS THINKING

Cronkite asked Gen. Millstein, "What if the United States decided that a limited nuclear war was not unthinkable?"

Millstein replied: "There is a great propaganda about the possibility of a first strike against land-based missiles. In the United States, they say that the Soviet Union is planning such a first strike. Well, that's all just a very dangerous way of military thinking, because they are trying to persuade people that a nuclear war is possible. No, a nuclear war is impossible!"

Cronkite then asked, "But isn't it true that through the last few years the Soviet Union has been developing these missiles at a much faster rate than the United States?"

Millstein: "My answer is categorically not. The United States had in the beginning Polaris A-1, then Polaris A-2, then Polaris A-3 (it is MIRVed), then Poseidon, with the MIRV system, then the Trident system is already going up. The land-based missiles—Minuteman I, Minuteman II, then Minuteman III."

#### LET HIM PASS

Cronkite was much too polite to point out to Gen. Millstein and his audience that this was nonsense. In 1962, the Soviets had fewer than 10 ICBMs capable of striking the United States. By 1979, they had 1,400 ICBMs, compared to our 1,054. In addition, they had 1,037 submarine launched ballistic missiles compared to our 656. Rather than contradict Millstein, Cronkite led him into a discussion of how the Soviets also have to worry about the nuclear weapons of the Chinese and the French and British.

Cronkite next brought on Alexander Bobin, said to be a speech-writer for Brezhnev. Bobin assured Uncle Walter that the trouble with the Americans was that they wanted superiority over everyone else. He said the Soviets had achieved military equality with us, and we interpreted that to mean we were lagging behind. Bobin said we could destroy the Soviet Union 20 or 30 times over. The viewer was obviously expected to conclude that expenditures on such expensive weapons systems as the MX were a foolish and unnecessary waste of money.

Gen. Agayants, a former head of the KGB's Department of Disinformation, once said that the main goal of disinformation was to conceal the true intentions of the Soviet Union from the rest of the world. The men that Cronkite interviewed on the air were masters of this art.

#### WHAT HE CONCEALED

Igor Glagolev, who was a consultant to the Soviet government on arms control before he defected to this country, says that he knew Gen. Millstein well at the Institute of United States and Canada. He says that Millstein has long been associated with the KGB, and that he was actually an opponent of arms control. Being a leading specialist on disinformation, he would not reveal that to Walter Cronkite, of course.

Glagolev points out that the Soviet theory of nuclear war has been described in a book edited by Marshall V. D. Sokolovsky, "Military Strategy." This book, which has been through several editions, says the Soviets will win a nuclear war by virtue of superior firepower. They have now achieved that superiority.



Cronkite and CBS News cooperated beautifully with these Soviet disinformation artists. Perhaps it's because they are dumb. That would be the most charitable interpretation.

[From Human Events, July 4, 1981]

#### CBS DEFENDS U.S.S.R. MILITARY BUILDUP

The broad consensus in the defense community here at home is that the United States is in grave danger of facing overwhelming Soviet nuclear and conventional superiority in the 1980s. In almost every conceivable category of relevant military power, the Russians outclass this nation—and they refuse to relax their remarkable efforts.

From a position of stark inferiority in the early 1960s, they now have more strategic launchers, more destructive power (measured in terms of megatonnage), and more hard-target kill potential. They have more land-based missiles, more submarine-based missiles, more men under arms, more tanks, more tactical aircraft, etc., ad infinitum.

Where we have purposely left our cities defenseless as a means of showing the Soviets our "good will," they have constructed a massive air defense system, with an anti-missile capability, and are in the process of constructing thousands of civil defense shelters throughout their country in a determined effort to achieve a nuclear war-winning capability. These facts are beyond quibble, and any prudent American President—assuming he has not been hypnotized by the ideologues at the Institute for Policy Studies—will, for the safety of his own country, feel impelled to increase the defense budget substantially.

President Reagan, in fact, is deeply committed to increasing our military strength. But the opposition forces in this country have already begun heavily mobilizing against the President's efforts to provide this country with a first rate defense program. Beginning June 14 CBS News, with such major guns as Dan Rather, and Walter Cronkite shaping the script, fired the first atomic blockbuster against the Reagan defense policy: a five-part series on the U.S. military that, in the words of its detractors, was "irresponsible," "shameful" and "bordering on sabotage."

The thrust of the series was clear: Despite all the evidence to the contrary, this nation has no need to embark on any program to bolster our defenses. Not only do we have enough weaponry, but we would probably weaken ourselves both militarily and economically by improving our defense capability in any substantial way. Nor does Western Europe have anything to fear from the Warsaw Pact or the Soviet divisions in Eastern Europe.

Virtually every assumption made by the Reagan Administration on the need for a stronger military is challenged through a CBS-TV newsman or "expert."

Are the Soviets more vulnerable to attack from us than we are from them? Yes, says a Dr. Jack Geiger. Does the U.S. already possess "overkill"? Surely, says a former specialist on national security. Should we rebuild NATO? "[W]e could find no one who thought the Warsaw Pact would invade" Europe, says CBS reporter Ed Bradley, adding: "Now we're about to spend billions of dollars on NATO, even though a long-term war in Europe is unlikely . . ."

Are the Soviets much of a threat? "Since 1960," says Walter Cronkite soothingly, "Soviet influence around the world has declined" and "if their [the Soviets'] percep-

tion of America is as flawed as we believe it is, then our perceptions of the Soviet Union [as an aggressive threatening force] just could be flawed, too."

And Dan Rather ends the series asking these rhetorical questions: "All of us, as Americans, want our defenses to be strong and secure . . . But will we make ourselves stronger by unquestioning faith in new weapons technology? Will our European Alliance be strengthened by a strategy that might force us to destroy Europe in order to save it? Will we increase our national security by insisting there is a way to fight a limited nuclear war without mutual destruction?"

This "documentary," which cost roughly \$1 million and took nine months to produce, was deliberately designed to undermine the consensus that the Soviets are even a major military threat. Howard Stringer, the executive producer of the series, explained to TV Guide that the "opposition [to increased defense spending] isn't doing its job," and informed the London Economist that "the Reagan Administration will hate it."

Pacifists, unilateral disarmers, New Left historians and men in the Kremlin must have loved it, however. Indeed, in order to present its case against a Soviet military buildup, CBS-TV relied heavily for its "facts" on individuals involved in America's far left and unilateral disarmament camp, even though CBS covered up this far from unimportant detail.

In the opening program, for instance, CBS News used two individuals to drive home a number of anti-defense arguments, including the idea that improvement of our nuclear arsenal would have no meaningful military significance, that we could not survive a nuclear exchange with the Soviets and that the U.S. was actually less vulnerable than the Soviets to an atomic attack.

These two men, Dr. Kosta Tsipis and Dr. Jack Geiger, not only were featured in the film as experts, but worked with CBS in preparing a portion of the film. But CBS News, while passing these men off as objective analysts, never let slip the fact that both have been deeply involved in America's anti-defense lobby.

Dr. Tsipis, for instance, spoke at the March 20-25 First Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, an outfit that appears to take the Soviets at their word about their peaceful intentions. He is also involved in the American Committee for East-West Accord, which strenuously advocates trade and detente with Moscow, and is a member of the Board of Directors for SANE.

A May 30, 1981, letter sent out by SANE to potential members, with Tsipis' name on the letterhead, urges people to join SANE to help the organization scrap the MX system, "host a delegation of leading Europeans to inform Americans about the peril of the new generation of NATO missiles in Europe," "sponsor a series of briefings around the country on the harmful effects of arms spending" and "counter the propaganda of the arms lobby through radio broadcasts on our 400-station national network and distribution of our newly revised slide show within the nation's school."

Dr. Geiger also belongs to a variety of left-liberal disarmament organizations and has an article pointing to the urgency of American disarmament in the June-July issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, which constantly runs articles justifying Soviet belligerency as a product of the West's diplomacy.

In the Sept. 23, 1973, New York Times, Dr. Geiger, along with then-Rep. Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.), peacenik Cora Weiss and the Black Panther party, signed a full-page ad harshly condemning the United States for the overthrow of Chile's Communist president, Salvador Allende. The ad, complete with the screaming headline, "Santiago: The Streets Are Red With Blood," appealed to Congress "to use every means at its disposal" to repudiate the government replacing Allende and called for an investigation of charges "of U.S. involvement in the coup." (The facts that eventually developed showed no American involvement in the coup and that the coup had been triggered by Allende's illicit efforts to impose a Marxist-Leninist government on his own people.)

Both men not only have a long-standing bias against America's efforts to defend itself, but their facts are frequently far off base. In an obvious effort to show that a civil defense program on our part would be fruitless, Dr. Geiger, for instance, made the claim that if the city of Omaha, headquarters for the Strategic Air Command, were hit with a major Soviet atomic weapon, "anybody that was in a shelter would be dry-roasted, as in a crematorium." To bolster his argument, he added that "Our limited experience of firestorms in conventional war, in Hamburg and Dresden in World War II, the only people who survived were those who fled."

But this is not true. One of several reports dealing with the Hamburg raids was an April 1953 report published by the Scientific Advisors Board of the British home office which said, in part: "Some 142,000 people survived in basement shelters or escaped by their own initiative, and 45,000 were rescued, in addition to an estimated 53,000 who survived in blast protection 'bunkers.'"

Based on the "technical" advice of Tsipis and Geiger, the CBS series suggested that the city of Omaha, assuming it was hit with a 15-megaton bomb at ground zero, would vanish and some two million people would die from blast, fire and radiation sickness. But a 15-megaton ground burst would not cover even a third of Omaha and the estimated deaths are based on no effort by American citizens to develop fallout shelters, space-based anti-ballistic missile weapons and the like.

While a real war would obviously be devastating, CBS, with Tsipis and Geiger egging them on, misled viewers into thinking that the U.S. government could do nothing to greatly minimize a Soviet strike. The inference to be drawn from the show was that nothing could or should be done to provide greater protection for our citizens.

CBS also relied on other anti-defense authority to make its case. The fourth segment, "The War Machine," concentrated on the "U.S. military industrial complex," suggesting that it is involved in a giant effort to push unnecessarily costly weapons upon the taxpayer. As CBS' Richard Threlkeld put it, "The Iron Triangle is obsessed with procurement—getting exactly the new hardware it wants and as much of it as it can."

Where did the name "Iron Triangle," meaning Congress, the Pentagon and defense contractors, come from? The Council of Economic Priorities, a New York-based disarmament organization, has just published a book called "The Iron Triangle," which basically suggests that U.S. industry is fobbing off hugely expensive weaponry upon the government. Interestingly enough, the book is being distributed by the far-left Institute for Policy Studies in Washington,

D.C., and Richard Barnet, a mainstay of IPS, has also been on the CEP's board of directors.

Even more extraordinary than the "New Left" influence on the film is that Walter Cronkite, who narrated most of the fifth and final segment, not only permitted Soviet officials to pour out their anti-Americanisms unchallenged, but clearly accepted their premise that the U.S. has developed a threatening military posture.

Cronkite's interview with the Soviets was about as tough as if he were interviewing his Aunt Suzy. He asked a Gen. Milstein, a member of Soviet military intelligence, if nuclear war is thinkable "No, nuclear war is impossible," responded the general. But haven't the Soviets "been developing these missiles at a much faster rate than the United States?" queried Cronkite. Milstein: "Categorically, my answer is categorically not." The U.S. is at fault, said Milstein—and Cronkite refused to pursue the matter, refused to rebut him in any way.

Cronkite, in fact, made it clear that he embraced the Soviet view that our military posture looks terribly threatening to Soviet survival. In talking about his interview with Brezhnev's speechwriter to CBS' Charles Kuralt on June 18, Cronkite said:

"[H]e tells you how they look upon our arming and you realize that they see it as totally hostile. They see it as totally aggressive. They see it as intending war against the Soviet Union, planning war against the Soviet Union."

And Cronkite further justifies the vast Soviet military expansion over the past decade by saying, "When you put the Western European and Chinese strength against their strength. They're surrounded—just their strength and the Warsaw Pact strength, we far outnumber them. And all they're trying to do is get parity."

So wrongheaded was the CBS film that John Fisher, president of the American Security Council, held a press conference last week in which he and such military experts as Lt. Gen. Daniel Graham, the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, made a point-by-point rebuttal to the CBS film, some of which has been recounted here.

In a seven-page letter to William Leonard, president of CBS News, Fisher stressed, "According to the National Association of Broadcasters, 'The keystone of the Fairness Doctrine and of the public interest is the right of the public to be informed—to have presented to it the "conflicting view of public importance."'"

"The reason for this is that democracy can't work if its citizens are poorly informed. So to meet your obligations under the Fairness Doctrine, and to make it a fair debate, we ask that you give at least one hour to the pro-defense, do-more-than-we-are proponents. And we ask you to devote at least one hour to correcting misinformation."

Will Fisher get his shot? Don't hold your breath. The day he held his news conference on the film—June 23—CBS News was there, its camera whirling the entire hour. But not a scrap of film has yet been shown. But if pressure will do any good, we suggest you write Leonard, politely urging him to accept Fisher's challenge. ●

## WELCOME NEW AMERICANS

### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pleasure that I congratulate 24 residents of Maryland's Second Congressional District who have chosen to become American citizens, accepting all of the responsibilities that freedom and citizenship entail. I hope that my colleagues will join me in welcoming these new Americans:

Woo Song, Jin Song, Guen Bock, Eun Kang, In Kang, Hung Tran, Antuan Vu, Abdul Waheed, Edward Gorin, Kim Pang, Rashida Awan, Mohammad Awan, Alexander Bergmann, Julia Wen, Suk Ahn, Olga Pais, Man Wu, Jacqueline Fraer, Martine Roberson, Chandrasekharan Nair, Alfredo Pennese, Mercy Paraniham, Jacob Blekher, and Nela Blekher. ●

## COURAGEOUS VOTE

### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the recent vote by the United States in opposition to the World Health Organization's code on the marketing of infant formula was a courageous stand and one which could be the beginning of solutions to this compelling problem of infant malnutrition. An excellent article by Smith Hempstone appeared in yesterday's Washington Star pointing to the important fact that solutions are needed to this problem; not complaints, grievances or restrictions. Castigating the manufacturers of infant formula may attract popular acclaim—but it does not even refer to the problems of polluted water, unsanitary living abodes, and other conditions that contribute to infant illnesses and mortality. What is needed is more enlightenment.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Mr. Hempstone's article for the RECORD in support of the U.S. position on this important issue:

[From the Washington Star July 8, 1981]

ALL THIS BREAST-BEATING ABOUT INFANT FORMULA

(By Smith Hempstone)

When the Reagan administration finds itself outvoted 118-1 in the World Health Organization and opposed by both the U.S. Senate (89-2) and the House of Representatives (301-100), the White House is in the wrong, right?

Not necessarily. And, in the case of the current breast-feeding brouhaha, almost certainly not.

For the past six years, an odd assortment of liberal activists and other gollywogs

(Ralph Nader, Cesar Chavez, Dr. Benjamin Spock, Mother Jones) have been after the scalp of the baby-food industry, and particularly Nestle, the venerable Swiss giant (with annual sales of \$13 billion) that markets about a third of the baby formula sold in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The charge: that use of the formula causes 1 million infant deaths a year in the Third World.

That is, of course, hogwash. The infant formulas, which are used extensively in the United States, are not responsible for a single death. When such deaths occur—and they do occur—the cause inevitably is the mother's improper dilution of the formula, the use of polluted water or the failure to sterilize bottles.

No one would argue that breast-feeding, when the mother is healthy, is the cheapest, healthiest and most emotionally satisfying method of infant nutrition. Unfortunately, not all Third World mothers are healthy, or able and willing to breast-feed their children.

## TRADITIONAL SUBSTITUTES

When this is the case, the woman denied access to nutritionally balanced baby-food formulas obviously will use traditional substitutes such as gruel, sugar-water or mashed fruits, foods that are lacking in nutritional value and hard to digest. Since such substitute invariably are mixed with the same polluted water, it is difficult to see how the rate of infant mortality is reduced.

The code passed recently by WHO, with the U.S. casting the sole dissenting vote, rests on the incorrect assumption that marketing practices are the primary cause of the decline of breast-feeding in the underdeveloped world.

There is not a scintilla of evidence to support this thesis, and more than a little to contradict it.

In the U.S. for instance, where baby formulas are heavily advertised, there has been a dramatic increase in breast-feeding over the past decade; in the Soviet Union, where there is no advertising, use of baby formula has been equally dramatically on the upswing. WHO's own 1975-77 survey of 23,000 mothers in nine disparate countries showed no causal link between breast-feeding decisions and marketing practices.

A cynic might observe that, since the WHO vote was only a recommendation, many nations that have not the slightest intention of enforcing it voted for it, not to save the lives of children but to indict multinational corporations, and to avoid admitting the existence of primitive and unsanitary conditions in their own countries.

But how to explain last month's votes in the U.S. Senate and House?

## "CORRECT" SIDE OF THE ISSUE

Rep. Larry McDonald, a Georgia Democrat who is a medical doctor, suggests that many of his colleagues "didn't have the foggiest idea what they were voting on . . . but simply wanted to be perceived . . . as being on the 'correct' side of this issue."

McDonald, who calls the WHO code "absurd," points out that it prohibits all advertising and promotion of formula, and bans all sales incentives to salesmen and efforts by marketing personnel to educate mothers on the proper use of these products.

The code "will not improve infant health but rather have the opposite effect," concludes McDonald.

It is clear that special precautions ought to be taken in marketing products in semiliterate societies lacking in hygienic tradi-



tions and refrigeration. But the baby-food corporations themselves have done much to regulate their marketing practices, and there is no reason to believe that supranational organizations such as WHO are better placed to dictate such procedures.

At least in theory, the WHO code could be translated into regulations that would be binding on all nations, including the U.S. Sec. of Health and Human Services Richard Schweiker, however, has made it plain that, in his view, application of the code here would violate constitutional guarantees of free speech and association, and violate anti-trust laws.

Rather than castigating a 100-year-old firm such as Nestle as "a babykiller," the liberal activists who created this phony issue might better spend their energy and money teaching Third World mothers to read labels and boil polluted water.

But then the health of the world's children is not their genuine concern, is it? They prefer a grievance to a solution.●

#### CONSULTANT REFORM AND DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1981—MAJOR PROVISIONS

**HON. JULIAN C. DIXON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the Consultant Reform and Disclosure Act of 1981—

Clarifies the authority of agencies to appoint experts and consultants pursuant to title 5, section 3109, United States Code, and requires that OPM assume a more active oversight and reporting role in relation to the use of appointments by agencies;

Defines consulting services, management and professional services, and special studies and analyses as the universe to which most provisions apply;

Requires the publication of all consulting services, management and professional service, and special study and analysis contracts in excess of \$10,000 in the Commerce Business Daily prior to award. Also requires notification and justification of all subsequent modifications which increase the contract value by \$25,000 to be sent to the respective Inspector General or comparable official;

Requires basic attribution information to be included in reports prepared pursuant to a consulting service, management and professional service, or special study contracts and in agency-prepared reports which include substantial portions of such contractor-prepared reports; and

Requires the evaluation of consulting management and professional service, and special study and analysis contracts which exceed a value of \$50,000. Special attention is focused on performance according to the terms of the contract and deviations from cost and time as specified in the original contract.

Organizational conflict of interest determinations are required which are

to be applied on a test basis—for 3 years—at the Departments of Energy and Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Actual conflicts and appearances of conflict are addressed in regard to consulting, management and professional service, and special study and analysis contracts only. Where an adverse determination is made the contractor will have an appeal procedure.

Line item identification in the budget submitted by the President to Congress is required for consulting service, management and professional service, and special study and analysis procurement requests. Agencies will also be required to explain requests for procurement budget in the budget justification process.

The Federal Procurement Data System is codified.

Agency contract listings for all contracts entered into within the preceding 12 months, and contracts which are active, are required to be maintained and be made available to the public for inspection. Such listing will be updated quarterly.

Written justification for consulting service, management and professional service, and special study and analysis contracts are required to be maintained by the agencies and are to be made available to the public.

All contracts, unless classified for national security purposes, are to be considered public documents and thus available for inspection by the public unless disclosure is prohibited by law.

Agency officials are held accountable for contracting decisions during performance appraisal and bonus consideration.●

#### WHAT REAGANOMICS IS ALL ABOUT

**HON. GEORGE C. WORTLEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, lately we have been hearing a lot about tax cuts. Spirited debate on this issue ranges from the size or amount of such a cut to whether there really should be any tax cut at all. My position is well known—I believe our Nation needs across-the-board reductions in personal and business tax rates so that real economic growth can be restored in our Nation.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried an Op-Ed column by David M. Smick entitled, "What Reaganomics Is All About" that crystallizes the entire economic package that the President has proposed to Congress. In this one column he has captured the essence of the central issues behind the Republican tax cut proposal—incentives and excellence.

Small businessmen and entrepreneurs have made this Nation a bastion of opportunity through their pursuit of creating profitmaking enterprises. Too often, however, we forget how important it is to establish an economic climate in our Nation that is conducive to risk takers and venture capitalists. In short, what our Nation needs is a large dose of good old-fashioned incentives that give small business men and women the opportunity to take a chance, not take a check from the latest tax gimmick.

Dave Smick is one of the founders of the recently rediscovered supply side economic model. He is truly a "supply insider" and a well-known spokesman and advocate around Capitol Hill on behalf of those Congressmen and Senators who believe that the private sector and not Government fiat is the better answer in restoring economic growth and rebuilding confidence in our free enterprise system. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

#### WHAT REAGANOMICS IS ALL ABOUT (By David M. Smick)

In the late 1930s, Chester Carlson had a revolutionary idea—an electrostatic printing process—which he tried to sell to the top mimeograph companies in America. Turned away time and again, he finally converted his kitchen into a workshop and went into business for himself. There was risk and a shortage of capital, but the tiny enterprise survived and prospered.

Today, we know it as Xerox.

Were Mr. Carlson alive, he probably would ask, "What ever became of those smug mimeograph companies?" The answer is that they fell victim to what Joseph Schumpeter, the economic theorist, called "the creative destruction of capital—the process by which a new idea enters the marketplace, making existing capital worthless.

What sounds like some arcane concept is the heart of Reaganomics. It explains the President's understanding of how growth is produced in the private sector, and why he believes, against a multitude of critics, that his across-the-board tax cuts for people will lead directly to new jobs.

To give the President credit, most policymakers have in recent years understood the process of job creation about as well as John McEnroe has mastered the art of diplomacy. Mention "jobs" and the picture is of giants of industry like Chrysler and U.S. Steel either protecting existing jobs or expanding plant and equipment to create new ones.

Actually, the Fortune 500 have experienced virtually no net job growth for more than a decade. The newest research shows instead that nearly all new jobs are coming from firms with precisely the opposite characteristics.

They are not only small, but minuscule. Nearly 70% of new jobs come from firms with 20 or fewer employees. Almost 100% of net new jobs in the Northeast come from such firms.

They are young. Most new jobs come from firms four years old or less.

They are unpredictable and unstable. The more stable a firm is, the less likely it is to produce new jobs.

## FAIL NATIONALLY AT SAME RATE

Many of these fledgling enterprises will go out of business (four out of five do so within the first year) with new ones springing up to take their place. Frostbelt or Sunbelt, such businesses fail nationally in metropolitan areas at roughly the same rate—8% a year. Booming Houston, according to David Birch of MIT, proportionally has more business failures today than the old cities of Boston, Baltimore, Hartford—indeed more than almost every other city in the U.S.

What these facts and statistics create is a perfect object lesson. Houston's success stems not from a strong defense, but a strong offense. Entrepreneurs with new ideas are creating jobs at a pace far exceeding the rate jobs are lost, providing Houston a tremendous engine for prosperity.

The secret to maintaining high levels of national employment is hardly import quotas or Chrysler-like bailouts or even tax proposals aimed merely at modernizing existing plant and equipment.

The secret is creativity—encouraging a groundswell of men and women with fresh ideas to strike out on their own. The secret lies in the enterprises yet unborn, the oil wells yet undrilled, the inventions yet untried. Some of these fledgling entrepreneurs will fail, but others—like Chester Carlson—will replace today's capital and products with new and better ones, to the benefit of all of us.

The irony is that city planners, government growth economists and even successful corporate executives usually find this thinking unrealistic. The reason may be that productive change is not in their own vested interest. But it also may result from the great frustration that in this age of sophisticated econometric models and corporate "five-year plans," enterprise and job growth is just as unpredictable as it was decades ago. It still involves the dynamic process of two competing forces: success and failure. And perhaps most frustrating, it continues to depend directly on the creative implementation of new ideas by folks who, in the eyes of corporate America and the federal government, appear unpolished and relatively inexperienced.

If you have met a true entrepreneur even once, you know they tend to be nothing but crazy. Like Chester Carlson, they appear illogical dreamers, even though many have that inner genius for success. As a sophisticated business or government executive would you, or could you, take the risk of investing in such unpredictable characters knowing that many will end up as miserable failures? Perhaps this is why large institutions have not provided many permanent new jobs.

While entrepreneurs may be crazy, they are crazy like a fox. Most expect to lose money in the early years; still they make a careful calculation of current risk against future reward. They are society's dreamers and will endure incredible risk—far more than established business—with promise of great future reward.

In a sense, every individual is a potential entrepreneur. By that I mean that we have near limitless sources of both human and financial capital—professionals in high tax brackets working only three days a week, mid-level industry technicians teeming with new ideas but apprehensive of the risks of individual enterprise, and many others.

Notice this is not just capital formation, but capital mobilization. Capital is more than money. It is also productive ability and thus exists in the minds, hands and hearts

of people. The question is, how do you encourage these potential new wealth and job creators to invest their talent and savings in a new enterprise instead of in real estate, elaborate tax shelters, money market funds or in doing nothing at all? What they need is a climate of economic buoyancy, so necessary to individual initiative, and a system that capitalizes on human nature by strengthening the link between effort and reward.

House Speaker Tip O'Neill calls this "the whims of free enterprise." With all due respect, it is precisely such entrepreneurial risk-takers, now lining Route 128 outside Boston with small "hi-tech" firms, who are shouldering his city's job and tax base. If he simply visited these enterprises, the Speaker would discover that entrepreneurial success in America is taxed and harassed more than in just about any other free industrialized country. By the sheer force of logic, he would immediately help lower or eliminate the capital gains tax, lower the corporate rate, eliminate senseless overregulation and, most importantly lower marginal tax rates on personal income across the board.

## POTENTIAL ENTREPRENEURS

After all, 90 percent of American businesses still pay taxes through the personal schedules. These include proprietorships, partnerships and all the other noncorporate entities engaging in enterprise. Just as vital are potential entrepreneurs who, before entering a risk situation by pulling savings out of tax shelters, look instinctively to their personal tax bracket, which inflation has pushed higher and higher in recent years.

This is why President Reagan calls his across-the-board personal tax-rate reduction plan a "small-enterprise incentive" and why he favors the proposed end to the distinction between "earned" and "unearned" income (establishing a top tax rate on personal income of 50% now, with the goal of 35% as soon as is politically possible). Both increase the after-tax reward for greater entrepreneurial risk, for the direct creation of jobs.

Congress, with a false sense of sophistication, has always preferred more complicated solution to the creation of jobs—the targeted gimmicks with built-in "triggers" that have failed for so many years. Yet the birth of an enterprise has an elusive, almost metaphysical quality that makes targeting, planning, certainty and "sophistication" most difficult. Something as common and essential as the ballpoint pen was conceived by, of all people, an insurance executive on his summer vacation. The arrival of the automatic transmissin has little if anything to do with the multi-million-dollar engineering departments of Detroit's Big Three.

Growth involves ideas and thus is unpredictable. All we can provide is buoyancy—that sense of economic boundlessness where a person can, with energy and initiative, take a new idea as far and as high as he or she wants. If we can keep that initiative from being stifled, as it is today by an inefficient tax and regulatory system, people may once again follow their dreams. Allow entrepreneurs and potential entrepreneurs across-the-board worthwhile returns on their effort and they will start taking risks. Our entire economy will gain in production and jobs, and the nation will regain the energy and opportunity and spirit upon which its greatness depends.

[Mr. Smick is chief of staff to Republican Congressman Jack Kemp of New York.]

## SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would call for schools to provide nutritionally superior lunches as part of the national school lunch program.

Too often schoolchildren know little about the relationship between good eating habits and healthful living. The poor eating habits acquired in youth usually last for a lifetime, bringing in their wake preventable sickness and ill health. Even if, as they mature, children learn about nutrition and health, they may have already been adversely affected during their formative years.

Twenty years ago, the Federal Government decided to try to do something about this growing and needless tragedy by establishing a national school lunch program. Participating schools had only to guarantee that the subsidized lunch was at least nutritionally adequate. Over the years, the national school lunch program has been a great success story. It has done much to improve both the physical and mental well-being of the Nation's schoolchildren. It has provided nutritionally adequate lunches for millions of our youth.

However, certain educators and nutritionists have pointed out two major areas in which the program could and should be greatly improved.

First, although "nutritionally adequate," the Federal lunches are not required to be nutritionally superior. Nor are they designed to comport with recent findings with respect to the effects of a high-salt, high-sugar and high-fat diet. Although these findings may not be proven to an absolute scientific certainty, there is strong evidence that too much salt, sugar and fat can have harmful effects on health. There is also some evidence that certain food additives not only may be carcinogenic but also may cause hyperactivity in some children.

The second involves so-called competitive foods; that is, those snacks sold in competition with the federally subsidized and nutritious lunch. For example, despite certain Federal laws and regulations which have been in effect at varying times, school cafeterias have been permitted to sell a wide variety of foods which are of questionable nutritional value. Also, schools have continued to permit the placement of vending machines in their cafeterias filled with candies, sodas, ice cream, and the like.

I am heartened by the fact that several school districts around the country have already decided to upgrade their school lunch programs in such a



way as to provide their children not with nutritionally adequate lunches, but with nutritionally superior lunches. For example, the Fulton County, Ga., school district, under the leadership of Mrs. Sarah Sloan, has gone to a low-salt, low-sugar, and low-fat program; they use only organically grown vegetables and fruits; they tolerate no chemical additives in foods; they do not permit the sale of candies and soda on school grounds. And what is more, the children apparently love it.

The bill which I am introducing would amend the National School Lunch Act so that schools and school districts will have to provide their students with a nutritionally superior lunch program in order to receive their allotted Federal subsidy.

To qualify, schools would have to include low fat as well as whole milk. All breads would have to be whole grain. Meals would have to be low-salt, low-sugar, and low-fat. "Competitive foods" would be strictly limited—especially salted snacks, soda, and candy. Courses in nutrition would be encouraged, and each school could have a nutritional council comprised of its principal, dietician, athletic director, and most importantly, a student representative.

All of us are abundantly aware of the changes being made in the Federal budget to reflect the people's desire to decrease Government spending and thereby improve the overall economic condition of our country. We are also aware of this administration's efforts to reduce the regulatory burdens imposed by our Government on its citizens. As an example, a provision of S. 1254 requires the Department of Agriculture to, within 90 days, make changes to the school lunch menu patterns in order to effectuate cost savings. S. 1254 does not go far enough to insure that our Nation's schoolchildren will receive a school lunch high in nutritional value—even though the taxpayer presently subsidizes this Nation's school lunch program. In this period of making our Government cost-effective, we must not sacrifice the quality of our children's school lunches simply to reduce the size of the Federal budget.

I am hopeful that over a period of years, more and more children will have access to the new program. Through good nutrition, they will be able to build stronger bodies and stronger minds. They will learn to drink milk instead of soda. They will learn to enjoy fruit as a dessert instead of candy. In brief, they will develop early the good eating habits which should stand them in good stead for all of their lives.

The very worthy idea for a superior school lunch program has been vigorously promoted by the National Nutritional Foods Association. As consider-

ation of this legislation progresses, we are very hopeful of receiving the strongest support of many other national groups concerned with the health and nutritional well-being of America's youth.●

### PARRIS ANNOUNCES VICTORY FOR NORTHERN VIRGINIA

#### HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the residents of northern Virginia, after a long and hard fought battle, achieved a tremendous victory. Secretary Drew Lewis' adoption of a plan to impose safer limits on commercial airline use of National Airport will benefit the residents of northern Virginia both environmentally, and economically. Not only will the increased safety at National Airport bring about lower levels of air, and noise pollution, it will also meet the long-term transportation needs and goals of both travelers and residents in the northern Virginia area, by reducing congestion.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that this issue will be extensively discussed and evaluated by my fellow colleagues.

I believe that the impact of Secretary Lewis' decision is of significant importance, and I am submitting the full text of his remarks for my colleagues information.

The statement follows:

#### STATEMENT BY U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION DREW LEWIS

The new policy we are proposing today for National Airport is designed to assure the maximum safety of air operations in the Washington area, reduce noise and congestion at National Airport, and encourage the greater use of Dulles International Airport.

In developing this policy, safety, as always, was our paramount concern. We have an excellent safety record at National Airport and we intend to make sure that flight safety is not imperiled in any way.

Noise at National has been a community concern for years. In addressing that issue, we took the position that those disturbed by the noise at National should get as much consideration as those who benefit from its services.

While its "close-in" location makes Washington National popular with the airlines, over-use of the airport can result in congestion—both on the air-side and the land-side, causing travelers delay and inconvenience, and resulting in operating inefficiencies. At the same time, Dulles is operating well below capacity.

Those are the concerns behind our policy proposal; now let me address the specific issues.

First, to prevent congestion, we are setting a ceiling of 16 million passengers a year. That is approximately the number of passengers that can be handled at National without a costly expansion of facilities.

From 11 million passengers in 1972, National grew to 15 million in 1979. There is, however, no legal limit on passenger growth

at the present time. According to recent forecasts, the traffic flow at National would probably reach 16 million by 1984 and could reach 19 million passengers a year by 1990. If growth were permitted to continue at that rate, at some point we would be faced with a substantial public investment in additional parking, gate positions and other facilities at National, while the ample facilities already at Dulles remained underutilized.

Second, we propose to meet the noise objections in two ways: first, by reducing the total number of daily airline operations; and—second—by setting strict noise limits that will bring late evening and night operations down to significantly quieter levels.

The scheduled air carriers currently operate at National on a 16-hour day and as a practical matter flights regularly operate after 10 p.m. and may arrive or depart as late as midnight. We propose to set strict scheduling limits of 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.

We are, in effect, putting a "noise lid" on National at 9:59 p.m. After 10 p.m. and until 6:59 a.m., no flights will be permitted to depart unless they can stay within a noise level of 72 decibels. No jet airliner presently in use can meet that limit.

To further control noise and avoid congestion, we are proposing to reduce the number of landing and takeoff "slots" available to the airlines. Slots were established some years ago as a means for dealing with the high demand by the airlines for access to Washington National. Under present rules, 40 slots an hour are available to the airlines, for a 16-hour day. Under our policy the air carriers will be restricted to 37 slots an hour for a 15-hour day.

We also propose to maintain the current number of slots for general aviation, at 12 per hour.

Allocations for commuter airline flights will be increased from eight per hour to 11 per hour, reflecting the growth in the commuter airlines and the service they provide to small cities. The smaller, quiet commuter aircraft are ideally suited, we believe, to National Airport.

A full regulatory impact analysis under the President's directive on federal regulations will be conducted on the basis of actual experience. That analysis, to be completed within a year from the effective date of the regulations, will provide the groundwork for any changes to the policy that may prove advisable.

In addition to reducing noise and congestion at National Airport, our plan—we feel—promotes the greater use of Dulles International Airport in five ways:

First, the noise limits to go into effect with this policy will force airlines operating the noisier aircraft or with nighttime operations to use the larger airport.

Second, we believe that the reduction in landing and takeoff positions will cause more carriers to opt for Dulles where there are no slot limitations.

Third, one of the impediments to the greater use of Dulles has been the limited availability of ground transportation. We are proposing to accelerate—by nine months—construction of the connector highway between I-66 and the Dulles access road. We would hope to begin construction this fall, with completion of the project in 27 months. We also plan to explore the feasibility of linking downtown ticket counters with free or low-cost public bus transportation to Dulles. If the plan proves feasible, passengers could buy their tickets at con-

venient downtown locations and take special buses direct to the airport.

Fourth, our policy also sets more stringent noise levels to become effective in 1986. On that date National Airport will become off-limits to virtually all of the air carrier jetliners now serving that airport. Only the new generation of quieter, more fuel-efficient planes—the DC-9-80, the 737-300 and the 757 and 767 aircraft now under development, plus other aircraft if re-engined—will be able to meet the noise levels we are recommending for National Airport in five years.

It is not practical to set lower limits at an earlier date because the new aircraft must come on line and quieter engines for the existing aircraft must be programmed. We believe that with proper incentives the transition to quieter jet aircraft can be accelerated, but in the meantime the noise levels we have set will provide immediate relief and—at the same time—encourage a more equitable balance of traffic between National and Dulles.

Fifth, we propose to extend the nonstop limit for National departures to 1,000 statute miles. This is the range within the limits of "same-day" round trips, and passengers flying farther by and large should not object to the few additional minutes needed to travel to Dulles. In addition to the cities served directly from National under the "grandfather" agreement, a number of other cities become eligible under the 1,000-mile non-stop rule. Those most likely to get direct service are Kansas City, New Orleans, Birmingham and Fort Lauderdale.

Those, we believe, are the key points in our policy proposal. The thrust of our plan, as I have indicated, is to strengthen air safety, reduce the noise in areas impacted by National Airport, make more efficient use of the public's investment in Dulles, and to assure that air travelers to and from the nation's capital are served efficiently and with a minimum of congestion.

A public hearing date has been set for July 28th, with the public comment period to close August 21st. If approved, the rule could go into effect October 25th.●

**DR. JAMES A. ROGERS—  
DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN**

**HON. JOHN L. NAPIER**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 9, 1981*

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, reflecting on the 205th birthday of our Nation, I would like to remind my colleagues that America is great because it was built by great people, people who knew how to sacrifice to obtain their ultimate goals, people who steadily forged ahead in the face of insurmountable odds. This Nation will forever be remembered for the people who carved it from the wilderness, gave it a purpose, ideals, and a heritage so awesome that the whole world looks on with envy.

When I stand on the floor of Congress, I am awestruck by a sense of responsibility so great that I feel fortunate to have the thousands of men and women of the Sixth District of South Carolina to rely on for support.

They, like their ancestors, are people who continue today to meet the challenges of keeping America great. Their ideas and ideals, while somewhat advanced from those of their 1776 forebears, are just as important and just as significant to the continued growth and prosperity of this Nation.

We have all heard the names of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Hancock, and many more. These were truly great individuals. But, we have rarely heard the names of those who remained at home when the famous statesmen were hammering out those important historical documents.

While I represent the Sixth District of South Carolina on the floor of Congress, I am ever mindful that back home there are men and women who are truly unsung heroes.

One man who has dedicated his entire life to the service of others is James A. Rogers. His distinguished career covers 35 years and touches many fields including journalism, education, business, religion, and civic affairs. Furman University, his alma mater, recently recognized his contributions by awarding him an honorary doctor of laws degree.

James A. Rogers was born in the Marlboro County town of Blenheim, S.C., in 1905. From this rural setting, he developed a humanitarian sixth sense which continues to serve as his hallmark.

After graduating from Furman University in 1927, Mr. Rogers felt drawn to serve God in an even greater capacity and undertook post college studies at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky. From there, he entered the public school system and served as a teacher and principal during the next 7 years.

His interest in religious activities led him to help organize one of the largest churches in the Sixth Congressional District today. As a charter member of Calvary Baptist Church, he has been a member of the board of deacons and teacher of the men's Bible class for more than 20 years. In 1970, the South Carolina Christian Action Council presented James A. Rogers an award and citation for "multiple contributions to South Carolina," an honor which has only been presented twice in the council's history.

James A. Rogers launched into the field of journalism with a fervor which was rarely observed. After 30 years service with the North and South Carolina media, he is recognized as a journalist whose credentials are honesty, objectivity, and credibility.

His long period of service with the Florence Morning News, Florence, S.C., came during an important period in the South's history. His Christian heritage and dedication led him directly to the front of the fray for civil rights. His battleground became the

editorial page, where he stood, many times alone, armed only with the ideals and concern for fellow humans which mark great humanitarians. And, he was not satisfied just to write about civil rights. He conceived and implemented the Litchfield Conference of Community Leaders for a special study of race relations and methods of achieving peaceful public school integration.

In his quest for improving the South Carolina educational system, James A. Rogers diligently served on the governing board of Clemson University, South Carolina State College, and Francis Marion College, the latter which he cofounded and where today, one of the State's finest library facilities bears his name.

Mr. Rogers' civic participation roster reads like a directory of important associations and agencies in the Pee Dee area. He has provided lifelong leadership in the Florence Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis Club, State Library Board, Governor's Committee for Police-Community Relations, Florence Museum, and the Connie Maxwell Children's Home. He has additionally offered his knowledge and expertise to the Christian Life Commission of the South Carolina Baptist Convention, the South Carolina Press Association, the Pee Dee Educational Foundation, Downtown Florence Association, the Salvation Army, and Florence County Mental Health Association.

James Rogers retired from journalism in 1975 and at that point, his life really went into high gear. A lifelong historian in a region rich with colorful figures and events which made this Nation what it is today, James Rogers naturally clung to his typewriter. From the vantage point of the Arundel Room of the library named in his honor, he has steadily churned out volumes of essays and articles revealing important historical facts about his native State and region. In 1978 he published a delightful collection of essays entitled: "Theodosia and Other Pee Dee Sketches" and will soon complete a manuscript detailing the life of Richard Furman.

It is with pride that I take this opportunity to tell the U.S. Congress about a man who has genuinely served mankind. If there is any public servant who is to be emulated in his personal and professional life, it is my dear friend James A. Rogers, one of the truly great men of South Carolina's Pee Dee area.●



A TRIBUTE TO HERB AND  
ETHEL STEIN

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we of this Congress are engaged in many matters, so many that I think we sometimes forget the everyday things of life and the unsung heroic lives people are living outside these walls.

I therefore rise today, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to two outstanding Americans—two unsung heroes if you will—Herb and Ethel Stein.

For the past 20 years, my good friends the Steins have owned and operated the St. George Sweet Shop in Colonia, N.J. Now they have sold their business and have retired.

Herb and Ethel Stein went into the luncheonette business after the Second World War. Since that time they have been members of the small business community—the very backbone of our national economy and national prosperity.

In this world of corporate giants and huge conglomerates, Mr. Speaker, we often either overlook or downplay the role small business plays. Yet over 100 million Americans are employed by small businesses; 87.3 percent of the new jobs in this country—jobs we need so desperately—are created by small business establishments.

Indeed small business people are extraordinary Americans. They serve their communities. Most are honest, industrious, conscientious. To be sure, these are qualities the Steins have in abundance.

We must not forget how important people like the Steins are to our Nation. They always give—they rarely take. They pay taxes—more than their fair share. The dollar earned by the small business owner turns over very rapidly. Further, that dollar is spent within the community, so it benefits other businesses and other people.

Small business provides jobs for the boy or girl after school. It gives part-time employment to others. A business like a lunch counter becomes a center for people getting together—for breakfast, for lunch, for a soda, for a lottery ticket, for a chocolate egg cream, and for some of Mrs. Stein's delicious homemade soup. My favorite is her clam chowder.

The Steins are an important and integral part of the community. When I was growing up I was often with the Steins; I have spent thousands of hours in their store. I will always cherish their friendship. I know hundreds of others who feel the same and who will dearly miss Ethel and Herb.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues in this House

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that every American has the right in this great land to do exactly what the Steins have done.

Not every American, however, has the courage, wisdom, perseverance or drive to do what the Steins have done.

Not every American has the physical or emotional stamina to work 10 to 12 hours a day, 6 to 7 days a week.

Not every American is willing to take on the incredible risks associated with the running of a small business. And believe me, I know the risks and difficulties first hand. My parents—Bern and Kay Smith—founded, own, and operate a sporting goods company located right next to the Steins' place. Leisure Unlimited Sporting Goods, which is where I worked most of my life, is a successful business because my parents worked the long hours, gave of themselves, were their own boss and employed every ounce of entrepreneurial skill at their command to make it work. My two older brothers and I worked our way through college at Leisure and learned invaluable lessons from my parents. My parents, you see, like the Steins, are rugged individualists who have the distinct satisfaction of succeeding, of making a good life for themselves, because they worked for it!

With all the chatter these days about the welfare state and womb-to-tomb subsidized living, it's refreshing to know that there are still some folks who march to the beat of a different drummer, who are willing to pay the price to determine their own destiny, to live their own dreams.

President Andrew Jackson, in a message to Congress in 1832, said Americans didn't want their Government conferring privileges or favors. The Government of the United States was not to foster monopoly or supply bounties for private enterprise. There must be "Equal Rights for All, Special Privileges for None" in the words of President Jackson. He went on to support "A Fair Field and No Favor."

The Steins represent all that is good about our country. They are entrepreneurs who helped build up the United States and make it great. They strived and succeeded in creating their own business. They asked for no privileges, no favors—all they wanted was opportunity.

That is all people like the Steins ask. They want the equal protection of the laws. They want the great opportunities so sought after by all Americans—the very promise of the United States. That is all they ask. They have no desire to take away from someone else or to have special privilege bestowed on them. What they get is the result of their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the United States can produce people like Herb and Ethel Stein we need not fear for our country.

July 9, 1981

As long as the United States has patriots as devoted as the Steins our future is secure.

As long as people like Herb and Ethel Stein have faith in their country and its foundation in freedom and justice we will endure no matter what the challenge.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to honor Herb and Ethel Stein. I wish them long life and every happiness. May God bless them.●

THE CLEAN AIR ACT—A NATIONAL COMMITMENT WE MUST KEEP

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as most regions of the country feel the continuing plague of polluted air, it is appropriate for the Congress to consider renewing its commitment to clean and healthy air. The main committees of both Houses of Congress are deep into their review of the Clean Air Act, while other committees, such as the Agriculture Subcommittee which I chair, are examining how air pollution adversely affects other important sectors of our economy, such as agricultural crops.

In recent weeks, there has been growing concern in the country that the Reagan administration intends to recommend legislation which would essentially "gut" the Clean Air Act. My friend and distinguished colleague from California, HENRY WAXMAN, has released an early draft of the administration's plan, which would be an object of ridicule were it not coming from the executive branch of Government. Like most of my colleagues, I hope this draft is rejected in-house, but, if it is not, the Congress must demonstrate why it is a separate and coequal branch of government, and act to protect the Nation's public health and welfare.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am inserting in the RECORD three editorials which eloquently express my concerns, and suggest the course of action Congress should follow.

The first is a guest editorial, written by Representative HENRY WAXMAN; the other two are editorials from newspapers in southern California which have lengthy experience in covering air pollution matters.

The editorials follow:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 28, 1981]

CLEAN AIR ACT: JUST ANOTHER TRINKET FOR REAGAN TO DUST OFF?

(By Henry A. Waxman)

Representatives of industry, environmental lobbyists, members of Congress and concerned citizens have been waiting for some

time to see the Reagan Administration's proposal for amendments to the Clean Air Act.

Enacted in 1970, our clean-air laws have established air-pollution standards designed to protect the health of the American people; they have forced industry to control pollution from their plants and required our cars to become progressively cleaner.

I recently obtained a draft of the proposal the Administration intends to submit to Congress this week. Even though it is only a draft, it provides the most definitive indication to date of the direction Interior Secretary James Watt and the Cabinet Council is contemplating.

In a word, the proposal would end the federal government's decade-long commitment to cleaning the air in our nation's cities. If this proposal becomes law, 140 million people who live in dirty-air areas will be permanent victims of air-pollution levels that threaten health by aggravating the incidence of heart disease, lung disease and cancer.

This proposal goes well beyond the changes that industry has publicly advocated. It goes far beyond even Vice President George Bush's publicly expressed goal of "Mid-course corrections" to make application of the law more efficient and equitable, to eliminate bureaucratic delay, and to ease somewhat the regulatory burden on industry. Instead, the Administration is proposing nothing less than a blueprint for the destruction of our clean-air laws.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the President persists in this course, there will be a furious and acrimonious battle in Congress that only will delay the passage of the changes that the law truly needs.

There is, after all, no reason for fundamental changes in the Clean Air Act. It has done much to improve air quality across America without hindering our economic and energy development. The President's Commission on Coal and the National Commission on Air Quality both have concluded that we can vastly increase our use of domestic energy reserves without sacrificing the Clean Air Act. This law also enjoys the broad support of the American people—86 percent of them, according to a Harris Survey released earlier this month.

But this draft proposal, currently under consideration at the highest levels of the Administration, would drastically limit the federal government's ability to protect the public health of America from air pollution.

It would do away with the federal program to clean up the air in cities where it is worst, such as Los Angeles, by repealing requirements that industries reduce their emissions until clean-air standards are met.

It would turn back the clock on auto-pollution standards, actually allowing cars in the future to pollute the air more than many of those being sold today do. The proposal would allow, for example, a doubling of the current output of carbon monoxide, and would take no further measures to control "nox" (oxides of nitrogen).

It would permit areas that are currently cleaner than the law requires—areas that have special protection to prevent significant deterioration in air quality—to become polluted to the maximum level now allowed under the law.

It would permit states, acting on their own, to relax pollution controls for industry, setting off an ugly process in which industrial growth would go to the dirtiest bidder. Even where clean-up technology is available and needed, industry would no

longer be required to use it. New factories could be built without adequate pollution-control equipment; for example, coal-fired power plants would no longer have to use scrubbers to remove dangerous sulfur emissions.

It would do nothing to alleviate the ominous threat of "acid rain"—precipitation loaded with industrial contaminants that can fall to earth hundreds of miles from the source, sterilizing lakes and spoiling forests.

And the proposal would erect new obstacles to federal enforcement of the law against polluters. Prosecution and fines against violators would be made optional rather than mandatory.

All of these proposals contradict the basic policies that have served us well over the past decade: First, that we should make sure that new sources of pollution be as clean as possible. Second, that we should not allow the states to compete with each other by offering lenient pollution-control policies. Third, that measures must be taken to control pollution that crosses state and national boundaries.

Air pollution is a problem that cannot be controlled by the states alone, and is a problem that will not be controlled by industry. The only effective guarantee of a clean environment is a coherent national policy to curb air pollution. The Administration's proposals would essentially repudiate that guarantee.

The Administration's philosophical approach to pollution control appears to center no longer on what happens to the health of the American people, but on what the cost might be to industry.

If everyone who has a stake in clean air made his or her views known, perhaps this Administration would understand that the American people do not want to live in a land irreversibly covered by a blanket of factory smoke and auto exhaust that threatens their well-being.

[From the San Bernardino (Calif.) Sun,  
June 23, 1981]

#### AMERICANS WANT CLEAN AIR

Late last week, a document surfaced that contained the text of proposals being made by a government task force concerning amendments to the federal Clean Air Act.

The task force, headed by Anne M. Gorsuch, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, calls for:

Abolishing the concept of "dirty air" regions and dropping the measures required to bring those urban areas up to national standards.

Eliminating the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program, which is intended to keep the quality in "clean-air" regions from getting worse.

Relaxing emission standards for new cars, including a method of measuring auto pollution by "averaging" vehicle categories—a method proposed by General Motors.

If these recommendations represent the true intentions of the federal administration, then it is embarking on a misguided and injudicious course.

As anyone who lives in the atmospheric cesspool of the Los Angeles Air Basin can tell you, the problem of air pollution is far from being conquered.

Indeed it is getting obviously worse. So far this year, the San Bernardino-Riverside area has had twice as many first-stage smog episodes as it had last year.

Our society cannot grow or prosper in conditions where, day after day, large segments

of the population must live in air pollution that is "unhealthful for everyone."

There is good reason to believe that the American people would resoundingly reject the kind of nonsense the task force is proposing.

In a Harris Survey released only a few days ago, it was found that "Only 18 percent of Americans are now convinced that the present (federal air pollution) rules are 'overly protective,' whereas 40 percent feel that federal environmental regulations are 'not protective enough.'"

When the Harris Survey asked people what they believe Congress should do in amending the Clean Air Act, 12 percent want to make it "less strict," 48 percent want to keep it as it is and 38 percent want it made stricter than it is now.

Apparently, the members of the task force who want to gut the Clean Air Act are proceeding on the assumption that air quality standards will lower the nation's rate of economic growth.

However, the majority of the nation's residents, if the Harris poll is correct, apparently are astute enough to realize that the benefits of a clean and decent environment should be considered as a part of a healthy nation's measure of economic output.

Pollution controls only lower a nation's economic standards if a society considers the costs of the controls to be greater than the benefits of a clean environment.

Obviously, the American people are not about to adopt that kind of assumption.

The American people are willing to buy an environment that is reasonably habitable and healthful. Therefore, the American government should cooperate in making room for investment in anti-pollution resources to achieve the goals the public mandates.

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 22,  
1981]

#### SMOG IS A FOUR-LETTER WORD

President Reagan chose a day during last year's campaign when smog oozed from every mechanical pore in Los Angeles to announce that the nation had won its fight against air pollution.

One deep breath that day told you he had it wrong. So did every bit of evidence collected from pollution monitors around the country for the past 10 years. Some pollutants have diminished, some have stayed about the same, some have increased.

One that has increased is nitrogen dioxide, without which nature could not cook up smog.

But Reagan is now the boss, and the new management at the Environmental Protection Agency understandably talks and acts as though he had his facts straight.

There is not much that Congress can do about some of ways in which the agency plans to let down the nation's guard against dirty air. But it can and must block proposals now circulating around Washington in draft form to punch holes in the Clean Air Act itself.

Congress, for example, is not likely to reject some of the candidates for top jobs at the agency, even though many of them trained for the work as lawyers for major corporations that have fought every attempt to regulate pollution.

Nor is there much that Congress can do about the agency's plan to reorganize its enforcement division, even though the new approach which be less effective in making certain that air and water pollution controls are in place and in operation.



But Congress can and should draw the line at some of the amendments to the Clean Air Act that the Administration seems ready to offer.

I can start by rejecting the notion that the deciding factor in setting pollution standards should be the cost to industry rather than the effect of pollution on human health.

Congress chose health as the overriding concern when it wrote the act in 1970. Trying to meet the tough standards has cost industry billions of dollars. It also has led to cleaner, if not clean, air. It is not credible that progress would have been made had industry been allowed to balk over the high price of control equipment.

The Administration wants to allow each state to decide how much pollution it can tolerate, without regard to the minimum standards in federal law. This would not only lead to bidding among states that wanted to trade off their air for new industry, it would also put unacceptable burdens on states upwind from states where pollution was allowed to grow.

Regulation is a dirty word to many of the people whom Reagan has called to Washington to run the government. Smog is a dirty word to everybody in the country, and Congress should bear that in mind.●

#### AMTRAK: NEBRASKA EDITOR TELLS OF HIS TRIP

#### HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, keeping passenger service on track is a matter of concern to all Americans. As the Hebron Journal Register pointed out in a recent editorial, while the Interstate Highway System receives \$16 billion from the Federal Treasury and the Federal Aviation Administration receives \$19 billion, Amtrak is getting just \$970 million this fiscal year. President Reagan requested only \$400 million for fiscal year 1982, but the House Energy and Commerce Committee authorized \$735 million. This higher figure is nonetheless below the \$853 million Amtrak officials claim is needed to continue service over the basic existing system. I believe the Journal-Register's description of an Amtrak vacation makes some important points about the future of passenger train travel in the United States.

I ask that the editorial be reprinted in full:

[From the Hebron Journal-Register, June 24, 1981]

#### DESPITE SETBACKS, AMTRAK DESERVES SUPPORT

Having just finished a 2,500 mile round trip journey on our nation's rail passenger system, Amtrak, it's understandable why the future of this transportation network is in doubt.

We need rail passenger service as an alternative to the high prices of airline passenger travel and the discomfort of riding in the surge of our country's smaller automobiles, particularly if you are 6-3 or so in height.

My family of four boarded the Southwest Limited in Kansas City, traveled to Chicago, then to Cincinnati, (rented a car) and returned from Toledo to Chicago to Kansas City for \$315. I'd be stretching the imagination to believe I could have driven that mileage for less. Air fare was \$870.

The Southwest Limited, successor to the Sante Fe Chief, El Capitan and other crack Sante Fe trains making the run from Los Angeles to Chicago, was completely refurbished with new Pullman double-decker coaches called "superliner" cars.

Heading east, the dining car offered such morsels as rack of lamb, Mexican dinners, prime rib, etc., all priced from \$6.50 to \$10.50. The meal was complete with silverware, dinner linen and waiters who cared about service.

Heading back, we had the misfortune to inaugurate Amtrak's new dining room service which gives you a choice of steak, fish or poultry on a plastic tray (without linen) served by an Amtrak attendant (who could care less if you had water or not.) My steak was predictably tough, especially so with plastic silverware, and we never saw the waitress again.

But it was fast. The Amtrak official explained that costs must be cut and serving microwaved meals on a plastic tray (a la the airlines) is the "in thing."

I hope they were "fishing" for comments. We gave them an earful along with several other rail buffs.

What this nation needs is more, not less rail passenger transportation. And the government, without a profit incentive, will not be able to handle the task.

We've talked to other rail passengers who enjoy railroad travel, it's inexpensive, faster than automotive travel and saves the nation on expensive imported oil.

The U.S. government subsidizes the interstate highway system to the tune of \$16 billion and the Federal Aviation Administration gets a subsidy of \$19 billion.

Amtrak's government subsidy is a paltry \$970 million.

Amtrak officials undoubtedly feel they are on the ropes financially since the Reagan administration originally planned to eliminate service to 36 states and 500 cities. This was to be done by cutting the Amtrak subsidy from \$970 to under \$400 million. The plan has been revised for the present and probably the cuts won't be as deep as feared.

Nonetheless, train travel is energy efficient and should be considered. We would prefer private companies like Burlington, Santa Fe, etc. to operate the trains, but freight is more profitable. That leaves the government. K.J.●

#### GRANTS FOR PUBLIC PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO ENCOURAGE AWARENESS OF OUR CULTURAL HISTORY

#### HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a society which increasingly focuses its attention on science, technology, and new developments for the future, we seldom have the opportunity to look back at our past, our national and cultural history, and the literary and ar-

tistic traditions of the cultures from which our present values and culture have grown. In the State of Washington, the Washington Commission for the Humanities, a private, nonprofit corporation supported by private contributors and the National Endowment for the Humanities, works to provide such opportunities to the general public, making grants for public programs designed to encourage public awareness and appreciation of the literature, philosophy, art, language, and history of our forebearers.

In this regard, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to Gayla Riggs of Spokane, a former commission program associate, for her tremendous efforts and success at helping to bring a host of enlightening lectures, exhibits, slide shows, discussions, and mass media programs on the cultural heritage of people in the Northwest to the people of the Fifth Congressional District. In 1980 her diligence and the diligence of commission trustees G. Thomas Edwards and Elizabeth K. McFarland of Walla Walla, John R. Elwood of Pullman, Ralph W. Franklin and Robert K. Powers of Spokane, and J. William T. Youngs, Jr., of Cheney, made available \$135,282 in grants used toward funding the following cultural events:

#### CHENEY

"Here's Shakespeare." Eastern Washington University (with support from KSPS-TV). \$5,380 (total project cost: \$15,520). Magazine articles and TV programs introduced Eastern Washington audiences to Shakespeare Plays broadcast over PBS.

"Live Theatre in a Media Age." Eastern Washington University (with support from Spokane Public Radio Assoc., Magic Lantern Theatre). \$985 (total project cost: \$6,425). Radio forums and lectures on live theatre vs. the media. Included performances of Dracula and A Servant of Two Masters, and a showing of the film Nosferatu.

#### COLVILLE

"Stevens County Pioneer Memories: A Nonrenewable Resource." Stevens County Historical Society (with support from Partnership for Rural Improvement, Stevens Cty. Planning Dept.) \$16,638 (total project cost: \$57,514). County-wide oral history project included slide/tape, workshops, in-school programs, displays and presentations at county fairs.

Planning Grant. Old Mission Art Galleries and Theatre of the Northwest, Inc. \$300 (total project cost: \$700). Planned public program exploring relationship between our cultural heritage and rural areas.

#### PULLMAN

"Finding Out—Oral History in Washington State." Oral History Office. Washington State University (with support from Whitman Coll., Eastern Wash. State Historical Soc., Whatcom Museum of History and Art, Peninsula Historical Soc., Skagit Cty. Oral History Assoc., Skagit Cty. Historical Museum, Yakima Valley Museum and Historical Assoc., Clark Cty. Historical Museum, Okanogan Historical Soc.) \$15,068 (total project cost: \$30,333). Seven work-

shops at different sites throughout the state, and a directory of oral history projects, programs, and collections within Washington State.

"American Foreign Policy and Afro-American Leadership: Mission or Mistake?" Black Studies Program, Washington State University (with support from NAACP; Eastern Wash. Univ.; Seattle Urban League; Central Wash. Univ.; Univ. of Wash.; Spokane League of Women for Community Action; WWU, Intercultural Programs, OSPI; Spokane Public Schools, Distr. 81; The Links of Spokane; Spokane Opportunities Industrialization Ctr.; Afro-American Players Theatre Group; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; Pasco Neighborhood Ccl.; Yakima Valley OIC; New Hope Baptist Church; Pullman School Dist., No. 267; Yakima Valley CC; Bethel AME Church, Minority Affairs, SFCC; St. Matthews Baptist Church; Fairchild Air Force Base; Fort Lewis; Dept. of Licensing; East Central Community Ctr.; McChord Air Force Base; Boeing Co.; Whitworth Coll.; Spokane Daily Chronicle; Pullman Herald; Medium; Tri Cities Herald; Tacoma True Citizen; Spokesman Review; Lewiston Morning Tribune; KTOY Radio; KYAC Radio). \$12,494 (total project cost: \$27,553) \$1,558 actually spent. Project not further implemented at grantee's request.

"Miniatures of South Asia: Human Understanding through Art." Asian Studies Program, Washington State University (with support from League of Women Voters of Pullman, Friends of the Museum of Art, AAUW, Pullman Advisory Ccl. to the Wash. State Human Rights Comm., Rotary Club of Pullman, Pullman Kiwanis Club). \$6,846 (total project cost: \$16,346). Lectures and slide presentation on Hindu, Buddhist, and Islamic Art. Focused on social, religious, political traditions of South Asian art.

"Swords of the Samurai: Japanese Arms and Armor From Northwest Collections." Museum of Art, Washington State University (with support from Friends of the Museum of Art, East Asia Resource Ctr., Japanese Amer. Citizens League). \$6,945 (total project cost: \$22,801). Interpretive exhibit on historical development and cultural significance of Japanese swords, armor, and the Samurai era. Included privately owned armor from local families of Samurai descent.

"Hoko River Rockshelter." Music Department, Washington State University, \$1,000 (total project cost: \$2,025). Film recorded archaeological excavation on Olympic Peninsula. Focused on work, play, speech, and song of Makah Tribe.

"Swords of the Samurai: Japanese Arms and Armor from Northwest Collections." Washington State University. \$1,000 (total project cost: \$3,000). Extension of previously funded WCH project. Supported additional demonstrations, guided tours, lectures, catalog, film series.

"Our Ethnic Heritage: A Conference of Washington's Germans from Russia." Washington State University (with support from Amer. Historical Soc. of Germans from Russia, Palouse Chapter). \$995 (total project cost: \$4,380). Conference discussed history of Germans from Russia who settled in the Pacific Northwest in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

"Washington State Oral History Conference, 1980." Washington State University (with support from Yakima Valley Museum and Historical Assoc.) \$1,000 (total project cost: \$3,380). Conference brought together scholars in the humanities and the public to

discuss collection methods and interpretation of oral history.

#### REPUBLIC

Planning Grant, Ferry County Cultural Workshop \$300 (total project cost: \$604). Planned public program for cultural interchange between Indian and non-Indian residents.

#### SPOKANE

"The Baroque Era—The Arts in their Historical Context." Connoisseur Concerts Association (with support from KPXB Radio, KSPS-TV, KREM-TV, Lutheran Col. of Greater Spokane). \$11,797 (total project cost: \$24,285). Lectures, television, and radio programs on baroque era, its history, culture, art, and music.

"Espejo: Reflections of the Mexican-American." Spokane Falls Community College (with support from Eastern Wash. Univ.) \$1,000 (total project cost: \$2,836). Lecture, slide show, photo exhibit on Mexican-American culture.

"Sacred Play in the Secular City." St. Stephen's Episcopal Church (with support from Spokane Public Library, Spokane Arts Comm.) \$847 (total project cost: \$2,047). Tour and slide show on religious art and the role that symbolism has played in our cultural development.

"Social and Public Policy Issues in Medicine and Health Care." Gonzaga University (with support from Spokane Area League of Women Voters, Eastern Wash. Univ., Whitworth Coll., Sacred Heart Medical Ctr., Spokane Cty. Health Distr.) \$15,880 (total project cost: \$43,184). Eight televised panel discussions on humanistic issues relating to health care.

"The Silhouettes of Gordon Vales: A Bridge to Understanding." Association for Retarded Citizens of Spokane County (with support from Kiwanis Club of NW Spokane, Gamma Epsilon, Soroptimists Intl. of Spokane). \$19,722 (total project cost: \$40,751). Forums, television program on public attitudes and values relating to mentally retarded citizens. Focused on experiences of artist Gordon Vales.

"The Pied Piper: A Public Radio Project on the Humanities and the Family." Spokane Public Radio. \$15,785 (total project cost: \$32,903). Forty-five radio broadcasts for children used drama, storytelling, poetry, music to involve children and their parents in the humanities. Subjects included: poetry-writing and appreciation; stereotypes; folklore; fantasy; theatre; philosophy; hero worship; music.

#### WALLA WALLA

"The Changing of Institutions: Family and Marriage." Whitman College (with support from YWCA). \$1,000 (total project cost: \$6,713). Eight lectures on historical, literary, and social contexts of the family.

Planning Grant, Walla Walla Symphony Society. \$300 (total project cost: \$900). Planned historical and interpretive activities to expand the Symphony's 75th anniversary programs.

I join with my fellow residents of eastern Washington to applaud the special efforts of Ms. Riggs and her co-workers at bringing to light the lessons and thoughts of our past that we may all gain a better understanding of our present. ●

OUR EVER-ESTEEMED CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER AND ALL YOU LOVELY PEOPLE OF OUR PLANET EARTH

#### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on this last Memorial Day, Mr. Sam Brenner, as he has so often done in years past, delivered a beautifully patriotic and stirring message to those gathered in Surfside, Fla., for an observance of Memorial Day. His meaningful words gave all of us present cause to pause and seriously contemplate the consequences of a continued arms buildup by the nations of the world. Mr. Brenner eloquently exhorts us in the Congress to find a way to stop the race to annihilation. He reminds us of the horrors of man's inhumanity to man in his touching poem about the holocaust, "Count to Six Million." Lest we forget the danger involved in the arms race, the unspeakable tragedy of the holocaust, or all of those noble Americans who gave their lives to defend our country and our liberty, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Sam Brenner's thoughtful address be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### ADDRESS BY SAM BRENNER

Upon the request of our Commander Louis Fenichel of the Jewish War Veteran's Harry H. Cohen Post 723, I will read my poem "Count to Six Million" and dedicate it to the memory of my friend, past Commander Charles Hatten and past vice mayor of our town of Surfside, whose steadfast devotion to these Memorial Day services sparked our Veteran's/Armistice Day observances as well, and to all those who lost their lives in all wars.

#### COUNT TO SIX MILLION

Mourn not for me when I am dead.  
Count to six million instead!  
On all the battlefields of time,  
Tally the toll for me!  
Ring out no bells for me  
Weep not for me  
Count, just count to six million!  
One! Two! Three! Four!  
And so on thru to many more  
To six million!  
Count, I defy you to count!  
Do you know how long it would take you to  
count to six million  
With each number representing a human  
being like you and me?  
One hundred Orange Bowl Football Stadiums  
fully packed  
With sixty thousand people to a bowl!  
That's six million!  
Line them up!  
One stadium fully packed alongside the  
others,  
Now kill them all!  
That's what they did to us!  
"Who knoweth one?" My father cries  
Reading the Haggada with watery eyes.  
I know one.  
But I do not know six million!  
I have no conception, no idea, no understanding



Of so vast an amount as six million people.  
Five! Six! Seven! Eight! Nine! Ten!  
Count, count to six million!  
Who was number six hundred three?  
Was it a he or what it a she?  
Or was it you and I  
In the cauldrons there to die?  
And sputter in the Nazi flame!  
Who can count the waves of the sea?  
Who was eight hundred eighty three  
Or four million two hundred eighty seven  
thousand

Two hundred twenty-four?  
It was really you and I who died!  
Mourn not for me when I am dead.  
Count to six million instead!  
On all the battlefields of time,  
Tally the toll for me!  
Ring out no bells for me  
Say no Kadishes for me  
Count, just count to six million!

Golda Meir, past Prime Minister of Israel, once quoted someone as saying, "It would take 2000 years for the stain of the holocaust to wear off . . ." and then she said, "It's already worn off!" The world forgets so soon! Does it seem possible that anything like that could ever really have happened, as we are here beside each other in the warmth of Surfside, Fla., and in the warmth of these flowers and of these trees? Does it seem possible that thousands upon thousands of people in a town like Hiroshima could have been destroyed by one atomic bomb?

On page 14 of the fifth year anniversary issue of the World Federalists Newsletter, Spring 1981 edition, Randall Forsberg is quoted as having said, "We now have the equivalent of 16,000,000 Hiroshima bombs in the U.S. and U.S.S.R. arsenals."

Sixteen million Hiroshima bombs: Who can deny that we are about to destroy the world? We are as good as dead, and I come here to speak for the dead. For I am the dead if I do nothing to preserve the living: Why do we come here to remember the dead if we are not going to safeguard the living for whom these men fought?

They groveled in the dust for us and they became the worms in the ground—for us. "Worms can't cry," they plead to me, "Worms can't cry." For if they could cry they'd scream to me "I'm innocent: I'm innocent." Why did they die? They died so that we can live. Peace is a wounded soldier and we must heal those wounds by an effective world order.

Are we those "The Lord God made and gave to have dominion over land and sea, to search the Heaven for power and feel the passions of eternity?" We are not living up to what we were created for. I defy that we must die upon another battlefield of time. Oh children, what have we done for you to bear the brunt of the sins of your fathers in a "World you never made"?

Our esteemed Congressman Claude Pepper turned to me as he was getting into his car several months ago and said, "Keep the flame burning, Sam." I feel confident that our Congressman would like to see what I have been clamoring for all these years, the restructuring of the U.N. into an effective world order protecting all nations, regardless of race, color, creed or form of government. Then gradually all nations could be disarmed and all nuclear bombs dismantled.

Therefore I beseech you, Claude, to immediately propose the formation of an impressive congressional committee to go to Russia and stay there as long as is necessary, until with due diligence and perseverance this world order is created.

Oh, there is a soundless Tocsin that peals for peace inside all of us. And I would like to see that Tocsin emerge from within our chests and ring out in the Halls of Congress like the clanging of a gong sounding a fire alarm proclaiming that the fuse to world holocaust is lit and burning, signalling the world's destruction. Who among us is here to douse the fire before it consumes us all? It is the task of each and every one of us.

These men we mourn today, went out to douse many fires burning throughout the world, that we may live. Now it's our turn. Let this be the meaning of our lives—that we were born for this purpose. Let us embark upon that era which is the triumph of man—the achievement of a free and lasting peace.●

CHIEF JUDGE HOWARD  
MARKEY DELIVERS COM-  
MENCEMENT ADDRESS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1981, Chief Judge Howard T. Markey, of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, delivered the commencement address to the graduates of my alma mater, Loyola University School of Law in Chicago.

His address is of such quality and eloquence that I must share it—with pride and pleasure—with my colleagues:

#### FREEDOM AND LAW—CIRCA 2010

I am pleased to see so many faculty and friends and loved ones here, but I am going to ask them to just eavesdrop while I visit a few minutes with my new brothers and sisters in the law—the graduates.

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be your commencement speaker. When you leave today you will take with you something of Loyola University School of Law, and you will leave a part of yourself here. Happily, for you and for our Nation's future you are being graduated from, in Father Baumhart's felicitous phrase, a "value oriented law school". How fundamentally important that phrase is. I have often wondered how those who opt for an education without values can express surprise when confronted with a society without values.

The world is a mess. Of course it is. So what's new? It always has been. But I put it to you that, because of our dreamers and doers, the world is less a mess today than it was when I sat among those chairs 30 years ago, and in far less a mess than it was a century ago, and in far away less a mess than it was in 1781. And 30 years from now, in the year 2010, with your help it will be infinitely less a mess than it is now.

So, welcome to the world! Come on in, the water's fine!

I have had, thank the good Lord, a wonderful life—but I have news for you. I would trade places with you in a moment. You are going to farm the ocean floor, you are going to live and work among the stars, and in your homes, which Toffler says will be "electronic cottages". You are going to live longer and healthier lives than any human beings before you. Whether you and your children may be as free to pursue happiness will depend on whether your dedication will

enable the law, in Learned Hand's words, to "reconcile our passions, or wills, and our conflicts".

The law can be a heady, intoxicating wine to those who study and savor all of its color and taste and history and excitement. Working at the very heartbeat of a free society—the law—using and increasing your knowledge of the law to preserve and extend justice and freedom for your fellow-man—is a privileged joy.

Certainly you will face problems. Of course you will. Massive, horrendous problems. But solving problems, and creating new ones, is the sparkle in the wine of life and law—the fun of living. Life without problems would be a total bore.

I propose to visit with you for these few moments about just one problem—but it is a big one. On your finding its solution all else will depend. I speak of the maintenance of freedom under law.

You have all heard it stated that Shakespeare said, "Let's kill all the lawyers". What many forget is that the bard put those words in the mouth of Dick, the butcher. When Dick hears the would-be Dictator Cade's plan, he says, "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers" because he knew that if even one lawyer remained alive, he would defend individual rights, and Cade's plan to destroy those rights would be doomed. I trust, and hope, and pray that each of you will be the kind of lawyer Dick was worried about.

An American soldier, taken prisoner, and risking punishment and death, scratched out on the wall of his dungeon these words: "Freedom has a special taste to those who fight and almost die, that the protected will never know".

So, if you like, you can label this a clarion call—a call to fight and almost die in the battle to preserve what is still only a little spark of freedom in the world. It is a spark that, when studied, can light the fire in men's souls. But it is still so little, and so new, and so unknown, and so threatened.

Freedom can be threatened, even among its friends, by a growing population pressing against finite resources. Robert Helbroner foresees an inevitable growth in the exercise of majoritarian power and a consequent curtailment of individual freedom. John Rawls and Ronald Dworkin have pointed to a desperate need to defend individual liberty against an inexorable growth of State and institutional power over the next 30 years. Though we are in the midst of a rights and litigation explosion, only a fraction of the problem can be dealt with in the courts.

Since man crawled from the caves, the fight has always been between tyranny—whatever its current name—and freedom. But in the years ahead freedom can be threatened by a tyranny of circumstance—a seemingly benign tyranny of big governments, big businesses, big technology and big institutions—leviathans whose institutional imperatives can make them cold and remote and often thoughtless of an individual's need for access to decisionmakers, for equality, consideration, and fair procedures—indeed for justice itself. The danger is, as Thoreau saw it, that man will become only "the tool of his tools".

Because the smaller liberties go first, mankind's march toward life as a robot—toward Orwell's world where everything is either ordered or forbidden—is insidious. The threat is the more subtle because it is at home, because it walks on little cat feet of separate, individual denials of the respect

due the humaneness of this person here and that person there.

As history teaches, only law can save freedom without revolution. Ah! But law and lawyers are not the answer in themselves. After all, Hitler had law and lawyers. Your task will be to see that law remains the servant to individual rights, that governments and institutions remain the servants of the people, not their predators, that we remain a nation of laws but not a nation of nothing but laws. We are already a legalistic, law-drenched, litigious society. We will always have plenty of laws. The question you must face is "What kind?"

What will you do to insure that law rests on Conscience and moral concepts, rather than on naked force and interest? What will you make out of the dichotomy presented by value-oriented law and result-oriented legal positivism? What will you do about some recent indications that rights not given an individual in some statute don't exist? Will you resurrect the "forgotten" amendments, the ninth and tenth?

Will you harken to Justice Frankfurter's prescient warning about giving the Federal courts "an excess of responsibility which may seriously impair their peculiar Federal task?" Or will you go on trying to make gods out of Federal judges by serving only as conduits to the nearest courthouse, by putting all the people's eggs into the judicial basket until it collapses? Will you find a way to protect individual rights without overloading the courts? Will you make clear the difference between laws that keep me from injuring you and laws that keep me from injuring me?

Will you eliminate wasteful delay and still fight for that quality of justice that can be achieved only after careful, considered, contemplation, at the slower pace which accuracy and truth require, remembering that truthfinding can be slow and searing, while error can be fast and fun, causing assertion to masquerade as conclusion?

Above all, will you keep alive the concept that there is one area not subject to invasion and control by the State, the mind and soul of man? If so, you must make one, very basic, decision. You must decide that you will never again say, "What can one person do? That cancerous phrase! Remember that the fight for freedom has always been for the few, and often for the very few—that this whole experiment in liberty we call America, this American dream, that man can govern himself, once rested on what one man did—one man, who walked the line, begging and pleading with his ragged soldiers not to quit and go home, and knelt in the snows of Valley Forge to pray.

Well, that is a lot to chew on. But I know you'll do it all. Certainly I am an optimist. Optimism means hope. And hopes and dreams are the engines of our progress. And mighty hopes and mighty dreams are the uniforms of heroes.

But there is reason for my optimism. You have two big things going for you. Your developed and developing sense of ethics—and the Constitution of the United States.

Unlike the piling-on of knowledge and experience in the fields of science and technology, man has not yet learned to build on the history of ethics and morals. Every baby starts from scratch. Yet there is hope. For with every baby our race gets a new start. And today our law profession gets a new start with you.

Dr. Schweitzer said that ethics is "the name we give to our concern for good behavior," i.e., our concern for the well-being of others

as well as for ourselves. Ethics is what our forefathers meant when they pledged in the Declaration their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor "to each other." They made their pledge not to a higher standard of living or to the interest of any pressure group, but "to each other," that is, to a concern for the good of all which is the essence of ethics.

You know that our complex, expanded society may provide an opportunity, but not an excuse, for unethical conduct, that honesty and ethics are even more needed in the shadows of a crowd. Whether you will be advising a President of the United States or the plainest citizen—to paraphrase Thomas More's comment to Cromwell—"I know you will counsel what ought to be done, not merely what can be gotten away with."

You know that life without liberty or the hope of liberty, is a fraud, a fake, an abomination in the eyes of Him who made us to be free. You know that every society has only two choices. It can be honest and free—or dishonest and controlled.

If you would make your maximum contribution to the preservation and growth of justice and freedom in the next 30 years, it would seem imperative that you define for yourselves a personal philosophy of the law. What is the law? Is it to you but a means of controlling social conduct? How, if at all, does it relate to ethics? To conscience? To Morals?

The answer to these, and to a long list of similar questions, depends on your personal philosophy of both life and law. Does a good end justify an evil means? Why were you born? What may be your end? What is the purpose, if any, of man? How does your concept of law relate to your concept of society and community? Choose carefully. Choose what you will. But—I beg of you—choose!

A lawyer with no philosophy of life and law is but an empty shell. Such men or women can but tinker with scraps of the law which may come their way, never filling their hollowness with the joy of true accomplishment, never knowing the satisfaction which gratitude for having lived can bring. Concentrating on each week encountered, they neither see nor smell the beautiful flowers which abound.

For if to you lawyering be merely a job, a mere means of getting, requiring of you no great contribution to society, then I cannot be sanguine about the preservation of freedom in this blessed land, nor about the continued life of either the law or the legal profession for very long. Nor can I imagine why you want to go to lawyering. It is certain that you can get more elsewhere, with less effort.

Ah, but to be truly a lawyer is to be different, to carry a special responsibility. Where cynicism is rampant, you must hold and exemplify ideas. Where patriotism and love of community is passe, you must show dedication to your fellow citizens. Where the easy life and the fast buck are sought, you must serve unstintingly the jealous mistress of the law. Where the ripoff and the slick grab are admired, your dedication to principle and ethics must stand out as a constant rebuke. Only then will you earn the title "Lawyer." Only then will you return public respect to the profession of the law. Only then will you, as a lawyer, be happy. Only then will you serve the causes of justice and freedom.

The other great thing you have going for you is the Constitution of the United States. Now relax, I am not going to give my standard two hour lecture on the Constitution. I'll mention just one of its many facets.

Gladstone called it "the most wonderful work \* \* \* by the brain and purpose of man." It is the oldest written Constitution of any major nation. Yet it is so new—only 194 years old. It was signed this morning, in history's eye. I am only 60, yet I have lived more than one-fourth as long as the Constitution. It is the protector of the poor and the rich. It is a constant threat to the scoundrel. It is, in Jefferson's thought, the chain that binds men to the rule of law.

It is, in my view, the charter authorizing the most sublime experiment in liberty in the history of the world.

The Constitution is all of that, but it is much more. Its greatest asset is not its words, or its brilliant compromises, or its flexibility. Its greatest asset—like yours—is its soul.

There are certainly other arguments for the rights of man, but the soul of the Constitution is to me the concept that you, and you, and you, and I—and every single human being—regardless of sex, of color, of creed or lack of creed, of appearance, of position, of status, of wealth or poverty—every human being, as was said a few years earlier in the Declaration, is the creation of a "Creator" and because of that fact, is born with certain unalienable rights. We have many of its promises still to keep, but that is the newest, shiniest, most revolutionary idea in the political history of the world!

John Marshall said, "The people made the Constitution and the people can unmake it. It is the creation of their own will and lives only by their will". So whether the Constitution lives depends on you. You can kill it, or "unmake" it, by neglect as well as by intent—by ignorance as well as by malice.

It will not do to accept the words of the Constitution and deny by our acts their application. It will not do to desire our own freedom but refuse to do the things that insure freedom for other men and women. It will not do to profess but not perform—to wish but not will.

Each of us, on birth, was handed a priceless, gleaming jewel—the Constitution and all it represents—fought for and died for by many brave men before us. We hold it only a little while on this Earth and must, someday, pass it—intact or shattered—on to those who come after us. How will you answer, in the year 2010, 30 years from now, if your children ask, "What have you done to keep that jewel intact and un tarnished? To spread its rays to others? To protect it from devaluation, compromise, abuse, or even loss?"

Each of you must answer for yourself—but answer you must—to history if to no other.

If your answer is that you fought the good, unselfish fight for freedom under law—the fight to preserve the old and precious wines of justice, integrity, charity, professionalism, ethics and honesty—then freedom may have for you the special taste it had for that unknown POW author who scratched his philosophy on dungeon walls with feeble hand.

For then you would have epitomized the words of Barbara Ward Jackson, who said the twentieth century was made for those who "dream greatly, and dare greatly, and let their work catch up with their dreams".

For then, through it all, you may move this world a little bit toward the day when the children of your children's children may walk the high sunlit uplands of a world at peace—finally—a world at peace with itself—and with its God.



And the, when you leave this life, as leave it you must, when your work is done and your time on Earth has run—the spirits of Coke and Cardozo, of Blackstone and Brandeis and Holmes—and of all their fellow romancers of the blindfolded lady of justice—will in chorus say to you—"Well done!"

### WILL REAGAN REPEAT THATCHER'S MISTAKES?

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the similarities between President Reagan's economic program and the policies of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain are inescapable. Both place emphasis on monetary policy, cuts in income tax rates, and reductions in Government spending.

In Britain, even conservatives now believe that Mrs. Thatcher's program has failed. Unemployment is at its highest there since the Depression, and interest rates remain perilously high. Riots in several major cities have brought the world's attention to the social problems that unfortunately are exacerbated by such failures of policy.

New York Times economic columnist Leonard Silk explored the similarities between the Reagan plan and the Thatcher policies in an article yesterday, the first of two on this subject. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, July 8, 1981]

#### THE THATCHER PLAN'S FAILURE

(By Leonard Silk)

A specter is haunting the Reagan Administration: Thatcherism. The riots in Liverpool this week, stemming partly from the worst unemployment Britain has experienced since the Depression of the 1930's, are grim evidence of the failure of what was once regarded as a brilliant innovation in economic policy.

When Mrs. Thatcher became Prime Minister in May 1979, she was the darling of conservatives on both sides of the Atlantic. Today, she faces a revolt in her own party and has been disowned by the Reaganites in Washington, who say she departed from and made a mess of what initially was a correct solution to the twin problems of inflation and industrial stagnation.

But was her fault one of execution or were there inherent inconsistencies and contradictions in the Thatcher program that the Reagan Administration is on the way to repeating?

The Thatcher plan certainly began with close parallels to the Reagan program:

A commitment to "monetarism," the doctrine that holds that the way to stop inflation is to reduce the growth of the money supply to a rate equal to the potential growth of the economy. Mrs. Thatcher elected to do this gradually: The Bank of England, under the domination of her Government, would reduce the rate of growth of the chosen monetary aggregate called "sterling M-3," currency in circulation plus sterling-denominated demand and time deposits in British commercial banks, to an annual

rate of 9 percent in 1980-81 and to 6 percent in 1983-84.

The real value of Government spending—total outlays corrected for inflation—was to be cut. The money the Government needed to borrow from the public to cover its debts and those of local authorities and public corporations would be scaled down to £7 billion in 1980-81 for openers.

Marginal income tax rates would be cut sharply to spur savings and productivity growth, with the biggest cuts both absolutely and proportionately going to those in the higher income brackets.

How faithfully did Mrs. Thatcher carry out her plan? On monetary policy she has striven to tighten up the money supply. It is true that sterling M-3 overshot its target but this resulted largely from removing the so-called corset from the commercial banks, the special deposit regulations that had limited the extent to which the banks could increase their interest-bearing deposits. However, the money supply narrowly defined, M-1, consisting of currency and demand deposits, was held to a mere 3 percent rate of growth during the first 12 months after Mrs. Thatcher took office and an 8 percent rate thereafter.

The clearest indication of tight money was the sharp rise in interest rates. The outflow of funds from London to New York, attracted by still higher interest rates, helped tighten money further, despite Government plans to make more funds available by bringing down public-sector borrowing.

In this Mrs. Thatcher failed. She quickly put through cuts in marginal income tax rates, bringing down the top rate on compensation income to 60 percent from 83 percent and the bottom rate to 30 percent from 33. And she cut the top rate on investment income to 75 percent from 98 percent. At the same time, to promote the shift from consumption to savings, the Government nearly doubled the value added tax, a kind of sales tax, to 15 percent from 8 percent.

Sharply rising interest rates pushed the economy into a deep slump, and the budget fell deeper into deficit. To curb the growing public borrowing, requirement, the Government raised excise taxes on tobacco, alcohol, gasoline, diesel fuel, road vehicles and other items.

Government spending kept climbing, despite Mrs. Thatcher's efforts at belt-tightening. She imposed her steepest cuts on public-sector investment items, thereby aggravating the problem of inflation. But instead of realizing her initial plan to bring down public borrowing to £7 billion in 1980-81, the Thatcher Government ran its borrowing requirement up to £13.5 billion, or 6 percent of the gross national product, one of the highest in the world.

Thus, Mrs. Thatcher's fundamental mistake has been to try to cure stagflation by combining a tight monetary policy with a loose fiscal policy. She has incurred big deficits that forced the Government to be a heavy competitor for scarce private savings, forcing up both nominal and real interest rates.

This has produced an extraordinary slump in production and employment. The jobless rate has doubled, to more than 11 percent, from 5.4 percent when Mrs. Thatcher took office two years ago.

With the slump, inflation has fallen to low double-digit numbers, but the high interest rates on both Government and private bonds reflect the pessimism of the financial markets about the prospects for solving the problem of British inflation.

The recent behavior of interest rates and the securities markets in New York reflect similar apprehension that the Reagan monetary and fiscal policies have more in common with those of the Thatcher Government than the Administration here is willing to acknowledge. Whether the Administration can still benefit from the mistakes of the Thatcher Government will be examined in a second column.

### MONDALE'S ADDRESS TO BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the text of an address delivered by former Vice President Walter F. Mondale to the graduating class of Brandeis University on May 24, 1981. As an alumnus of Brandeis University, one of the finest learning institutions in the United States, I had the privilege of attending a college which implicitly emphasizes the close connection between the world of thought and the world of action.

Mr. Mondale's excellent speech stressed the importance of this relationship between thought and action. He noted that our Nation's commitment to social justice and the promotion of human rights are instrumental in the pursuit of a strong economy and effective foreign policy.

Mr. Mondale effectively stated that America's strength lies in continuing to stand for what we are. Successful policies aimed at fighting inflation and increasing productivity must reflect our Government's commitment to compassion and concern. Likewise, he pointed out that the human dimension of our foreign policy is the basis of its effectiveness.

We are a nation united for humanity. Mr. Mondale has eloquently called upon the graduating class of 1981 of Brandeis University to continue a tradition rooted in our Constitution and Bill of Rights—the integration of national and societal interests with moral concerns when dealing with the issues of the day:

REMARKS OF WALTER F. MONDALE, BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, MAY 24, 1981

Today we are concerned with two great issues: The vitality of the American economy and our strength as a nation in the world.

Our economy now faces the worst inflation in modern times. Like the Great Depression a half-century ago, inflation is calling into question whether our economic system can enable our working men and women to earn a decent living, to provide for themselves and their families, and to have confidence in the future.

I believe it can. Yet inflation, and the means for controlling it, also contain a deeper meaning and potentially a deeper

threat. They raise profound questions about our willingness and ability to sustain one of the most important elements of what it means to be American: Our compassion as a people.

In difficult times economically, it becomes easier to ignore the needs of others who are less fortunate. In difficult times, bigotry and intolerance find fertile ground—and are even justified in the name of "morality". But let there be no mistake: In this country there is a "majority"—and it opposes racism, it opposes anti-Semitism, it opposes the arrogation, by any group, of the right to define what is "moral". And it always will.

During the 1930's, many nations were torn apart by developments like these, brought on by economic crisis. But we emerged from the Great Depression with both our economy and our moral vision intact—indeed, with a new burst of effort to build a compassionate society. And we can and must do the same again.

What makes America different from other nations? There are many answers: Our abundance of resources; the creative energies of millions of immigrants and their descendants; more than a century without war on this continent; and a spirit of adventure and invention.

But none in my judgment rival in their importance a deeper reason for our uniqueness and our success: This nation and our people believe deeply in social justice.

During the past half-century, we did not decide merely that building a nation of hope and opportunity was something to be desired, but that the American people should have it as a matter of fundamental human right. And our great men and women of conscience, like Justice Louis Brandeis, worked to enlarge human freedoms, not to confer benefits, but to confirm rights.

This Administration says we must retrench, fight inflation, and make our economy more productive again. And there isn't a single person here who does not hope that they succeed—because if they succeed, America succeeds.

But there will be a true success only if we remember who we are, if we remember what we have already achieved in the long fight for equality of opportunity, justice, tolerance—and a society and a government of true compassion and concern. These must be human rights, not expedient gifts of the moment.

Inflation is not our only concern. Today, America's strength and position in the world are also under challenge. Soviet power is real—and faces us not just in direct confrontation, but also in far-flung areas of the world. We need to modernize our armed forces. We need support from friends and allies in meeting threats to peace and in helping to resolve conflicts. And we need a strong economy if we are to be effective abroad as well as prosperous at home.

Yet as we act to renew American strength—military, economic—we might neglect a third factor, on which rests so much of America's effectiveness and which indeed is basic to our purpose in the world: The human dimension of our foreign policy.

In our history, we have sought to be powerful: not to create an empire, but to promote peace.

We have entered into alliance with other nations: not to make them satellites of American interests, but to enable them to share the benefits of freedom and independence.

We have shared our economic abundance with others: Not to pervert the course of

others' destinies, but to foster human development.

And we have promoted human rights: Not to impose our will on others, but to answer deep-seated desires for freedom, dignity, and justice.

American power has a purpose, a deeply human purpose. When we have forgotten that purpose, we have made our greatest mistakes; when we have remembered it, we have had our greatest successes. And the renewal of that power must not neglect that purpose—at peril of losing our ideals both abroad and at home.

In recent years, no issue in our foreign policy has been more contentious or more deeply misunderstood than our pursuit of human rights. Yet no issue is more germane to America's fundamental role in the world; none is more rooted in our entire history as a nation—long before efforts of the past four years to ensure that human rights have their proper place on the national foreign policy agenda.

With the pursuit of human rights, our efforts to limit conflict, work with friends and allies, secure peace and promote economic development gain a deeper significance. But ignoring human rights would risk misunderstanding of our efforts by people abroad and erosion of support at home for an effective foreign policy. Our power could become less useful through distrust of our motives; our foreign policy sterile through lack of underlying moral purpose.

As Vice President, some of the most difficult—but more rewarding—involvement I had in our nation's business was in the pursuit of human rights. I took part in all the difficult decisions we faced in balancing human concerns against other national interests. I brought Vladimir Bukovsky to the White House, to tell of the suffering of people in the Soviet Union who only seek to worship God and express their humanity. I confronted South African leaders in Vienna, in an effort to make a dent in Apartheid. And I represented the United States at the Geneva Conference on the Boat people—and saw the heartbreak and tragedy of these dispossessed individuals. We were determined that there would be no repetition of the Evian Conference of 40 years before, which turned its back on European Jews—and I thank God we succeeded.

I only regret that, four decades earlier, when our country was confronted by the emerging reality of Hitler's Holocaust, we did not respond, as we have to the refugee crisis in Indochina, with the kind of sustained commitment and humanitarian initiative that could have saved thousands and maybe millions of Jews whose lives were lost in the concentration camps and gas chambers of Nazi-occupied Europe.

As I learned in government, there are those who argue that we should play down moral issues and objectives, because "security" is too important. They insist that we focus unashamedly on our interests alone.

Others would have us serve moral ends in crusades, even if we become blind to the practical consequences for our nation's interests and well-being.

I believe we must try to reconcile these two approaches. In fact, doing so is particularly American and a source of our national strength. Perhaps more than any other quality, this ability and willingness to blend the practical with principle, to synthesize our interests and moral concerns, has placed us at the forefront of history.

Safeguarding both our interests and our values often requires active and creative di-

plomacy. At times it requires the deployment of military power—as when we help others resist aggression and threats to peace.

But it also means advancing our values directly and explicitly.

At the conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, we proclaimed to the world the abuses and moral poverty of the Soviet political system. We insisted that the cry for freedom—the call of the Orlovs and Shcharanskys—was heard at the Belgrade and Madrid Conferences, and we put the full weight of that process behind the principle that the Polish people should be able to work out their path towards liberty by themselves.

In recent years, we in the United States have heard—and responded to—the human needs and concerns of millions of people in every corner of the globe. How many people are alive today, because the United States did not keep silent, did not pass by when human rights were being trampled underfoot? How many people have gained some measure of hope, because the United States did not abandon more than two centuries of concern for the principles which gave our own land birth and sustenance?

This is not always easy for us to do. There are countries and peoples whose strategic positions are so important to us that we must work together even though we disapprove of their governments' human rights policies. But even when we do so, we must not lose sight of our moral purpose.

For example, it was imperative to work with the new government of South Korea after the assassination of President Park. But we also worked long and hard—and ultimately with success—to save the life of the Korean Dissident, Kim Dae Jung.

Regrettably, in recent months, this nation has begun to slip back in its commitment to human rights.

The people an administration appoints to senior positions says a lot about its stand on the issues. Yet appointments in human rights are carrying the clear message that the U.S. government no longer believes that the human dimension of policy is important—and repressive governments have taken heart.

No sooner did a great man of courage and conscience—Jacobo Timerman—speak vividly of the torture and killing in Argentina, than the United States again embraced the leaders of that country. What conceivable reason could there be? It can't be strategic interests. It can't be economic interests. It can't be anything that would justify ignoring this brutal repression.

But not everyone has forgotten. This week, a Senate committee considered the nomination of a man to be in charge of human rights policy. It was a sad hearing, full of justifications for indifference. Then a man appeared out of the crowd . . . a man who truly understood the meaning of human rights. "A silent diplomacy is silence," he said, "A quiet diplomacy is surrender." His name was Jacobo Timerman and he was greeted with thunderous applause. And this Nation joins in applauding that giant of a man.

At the United Nations, we have often stood alone—when the issue was too important morally for us to join the rest. Yet this week the United States again stood alone—not in defense of a moral issue but in defiance of the world's conscience. We voted alone in the world to oppose restraints on efforts to lead women in developing countries away from healthy breast-feeding to



dependence on milk-substitutes that, improperly used, risk infection and stunted growth. A commercial interest prevailed over a human concern shared by the rest of the world.

During the last 10 years, the United States also took a strong stand against racism and the last vestiges of colonial repression. Yet only a few months after we worked out a path to peace and justice in Zimbabwe, this country has begun showing uncritical sympathy for South Africa.

And some administration spokesmen now say that there is a difference between right-wing authoritarianism and left-wing totalitarianism, and that we must tolerate the terror of the one; but must condemn that of the other.

In the organization of their economies, there is a difference. In the pretexts they give for repression, there is a difference. But between the army colonel who tortures Jacobo Timerman, and the Central Committee which tortures Anatoly Shcharansky, there is not one iota of moral difference.

Torture is torture, and terror is terror. And whether it occurs in Cuba, Russia, Vietnam, Argentina, Chile, or El Salvador, we in America should oppose it, condemn it, and do our best to stop it.

How soon we forget. The basic lesson of our experience in struggling to promote human rights is that the advance of our own moral concerns for humanity, democracy, freedom, and justice is profoundly in our national interest. It is a strategic advantage as we contest for support from the developing world and leadership of our alliances.

Israel is an embodiment of our own commitment to freedom and democracy. There are dozens of countries which have long since extinguished democracy on the grounds that the threat to their security does not permit them the luxury of freedom. Yet Israel, through four wars and continuing challenges—not simply to its security but to its very survival—has remained steadfast in its commitment to the principle of pluralism and the lessons of liberty on which our own country was founded.

In the face of a growing Soviet threat to the Middle East, there can be no doubt that Israel is a significant strategic asset. But let us never forget that if human rights means anything at all, it means that we should nurture and support the one country which, more than any other in that vitally important region, shares our own principles and purposes.

It is no accident that we are principally allied with democracies and that our basic adversary is totalitarianism. It is no accident that every day we pursue our values, we become stronger in our dealings with other nations; and that every day the Soviet Union shows its contempt for human values—in Afghanistan, in Poland, or in Moscow itself—it telegraphs its moral and political bankruptcy to countries it seeks to influence.

A world of tyranny would threaten our security. A world where pluralism predominates, where there is freedom of religion, where democracy prevails would not be a world without conflict, but it would be a world safer for Americans.

We have seen enough in this century to know that our greatest strength at home is our love for the values embedded in our Constitution and Bill of Rights and religious beliefs—and that our greatest attraction abroad is the beacon those values cast into a world darkened by turbulence and oppression.

Our deep commitment to social justice—our commitment to give opportunity to the poor and disadvantaged, to care for the old, to end discrimination, to safeguard the family—this is the rock upon which is founded our nation's true security. And I for one will not stand idly by when this lesson is forgotten—and I know that you will join me.

I had no prouder moment as Vice President than when I met with the leaders of Nigeria—just after they had adopted a constitution—a federal constitution closely patterned on our own. The power of example is the greatest power we have. The real strength of America lies in continuing to stand for what we are.

Conscience can never take a holiday—however deep the crisis. Several years ago, Pastor Martin Niemoller wrote the following, after the dark night of the human soul we call the Holocaust:

First the Nazis went after the Jews, but I was not a Jew, so I did not object.

Then they went after the Catholics, but I was not a Catholic, so I did not object.

They then went after the trade unionists, but I was not a trade unionist, so I did not object.

Then they came after me, and there was no one left to object.

The highest calling of today's graduates is to join ranks with the generations of Americans who have heeded that message—a nation united for humanity. Let it be known: If the enemies of freedom and justice come for one of us first, they must come for all of us.

Thank you.●

## ENVIRONMENTAL PERSPECTIVES

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us in public life do not keep our jobs very long if we do not learn quickly to listen to all sides of an issue before rushing to judgment. Input from a variety of perspectives is always helpful in estimating the performance of a program, a group, or an individual. A major newspaper in my district, the Johnson City Press-Chronicle recently aired one such perspective on environmental questions and the need for a balanced view in addressing such controversies. In the interest of widening the range of views presented this body, I am submitting for the consideration of my colleagues the views of Edward J. Walsh of the U.S. Industrial Council, as they appeared recently in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PERSPECTIVES

Among the positive signs that Congress and the Reagan administration are genuinely interested in rebuilding the American economy is the increased attention being given to limiting the heretofore near-limitless influence to the extremist environmental movement in the United States.

The centerpiece of this new sanity regarding the environment was the nomination and approval of James Watt, a self-confessed non-hiker and non-canoeist as Secre-

tary of the Interior. Watt has stoked the fury of the militant environmentalists by pledging to relax strict federal limits on exploration and development of mineral resources on federal lands, particularly in the Western states and Alaska. This fury is most recently expressed in threats on Watt's life by nature-loving fanatics. Recently it was revealed by Dr. William Dresher, in a speech to the United States Industrial Council's Annual Meeting at Sea Island, Ga., that Watt now receives Secret Service protection.

But Dr. Dresher also had some good news. He reported to the USIC, a nationwide organization of conservative businessmen, that a Cabinet-level Council on Natural Resources and the Environment has been formed, in order to establish a national minerals policy. In this connection, Rep. James Santini, (D-Nev.), the leader in the domestic minerals development fight, is sponsoring a bill called the National Minerals Security Act, which will implement the Minerals and Mining Policy Act of 1970, pending for eleven years.

The NMSA will amend tax laws to assist the mining industry in making investments in minerals exploration and development, and allow the Secretary of the Interior to increase the availability of the withdrawn public lands. It will require the Secretary of the Interior to inventory domestic supplies and accessibility of strategic minerals. The Department is examining the possibility of opening large areas of wilderness lands to mineral exploration by asking for a 20-year extension of the Wilderness Act, which currently permits mineral exploration and location of mining claims only until 1983.

With this, a word about the environment. As in all political, non-moral questions, the key word is balance. Environmentalists who are convinced that Secretary Watt is out to rape the mountainsides and befoul the rivers forget that he is from Colorado, and thus knows all about natural beauty, the limits of growth, and the consequences of over-development and indifference to the environment. But he is demanding balance, a concession the Sierra Clubs and the whole array of anti-development extremists are unwilling to make. For the past decade they held a vise grip on public lands policy. As a result, America's dependence on unstable foreign sources of important minerals is growing, even as our dependence on foreign sources of important minerals is growing, even as our dependence on foreign oil once grew, without regard for the larger questions of the nation's security, and indeed, its comfort. The answer is balance. Secretary Watt is trying to restore it.●

## REVITALIZING AMERICA'S RAILROADS

### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, On June 25, 1981, I introduced H.R. 4028, the Rail Passenger Systems Act of 1981, aimed at creating in the United States high-speed rail passenger systems equal to or better than those of the other industrialized nations. I want to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an excellent article,

which appeared in the July 1981 Traffic Quarterly, on the existing incompatibility between U.S. rail freight and passenger service. The article, by L. Fletcher Prouty, outlines the impediments to high-speed passenger rail service in the United States, which H.R. 4028 is designed to remove. Excerpts from the article follow:

TRANSPORTATION AT THE CROSSROADS  
(L. Fletcher Prouty)

The ship of transportation sails on a sea of petroleum and the tide is running out. Today's transportation modes are dependent on portable liquid fuel. Railroads can use electricity, but for the most part they have not installed electrical systems. Petroleum fuel substitutes still appear to be years away, shackled by a many-sided problem of cost, quantity production, environmental protection, and questions of policy.

This is a time for review, for total reappraisal and for realignment of the transportation structure. Because of rapidly growing transport demand and inadequate funding, this Nation's streets, highways, and bridges are under-repaired and frequently over-crowded. Airports and airways are over-crowded and there will not be any relief in the form of new airports for larger metropolitan areas before the year 2000, if then. Freight trains chug along at an average speed of 20 mph and suffer more than 8,000 derailments per year while the rail passenger system is suffering a near fatal illness. The costs of maintaining the existing system of transportation is spiraling to record heights, and a growing share of these staggering costs will fall on the general taxpayer—and not on user sources. In short, "We are facing a transportation crisis in this country just around the corner."

Some of transportation's problems can be solved by reapportioning the modal balance. This is a more important factor. The authoritative National Transportation Policy Study Commission has said that by the year 2000 "national domestic person miles of travel . . . will increase 81 to 96 percent" and "national domestic freight ton miles will increase . . . from 165 to 314 percent." These massive increases, in so short a time, are simply not going to be able to be put on top of the present highway congestion and on top of existing airport and airway overcrowding. There is little, or no more space to increase these structures and we are having serious financial problems with the high cost of maintaining what we have now. The answer to this grievous situation lies in the restructuring of the present balance of transportation; and the railroads have the capacity to accept major increases in both passenger and freight movement.

This essential restructuring needs to begin in the railroad industry, as railroads have tremendous potential for moving passengers and freight efficiently and safely—more so than any other mode. And, they are not necessarily dependent on petroleum or other liquid fuel.

But the interdependent railroads are their own problem. American railroads suffer from serious technological deficiencies. First of all, they have failed to take advantage of electric traction. Second, their railways are not designed, constructed, operated, and maintained for the speed regime that is essential for operational and financial efficiency. And third, heavy cars, long trains, and slow speed all work against each other to produce very high costs with inferior

services and to destroy the rail guideway system . . .

The degradation of the nationwide guideway infrastructure was brought about by excessive axle weight and the resulting slow speed. This, in turn, required the conversion to a "flat track" geometric design that sealed the fate of the passenger train business and the death, with one exception, of the car manufacturing industry. Even before the car manufacturers closed their doors the essential subcomponent supporting manufacturers had to leave the business. All of this happened, right at the time the automobile, truck, and jet aircraft were reaching their prime on new highways and new airports. As a result, the public and our government officials over-reacted in favor of the motor vehicle and the new aircraft.

The challenge to the American railroads is very great. They must respond. They must join their talents to create a new generation of railroads to ready the transportation field to meet the demands of the future. The railroads are in place; they serve 45,000 communities nationwide; their improvement will require little or no additional space; they are the most energy efficient movers of passengers and freight; and their operation into and out of city centers brings social and economic vitality to the community.

HEAVY CARS, LONG TRAINS, AND SLOW SPEEDS

Shortly after World War II, when the railroads had been overworked and under-maintained, a gradual evolution began toward an operational system designed for the heavy freight car, the very long freight train, and slow speed operations. These developments in rolling stock and in operational methods dictated changes in the track structure. The track had to be flattened by reducing the amount of cant or superelevation in curves. This change made it impossible to run passenger trains on their former time-table schedules because they had to slow down for flattened curves, making train speed less reliable, fuel consumption higher, and passengers more uncomfortable. Thus, passengers were discouraged from using trains just at a time when alternative travel modes were gaining in acceptance.

Labor and market forces, similar to those that caused the heavy car/long evolution in the United States, were at work in other industrialized nations, but in most instances their railroad managements did not succumb to the heavy car/long train illusion of improvement. In Japan for example, all factors were taken into consideration: socioeconomic, national development, and engineering feasibility among others. The result was that they decided to construct an entirely new railroad system for higher-speed passenger service, instead of attempting to operate faster passenger trains on the existing system with freight trains. That key decision, since followed by the French and, to some degree, by the British, Germans, and Italians, led to the development of the most successful railroad system in the world. As a bonus, the decision to go ahead with the Shinkansen "Bullet" trains has been beneficial to the Japanese freight services also because the high-speed passenger services do not interfere with freight operations, and vice versa.

High speed passenger train operation is not compatible with operation of heavy tonnage and high capacity freight cars on the same track. (Witness the terrible accident in

Italy—Nov. 22, 1980.) With American railroads this is the dilemma, the physical, fundamental engineering, and operational issue of separating higher speed passenger train operations from heavy, low-speed freight operations. There are several other factors, such as the prevalence of short sidings; the necessity to make up long freight trains on main-line track; the space consuming interference of high frequency, low-speed freight trains; inadequate signalling and other operational and safety controls; and the tremendous number of grade crossings and speed restrictions attributable to grade crossings. These are not the fundamental issues, albeit they are important.

Failure by the railroads to order new passenger rolling stock rendered the coup-de-grace to passenger services, killing the car manufacturing industry; its supporting subcomponent suppliers and all research and development in the passenger car rolling stock field. With this silent and unseen stroke, whether the ICC approved or not, the passenger business was assuredly doomed to die. Amtrak lives on a life-support system with a slender chance in a terminal case.

At the same time, the railroads pushed ahead with brute strength and heavy bankrolls in a generation-long attempt to force the residual "heavy-long-slow" freight system to work. By the late 1970s the rail industry began to realize they were struggling in a sea of quicksand. They were bucking the immutable laws of physics, and these problems had their roots in the earliest days of the industry.

THE TRACK PROBLEM

The absolute interdependence of all railroads on each other, with no central control mechanism or discipline, has made it impossible for superior railroads acting alone to put into practice things they know are essential to their common welfare. Furthermore, as locomotive power and train equipment strength, such as draw bars, increased it became possible to run much heavier and longer trains. Longer and heavier trains did initially reduce operating costs, and gross ton miles per train-mile became a near sacred measure of operating efficiency along with gross ton miles per train-hour and average number of cars per train. These heavy trains could not be operated at the former, i.e. passenger train era track design speed. Thus, they destroyed the system for passenger service and eventually brought about the degradation of the freight train system too. As a result, today the entire infrastructure, the total system, has deteriorated.

In other countries, where they have a single management, they run shorter, lighter, and faster freight trains. For example, freight trains in France run regularly at 60 mph and often faster. French passenger trains are operating at speeds up to 125 mph . . . and doing it on track laid 100 years ago . . . The heavier cars and longer freight trains used in the United States, coupled with a flattened track design, will not permit high speed operations for either freight or passenger service. In addition, the lower speed, heavier weighted train causes unmanageable rail and rolling stock maintenance problems, as well as higher costs.



*Over-weight and plasticity*

Since freight was the big dollar business it took precedence in the Board Room over passenger services, and management had no other alternative than to put out the word to reduce or remove superelevation. The resultant "flat" track redesign that came about after World War II required crack passenger trains to slow down. They ran late and uncomfortable and inevitably brought about the conditions that destroyed the business. At the same time super-highways and jet aircraft came on the scene. There was no way to have it both ways.

But this is only one of the very serious and costly problems created by heavy freight cars. Each wheel on heavy freight cars does immediate damage to the steel railhead with every single passage of each car in every train and this damage is accumulative and permanent, resulting in the necessity to replace the wheel-sets and rail early. Early replacement of both raises costs exponentially!

Plastic flow (caused by the heavily weighted wheel) at the railhead is the evidence of fatigue. Fatigue marks the end of elasticity. Surface fatigue occurs under highly concentrated compressive loading between two rolling members, and results in flaking off or spalling, of material on both surfaces. This creates contact shearing stress that is the prime cause of rail failure.

*The problems come together*

Industry-wide catch-up pricing efforts have not endeared the railroads either to their shippers or to the politicians. All this because of the mess with track, and the track problem is the result of two Frankenstein factors: (1) heavy cars in long trains that must run too slowly and are therefore not operated in conformance with the requirements or the geometry of optimal higher speed track design and (2) every 92-ton car, and above, does immediate damage (plasticity, metallurgical fatigue) to the track. The results of these management blunders have destroyed the track for the passenger business and are now threatening the very future of the freight business. Add the extra costs of excessive track wear to the soaring costs of fuel, and the railroad industry has doomed itself unwisely to a no-win existence.

*Shorter, lighter trains*

Without any special consideration of track and track costs, a 1974 study concluded that economic justification can be made for operating trains with as few as 50 cars to as many as 150. It must not be concluded that because operational costs are higher for short trains, short trains are uneconomical. The converse may be true. The marginal increases in short train operational costs are less than marginal increases in the market value (earnings) generated by improved service. Short trains, running faster are preferable to long trains lumbering along at a destructive twenty mph.

At the same time, passenger trains must have faster track in order to operate efficiently. In this sense faster track is safer, more comfortable, more reliable, and lower cost. Passenger trains must be able to average 95 to 115 mph in order to produce door-

to-door elapsed times competitive with that of the automobile and to beat the aircraft on most city-center to city-center journeys of up to 250 and even 350 miles.

Faster track can come only from a system that is designed and constructed, with the necessary design geometry, for a reasonable speed regime. Once money has been spent on track to establish this speed capability for higher speed passenger trains and to make it smoother and safer, there must be a safe-guard stipulation that freight trains may use it, passenger train frequency permitting, only if they (1) maintain sufficient speed at all times to stay within the permissible high speed design envelope, and (2) contain no cars that weigh when loaded, more than an approved maximum weight such as 80 to 85 tons. The speed stipulation would bring about a lower limit on the length of the freight trains—so that they would be able to run faster (55 to 60 mph minimum).

*Passenger trains as catalyst*

It is essential to begin improving passenger service immediately, particularly in heavily populated corridors, to reduce the demand on the automobile and the gasoline that it consumes; to relieve the airlines of the high-cost, low efficiency business of short flights in congested areas; to relieve highway and airport crowding and to lessen the demand for more and more high-priced space to accommodate motor vehicles in contiguous areas of already jammed cities. All of this must be done to handle today's congestion, and does not begin to provide for the enormous increases in passenger and freight movement forecast by the year 2000. This is the real cause for nationwide alarm.

Rising demand for improved passenger trains requires a transition to the new second generation high-speed passenger system best exemplified by the new northern sector of the famous Shinkansen "Bullet" trains of Japan. This is a dedicated railway system with no crossings at grade and designed for speeds of up to 160 mph (they have run at 198 mph). The Shinkansen is very energy efficient, totally electric, profit making, and in 16 years it has carried more than 1.5 billion passengers comfortably, reliably, and without a single casualty.

When the president of the Japanese National Railways, Mr. Fumio Takagi, spoke to members of both houses of Congress late in 1979 he reported, among other things, that the Shinkansen system itself—that 663 mile-long corridor through the Japanese heartland—had grossed \$3 billion in 1978 with total overall expenses of \$1.7 billion. There is gold out there in a well designed, well operated, and safe railroad. And in the same year, the Shinkansen system saved the people of Japan 40 million barrels of crude oil by transporting 124 million passengers by rail.

*Railroad electrification*

Main-line railroads in the United States will have to be electrified in order to provide a transport alternative to petroleum fueled modes; and the rail electrification fuel base could most conceivably be coal. In the prime of the railroad's first generation, coal was burned onboard in steam engines. As the second generation rises and prepares for a new day, coal will be burned in the furnaces of the utility companies and distributed via the utility grid to more efficient, more profitable trains.

*CONCLUSION*

Today the trend is toward reindustrialization. The railroads of the United States are

a priceless national asset, and they would benefit tremendously from total revitalization.

In a country that pays an annual bill of not less than \$44 billion for its highway accidents; where government is projected to spend \$1.242 trillion (and may need to spend more) in transportation outlays to the year 2000 there are compelling reasons for the transfer of a very modest amount of these enormous funds to railroad improvement. This country has never been famous for being second best. It is time that the railroads, as well as the other modes of transportation began cooperating to assure that this nation's transportation system is never again less than the best.

The new generation of railroads can be one of faster freight operations given lighter cars and shorter trains; and one of faster passenger services, given dedicated corridors and dual purpose long-distance route segments designed for mutually beneficial optimum speeds. All main-line rail operations should eventually be under electric power, and when all is done, the American system of private railroads will have been reindustrialized for the good of all concerned. On our railroads this is possible. Meanwhile it is not possible to double the capacity of our highways, airports and airways; yet overall passenger travel will double and over-all freight movement will triple by the year 2000.●

## SUPPORT FOR NUCLEAR ARMS MORATORIUM

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the town meeting of Lincoln, Mass., recently adopted an article calling for a nuclear weapons moratorium to be observed by the United States and the Soviet Union. This important expression against escalation of the dangerous arms race deserves to be noted, and the people of Lincoln should be congratulated for speaking out so firmly in behalf of world peace.

Passage of this article came after several eloquent speeches on its behalf. I wish to share with my colleagues the text of that article, and the arguments for it made by Ms. Sarah Cannon Holden, who introduced it, and Mr. Russell Turner. These remarks are taken from the account printed in the Concord Journal. Mr. Speaker, this is in the finest tradition of grassroots New England democracy.

The articles follow:

NUCLEAR ARMS MORATORIUM URGED BY YOUNG RESIDENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is the text of a statement made at a Town Meeting by Russell Turner, of Old Sudbury Road, in support of Article 14 which called for a moratorium on nuclear weapons construction.)

"For the last couple of nights we've been deciding issues which directly affect our future and the future of Lincoln. Unfortunately, all of these issues are completely

overshadowed by the presence of nuclear weapons in the world.

"High-density housing, low-density housing and conservation land come very hard to distinguish after a 10 megaton bomb hits Boston.

"There's a tendency for people who have seen this town survive world wars and various other crises to believe that things are going to stay pretty much as they are.

"I'm 21 years old. I've lived all my life with the prospect of total world destruction. I don't really expect to live to the age of most of the people in this room. I wish I could impress upon the people here how deeply the possibility of such massive death at any time affects my attitude, and the attitudes of so many people my age, towards the world.

The point I would like to make is that something is very, very wrong in the world right now. I wish we could pass a resolution right here in this room removing all nuclear weapons from the earth, but that is something we cannot do.

What we can do is pass this resolution calling for a moratorium on their further construction.

#### WAGING PEACE, NOT WAR

(By Sarah Cannon Holden)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is a reprint of an address delivered by Sarah Cannon Holden at last Thursday's Town Meeting. Holden made the remarks in introducing Article 14, which proposed that the United States and the Soviet Union adopt a nuclear arms freeze. Town Meeting approved the article.)

This is to certify that under Article 14 of the Warrant for the Special Town Meeting on June 16, 1981, with an adjourned session on June 18, 1981, it was voted by an overwhelming majority vote, as follows:

Voted that the town of Lincoln, Massachusetts, forward the following resolution to the elected representatives of the Town: "Be it resolved, That, in order to promote peace and to reduce the threat of nuclear war, we call upon the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union to adopt an immediate nuclear weapons moratorium, as a first step towards world wide nuclear disarmament."

The motion before you at this time comes as a result of a petition initiated by the Lincoln Waging Peace Coalition and signed by over 300 of Lincoln's registered voters. Similar petitions have been passed in Newton, by the Board of Aldermen, in the Massachusetts Senate, in town meetings in 13 Vermont towns and in three western Massachusetts senatorial districts.

The Lincoln Coalition grew out of a nuclear weapons freeze symposium in May at the Kennedy Center for Government and Politics. Thus far, participants in the local group represent a complete spectrum of Lincoln citizenry—the old and young, Democrats and Republicans, people with a church affiliation and people with no church affiliation, people active in politics and people who have never been active in politics. There are no stereotypes.

We were brought together by a singular and common goal—to work for a nuclear arms freeze. None of us could accept any longer the notion that there was nothing we could do as individuals. We felt we should begin now to halt the nuclear arms race.

This petition is our first step. It asks for bilateral consideration of the issue. It calls not for disarmament, but for a moratorium—a freeze.

If a nuclear arms freeze were to be adopted, it would mean that the participants in that freeze would accept the status quo with regard to nuclear weapons. The question is then raised concerning who is ahead of whom under those circumstances. We know that the United States and the Soviet Union have the power to destroy each other at least once. Does it really matter whether they can do it 23 times, and we can only do it 19? Or visa versa?

There are no winners. There are only losers in a nuclear war.

The goal of a nuclear arms freeze favors no one group over another. It does not favor the United States over the Soviet Union nor the Soviet Union over the United States; it does not favor Republican over Democrat nor Democrat over Republican. It simply favors the continuation of life.

We are all the beneficiaries of this mysterious earth—let us respect it, preserve it, listen to it and be able to leave it knowing that we have tried.

You were provided with a piece of paper tonight on which are printed several quotations from a cross-section of people from different parts of this one world. I would like to read just one other.

Even Thomas J. Watson, Jr., former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and former President of IBM, who is certainly not known as a disarmament advocate, recognizes that it is time to change our defense priorities. He spoke, as many of you are aware, at Harvard's recent commencement:

"So-called nuclear superiority assures us safety—not for the Soviet Union; not for us—because what counts is not superiority but sufficiency . . .

"Yet the pursuit of the mirage of superiority persists. And over the years the two superpowers have piled weapon on useless weapon . . .

"By overwhelming odds, the result of any use of nuclear weapons would not be victory. It would be all out war and total destruction. And in the words of President Kennedy, 'The living would envy the dead.'"

I have to ask myself why we continue a race when the participants passed the finish line long ago? If we need a race, is it now time to start another one in another direction?

A nuclear freeze is not a sign of weakness but rather courage, courage to know and speak out when enough is enough.

I am still trying to understand how we can be so careful about removing from the market place simple plastic toys with buttons which may potentially be dangerous to our children, and yet, we continue to flood the marketplace of defense with nuclear weapons with buttons whose only use is for the elimination of the full spectrum of life as we know it.

President Reagan has said he would "negotiate as long as necessary to reduce the number of nuclear weapons to a point where neither side threatens the survival of the other." Why then do we produce or deploy any more weapons? Why then do we not make it our top priority to begin negotiations on a nuclear arms freeze?

How can we seek bigger and better bombs without draining completely a withering economy whose scream for attention may fade to an exhausted whimper?

We ask for open discussion of the issues. It will do no good if likeminded people talk only with themselves on whatever side. The issue of survival is for all of us to examine. The issue of the allocation of a major portion of our tax dollar is also for of us to examine.

We welcome dialogue, reaction and an effort on everyone's part to listen. Let us begin.●

LT. COL. JAMES F. NORRIS, JR.,  
ON FREEDOM

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is my duty to submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD addresses given by outstanding Americans significant to the American people. I was privileged to hear such an address by Lt. Col. James F. Norris, Jr., retired from the U.S. Air Force, on Memorial Day 1981 in Surfside, Fla. On the day we set aside to remember those who served our country so bravely, Lieutenant Colonel Norris reminded all of us of the reward received from that service, freedom. His well-taken and profound words rang true and clear that day, as those of us who heard them stood silent—listening deep in thought. How soon we forget after celebrations such as Memorial Day and the Fourth of July subside the gift of freedom which we constantly enjoy and which so many gave their lives to achieve. As a reminder, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this notable address by Lt. Col. James F. Norris, Jr., and commend it to my colleagues and fellow countrymen:

ADDRESS OF LT. COL. JAMES F. NORRIS, JR.,  
MEMORIAL DAY 1981, SURFSIDE, FLA.

Distinguished guests, Surfside Commissioners, ladies and gentleman, more than 2,300 years ago Diogenes, a Greek, said, "The most beautiful thing in the world is freedom of speech"; 2,000 years later, a Frenchman, Voltaire, said, "I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it"; 250 years ago John Peter Zenger, a German born printer in America, dared prison for printing what he had to say; 200 years ago American Colonists bled and died for that freedom. Americans have been bleeding and dying for freedom ever since so that we might stand here today as free men and women. We are here today to honor and pay homage to the defenders of freedom in a world where freedom is denied to most people, a world in which freedom is continuously besieged by those who would deny it to us. On this sacred day of memory it is fitting that we pause in tribute to those men and women who for us give themselves as willing sacrifice on the altar of freedom.

When the strident voices of the professional pacifists who would disarm the free world intrude upon the quiet of our meditation try to forgive them. They know not what they say or do. They are asking us to surrender to the tyrant the freedom our gallant people won for us. On this hallowed day their desecration of the memories of our loved ones and of all the others who died that we might speak exposes them as ungrateful, insensitive men.

From the Baltic Sea to the Sea of Japan, an area containing half the world's popula-



tion there is no freedom. A World War II anecdote makes the point. An American soldier and a Russian soldier were fishing in a river that divided their occupation zones in Germany. As soon as the American cast on his side of the river he hooked one fish after another. Several hours passed with the Russian getting not a nibble. "Hey Joe", he called, "How come you catch so many fish and I don't get a one?" "Hell Ivan", replied the American, in the Russian zone even the fish are afraid to open their mouths".

Ninety miles off shore in a citadel of repression there is no freedom. South of us freedom is gasping for life. Far from being blindfolded the Statue of Liberty is a shining beacon of freedom that continues to beckon to the refugees from all over the world. Refugees who had neither the will nor the weapons to fight for freedom in their own lands. Freedom exists only where men are willing to stand and die for it, but even that is not enough. They must be adequately armed and trained to repel the tyrants of the world. Never again must our men train with poles or "broomsticks" as they did at Camp Upton in 1917 because there were no rifles for them. Never again must American pilots be forced to use foreign planes as they did in 1917 because the American planes, the "Jennies", were known as "flying coffins". Today we are more vulnerable than ever. Never again will we be given that breathing spell we had in 1941.

The false prophets who advocate unilateral disarmament wittingly or unwittingly are allies of oppression. I say that advisedly because they never could speak their views in most parts of the world where freedom is an alien and unwelcome stranger. Only here does a man have the freedom to speak out and advocate the death of freedom.

Free men do not seek war but when the choice is freedom or slavery what is left?

In 1776 the greatest minds in the American Colonies proclaimed their independence. All the proclamations couldn't do what the embattled farmers did. They breathed life, at the cost of their own, into a lifeless document. That document became a living part of man's ongoing struggle for freedom. In parts of Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, and most of Asia freedom is dead. In the Caribbean, Central and South America freedom is losing ground or is already dead. Freedom is under siege everywhere. Under these conditions to undertake unilateral disarmament is to betray the Nation into the hands of the enemy.

On this day of remembrance each of us should swear a solemn vow never again to betray our defenders by sending them forth in defense of freedom poorly trained and inadequately armed. We are the last bastion of freedom, the last hope of the free world.●

#### SAN DIEGO'S MASS TRANSIT SYSTEM

#### HON. JIM JEFFRIES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a story printed in the Washington Post on July 2, 1981.

This story reported that the city of San Diego recently completed a mass transit system stretching from the downtown area of San Diego to the Mexican border. What is unusual, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this system was completely built without a single dime from the Federal Government. Instead, funds for the transit were raised through a State gasoline tax and a local sales tax.

Mr. Speaker, in the era of the big-spending Federal Government, I find it refreshing to hear that a city can build and maintain an entire mass transit system without any Federal funds whatsoever.

As a member of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, I congratulate the city of San Diego on their accomplishment, and hope that this transit system will become a model for future systems around the country. In addition, may I say that this example is a perfect one to demonstrate what can be done if the Federal Government stays out of an area where the States should remain supreme.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the Washington Post article that they might have missed during the Fourth of July recess:

#### SAN DIEGO BUILDS ITS TROLLEY LINE WITHOUT U.S. AID

SAN DIEGO.—This city has built a mass transit system without a nickel from the federal government.

Known here as the "Tijuana Trolley," the system is to begin operating in late July, on time and on budget, serving a 16-mile route between downtown San Diego and the Mexican border. Local officials are so pleased that they are talking of building a line that would connect downtown and the city's eastern suburbs.

The \$86 million light-rail project was funded by the state gasoline tax, with some help from a .25 percent local sales tax.

It is the first trolley system built in the United States in a generation and the country's cheapest mass transit system, in terms of dollars per mile, in 40 years. It cost only a little more than \$5 million per mile, compared with \$34 million for San Francisco's Bay Area Rapid Transit system and \$43 million for Washington's Metro.

The basic fare is \$1, although those using the trolley in the downtown area alone will pay just 25 cents.

The city already owned 14.2 miles of track that once belonged to the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway. That track, running past most of San Diego's biggest factories, through its southern suburbs and stopping 200 feet from the Mexican border, provides the bulk of the trolley line.

To complete the line, the transit development board had to install 1.7 miles of traditional track along city streets. An overhead electric wire will provide power.

The two-car trains will make the trip in 33 minutes. The bus takes 77.

The cars, with a starter fleet of 14, were built by Siemens-DuWag of Dusseldorf, at \$800,000 apiece.●

#### CONGRATULATIONS

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I offer congratulations to Warren Bloomberg for completing 50 years of outstanding service with the U.S. Postal Service.

Mr. Bloomberg, now postmaster of Baltimore and sectional center manager for northern Maryland, began his distinguished career with the Postal Service July 13, 1931, when he served as a window clerk at the then independent Halethorpe Post Office. He later worked as clerk stenographer and foreman of the mails, before being named safety director and personnel manager. In February 1966, Mr. Bloomberg was promoted to deputy regional director, and in November that same year, was promoted again to postmaster.

During his tenure in the personnel department, Mr. Bloomberg developed a special interest in on-the-job safety and labor-management relations. He was instrumental in instituting safety measures later adopted nationwide. He has also been a strong advocate of equal employment opportunities for the qualified handicapped.

Mr. Bloomberg has received many awards from employee organizations and labor unions for his outstanding contributions to improvements in the workplace and his work in labor-management relations. He was named "Postmaster of the Year" in 1978, and received citations from the Maryland Traffic Safety Commission and the Maryland highway safety program.

I commend Mr. Bloomberg for his fine work, and wish him many more good years at the Postal Service.●

#### WE HAVE COME TO THE CAPITOL

#### HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1981, Kenneth Jernigan, president of the National Federation of the Blind addressed an audience on the west side of the Capitol. In this inspiring speech he gives praise to the new era this country is entering. I believe the courage, the dignity, and the determination by which the blind of this country are facing Government cutbacks in social programs should be an inspiration and a lesson to all. For this reason, I am proudly inserting Mr. Jernigan's inspirational message in the hope that all my colleagues will be

moved by the strength of character with which the blind face the challenges of the future.

#### ADDRESS BY KENNETH JERNIGAN

We, the blind of this country, have come to the nation's Capitol to talk with the leaders of our government and the members of the public-at-large. We do not come with protest; we do not come with complaint; we do not come with anger. Instead, we come with hope; we come with belief; and we come with determination.

Today there is a new mood in the land, a reexamination of values and goals. Some are afraid of the newness, but we are not afraid. Change has come before, and it has been good or bad depending upon how it has been dealt with and understood. In 1933 a change came, and some cried out and wept for the days that were gone. They looked back and wished that the past would return. But we did not look back or weep for the past, for in the main it had brought us only isolation, loneliness, and poverty. Throughout the long centuries we had experienced lack of opportunity, lack of jobs, lack of acceptance, and lack of understanding. Most of us had no help and no hope.

The newness in 1933 brought change, and it also brought the promise of better lives for the blind. Some of that promise has been fulfilled, but much of it remains a hope deferred and a dream delayed. Since 1933 a growing number of government and private agencies have been established to give us services, and many of these agencies have been helpful and constructive. But increasingly they have turned away from their original purpose to build empires and enlarge their staffs. Service has become secondary. More and more the primary purpose of far too many of the agencies has become the perpetuation of the system and the growth of power. They have forgotten that they were created to be servants and have sought to become masters. They now try to dominate, control, and custodialize us. They treat us like children and wards.

But no more! Now, in 1981, another time of newness has come; and, as in 1933, we are not afraid. We do not weep for the past or hope that it will return, for the years ahead can be better for us than any we have ever known. We do not want to go back to the pre-1933 days of isolation, neglect, and poverty; nor do we want to go back to the pre-1981 days of custody, control, and half fulfilled promises.

Some have oversimplified the relation of citizens to agencies of government. They have said that we must either be in favor of more money, bigger bureaucracy, and service to people—or less money, reduced bureaucracy, and no service to people. This is not the way it is. It is not the way we as blind people have experienced it in our daily lives.

Earlier this year the President of our Salt Lake City Chapter was cursed and beaten by an employee of the Utah State Agency for the Blind. He as an individual (and we as an organization) had dared question the audit of that agency. The agency employee who beat and cursed him was not fired. A month later he hit him again (this time in the back), causing contusions of the spine, absence from work, and medical treatment. The agency employee has now been convicted of criminal assault, but so far as I know, he has still not been fired. He continues to draw his paycheck from the government for the "service" he gives to the blind.

In Cleveland blind food service operators (in order to have the opportunity to work)

were compelled to sign an agreement that the agency had the right to tell them what kind of food to eat, when to change their underwear, and what type of deodorant to use. In Cincinnati and Houston blind workers in the sheltered shops are even now fighting for the right to organize and to have minimum wages. Part of what they fight is federal rules and regulations which encourage the substandard conditions.

In Phoenix a blind sheltered shop employee has done higher production than a sighted employee doing exactly the same job, but he is paid lower wages. Federal regulations permit it. In Alabama the former head of the state's federally established rehabilitation program went to the federal penitentiary this year for stealing money appropriated for the handicapped. In Michigan a blind man passed a State Civil Service test for automobile mechanic, with a score of 96. Government officials removed his name from the list and placed it on a separate register for the handicapped. All of the handicapped who apply for Civil Service jobs in Michigan are now to be given uniform scores of 70 and have their names placed on the segregated register.

Last year in Florida and in the state of Washington, agencies of government tried to take children from their mothers on the grounds that blind mothers cannot properly raise their children. There are many in this audience today who are living proof to the contrary, and we of the National Federation of the Blind were able to defeat both attempts.

No, we the blind are not afraid of the newness which lies ahead. We are glad to leave behind us those elements of the past which have been negative, and we are equally glad to bring with us into the present and the future those elements which are positive and good. We want to give up the isolation and poverty of the pre-1933 days, but we want to keep the good will and the kind intentions. We want to give up the custody and the agency domination of the pre-1981 days, but we want to keep the opportunities and the services which are truly needed. Most of all, we want the right and the chance to do for ourselves and live as equal citizens.

Many of the government agencies (and the people who run those agencies) are well-suited to the newness in the land. We will work to help them get funding, and we believe that our Congress and our President will want them to have it. We will work with equal vigor to see that those agencies which live in the past and try to custodialize and control our lives are either reformed and restructured, or put out of business. Again, we believe our Congress and our President will help us do it.

We the blind have come of age, both as a people and a movement. Our journey to freedom has been slow and painful—but we feel that this is a time of infinite possibility and great opportunity. It can also be a time of challenge and threat. The future is not fixed and determined but alternative and flexible. It will be what we make it, and this is why we have come today to the nation's Capitol. We ask for acceptance and understanding, both from our Congress and from the Executive branch of Government. We know that achievement is made of high hopes and hard work, of drudgery and dreams. We are willing to work, and work hard—but we also hope, and we dare to dream. We believe that, through understanding and good will, the officials of our government and the members of the general

public will help us find the opportunity to work, and will share with us the joy of our hopes and the wonder of our dream.●

#### FOREIGN AID BENEFITS WASHINGTON STATE

#### HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, at a time of widespread efforts to cut Federal spending, it's good to note that there continues to be support for our foreign aid program.

Recently, a prominent newspaper in my district, the Tacoma News Tribune, editorially supported the aid program. It particularly points out that much of the Federal funds are returned in the purchase of U.S. products and services. This represents an economic benefit to Washington State. The statistics show that goods and agricultural products totaling \$56.3 million were purchased in the State last year by AID, and another \$9.5 million for goods and commodities used in foreign assistance development programs.

Behind the humanitarian benefits, one should not forget the economic benefits that come through our foreign assistance program.

#### REASONS TO SUPPORT U.S. FOREIGN AID

Admittedly, the Agency for International Development has an ax to grind in behalf of foreign aid—A.I.D. administers overseas assistance programs.

Still, A.I.D. makes a powerful case for U.S. foreign aid, especially if you happen to live in Washington state. According to statistics supplied by the agency, goods and agricultural products totaling \$56.3 million were purchased in this state last year for A.I.D. foreign assistance programs.

In the 1980 fiscal year, Washington farmers and food processors were paid \$36.8 million for grain and other agricultural commodities supplied to the Food for Peace program administered by A.I.D. The state's manufacturers and businesses received another \$9.5 million for goods and commodities used in foreign-assistance development programs.

And don't forget either, pointedly adds the A.I.D., that another \$16.6 million in foreign-assistance technical and research contracts were negotiated with universities and private research institutions in the state of Washington.

Even more dramatic, of course, is the effect of foreign aid on the national economy. According to A.I.D., \$9.1 billion in orders have been placed in the last dozen years with manufacturers and suppliers in all 50 states.

Obviously, A.I.D.'s vested interest in seeing that foreign aid is continued or expanded provided the impetus for the release of its statistics.

Nevertheless, the figures for Washington state in particular serve to remind us that foreign-aid dollars do indeed have an impact that is close to home.●



SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
POLICY—WHAT'S AHEAD?

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, next week the Senate of the United States will conduct confirmation hearings on the President's nominee for Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy. As the head of this small but important office within the Executive Office of the President, Dr. George E. "Jay" Keyworth will also, if confirmed, serve as the Science and Technology Adviser to the President.

As Chairman of the committee which originated the enabling legislation for the OSTP, I am especially pleased that this post is being filled. Dr. Keyworth will be facing many challenging and important issues and we in the House of Representatives look forward to working with him as the administration's chief spokesman on questions of national science and technology policy.

Dr. Keyworth's first public address was given to the Sixth Annual Research and Development Colloquium sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science here in Washington last month. In his address Dr. Keyworth gives his views on several issues which in the past have been the subject repeated debate and which undoubtedly will continue to be on the agenda for our deliberations.

Whether one agrees with each of the positions taken by the nominee on this occasion, there can be no doubt of the significance of this address as an expression of the administration's views with respect to science and technology in America's future and the role of the Federal Government in maintaining that position.

Dr. Keyworth's discussion of the need, as he sees it, to review priorities both for science in relationship to other programs and priorities within science is especially interesting and will, I believe, serve as a helpful contribution to the debate already begun in the Congress on these questions.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the text of this address be printed in the RECORD for the benefit and information of the Members of the House. Dr. Keyworth was introduced by the A.A.A.S. president, Dr. Alan Bromley:

REMARKS BY DR. GEORGE A. KEYWORTH II,  
DIRECTOR-DESIGNATE, OFFICE OF SCIENCE  
AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, JUNE 25, 1981SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY—WHAT'S  
AHEAD

I appreciate Alan Bromley's invitation to speak to you this evening. It gives each of us an opportunity. For most of you it's the first chance to meet and size up science poli-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cy's "new man in town". For me, it's my first chance to participate in one of these outstanding R. & D. colloquia, and a timely opportunity to speak to so many so closely involved in the Washington science policy scene.

Considering your diverse backgrounds and interests—and the fact that this is my first public appearance as Director-Designate of the OSTP—this is really being thrown into the breach!

Nevertheless, I've looked forward to it. In addition to our getting acquainted, I think it's important to answer a number of questions that may be on your minds, and to try to put to rest some of the speculation that naturally builds up with a change of administration.

THE ROLE OF THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
ADVISER

Perhaps I should begin with a few general thoughts on my perceptions of science advising in the Reagan Administration—on the science and technology adviser's role, his office, his influence, and so forth. Much has already been written about this. Some of it accurate, much of it—to be kind—inaccurate.

Initially, I should emphasize that this administration places great value on the country's scientific and technological strength, recognizing that it underlies most of our economic and social well-being as well as our national security. By the same token, the administration realizes that these vital forces need national attention, support and encouragement.

Behind this recognition is President Reagan's own interest in scientific and technological issues. In my first interview with the President's Chief of Staff, Jim Baker, he assured me that I would not need to act as an advocate of science and technology since the administration's strongest advocate of science and technology was next door in the Oval Office.

The President's personal interest in science and technology accounts for his senior advisers' recognition of a direct need for scientific and technical expertise close at hand. And such expertise depends on a strong link to the science and engineering communities. All this underlies the White House's belief in the importance of a Science and Technology Adviser, and its decision to retain the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Executive Office of the President.

All my discussions with senior White House officials have reinforced this. I have every confidence that the Office of Science and Technology Policy will be an important voice in the Executive Office, and that as its Director, I'll have access to the President whenever necessary.

As you know, there are many interpretations of the Science Adviser's role. My own—and I believe it is one that many of my predecessors in the job have shared—is that the Science Adviser's principal responsibility is to serve the President by providing him and his senior advisers with the best possible technical judgments on specific questions of national importance, and to confront and advise on broader science policy matters of similar importance. Other explicit responsibilities are, of course, set forth in the legislation that created the OSTP.

Note, however, that nowhere is it indicated that the OSTP or its director is to represent the interests of the science community as a constituency. This should be understood and the reason for it appreciated. It is

to the decided advantage of the science and engineering communities to have a Presidential adviser that is looked upon by the White House, not as a political pleader for those communities—an "inside lobbyist" if you will—but as an objective adviser who can act as an effective link to them.

Because of President Reagan's personal management style, the Science adviser in this administration perhaps more than in any other will be an important member of a team of domestic and international advisers. These advisers will analyze, design, and develop the policies and programs that constitute the President's overall program. The contributions of the science adviser to specific policies or programs may not be identifiable or visible, but, nevertheless, they will be there. Working in this way the science adviser and his office will best serve the President, the broader goals of science and technology, and most important, the needs of the country.

I'm looking forward to working in this manner. I'm committed to the team management concept practiced in the White House and am already included in important deliberations involving science and technology considerations.

Let me be clear. In order to be most effective in this position, it will be imperative that I maintain a broad and continuing contact with the science and engineering communities—in the universities, in industry, and in our national labs and Federal, State and local government agencies. I intend to have an open door and an open mind to them, and plan to call on them often. I also plan to be in close touch with the Congress, keeping its members and their staffs well informed of our interests and activities. It's essential that we maintain this kind of contact and cooperation. More than ever we'll need it in order to work effectively on what this colloquium calls the New National Agenda.

Let me turn to some aspects of that agenda and offer a few comments on how I see science and technology relating to it in this administration.

THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION PHILOSOPHY AND  
R. & D.

I think we all recognize by now that a principal concern of the Reagan Administration—an underlying issue that will affect all others—is the economic emergency we face as a nation. A number of things contribute to that condition. Let me list a few of them.

For perhaps too many years we have been emphasizing the distribution of the country's wealth far more than the improved production of it. Inflation has skyrocketed as our consumption has increased and our rate of saving declined. We have neglected necessary capital formation, investment in new more efficient and productive plants, and longer range research and development. Our ever-increasing taxes have acted to drain off investment and dampen incentive and innovation. And, in our zeal to manage the many environmental, health and safety impacts of industrialization, we have often overreacted—or reacted without adequate knowledge burdening many sectors of the society with unnecessary, costly regulation. The results have been slower industrial growth, a leveling off of productivity gains, and decreased competitiveness abroad.

These are among the most urgent problems this administration confronts. And confronting them in every possible way must be our top priority if we are to prevail

as a leading economic force in the world—a world that looks to, and depends on, our success in such leadership.

Research and development, of course, play a key role in all this. New scientific knowledge and technological know-how represent our most productive capital today. It is capital that can only be generated by adequate investment in research and development, both by government and the private sector. All of us recognize this. And it is very much a part of the Administration's economic recovery plan.

In line with this belief, the Administration views basic research as a vital investment with a good return. That investment is a Federal responsibility but one that must be shared by the private sector. In the spectrum of basic research, applied research, development and demonstration, the heaviest responsibility for basic research naturally falls on the government. This is particularly true where long-term, high-risk research is involved, and in areas where the payoff for such research is likely to offer broad societal benefits with little commercial payoff. It has been characteristic that as work moves from the basic research stage toward application and development, the private sector assumes a greater part of its support. But there are certain projects, such as those involving national security, large space ventures, or advanced energy technologies, where the government's support continues throughout research, development and demonstration because of the broader national interests at stake, and where the government may be the principal consumer of the product. This, of course, will continue to be the case. But wherever possible we hope to expand industry's involvement and support.

In spite of the Administration's commitment to the support of R. & D., I think we all have to realize that Federal R. & D., like all other government activities, will be strongly influenced by the stringencies of today's economic conditions. There will be limits and priorities to contend with. And R. & D., for all its recognized worth, will have to contend and compete. It is too easy for us to forget or overlook this, particularly when we in the science community talk among ourselves. Therefore, it was probably a good thing when, as I understand happened last year at this colloquium, the then Chairman of the House Budget Committee emphasized that R. & D. requests for taxpayers' dollars do compete with other needs—even for such things as school lunches. That lecture in practical politics emphasized that the science community, as articulate as it may be, is heavily outnumbered and must learn to make a stronger case for its cause before the Congress and the public. This, of course, will continue to be a major challenge for the AAAS. I know it has been working hard to deal with this—to live up to the promise of its name to "advance science".

Considering the magnitude of the budget cuts proposed by the President as part of his economic recovery strategy, I think that most R. & D. functions fared quite well in the revised budget. And in cases where cuts were made, they were made "surgically" after careful review, and are consistent with the philosophy I've discussed. Since this is a matter that is a major focus of this colloquium, I don't want to dwell on it here.

A while ago I mentioned that the Reagan Administration would seek to increase industry's involvement in R. & D. This is one aspect of a broad move to improve our industrial strength—to stimulate increased industrial innovation and productivity. I think

you will see the administration approaching this task in a manner different from previous efforts. Industry will be allowed and encouraged to revitalize its own inherent strengths and capabilities, in which this administration has great faith. The main government assistance will come through tax policy and regulatory reform, rather than through direct stimulation of industrial R. & D.

An improved tax situation will allow industries to make larger investments in new and more productive plants, as well as put more of its own money into new product R. & D.

Regulatory reform will reduce the overall burden of compliance with many unnecessary regulations. And perhaps just as important, it will reduce the R. & D. previously needed to meet such compliance rather than targeted toward other innovations.

The Administration has already made significant progress in this direction through OMB's new intensive and extensive review of Federal regulation and rule-making. This is not an effort to undermine important gains in environmental, health, and safety matters. Rather it is an essential adjustment to a period when we overreacted and created a climate of uncertainty and an excessively adversarial relationship between government and industry, all of which has taken its toll on our economy. An important step in rationalizing Federal regulation is to increase the reliability of the data and analytical methods on which estimates of environmental and occupational health and safety risks are based. Therefore, my office will work with others in the administration to strengthen the scientific foundation of Federal regulatory decision-making.

Clearly, an important initiative of the administration is to encourage more trust and cooperation between government and industry, allowing the private sector and the market to act more freely. Tax incentives and regulatory reform, along with the proper attention to such matters as trade policy, patent reform and clarification of anti-trust restrictions on R&D, should go a long way toward revitalizing American innovation.

I also think we should seek to encourage and improve the link between our universities and industries. But such cooperation is not a matter for heavy-handed government involvement. We can only act in some cases as a broker or catalyst, removing barriers where possible. The main thrust must come from university and industry creating the partnership.

Let me turn to a few of the other areas in which I see our office involved to varying degrees. And I think you'll appreciate that I can only comment on these briefly at this early date.

#### BASIC RESEARCH

As I stated earlier, responsibility for the support of basic research falls primarily upon the Government. Undoubtedly, our country has relinquished its preeminence in some scientific fields while others are strongly threatened through efforts in Europe, Japan, or the Soviet Union. It is no longer within our economic capability, nor perhaps even desirable, to aspire to primacy across the spectrum of scientific disciplines. The constraints of reality require discrimination and vision, attainable only through a collaboration of the Government and the scientific and engineering communities. We must strive to identify those disciplinary areas where vitality is required to support industrial, military and other essential tech-

nologies, as well as those with particular scientific promise, the latter measured in terms of probability of major breakthroughs.

As Government support has proceeded to dominate basic research in the latter half of this century, we must ask ourselves if we have apportioned resources wisely. My own perception is that, whereas the present distribution of resources is reasonable, the future will require difficult choices and reapportionment. I believe the criteria upon which these choices must be based, must be both clear and simple: the principal criterion for the pursuit of knowledge must be excellence, excellence in the investigators and excellence in the subject. The principal criterion for the support of areas of research directed toward technology advances is pertinence.

These considerations imply value judgments. Value judgments are difficult and fallible. However, if one concentrates upon the extremes, emphasizing what appears to be clearly the most promising avenues, and deemphasizing those that have been least productive in recent years, the probability of a large error in judgment is diminished.

My central premise is simply that we cannot continue to distribute our limited support of basic research without applying stringent and fundamental criteria, those of excellence and pertinence to national requirements being paramount. This new leadership can only be effective and beneficial if carried out in tandem by the Government and scientific and technological members of the academic and industrial communities.

#### SPACE

Another area that will call for perceptive judgments, and in which I see my office playing an important role, is that of space policy. The initial success of the Space Shuttle has stimulated the administration to embark on a major interagency review of questions involving its operational future, plus a number of other vital matters concerning the direction of our space program. From this will come the ideas and plans that will set the course for our country's activities in space for years to come. As you know, the implications and prospects for this are enormous. They involve advances in communications, resource exploration, environmental observations, activities related to agriculture, forestry, water, climate and weather, the oceans, and national security matters. There is a large potential for industrial activity, for increased efficiency of Federal, State and local programs, and for exciting, "far-out" space science research.

#### BIOLOGY AND AGRICULTURE

Coming back to earth, there are other science policy areas in which I'm sure my office will be active. Two of these which have long been of vital importance to the nation are health and agriculture. In both of these, exciting developments are taking place, or imminent, because of advances in scientific research.

Advances in biology, particularly in such fields as molecular biology and genetics, give rise to the idea that we are on the threshold of a biological revolution comparable to that which took place in physics earlier in this century. If so, the impact could be significant, not only for human health but for various industries and agriculture as well. We must press ahead vigorously with this research, and I'm sure we will. In general I think we will see continued strong support for the biological and



biomedical sciences. They underlie such a large segment of our economic and social well-being, indeed of well-being on a global scale, that as a nation we could ill-afford to do less—and will certainly benefit by doing more.

As I indicated, an area of related importance is agriculture. When one stops to think about it, it's amazing how much we take for granted the enormous productivity of this sector of our society. Food and agriculture comprise our largest industry. It accounts for 20 percent of our GNP and provides employment for 20 percent of our civilian work force. In addition to supplying our own need, American farmers today supply 60 percent of the grain and 75 percent of the soybeans in world trade, and 70 percent of the food aid to food deficient nations around the world. Last year our agricultural exports exceeded \$40 billion, producing a trade surplus of \$23 billion and offsetting about 43 percent of the deficit of the nonagricultural sectors.

Of course we can credit our abundant arable land and temperate climate for much of this success. But not to be overlooked is this country's historic interest and success in agricultural sciences and technology. This has been an investment of incredible pay-off. However, we must recognize that it is an investment that must continue to meet ever changing conditions and demand. In today's harvests we are reaping the successes of scientific and technological advances made many years ago. New pressures on our land and water resources call for new ideas and techniques for conserving these and maintaining their productivity. Much exciting and challenging agricultural R&D is underway today related to fertilization, pest control, energy use, multiple cropping, genetic improvements of plants and livestock and environmental concerns, such as erosion and salinity. We must forge ahead with this work, and with our efforts in international cooperation in agricultural R&D, to build a solid base for world food security in the years and decades to come.

#### INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

I believe that international cooperation in science and technology will be an item high on our agenda. I don't feel I have to dwell on this with this audience. Scientific and technological exchange remains a most vital link among nations, one that affects almost every aspect of our lives.

In addition to the careful attention we must pay to the exchange of scientific information and technology transfer, we must recognize the growing importance of collaborative R&D in large-scale, costly scientific technological ventures. Today this includes such areas as high energy physics (particularly the next generation of accelerators), fusion, some space activities, and global environmental and oceans research.

I also look forward to working with China in our cooperative efforts to assist that nation in its modernization program, and to reviewing our binational and international programs involving the developing world. Exciting and challenging opportunities abound in these areas.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY AND WORLD PEACE

Let me conclude with a comment on national security. Much has already been written about my associations and interests in this matter. Much of it is true. I do believe that our country's military might should be second to none—that this is essential today to world peace and to the survival of the free world. I also believe that science and

technology play a key role in providing us with this strength, and I will work to see that we excel in this.

If we can maintain peace through such strength, we also buy the time to use science and technology to improve the condition of mankind throughout the world. And this is the path to lasting peace—a peace based on the fulfillment of human needs, on dignity, self respect, mutual respect, and on confidence in a better future. This is an ideal worth striving for, and I believe this country is prepared to do just that.

I've enjoyed this occasion to meet with you. I know it's only the first of many we'll have to get together, and to work together. I look forward to them. I'm sure they will be productive. Together we can accomplish much toward strengthening our country's science and technology. Together we can see that they serve the best interest of this nation and of people of good will everywhere. That is both an enormous challenge and a great opportunity. What more can a Science Adviser ask for?

Thank you.●

#### RESOLUTION—REWARDS FOR THE ELECTED

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues the resolution, "Rewards for the Elected," which was recently adopted by the Michigan Council of Senior Citizens. This resolution expresses the council's intention to hold Members individually accountable for their votes on the administration's budget cuts and legislation affecting the elderly in the future, especially the administration's proposed social security cuts and the deregulation of natural gas.

The administration was successful in having its budget considered as a whole, in an obvious effort by Members to avoid taking individual responsibility for the harm that will be caused by particular cuts. I am pleased that the Michigan Council of Senior Citizens has seen through this ploy, and I urge my colleagues to consider the point of view expressed in this resolution:

#### RESOLUTION—REWARDS FOR THE ELECTED

Whereas, many of the Reagan Administration's proposals will inflict devastating results and uncountable tragic hardships on and for many senior citizens, the handicapped and the poor in Michigan and in the whole country, and

Whereas, some of Michigan's elected officials, both in the State and in Washington, D.C., are blindly supporting the Reagan Administration's programs because, of the Administration's "claimed," "mandate" from the country's electorate, and

Whereas, many state officials and some of those serving in Washington, D.C., have forgotten they were elected by Michigan voters and not the oil and natural gas industries, the banking and other big businesses, therefore be it

*Resolved*, the Michigan Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., joins the millions of citizens, nationwide, in opposing the Reagan Administration's butchering of all social programs, be it further

*Resolved*, That we of the Michigan Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., shall make every effort possible to bring to the attention of those elected officials the needs and requirements of senior citizens, the handicapped and the poor, be it further

*Resolved*, The "mandate" if in deed there was one, it was to reduce unemployment, reduce inflation, reduce high interest rates and to curb the enormous profits of the oil and natural gas industries and the blank checks to the military, be it further

*Resolved*, Our elected officials shall be held, individually accountable for their respective actions and votes on all Reagan Administration budget proposals, tampering with Medicare and Social Security, all social program cuts, oil and natural gas deregulation and the monumental military expenditures for weapons and particularly—the huge "cost over runs" be it further

*Resolved*, That the entire membership of the Michigan Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., do hereby pledge themselves to give and work for the removal from office all those elected officials, who by their actions and vote prove themselves our enemies, be it finally

*Resolved*, That the Michigan Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., do all in its power to enlist the members of the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., to encourage all Seniors to join in this effort of rewarding our friends and the punishment of our enemies.●

#### DECLARATION OF TALLOIRES

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent meeting of journalists at Talloires, France, pointed out the grave seriousness of a movement which is of concern to Western governments, journalists, and advocates of a free press throughout the world. It is the attempt by Soviet bloc nations and many Third World governments to control the free flow of information, its collection, dissemination, and its content. The forum for this debate is one which receives funding from the United States and other Western nations whose very roots of freedom are under attack. This forum is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the largest specialized agency of the U.N. system.

Since the early 1970's, this debate has been gathering steam. Many less industrialized nations feel that the large, Western-based press agencies distort Third World news, give pessimistic reports of Third World progress and government programs, and concentrate more on negative reporting, than on positive developments. In addition, many feel that their cultural identity is lost beneath the crush of

news from the industrialized world and the spread of Western culture through the various media. They are crying out for a greater measure of control, development of their indigenous media, a method to use the media to tell their own story, to measure their accomplishments, and to strengthen their own traditions. To a degree, their plea is one that may be considered within the forum of UNESCO. But within such proposals lies the opportunity to place the press in the hands of governments and to license journalists under the guise of protection. Such licensing, according to some UNESCO members, should subject journalists to an international code of journalistic ethics which has yet to be defined.

The United States and eight other nations, contributors of a substantial amount of UNESCO's budget, have opposed such plans and continue to do so amidst calls for the United States to completely withdraw its participation from UNESCO. Such attempts have had mixed results. However, through the combined efforts of journalists, the development of a strong U.S. policy, and congressional initiatives, we hope to enter the arena of UNESCO well armed to defend our basic first amendment freedoms.

At the 1978 UNESCO General Conference in Belgrade, the United States offered an alternative approach to the wrangling over the control of news coverage and activities of journalists. We proposed a solid and practical mechanism to help and encourage nations to increase their communications capabilities rather than using the regulation of information flows as a great equalizer among nations. This mechanism is the International Program for the Development of Communications (IPDC). As an organization within UNESCO, with its own governing council, the IPDC would act as a clearinghouse to match communications needs with available grants from several sources: UNESCO itself, member governments, UNDP, the World Bank, and private sources. While this concept has already been granted general UNESCO approval, disagreement still exists as to its funding. The United States and other Western nations reject the idea of a pledging conference to provide new sources of UNESCO funds for development, desiring instead an IPDC free from a multilayered bureaucratic structure.

Already, a number of U.S.-based organizations fund development projects similar to those to be undertaken by an IPDC. The International Communication Agency, a Federal Government agency, works to train foreign journalists. Perhaps its grants could be expanded and administered through the IPDC. Other private groups, such as the World Press Freedom Committee, whose President

George Beebe was one of the prime movers at Talloires, sponsor and fund various projects to aid worldwide communications development.

Though such initiatives are to be encouraged, they must be administered through an IPDC which concentrates on development issues, not politics, and whose membership does not exist solely to vie for the favor of the Third World. We must also focus on the statements ratified by the 63 delegates at Talloires which urge UNESCO to abandon its attempts to regulate global information flows and recognize press freedom as a basic human right. The founding of an IPDC must not be misconstrued as a mandate for UNESCO to regulate international information flows.

In the Congress, we are attempting to send UNESCO a similar message. In hearings scheduled for July 9 and 16, 1981, the Foreign Affairs Subcommittees on International Operations and Human Rights and International Organizations will consider House Resolution 142 and House Concurrent Resolution 137 sponsored by Representatives SHAMANSKY and FENWICK. These resolutions affirm the message of the journalists at Talloires: that it is not the province of UNESCO to govern the future of the journalistic profession or to regulate the future of the media. We hope that such actions will encourage the development of a strong U.S. policy backed by a strong and experienced delegation to future conferences. For our goal should not be to withdraw from an organization which provides an international forum for communications, technological, cultural, educational, and human rights issues. No one ever won a battle by withdrawing from the fray. Instead, U.S. leadership is and must be paramount in all of these areas. UNESCO would take a decidedly different course if we neglect to engage the Soviets and their allies in debate within the UNESCO framework. I believe that our answer is to engage more fully in the debate and more wholeheartedly in the organization in order to lend both respect and credibility to our proposals and our commitment. We have neglected our role in UNESCO for too long.

For the record, I would like to include the text of the Declaration of Talloires which should be our policy base. With this foundation, we may attempt to build an affirmative response to the new world information order and the fulfillment of American ideals in the IPDC.

#### THE DECLARATION OF TALLOIRES

##### WHY WAS A CONFERENCE HELD AT TALLOIRES

For 7 years a debate has been conducted in the councils of UNESCO and other international organizations over the media and proposed curbs of press freedom. Those who advocate these controls have pressed for the

creation of a so-called New World Information Order which is as yet undefined.

In response the free world media decided to take the initiative and to announce the principles to which a free press subscribes.

To accomplish this a Voice of Freedom conference attended by media leaders from five continents was arranged by Tuft University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at its European center at Talloires, France, May 15-17, 1981, in cooperation with the World Press Freedom Committee.

At this session for the first time Western and other free newspapers, magazines and broadcasters took a united stand against the campaign by the Soviet bloc and some Third World countries to give UNESCO the authority to chart the media's future course.

In a joint declaration adopted unanimously by the 63 delegates from 21 countries, UNESCO was urged to abandon attempts to regulate global information and strive instead for practical solutions to Third World media advancement.

But UNESCO has made known it will proceed with the program, obligated to permit discussions and possible action on proposals unacceptable to the West.

Those attending this historic conference stated that they are "deeply concerned by a growing tendency in many countries and international bodies to put government interests above those of the individual, particularly in regard to information."

The delegates placed emphasis on the continuing needs of the developing media, to which many have given assistance for years.

They pledged to expand the "free flow of information worldwide," and said they would support efforts by international bodies, governments and private agencies to cooperate with the Third World in updating production facilities, and in training.

The declaration provides that "press freedom is a basic human right" to which the conference pledged its support.

The declaration which follows is a statement of the principles adopted:

(Here is the text of the Declaration of Talloires, adopted by leaders of independent news organizations from 21 nations at the Voices of Freedom Conference in Talloires, France, May 15-17, 1981—a statement of principles to which a free world media subscribes, and on which it never will compromise.)

We journalists from many parts of the world, reporters, editors, photographers, publishers and broadcasters, linked by our mutual dedication to a free press,

Meeting in Talloires, France, from May 15 to 17, 1981, to consider means of improving the free flow of information worldwide, and to demonstrate our resolve to resist any encroachment on this free flow,

Determined to uphold the objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which in Article 19 states, "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media regardless of frontiers,"

Mindful of the commitment of the constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to "promote the free flow of ideas by word and image,"

Conscious also that we share a common faith, as stated in the charter of the United Nations, "in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, and of nations large and small,"



Recalling moreover that the signatories of the final act of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe concluded in 1975 in Helsinki, Finland, pledged themselves to foster "freer flow and wider dissemination of information of all kinds, to encourage cooperation in the field of information and the exchange of information with other countries, and to improve conditions under which journalists from one participating state exercise their profession in another participating state" and expressed their intention in particular to support "the improvement of the circulation of access to, and exchange of information,"

Declare that:

1. We affirm our commitment to these principles and call upon all international bodies and nations to adhere faithfully to them.

2. We believe that the free flow of information and ideas is essential for mutual understanding and world peace. We consider restraints on the movement of news and information to be contrary to the interests of international understanding, in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the constitution of UNESCO, and the final act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and inconsistent with the charter of the United Nations.

3. We support the universal human right to be fully informed, which right requires the free circulation of news and opinion. We vigorously oppose any interference with this fundamental right.

4. We insist that free access, by the people and the press, to all sources of information, both official and unofficial, must be assured and reinforced. Denying freedom of the press denies all freedom of the individual.

5. We are aware that governments, in developed and developing countries alike, frequently constrain or otherwise discourage the reporting of information they consider detrimental or embarrassing, and that governments usually invoke the national interest to justify these constraints. We believe, however, that the people's interest, and therefore the interests of the nation, are better served by free and open reporting. From robust public debate grows better understanding of the issues facing a nation and its people; and out of understanding greater chances for solutions.

6. We believe in any society that public interest is best served by a variety of independent news media. It is often suggested that some countries cannot support a multiplicity of print journals, radio and television stations because there is said to be a lack of an economic base. Where a variety of independent media is not available for any reason, existing information channels should reflect different points of view.

7. We acknowledge the importance of advertising as a consumer service and in providing financial support for a strong and self-sustaining press. Without financial independence, the press cannot be independent. We adhere to the principle that editorial decisions must be free of advertising influence. We also recognize advertising as an important source of information and opinion.

8. We recognize that new technologies have greatly facilitated the international flow of information and that the news media in many countries have not sufficiently benefited from this progress. We support all efforts by international organizations and other public and private bodies to correct this imbalance and to make this technology available to promote the world-

wide advancement of the press and broadcast media and the journalistic profession.

9. We believe that the debate on news and information in modern society that has taken place in UNESCO and other international bodies should now be put to constructive purposes. We reaffirm our views on several specific questions that have arisen in the course of this debate, being convinced that:

Censorship and other forms of arbitrary control of information and opinion should be eliminated; the people's right to news and information should not be abridged.

Access by journalists to diverse sources of news and opinion, official or unofficial, should be without restriction. Such access is inseparable from access of the people to information.

There can be no international code of journalistic ethics; the plurality of views makes this impossible. Codes of journalistic ethics, if adopted within a country, should be formulated by the press itself and should be voluntary in their application. They cannot be formulated, imposed or monitored by governments without becoming an instrument of official control of the press and therefore a denial of press freedom.

Members of the press should enjoy the full protection of national and international law. We seek no special protection or any special status and oppose any proposals that would control journalists in the name of protecting them.

There should be no restriction on any person's freedom to practice journalism. Journalists should be free to form organizations to protect their professional interests.

Licensing of journalists by national or international bodies should not be sanctioned, nor should special requirements be demanded of journalists in lieu of licensing them. Such measures submit journalists to controls and pressures inconsistent with a free press.

The press' professional responsibility is the pursuit of truth. To legislate or otherwise mandate responsibilities for the press is to destroy its independence. The ultimate guarantor of journalistic responsibility is to the free exchange of ideas.

All journalistic freedoms should apply equally to the print and broadcast media. Since the broadcast media are the primary purveyors of news and information in many countries, there is particular need for nations to keep their broadcast channels open to the free transmission of news and opinion.

10. We pledge cooperation in all genuine efforts to expand the free flow of information worldwide. We believe the time has come within UNESCO and other intergovernmental bodies to abandon attempts to regulate news content and formulate rules for the press. Efforts should be directed instead to finding practical solutions to the problems before us, such as improving technological progress, increasing professional interchanges and equipment transfers, reducing communication tariffs, producing cheaper newsprint and eliminating other barriers to the development of news media capabilities.

Our interests as members of the press, whether from the developed or developing countries, are essentially the same: Ours is a joint dedication to the freest, most accurate and impartial information that is within our professional capability to produce and distribute. We reject the view of press theoreticians and those national or international officials who claim that while people in some

countries are ready for a free press, those in other countries are insufficiently developed to enjoy that freedom.

We are deeply concerned by a growing tendency in many countries and in international bodies to put government interests above those of the individual, particularly in regard to information. We believe that the state exists for the individual and has a duty to uphold individual rights. We believe that the ultimate definition of a free press lies not in the actions of governments or international bodies, but rather in the professionalism, vigor and courage of individual journalists.

Press freedom is a basic human right. We pledge ourselves to concerted action to uphold this right. ●

## NATIONAL DEFENSE WITHOUT THE MX

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most momentous decisions on the future of our national defense which Congress will make is the future of the MX missile system, which could cost \$100 billion or more. Two factors are involved in this decision: Whether to proceed with development of the new missile, and where it is to be based.

Harold Agnew, the former director of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory has written an excellent article in the Washington Post in which he persuasively argues against the proposed deployment of these missiles in the Nevada-Utah area. As an alternative, Agnew proposes strengthening our capability to absolutely confirm an incoming enemy attack on our existing Minuteman missiles, and to assure that those missiles could be launched before their destruction.

This article outlines a system that would be a stronger deterrent to a Soviet attack than the proposed MX missile system. The system proposed by Mr. Agnew would cost less than the MX, would not encourage a further buildup of Soviet missiles, and would not jeopardize future arms control talks to the extent the MX would. The arguments of a respected defense specialist deserves the thorough consideration of Members of Congress during the debate on the MX missile system.

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1981]

DEFENSE: THE TWO BIG CHOICES

MX—BUT NOT YET

(By Harold M. Agnew)

Why do we need an MX? The stock answer is because Minuteman's survival is at stake. But if one thinks about it, building the MX really doesn't help Minuteman. It would simply provide (assuming a limit on the number of Soviet and Chinese and French and British reentry vehicles) that if Minuteman were to be targeted and attacked, MX might survive for a retaliating

strike—but not Minuteman. Minuteman is part of our triad of strategic systems whose function is to maintain a credible deterrent. If we have to build MX so that we can fire it after Minuteman has been destroyed, we haven't helped Minuteman—and we certainly haven't maintained a deterrent, so we really haven't gotten much for our \$100 billion.

One of the first decisions a president should have to make relates to whether he'll ever order a retaliating ICBM launch against a foreign power. If the answer is no, then we really don't need an MX or anything else during his tenure in office. But we certainly should not let that fact be known. If the answer is yes, then the question is when and under what conditions would he launch such an attack. One could ask: "Would he retaliate after receiving 100 foreign detonations on the United States?" He would probably say yes. The next question should then be: "How soon after and at what?" He would probably say: "Immediately and at the original targets." By this questioning, we have narrowed down the decision time to something like a half-hour the time between the launching of the foreign missiles and their arrival.

Then this question might be appropriate: "Mr. President, would the enemy warheads have to hit the ground before you would launch?" How a president would answer that question would depend on his philosophy with regard to nuclear weapons but, more important, on the accuracy with which one could guarantee that the information being supplied to him was valid.

Technology is available today to determine whether an appreciable fraction of Minuteman is at risk from any foreign ICBM launch. The key words here are "appreciable fraction." Important to this determination, however, would be the ability to guarantee that the information received is valid and cannot be interrupted. Instead of having a minimal number of satellites and a few ground stations—with sometimes cantankerous computers—monitoring foreign ICBM launchings, one would need redundant systems numbering in the tens. Many of the satellites would have to be silent, only talking to each other and being appropriately monitored. Some might be decoys, but I suspect that the launching cost would dictate that all space hardware be operable. The shuttle could be the answer to cutting costs in putting this hardware in space.

Such redundant monitoring systems could provide absolute information about the risk to Minuteman. If Minuteman were at risk, it could be launched so that it would no longer be at risk. With proper information, Minuteman could be launched at other-than-empty foreign silos. Moreover, the whole Minuteman force would be available. A properly designed system could serve as a much more credible deterrent than the MX, which would always be vulnerable to an increased number of foreign re-entry vehicles, which could be built in a shorter period than could the MX. Such a system would be cheaper, could be in place sooner and would help put a cap on the arms race because not one new offensive system would be required. It would also greatly improve the present alerting situation, where the failure of an electronic component causes local and international concern.

When the concept of being able to launch after attack is suggested, many individuals believe one is proposing an automatic system. Not so. The system, as with all of our nuclear missile systems, could be

launched only upon the president's orders. It should be no more automatic than any existing system. It would, however, have the advantage of providing the president with credible, advanced information with which he could make a decision. He would not have to wait to have a sizable fraction of Minuteman or any other part of the United States destroyed before he could be certain that we were under a real attack. Such a system could guarantee that Minuteman would never be at risk if the president did not wish it to be at risk. This, to me, would maintain a very credible deterrent at a much lower cost than any MX would require.

If 1,000 non-vulnerable Minuteman missiles are a sufficient deterrent, additional MX missiles based in Utah would not be required. This is not to say that the Minuteman missile should not be replaced by the MX missile. As Minuteman ages, it must be replaced, and the MX is a logical candidate. And if, alas, a completely new MX deployment mode is required, the information that a redundant satellite alerting system would provide could be available to reduce the vulnerability of even that system. Clearly, Minuteman, or preferably the MX missile in the Minuteman silo, would need to be appropriately hardened so that it could indeed be launched when threatened.

Serious consideration should again be given to an active hard-site defense of Minuteman. Compared with the weaknesses of the present proposed MX deployment, this option should be given much greater consideration than it has in the past. My proposal lends itself better to the role of a meaningful deterrent as well as to future arms control options, since the number of strategic systems initially would not be increased, and the present full effectiveness of our strategic deterrent could be preserved. ●

#### FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

#### HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the eruption of Mount St. Helens has impressed upon me—and upon the many people of my congressional district impacted by the disaster—the vital importance of Federal disaster assistance. For example, without the quick, efficient, and professional action of the Army Corps of Engineers, the scope of damage and destruction in the wake of the eruption would have been much greater than it actually was.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an example of the selfless dedication and public service that helped the corps avert major flooding on the Cowlitz River in Washington State. Gerald L. Hadley of the corps' Portland district, at great personal sacrifice and through much hard work, helped organize one of the largest dredging and diking operations of our time. His competence, professionalism, and long hours on the job earned him widespread trust and respect.

On June 10, 1981, the Longview, Wash., Rotary Club presented Jerry Hadley with the Special Service Award. The text of the presentation follows:

#### LONGVIEW ROTARY CLUB SPECIAL SERVICE AWARD TO GERALD L. HADLEY

The May 18th eruption of Mt. St. Helens will long be remembered by all who experienced the disaster, and each of us will remember it differently depending upon our degree of involvement.

During the late night of May 18th a man arrived on the scene who quietly, but effectively, started the involvement of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Many representatives of the Corps have participated in the dredging and recovery effort to date, but only one—the first to arrive, is still on the scene. For over a year now Jerry Hadley has lived in a motel in West Kelso, leaving only occasionally to visit his family in Oregon.

Originally assigned as a flood flight engineer, Jerry set in motion the immediate raising of Castle Rock dike, the raising of King Road, and the work needed to protect the BPA substation at Lexington. He was the first contact person, representing the Corps, for the County Commissioners, Emergency Services, PUD and the Public Works Department. Under his leadership and direction a small group of men worked out of the Hall of Justice gathering data and information needed to determine the extent of damage and an assessment of what needed to be done to get the Cowlitz River back to normal and under control. As the days passed, his staff and responsibilities grew, and he let contracts to get the necessary emergency work done. While citizen panic was running high, he quietly assured the local people and government officials that the Corps was here to help and that they would find a way to protect the residents of Cowlitz County.

Early, before the Corps recovery plan was unveiled to the public, he told me, "You're about to see on the Cowlitz and Toutle Rivers the largest massing of dredges, draglines, saurmans, earthmoving equipment and engineering people that have ever been assembled in one place at a single time." How true his prediction was. He was instrumental in organizing and setting up the first public informational meetings to explain to our citizens what the Corps would be able to do. His first meeting in Castle Rock drew close to 1,000 people, and each person had a question to be answered. A regular schedule of these informational meetings followed and proved to be the best method of communicating with the general public.

When the Resident Engineer finally arrived on the scene in late June, Jerry was assigned a portion of the Cowlitz River from river mile 13 to 16 in the Horseshoe Bend area. There, he worked closely with the property owners, the contractors and the various governmental agencies. After all these months and long hours, no one has ever voiced a harsh word against this quiet, dedicated man.

In every war of our nation's history, we've had a few unrecognized heroes. These are the people who quietly and effectively do their job without media exposure. The battle of the Cowlitz and Toutle Rivers is not completely over, but because of people like Jerry Hadley, we all sleep a little more easily with each passing day.

After 13 continuous months on the job, Jerry Hadley will leave our area on June



14th and with him will go a part of the story of the Mt. St. Helens disaster. His efforts and his dedication to his job will long be remembered by all who had the privilege of knowing him and the opportunity to work with him.

On behalf of the members of the Longview Rotary Club and the citizens of Cowlitz County, we say thank you for a job well done.●

### ARLINGTON, TEX., GETS SYNAGOGUE

#### HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a good and decent act currently being performed in Arlington, Tex. I think that it is fair to say that Arlington has been one of the few cities of its size without a synagogue. This situation has now been remedied by the creation of Congregation Beth Shalom. A dedicated group of people led by Robert Kaplan, president of this new congregation, has firmly established itself in Arlington in just 9 short months.

No community can consider itself progressive and caring unless it is able to meet the needs of all of its people. Congregation Beth Shalom now provides the Jewish population of this growing community with a place both to worship and to offer religious education for their children within their own community.

The difficult path that these determined people have chosen to embark on has elicited kudos from all sections of the community. The sacred High Holy Day period will be observed in Arlington this year with Rabbi David Teutsch leading the congregation in prayer.

Mr. Robert Kaplan and the entire Jewish leadership of Arlington are to be congratulated on their strength and dedication as well as on their commitment to the highest ideals of Judaism.●

### FEDERAL PAY CAPS WASTE TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

#### HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the information of my colleagues the recent "Federal Diary" column of Mike Causey of the Washington Post, which makes the point of how expensive it is for Congress to foolishly cap executive pay in the civil service each year. The General Accounting Office has pointed out that it costs far more to pay pensions to Federal personnel

who retire because of frozen salaries, and to hire new replacements at the frozen salary level, than it would be simply to provide equitable raises to top-level Federal personnel.

The Post column, of Wednesday, July 8, 1981, follows:

#### GAO SEES BIG SAVING IN RAISING TOP PAY

(By Mike Causey)

Advocates of better pay for federal executives are trying to hit congressional tightwads where it counts, telling them government is actually losing money by keeping its top career people on \$50,112.50-per-year diets.

The General Accounting Office says the executive turnover rate is now running above 90 percent. That means that nine of every 10 top career officials retire—some as early as age 55—as soon as they become eligible.

Because of the pay cap (\$50,112.50) on top government salaries, the GAO says that too many executives are retiring too soon. This, it says, puts a drain on taxpayers who help finance retirement benefits and also pay for executive replacements. GAO says the executive turnover rate in the 55-to-59 age group has jumped from 18.3 percent in early 1978 to a level of 94.7 percent last August.

Most of the officials leave as soon as possible, GAO surmises, because their salaries have been frozen and many believe they would be better off getting cost-of-living adjustments as retirees, or taking second careers in the private sector, or both.

(Key Senators are working on a plan to give top executives some kind of pay raise this fall, over and above the 4.8 percent slated for rank-and-file bureaucrats. Federal executives have been denied raises for the last couple of years and are now due a catch-up of 16.8 percent. But opponents of the executive pay raise are planning to renew a no-raise rider on an appropriation bill that would continue to deny nearly 30,000 top federal workers, most of them in metro Washington, any pay raise this year.)

In a letter to Senate and House leaders, the GAO says that the abnormally high retirement rate of executives, coupled with the costs of replacing them, will cost the taxpayers about \$67,000 per executive over the next three years. This is how GAO figures it:

If an executive aged 55 with 30 years service (at the \$50,112.50 level) retires today he would get a pension of about \$92,828 over the next three years. Presumably the government would replace that individual at a three year cost of \$150,338, GAO says.

If Uncle Sam could slow the retirement pace, GAO says, by giving executives the 16.8 percent catch-up raise, many executives would stay on in government. Even at the higher pay rate, the executives' three-year salary of \$175,593—would be cheaper, by \$67,573, than the cost of putting him out to pasture and hiring and paying a replacement.

GAO says raising executive pay to encourage top brass to stay on would "not only prevent the loss of valuable managerial talent" but also—and it uses those magic words—it would be "cost-effective." Many members of Congress tend to salivate anytime they hear the words "cost-effective." If enough of them can be convinced that the government can save money by raising executive pay, the supergraders' salary increase should be assured this year. The key word is if!●

### BILL GREEN PRAISES FILM BOARD

#### HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding community service that the National Board of Review of Motion Pictures has performed since it was founded in 1909.

The National Board of Review was created by a group of American citizens who recognized that motion pictures held the potential to become a new form of expression and an important addition to American culture. At the same time, however, this group of concerned citizens realized that the blossoming motion pictures industry was vulnerable to censorship and violation of its first amendment rights. A large number of communities in the United States at that time had special local boards which could edit or ban a film from its area. The National Board of Review was able to defeat such censorship "through an affirmative policy of publicizing and winning audience support for good films."

Today, the stated objective of the National Board of Review remains the same, "to seek out, recognize, publicize and reward excellence in films." It informs citizens about good movies, while steering them away from the bad ones. In addition, the National Board of Review sponsors programs designed to aid the community in special ways by teaching groups such as the handicapped, the elderly and children to appreciate movies more fully and to learn from viewing them.

I welcome the opportunity to recognize and honor the valuable contributions made by these remarkable public citizens who comprise the National Board of Review, which, in the words of its president, Robert Giroux, "remains the voice of those who want better films without censorship."

I would also like to take this opportunity to alert my distinguished colleagues to the fact that we New Yorkers take particular pride in the steady growth of filmmaking in our city over the course of the past few years. Feature films shot in New York City have nearly tripled from 26 in 1977 to 71 in 1980, while television movies, specials, and pilots have more than tripled from 16 to 50 during this same period, according to figures compiled by the New York City Mayor's Office of Motion Pictures and Television. I am especially proud that "Kramer Versus Kramer," which won an Oscar for best movie, was shot within the boundaries of my own 18th Congressional District.

New York City looks forward to a growing and prosperous partnership with the filmmaking industry.●

## RECONCILIATION

## HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate President Reagan in his efforts to reduce Federal spending, to reform and update the Nation's tax laws, to eliminate unnecessary and burdensome Government regulations and to strengthen the Nation's monetary system.

All these steps are necessary if our Nation is to regain its productive capacities, to create jobs needed to employ the jobless, to reduce inflation—correctly called the cruelest tax of all—and to stabilize the currency.

The first step along the path leading to America's economic recovery was taken in May. On May 7, I voted for the bipartisan package of fiscal year 1982 budget cuts and reconciliation instructions—supported by President Reagan. This package was termed the Gramm-Latta resolution after its two main sponsors.

When I cast my vote for Gramm-Latta, I did so pledging to my constituents that I would continue to support those Federal programs which serve as a lifeline for the elderly and the needy and that I would do all possible to insure that the cuts made by the standing committees of the House—in response to the reconciliation instructions contained in the Gramm-Latta resolution—would be fair, equitable, and balanced among all groups in our society.

The reconciliation process requires standing committees to achieve a certain level of savings in Federal programs. The committees must rewrite entitlement programs, change eligibility standards, and make all other changes in existing law in order to achieve the savings called for.

The reconciliation process is a stern, uncompromising one—one obviously not held in high esteem by committee chairmen—but it is the correct system.

It allows the committee, which has jurisdiction over a particular subject matter or program, to decide which programs must be cut and the amount of such cuts. In the end, Mr. Speaker, I believe the committees themselves are in the best position to determine, in a fair and equitable and balanced manner, the winners and the losers in the budget-cutting procedure.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, the committees went to work, as directed by the Gramm-Latta resolution adopted in May, and after the most difficult of deliberations, achieved budget cuts of approximately \$37 billion.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Had this series of cuts—which were assembled into a package by the House Budget Committee—been adopted by the House, Government spending patterns would have changed more profoundly, according to the Budget Committee chairman, than at any time in the last 50 years.

But, the House rejected the Budget Committee package assembled from the recommendations made by all the standing committees of the House. And, by a narrow vote, it adopted the so-called Gramm-Latta II reconciliation resolution which made even deeper cuts in the Federal budget. More to the point, it made them in the form of a hastily drawn document of approximately 600 pages, not all of which pages were numbered or even in the proper sequence. Furthermore, the bill was produced overnight—literally—and was available to Members only on the very day of the vote.

The House does not, Mr. Speaker, always operate within the strictest observance of its rules and procedures. But, Gramm-Latta II, with all respect to the fact that its general outlines were known to most congressional observers, did not follow even the minimum House standards for legislative draftsmanship and parliamentary procedure.

Under the circumstances—or should I say chaos—which prevailed when Gramm-Latta II hit the floor, I was persuaded that the Budget Committee's package was a preferable alternative.

The Budget Committee version would have cut deeply into Federal spending and made important changes in Federal programs—but it would have done so with heart, with compassion and with sensitivity.

It would have moved the Nation to an era of less inflation, more growth, stable money, and less joblessness—but it would have done so with attention to the special needs of the elderly, the poor, the handicapped, and the children of America.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that Gramm-Latta II, which the President and the White House pushed so hard for, will succeed. I intend to do all I can to see that it works. I want economic conditions for all Americans to improve regardless of who gets credit for the improvement.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must add that, if the President's economic plan fails, the failure must be traceable to the altogether too helter-skelter process by which it was adopted.

There remains a lot we do not know about Gramm-Latta II. Mr. Speaker, what we do not know may not always hurt us. But, this time it just might.●

## SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY

## HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, the current and future solvency of the Social Security Trust Fund is an issue with which we must come to terms. A constituent of mine, Mr. Alfred Wolfson, 310 N. 14th St., Murray, Ky., has proposed a solution to the problem of solvency in the social security system. I would like to share Mr. Wolfson's solution with you now:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HUBBARD: I would like to propose a solution to the problem of the solvency of the Social Security program, one which I have not heard discussed previously.

There must be millions of people presently receiving Social Security benefits who do not need them. I myself am one of these. Though far from being a millionaire, I would willingly give up a portion of my benefits (\$670 per month for my wife and me) if others in my income tax bracket or a higher one would do likewise. Why not reduce the benefits for everybody whose taxable income is more than \$20,000 per year or whatever seems reasonable?

The reduction in the lower brackets could begin at one or two percent and increase gradually at whatever rate is necessary to save the system. Why penalize the poorer people just receiving their first Social Security benefits when there are so many who wouldn't miss the benefits they are receiving?

Very sincerely,  
ALFRED WOLFSON.●

## THE SUGAR DEAL

## HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues Art Buchwald's recent column on the sugar deal which occurred during consideration of the reconciliation bill. I am sure that my colleagues will find it interesting reading.

As one who was working with the administration up until the time of the reconciliation votes to defeat the sugar loan program, I was very surprised by the sudden change in its position. However, one thing which has not changed is the cost of such a program to the Government and to the consumer. I will continue to work for the defeat of this sugar program when it reaches the House floor.

WINNING ONE FOR THE, UH, GIPPER

(By Art Buchwald)

President Reagan is given full credit for his budget-cutting victory in the House. He used the telephone to persuade 29 "boll weevil" democrats to vote for this program,



which gave him just enough of a majority to get all the cuts through without debate.

This was the same tactic Lyndon Johnson used to get his "Great Society" program through. But whereas Lyndon did his by arm-twisting, President Reagan's style was entirely different.

I wasn't listening on the phone when he made the calls, but I heard they went something like this:

"Congressman Lighter, this is Ronnie Reagan. I have a great favor to ask of you."

"Yes, sir, Mr. President."

"I would like you to break from your party and the Democratic leadership, and vote your conscience by passing my budget recommendations without reading them."

"That's pretty tough to do, Mr. President."

"Before you say no, Tom, I would like to tell you a story. When I was playing college football, there was a fellow on the team named George Gipp. We used to call him the Gipper. George had a rare terminal illness and I used to visit him at the hospital every chance I got."

"One day, when it looked as if the end was near, he said to me, 'Ronnie, some day you're going to be president of the United States and you will be up against it. You're going to want to balance the budget, and cut taxes and bring a new prosperity and hope to the American people. It's going to be tough because with the fat and waste, you will have to cut out some meaningful programs that people need and want. And they're going to fight you in the House of Representatives where they will demand an up-and-down vote on each cut.'"

"Are you still with me, Tom?"

"Yes, sir, Mr. President."

"Gipp continued, 'And because they're Democrats, Ronnie they're going to want their own budget-cutting package, which will not do the job, and sabotage your well-thought-out economic package. These free spenders, who don't care what happens to the taxpayers' money, will forget the mandate that you won from the American people to cut out all the social programs that destroy incentive and cause inflation that hurts every man, woman and child in America.'"

"Is there much more to this story, Mr. President?"

"Gipp was having a hard time breathing by then, but he told me, 'The day before the vote, the speaker is going to do some dirty maneuvering to see that all the reforms you worked for will go down the drain. It is then, Ronnie, when you think all is lost, that I want you to do something for me.'"

"Anything, George," I told him. And he said, 'I want you to call up 29 Democratic congressmen, men who would vote their convictions over their party loyalty, and tell them—and tell them, to win this one for the Gipper.' That's the end of my story, Tom."

"Did George Gipp say anything about sugar?"

"I don't think so."

"Well, in Florida we raise a lot of sugar and were interested in farm supports for our crop. The world price of sugar is ridiculous, and unless the federal government steps in and keeps the price above 19½ cents a pound, I'm going to have a lot of unhappy farmers in my district."

"Come to think of it, Tom, the Gipp did mention sugar subsidies. I think his exact last words were, 'Ronnie, I got one more favor to ask of you. Whatever you do, don't ever let imported sugar drive down the domestic price, so our own farmers can't sell theirs at a profit.'"

"He said that?"

"The Gipper loved sugar, Tom, as much as he loved life itself."

"That's a wonderful story, Mr. President. I'm glad you called me up and told it to me. I'm going to go out there tomorrow and win one for sug—I mean for the Gipper."

"Bless you, Tom. By the way, who else has a sugar problem in your state?"

#### TRIBUTE TO JEAN PARADIS

#### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a woman who has dedicated a career to the working men and women of this Nation. At this very time, she is receiving deserved accolades from her coworkers and from those who have benefited so greatly from her many years of dedication. Jean Wertz Paradis will soon retire after 22 years of faithful service with the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

Long before it was popular for women to become recognizable and active in the marketplace, Jean Paradis was the first COPE coordinator hired by any labor council in the Eastern half of the United States. Her jurisdictions were Washington, D.C., Prince George's County, Montgomery County, the 8th and 10th Districts of Virginia. Her skills soon became evident, and she was promoted to be the COPE secretary and council bookkeeper, the positions she retires from on July 31, 1981. During all those years, Jean Paradis has been a most loyal and competent assistant. Her allegiance and devotion to Martin Bond were exceptional and their mutual affection for each other manifested itself into a great working team. The passing of Martin grieved us all, particularly Jean, but she carried on assisting the new executive assistant, Josh Williams, in the same efficient and caring manner.

There is, of course, another side of this extraordinary lady and that is the community-minded Jean Paradis. She is a wife, mother, and something else we can all appreciate, Mr. Speaker, she is Chief Democratic Precinct Judge in my own Prince Georges County, Md. She has been involved in local political circles for many years, and has been elected three times as a delegate to the Democratic State Convention. In 1962, Jean ran on the same reform ticket with my esteemed predecessors Congresswoman Gladys Spellman and Congressman Carlton Sickles. That is the caliber of Jean Paradis' politics. We are proud that her principles are the same as those held by these two highly respected public servants, principles which respect the rights of individuals and recognize the dignity of working people.

Jean and her devoted husband, Larry, now will be able to begin their leisure life together as they have spent their industrious years with one another. Their quiet moments are to be spent in traveling about our country and enjoying, without pressure, the beauty of our Nation. And while I am certain this ideal plan will surely unfold, I am also strongly certain that it will not be long before Jean is called upon by those who need her to serve once more. And knowing, Jean, and the kind of dedicated individual she is, she will answer that call.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of this House will join me in paying tribute to Jean Paradis as she embarks upon retirement, along with our sincere hope that whatever activity she may choose, whatever endeavor she may pursue, her years will be filled with happiness and contentment.●

#### REAUTHORIZATION OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT

#### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with my colleagues the following letter to President Reagan on the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act. I share Governor Byrne's commitment to achieving a clean and healthful environment in New Jersey. New Jersey has made significant progress toward that goal to date, but a strong Federal statutory framework is essential to the State's continued progress.

National standards with fixed attainment dates are necessary. Once the deadlines are eliminated, we will see the removal of the sense of urgency we need to stop polluting the air. Moreover, economic equity can only be achieved by a strong Federal role in standards setting.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Trenton, June 19, 1981.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am increasingly concerned over recent reports that the Administration's recommendations to Congress on the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act may include fundamental and sweeping policy changes in the Act. While I agree that certain provisions of the Clean Air Act and the administration of the Act can be substantially improved, I do not believe that the fundamental precepts of this landmark legislation should be significantly changed. The citizens of this country have consistently voiced their concern over the need for a clean and healthful environment. Time and time again, public opinion surveys have confirmed the commitment to this goal and reaffirmed the public's willingness to pay higher costs to achieve this end.

I also recognize the importance and the need to implement an aggressive program to improve the economic health of our country as well. Lagging productivity, unemployment, and inflation are all problems of major concern to each of us. However, I strongly believe, based on our experience in New Jersey over the last decade, that economic health need not and should not be acquired at the expense of our public health. These common goals—a healthy economy and a healthy environment—can be achieved together.

In 1954, New Jersey became the first state in the nation to adopt comprehensive statewide air pollution control legislation. Since that time, New Jersey and your home state of California have become pioneers and national leaders in the development of sound and effective air quality management programs. Since 1970, we in New Jersey have achieved substantial reductions of virtually all major air pollutants. We have achieved these results in a state which has the highest concentration of population, motor vehicles, and industry in the nation. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the ultimate success of our program is dependent on responsible actions by our sister states. Due to the extensive interaction among state economies and the transport of air pollution across state borders, strong national legislation is absolutely essential.

Retention of the concept of uniform national health based standards for air quality within the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act is crucial. These standards must be set at levels that will truly protect the health of all our citizens. We cannot be satisfied, indeed we cannot afford to protect only the most robust members of our communities. We will not satisfy the public's demand for a healthful environment by redefining "clean air." Furthermore, the responsibility for establishing these standards should not be left to the individual states. This approach was tried once before and abandoned for good reasons. First, health effects do not change among states, and second, air pollution emissions do not respect borders. Even under existing legislation, interstate tensions arise due to widely varying approaches to air pollution control among the states. Requiring each state to establish separate standards can only exacerbate an already difficult situation.

Finally, I firmly believe that national standards will only be meaningful if states are required to attain such standards within fixed time frames. Certain areas of the country with the most severe and pervasive air quality problems will undoubtedly require more time, and should be granted more time, to attain standards; however, the concept of deadlines must be retained. We all know the control of air pollution is not free. It requires significant expenditure of capital, human, and political resources. While these costs are offset by the benefits in terms of reduced human suffering and improved quality of life, the benefits are indirect and difficult to quantify. Only through strong incentives, imposed at the national level, will individual states and localities be able to assemble the necessary resolve to implement acceptable air quality programs.

I have offered these remarks to underscore my commitment to continue to strive for the attainment of clean and healthful air for the citizens of New Jersey. One state cannot act alone, however. Only through strong national legislation can interstate equity be achieved while we protect the

health and welfare of the American public. I hope that we will be able to work together during the upcoming deliberations on these very important issues.

Sincerely,

BRENDAN BYRNE,  
Governor.●

**LOOK FOR CHARACTER, ABILITY, AND ADHERENCE TO THE RULE OF LAW IN JUDGES, NOT POSITIONS ON ISSUES**

**HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the President has made his choice for the Supreme Court vacancy left by the resignation of Potter Stewart. He has done so after an extended search period beginning as early as mid-April. He is satisfied that Mrs. O'Connor meets the standards of judicial temperament, intelligence, and integrity for service on our highest court. He is satisfied that she will do her best to apply the law fairly and equitably.

But Mr. Speaker, there are those who, while not challenging the President's judgment of Mrs. O'Connor's character and ability, attack her for positions on substantive issues taken at other times and in other forums. In so doing, not only do they exhibit ignorance of our Constitution and our history, but they do a decided disservice to our Nation.

Nowhere in the Constitution can there be found a philosophical test for judicial service, except perhaps the insistence that judges take an oath to support the Constitution itself. Nor should there be any other test. The very nature of the responsibilities of a judge—to interpret and apply the law as adopted by legislative bodies representing the people—should preclude the embodying by any judge in his decisions of his personal position as to what the law ought to be.

It is this very test of understanding the proper nature of the judicial position that the President himself made his highest standard in determining Mrs. O'Connor's qualifications, and he has certified that she received the highest of marks with respect to it.

The issue critics of this side or that, Mr. Speaker, have no place in this process and, indeed, depreciate it and themselves with their insistence upon some narrow litmus test. There are things more basic and important than our viewpoints on the issues of the day. One is our adherence, through all issues, to the Constitution and the form of government that we, as a people, have selected for ourselves. Another is the intelligence and honesty of judgment necessary to do equal justice for all. These are legitimate themes of the judicial confirmation

process and the qualities all Americans should look for in determining the best people for our courts. Agreement on issues is not a germane subject of the inquiry, Mr. Speaker, and to the extent that it is made so, the rule of law, our courts, ourselves, and our country are all diminished.●

**ROSE O'BRIEN LUTE**

**HON. VIRGINIA SMITH**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform the Congress of the passing of a Nebraska resident who made many contributions to the educational and cultural life of her native State. Rose O'Brien Lute, who died June 20, 1981, in North Platte, Nebr., was the daughter of Michael and Mary O'Brien and was born on the family ranch in Keith County, Nebr.

She received her early education in a sod schoolhouse and later attended school in Ogallala. She received her high school education at St. Patrick's Academy in Sidney and took her teacher's examinations. Mrs. Lute attended Creighton University, Duschene Academy, Kearney State College, and the University of Nebraska.

Known to her many students as "Miss O'Brien," she began her teaching career in the rural schools of Keith County. From 1927 to 1942 she was an elementary teacher and principal in the North Platte public schools.

On June 15, 1942, she married rancher Robert Lute and they had one son, Robert II.

She was active in the Altar Society, PTA, and other community service organizations. She was a member of the National, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Angus Cow-Belles and served as historian of the Nebraska Cow-Belles.

In recent years, she enjoyed writing and belonged to the Nebraska Chaparral Poets and the Nebraska Writers' Guild, serving as the Guild's Bulletin editor.

Mrs. Lute was appointed to the Nebraska Commission on the Status of Women by Governor Tiemann and was reappointed by Governor Exon. After completion of the maximum term allowed by law, she founded and became the first president of the Priors, Club of Nebraska, the first alumni and support group of a State women's commission in the Nation.

Memorials have been established to the scholarship of the Priors Club of Nebraska and the Nebraska Stock Growers Association Research and Education Foundation.●



MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION  
ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. JOHN B. BREAU

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BREAU. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to improve the operation of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972. This legislation has been developed in close cooperation with representatives of the States, the environmental interests, and other interested parties. While not all of the parties agree with every detail in the draft, I believe it represents a conceptual consensus on the major provisions and our best effort to reach legitimate, workable compromises on the remaining issues. As such, it is intended to serve as a vehicle for the hearings that will be held by the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment on July 13.

The issues that the bill addresses are the incidental take of porpoise in tuna fishing operations and the return of management of marine mammals to the States which have resident populations of marine mammals.

The main issue involving the incidental take of porpoises is that the act states that it shall be the immediate goal of the act that the incidental kill and serious injury of marine mammals in the course of commercial fishing operations be reduced to insignificant levels approaching zero mortality. Some have argued that the tuna industry, which takes porpoises during its fishing operations, must therefore reduce incidental mortality to zero, even though the estimated porpoise mortality has decreased from about 368,000 in 1972 to an estimated 15,303 in 1980. The tuna industry contends this cannot be done. To reduce the threat of law suits, the tuna industry and representatives of the environmental community have agreed to an amendment to modify the zero mortality goal which is included in this legislation.

The amendment retains the act's goal of reducing the incidental taking of marine mammals to insignificant levels approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate but clarifies that goal in the case of the purse seine fishery for yellowfin tuna by providing that the goal shall be satisfied by "a continuation of the application of the best marine mammal safety techniques and equipment that are economically and technologically practicable."

With regard to return of management of marine mammals to the States, a concept included in the current law, State agencies contend that the formal hearings and other procedural steps required under the act for

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

return of management are too cumbersome and that the standards under which they can secure return of management are too restrictive. The result is that no State is now managing marine mammals and the Federal Government lacks the resources to do the job. The effect on the species has in some cases been clearly detrimental.

The legislation I am introducing will simplify the return of management procedure and place the administrative procedures required to allow the harvest of marine mammals at the State level. This will put the management decisions involving resident marine mammals where they should be—at the State level. The concepts involved in this legislation have been accepted by representatives of the State of Alaska, the environmental community, and the Alaska Native federation.

In addition to these major issues, I have tried to address a number of other problems with the act that have become apparent over the years. Some of the changes we have proposed are not without controversy, but I believe that they will improve the management of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this bill is a part of a process which we began in April when we first held hearings on the Marine Mammal Protection Act. To conform to Budget Act deadlines, we reported out a bill authorizing the act for 1 year and made a commitment to work with those concerned with the act to remedy the problems in the act. I stated then that if a satisfactory solution could be reached, we would extend the authorization for a longer period of time. We have accordingly included authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 for the Government agencies having responsibilities under this act.●

## OPTIMIST CLUB OF VIENNA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work of the Optimist Club of Vienna. The club has excelled in the purpose set out by the international organization to "develop optimism as a way of life; to promote an active interest in good government and civic affairs; to inspire respect for the law; to promote patriotism and work for international accord and friendship among all people; and to aid and encourage the development of youth."

As a result of their work, they were awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge on May 21, 1981,

July 9, 1981

in the U.S. Capitol Building. The George Washington Honor Medal recognizes an individual, group, or organization for activities that strengthen our Nation and our understanding of the privileges of citizenship. The foundation is based on a credo of rights and responsibilities, incorporating the freedom principles found in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

The Vienna Chapter of the Optimist Club, which was founded on June 21, 1955, has since been serving the youth of the Vienna community. The club is known for its generosity in providing time and funds for youth related athletic, educational, and deserving community betterment activities. Funds raised from its many events are used to advance its service projects which include generous donations, "Respect for Law" programs, community "Hotlines," and awards recognizing outstanding performances by young persons in the area. Its record of service is well known throughout the area.

The Vienna Optimist Club is one of nine service clubs to receive the prestigious George Washington Honor Medal and should be commended for its fine work.●

BILL GREEN SUPPORTS U.S.  
HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, 56 of my colleagues and I recently sent a letter to President Reagan asking him to nominate an Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Human Affairs as soon as possible. The original sponsors of this petition were Congressmen FISH, HARKIN, JEFFORDS, OTTINGER, and I.

Our action was prompted by reports that the President might abolish the post. His original nominee, Ernest Lefever, withdrew under heavy criticism for, among other things, not considering human rights as a priority in international affairs. It would be a tragic irony if the strong showing of public support for human rights that followed Mr. Lefever's nomination resulted not in a nominee with stronger human rights credentials, but in the elimination of the entire office devoted to incorporating human rights considerations into our foreign policy. Governments around the world must be assured that human rights concerns will remain an integral component of American diplomacy that transcends a particular President or appointee.

To lessen our concern for human rights will be to ignore our national history and traditional commitment to humanity. Civil liberty is a corner-

stone of our democracy and we must not condone through our silence civil liberties abuses that occur elsewhere. If we abandon our commitment to human rights, we abandon our commitment to the causes of peaceful political dissidents such as the "refuseniks" in the Soviet Union and the clergy in El Salvador.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all who joined this show of support for a foreign policy that recognizes the importance of human rights, and also ask that our letter be inserted in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1981.

President RONALD REAGAN,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because of our support for human rights laws and concern for gross violations of human rights around the world, we would like to take this opportunity to encourage you to nominate an Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs as soon as possible.

We believe that strong advocacy and support for human rights, and condemnation of torture, assassination and terrorism wherever they occur are an integral part of U.S. foreign policy. The Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs was established by the Congress to ensure that human rights issues would be given high priority and visibility in the conduct of our foreign relations.

Among other duties, the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs prepares the State Department's Human Rights Report and makes recommendations to the Secretary of State regarding compliance with human rights laws. Because of the sensitivity and importance of these and other duties, the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs must be a credible, effective and even-handed advocate for human rights in every country.

We respectfully urge you to nominate such an advocate to the position of Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs as soon as possible, and in so doing, signal the rest of the world that human rights considerations continue to be an important factor in U.S. relations with all governments.

Sincerely,

Tom Harkin, William Green, Richard Ottinger, James Jeffords, Hamilton Fish,

Thomas Foglietta, Parren Mitchell, Shirley Chisholm, Peter Rodino, Toby Moffett, Benjamin Rosenthal, Matthew McHugh, Thomas Downey, Frederick Richmond, Joe Moakley, Howard Wolpe, Bob Edgar, Mike Barnes, John LaFalce, Sam Gejdenson,

William Ford, Albert Gore, Don Edwards, Barney Frank, Dennis Eckart, George Miller, Austin Murphy, Jim Weaver, Walter Fauntroy, Claude Pepper, Harold Hollenbeck, Mike Lowry, Paul Simon, James Oberstar, John Seiberling, Martin Frost, Dan Glickman, Ed Markey, William Brodhead, Tom Daschle.

Mickey Leland, George Crockett, Ron Dellums, David Bonior, Tony Hall, Julian Dixon, Bob Kastenmeier, Dale Kildee, John Conyers, Gerry Studds,

Bill Gray, Leon Panetta, Doug Walgren, Robert Garcia, Berkley Bedell, William Hughes, Antonio Won Pat. ●

## WITHDRAWAL OF AMENDMENT

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have withdrawn my amendment published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8 to repeal the Vinson-Trammell Act due to an agreement reached today with SAM STRATTON that he will push for repeal of Vinson-Trammell, in conference with the Senate, provided that his language for a standby profit-limitation provision in event of war or national emergency is accepted.

A copy of that language, which I find wholly acceptable although I understand it will be slightly modified to accommodate technical changes, follows:

### MODIFICATION OF DEFENSE CONTRACT PROFIT LIMITATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 911. (a)(1) Section 2382 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2382. Contract profit controls during emergency periods

"(a)(1) Upon a declaration of war by Congress or a declaration of national emergency by the President or by Congress, the President shall transmit to Congress, within sixty days after the declaration of such war or emergency, such regulations to control excessive profits on defense contracts as he determines are necessary during the period of such war or emergency. Such regulations shall be issued only after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Commerce and shall apply to appropriate defense contracts and subcontracts (as determined by the President), and to appropriate major modifications of defense contracts and subcontracts (as determined by the President), that are entered into during such war or emergency.

"(2) Such regulations shall set forth a standard and procedure for determining what constitutes excessive profits and shall establish a threshold for coverage of contracts that will minimize administrative expenses and not impose unfair burdens on small contractors.

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection, excessive profits are profits that, taking into consideration all the circumstances (including the risk of the contractor or subcontractor, the complexity of the contract, and the amount of investment required), are unreasonable or that result in the unjust enrichment of the contractor or subcontractor.

"(b) Regulations transmitted by the President under subsection (a) shall take effect only if neither House of Congress, within thirty days after the date upon which the President transmits the regulations, adopts a resolution stating in substance that it disapproves the regulations.

"(c) Regulations not disapproved by either House of the Congress shall remain in effect for a period of not more than five years after the date on which they take effect unless they are extended by a resolution

passed by both Houses of the Congress before the date on which they would expire. Any such extension may not be for a period in excess of one year.

"(d) The United States Court of Claims shall have exclusive jurisdiction over claims arising from actions taken under this section and under regulations prescribed under this section.

"(e) The President shall transmit a report to Congress on the operation of this section at the end of each one-year period during which regulations issued under this section are in effect and at the end of any war or emergency during which such regulations are in effect."

(2) The item relating to section 2382 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"2382. Contract profit controls during emergency periods."

(b)(1) Section 7300 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 633 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 7300. ●

## IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN ARMED FORCES AND DEFENSE INDUSTRY STRESSED

HON. JOHN HILER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, Gerald C. Meyers, chairman of American Motors Corp., addressed the U.S. Army TACOM Military Vehicle Manufacturing Technology Conference. Mr. Meyers' words reaffirm the commitment of the defense industry to work with the administration and the Congress to build a strong defense posture. I wish to share his comments with my colleagues:

REMARKS BY GERALD C. MEYERS, U.S. ARMY TACOM MILITARY VEHICLE MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY CONFERENCE, JUNE 30, 1981

Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here. Since the last conference of this kind as held here in 1978, historic changes have taken place.

One landmark event, of course, was the election of last November. The American people gave their overwhelming approval to a man who spoke repeatedly of the urgent need to strengthen our Armed Forces.

The election of President Reagan signaled a sharp turn in the nation's defense posture. We have left behind, I hope forever, the dangerous illusion that somehow this nation could allow its armed forces to deteriorate while those of our most likely enemies grew stronger at an alarming rate.

Now we have entered an age of realism, an age in which we finally seem to recognize that to be unprepared for war is to invite it.

The Reagan Administration has declared its commitment to rebuild our defense to a level unmatched by any nation.

That urgency was underscored by Secretary of Defense Weinberger in a recent interview with the New York Times.



"We must move very rapidly," he said, "to be ready with what we have, and to bring onto line additional strength right away."

The commitment to a strong defense is equalled by its determination to rebuild our industrial base. This double commitment is new and important. We simply cannot have a strong defense unless our defense industry is strong and vigorous.

AM General, a subsidiary of American Motors Corporation, is the world's largest producer of tactical wheeled vehicles. We are the primary manufacturer of such vehicles for the U.S. Armed Service and other friendly nations. We're very pleased to be awarded the contract to provide the U.S. Army with 11,000 newly designed 5-ton tactical trucks.

Our experience as a supplier of trucks to the U.S. Army dates back to 1940, when we began producing the world-famous Jeep. Since then, we've combined our experience as a mass producer of automobiles with our military design know-how to produce a wide array of tactical wheeled vehicles for military forces throughout the world.

We're proud of our record and we want to play a major role in the design and manufacture of new and better vehicles for the military.

We are an international company also. We are not limited to the technology of North America, nor are we bound to think of military vehicles in the traditional sense.

As an example, earlier this month we unveiled in Washington a new light armored vehicle called the "Gator." This vehicle was derived from a combat-proven "forward area armored vehicle" manufactured by Renault.

The Gator is an example of our technological capability. Our manufacturing capabilities are already well known to all of you.

This is a critical time for our Armed Forces and the industry which supplies them.

With the election of President Reagan, the American people have voiced their strong approval of a first-rate national defense.

The cost of buildup will be very high—an estimated \$1.3 to \$1.5 trillion dollars over the next five to seven years.

But as Secretary Weinberger also said, "the money must be found not only to deter Soviet aggression but to defeat it if it comes. We can't build weapons less accurate or less lethal than theirs."

Americans are willing to bear the cost, but they expect the new Armed Forces to be equipped with weapons and vehicles of the highest quality. They are willing to do battle in the nation's defense, but they want our troops to fight with the best equipment.

To do this, we need the closest possible communication between the Armed Forces and the industry. This is why conferences of this kind are essential to the goal of a national defense second to none.

Again, I am pleased to be here. I wish you every success as we work to preserve the nation's freedom.

Thank you.●

#### DOL REPORT IGNORES REALITY

**HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the administration has reassured critics of

its decision to eliminate the public sector employment program of CETA that those newly unemployed workers would be picked up by the private sector. A recent Labor Department study is cheerfully upbeat in the success of its reemployment effort; too cheerful, I feel, if the facts are carefully scrutinized.

#### DOL REPORT ON PSE CUTS

On June 30, the Department of Labor released an interim report on the reemployment of CETA participants who had lost their jobs as a result of the Administration's elimination of funding for public service employment.

The report cites the achievements of the "Reemployment Effort" implemented by the Department of Labor to place the 131,220 individuals who had been terminated through May 31, 1981. (Approximately 175,000 more PSE participants will lose their jobs by September 30, 1981.) The DOL report gave a cheery assessment of the status of those individuals who had been terminated to date: approximately 64 percent, according to DOL, had been placed either in unsubsidized employment or in training.

While it is most gratifying to learn that many PSE participants have moved smoothly to unsubsidized employment or to training, it would be entirely misleading to assume that substantial hardship will not result from the Administration's abrupt termination of CETA jobs and that the private sector will pick up hundreds of thousands of low skilled workers.

The staff of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities has analyzed the Department of Labor's interim report and has contacted a sample of CETA prime sponsors to determine the impact of the PSE cuts in those communities.

The Subcommittee found that the placement rates reported by the Department of Labor are less, in spite of the massive effort by prime sponsors, than the rates experienced under the PSE program in the past—rates which this Administration has criticized roundly and which formed the basis for eliminating the PSE program. According to the Department of Labor's Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey findings released in May 1981, 56 percent of past PSE participants were employed at termination and 60 percent were employed 3 months after termination. The findings of the CLMS survey compare with a total placement rate of 43.8 percent in the current "Reemployment Effort". This comparison is not meant as a criticism of the efforts of prime sponsors who have conducted massive jobs campaigns to place the laid-off CETA workers. The reduced placement rates more likely reflect the declining job market, the precipitous rate of CETA job terminations, and the fact that prime sponsors are themselves losing staff to assist in the placement efforts as a result of program cuts.

Only 18 percent of the current PSE workers have been placed in private sector jobs in spite of the Department's assertion that "the jobs are there". The disappointingly low rate of employment in private unsubsidized employment clearly indicates that the private sector cannot be expected to assume the responsibility for training and hiring the hard-core unemployed when Federal funds are drastically cut back.

According to DOL, approximately 33,400 terminees (25 percent) were placed in public employment. These jobs, however, may

prove to be fleeting opportunities as more and more local government agencies reduce staff as a result of reductions in public funding for other programs and services.

The Department of Labor reports that 20,721 persons, or 15.8 percent of the CETA terminees, were transferred to other CETA training programs. This finding raises serious concerns: (1) Many of these training slots will be eliminated when the 1982 budget reductions for CETA training are implemented. The Gramm/Latta Budget Reconciliation Bill which passed the House on June 26 would cut funds for CETA training 27 percent from 1981 levels. (2) Even without the pending reductions in training, the transfer of laid-off PSE workers to other CETA programs will simply mean that other potential trainees, also economically disadvantaged and equally in need of employment and training services, will be denied such services. The priority given to placing PSE workers raises a vexing public policy dilemma: should those individuals who have already received some publicly financed assistance through their PSE positions be given blanket priority over those for whom no services have been made available?

Finally, the DOL data are misleading because the "positive termination" figures do not include approximately 43,000 persons who have lost their PSE jobs, but who have been kept on the CETA rolls in order to obtain job counseling or placement assistance. If these terminees are included in the placement calculations, the positive termination record is diminished from 64.6 percent to 48 percent and the job placement rate would be reduced from 43.8 percent to 33 percent.

The Subcommittee staff contacted a number of prime sponsors to determine how their placement rates compared with the DOL national data. Our survey indicates that many communities are experiencing great difficulty in finding jobs or training positions for the PSE terminees:

Los Angeles laid off 4,500 CETA workers as of June 30; 10 percent have been placed in public agencies, 8 percent have been placed in private sector jobs and 40 percent have gone on unemployment.

In Dade County, Florida, 1,290 PSE participants have lost their jobs. Only 1 percent have been placed in private sector jobs, and 37 percent have been hired by the county.

In Philadelphia, 3,200 PSE workers were laid off as of July 7; 35 percent found employment in public agencies while only 151, or less than 5 percent were placed in private sector jobs.

New York City laid off 6,900 PSE participants as of June 30. Of these, 38 percent have been placed in public agencies and only a small number of participants are expected to find jobs in the private sector.

Baltimore laid off 2,833 CETA workers as of the end of June; 28 percent have found unsubsidized employment including only 306 private sector jobs.

These statistics do not support DOL's encouraging account of the Reagan Administration's phaseout of public service employment. Nor do they offer hope that the 175,000 remaining PSE workers will fare any better. On the contrary, the remaining CETA workers will face even tighter job markets as public agencies cut back staff and services to meet budget cuts taking effect in October.

The Reagan Administration has eliminated the only program providing jobs for the

hard-core unemployed and has offered in its place the hope that the private sector can take up the slack. That faith is slim comfort for hundreds of thousands of PSE workers who are now unemployed.●

## WILDERNESS AND THE REAL WORLD

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior James Watt has been unfairly labeled by the eastern press and the extremists within the environmental movement as an antienvironmentalist since assuming his position within the Reagan administration. The people of Alaska, on the other hand, have overwhelmingly endorsed Secretary Watt as a man with a balanced approach toward the lands he oversees and the people who are affected by his decisions. In the past administration, policies guided by extreme environmentalists threatened to exclude man from being a part of the environment, and at the same time, disregarded the concept of "management" of lands, fish, and wildlife. If we do not manage what we have, we sentence the wildlife and fish populations to starvation and overburdening of the lands, and we sentence our forests to the ravages of natural disaster and overgrowth which eventually destroy the integrity of those forests.

Secretary Watt has proven himself to be a man of vision, who understands the proper management of our vast natural resource holdings, and is willing, despite the protests of those who willingly follow the self-serving statements of the Sierra Club, to use his office to properly manage the public lands for its natural beauty as well as for the people who care to enjoy such beauty with their families, in accessible and well-managed parks. These people's disregard for good management is evidenced by the way in which they raise a hue and cry when he talks about taking care of what parks we already have, instead of using our limited dollars to accumulate vast amounts of new lands at the expense of our rundown parks.

Despite the bad press I have mentioned, I believe that things will change for Secretary Watt. I believe that those who feel that man has no place in the environment will soon be drowned out by those who will come to recognize that Secretary Watt is a reasonable man who seeks only to make sure that we take care of what we have, while following a cautious policy of legal development of those resources so critical to our industrial economy. I believe that the tide will turn—indeed, that it is beginning to

turn. In the July 8, 1981, edition of the Washington Star, an article appeared which I believe my colleagues would do well to read, in the face of all the negative rhetoric generated by those groups who have seized upon Secretary Watt as a means to fatten their membership dues coffers. Written by Alan Fitzsimmons, associate professor of geography and chairman of the environmental studies program at George Washington University, it is a level-headed look at what our public land policy laws suggest in light of the hoopla surrounding Secretary Watt's actions. Such a fine article by such a distinguished academician within the field of environmental studies is encouraging for those of us who support and cheer the policies of Secretary Watt.

### WILDERNESS AND THE REAL WORLD

(By Allan Fitzsimmons)

I recently received a letter from the Sierra Club advocating the replacement of Secretary of the Interior James Watt. Accompanying the letter was a petition to the Congress and a listing of the objectionable positions taken of Mr. Watt. Heading the list was his intent to allow oil and gas exploration in wilderness and wildlife refuge areas.

Wilderness advocates are motivated by the pursuit of an ideal relationship between man and nature. In a perfect world, mankind would have no impact on the natural environment. For many activists, the ideal is irrevocably intertwined with spiritual and religious values. Mankind is viewed as a despoiler of nature—we are profane while nature is profound. The ideal and its sacredness provide a core of beliefs around which many rally and organize.

### AVOIDING HUMAN INTRUSION

The Wilderness Act in 1964 enabled statutory protection to be given to lands demonstrating little human impact. Such lands are the embodiment of the ideal. For the wilderness advocates they have become sacred space and in need of protection from those who would vandalize them. In this case the vandals are those who would explore for minerals, cut timber, or build roads and summer cottages. Each of these activities affects the environment and so is a retreat from the ideal.

The establishment of the National Wilderness Preservation System allowed some of the advocates' energies to be turned to the pursuit of the ideal on other fronts. In recent years they have become involved in onshore and offshore petroleum and natural gas decisions; surface mining procedures; national forest management activities, and many others. Their purpose always has been to try to move policies and actions toward fulfillment of their goal of trying to minimize human impact on the environment.

Whereas movement in this general direction has attracted widespread support, there is, on the other hand, concern about how much movement is prudent—about the costs and benefits involved in the resource use-environmental protection tradeoffs inherent in the wilderness advocates' positions.

The assessment of the wide variety of costs and benefits associated with particular policy decisions is a major difficulty in the current natural resource debate. Many of the costs and benefits are intangible and defy even crude quantification, whereas

others can be estimated with more precision.

Many of the intangibles are closely associated with the beliefs and values of the wilderness advocates. They have succeeded in turning the vagueness surrounding the benefits of their espoused positions to their advantage. While using the more quantifiable benefits of their policy opponents against those same opponents.

### ONLY 6 MONTHS' SUPPLY

For example: From the advocates' perspective, it is relatively easy to construct an argument around the need to protect a wilderness from petroleum exploration. They cite the spiritual benefits of an untouched area, stressing such secular benefits as gene-pool preserves, maintenance of living laboratories, and the provision of certain recreational opportunities. At the same time they point out that the upper limit of potentially recoverable petroleum is, say, only a six-month supply for the United States. They then argue that the benefits of such a limited supply are not worth the irrevocable costs associated with introducing human activity of this kind into a sacred (wilderness) area. This line of argumentation has been extended to nonwilderness areas, as witnessed by the current northern California offshore leasing controversy.

The costs of such arguments can be high. In the case of petroleum there is widespread agreement that most new and future domestic discoveries can be characterized in terms of so many weeks' or month's worth of our total petroleum requirement. Furthermore, most such discoveries will occur in or near areas that wilderness advocates deem worthy of special protection. Should the don't-develop-it-because-it's-only-a-few-weeks-worth-of-petroleum argument prevail, the Nation's petroleum producing future could be significantly altered.

It must be determined if the benefits of the purists' positions are real or illusory, and, if real, what is the least overall societal cost path to obtain them. For example, is statutory wilderness really necessary for society to gain such secular benefits as gene-pool preservation and living laboratories, as the wilderness advocates insist? Or can they also accrue in carefully managed multipurpose lands, without incurring the costs of foregone mineral production associated with statutory wilderness areas? Are the spiritual benefits of wilderness real? If so, for whom, and can they also be obtained in the national parks or national forests?

This is not to suggest that the benefits which the wilderness advocates attach to their policy positions are without merit or that they should be dismissed offhand. It is to suggest that perhaps policies other than those of the wilderness advocates can secure for the country many of the benefits of their positions without some of the attendant costs. It is to suggest that perhaps a better balance can be struck between use and preservation.

I will not be signing the Sierra Club petition.●



# ACCIDENT OR INCIDENT: THE NEED TO INVESTIGATE A MYST- ERIOUS DEATH IN TAIWAN

## HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the story of Dr. Chen Wen-cheng, an assistant professor in the Department of Statistics at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh. A Taiwanese living as a permanent resident here in the United States, Dr. Chen, returned to Taipei with his wife and his 1-year-old son for a 6-week vacation upon conclusion of the spring semester this year. The family planned to return to the United States this week so that Dr. Chen could pursue a research project at Carnegie-Mellon, but it will not be coming back. Dr. Chen was found dead last Friday morning on the campus of National Taiwan University in Taipei.

The Taiwan Government has stated that preliminary evidence indicates that Dr. Chen might have taken his own life, but murky circumstances surrounding his death make this conclusion highly doubtful.

Dr. Chen had a reputation as a competent, devoted, and popular teacher, highly regarded by colleagues and students alike. Shortly before he left the United States for his visit to Taiwan he was notified of his reappointment for a second 3-year term as assistant professor at Carnegie-Mellon. A faculty colleague told my office that Dr. Chen was "extremely pleased" with his reappointment and that he was a "stable teacher who never showed any of the personality traits that even under the worst of circumstances would lead to the taking of his own life." He was apparently a very determined, dedicated young man who loved life.

Certain facts about Dr. Chen's death have been established. He was called in for a 13-hour interrogation at the Taiwan Garrison Command on the day of his death. After conclusion of what must have been a very traumatic confrontation with security forces who arbitrarily detained him under the authority of the martial law that has been maintained for 32 years on the island, Chen was reportedly taken to his father-in-law's home, where he and his family were staying, at about 9:30 p.m., and was seen there by some as yet unidentified witnesses. According to one report from Taipei, he then went to the home of a good friend, in whom he confided that he feared he was going to be put in prison for what the Taiwan Garrison Command called anti-Government activities here in the United States. He is said to have asked his friend to take care of his family in

the event of his arrest. This declaration is in stark contrast to Government reports that the interrogation at the Taiwan Garrison Command was conducted in a friendly and cordial atmosphere.

Dr. Chen's friend reportedly later observed that Dr. Chen did not say anything or behave in any manner which would indicate that he was contemplating suicide.

The rest of the story is even less clear. Coroners' reports so far show only that Dr. Chen died of injuries sustained in a fall from the fourth-story fire escape or balcony under which he was found dead the next morning. Whether he jumped, fell, or was pushed—or was dead before the fall—is not known. That Dr. Chen would go to the deserted campus in the middle of the night in the first place has struck close observers as odd.

Many more questions about this case remain and I have indicated to Dr. Tsai Wei-ping, director of the Washington office of the Coordination Council for North American Affairs, my concern that this tragic incident be thoroughly investigated and that the results of the investigation be made public as soon as possible.

Hopefully, the investigation will yield better results than another about which many Americans concerned for the future of Taiwan remain deeply alarmed. Just 16 months ago, the mother and twin daughters of Taiwan legislator Lin Yih-siung were massacred in their home while Lin was under detention by martial law authorities who accused him of seditious activity related to the December 1979 Kaohsiung incident. Many questions about the murders of the family of one of Taiwan's most respected young legislators, whom I have been privileged to come to know personally, remain unanswered to this day, but it would appear that the investigation has been abandoned.

In the case of Dr. Chen, there is a need to know not only who might have played a role in his death and why, but also a need to probe other aspects of the Taiwan Government's treatment of its critics. How extensive is the Taiwan Government's network of informants here in the United States? Does the Government keep files on every person who participates in anti-Government groups or demonstrations? Why would the Taiwan Garrison Command consider Dr. Chen, whose views were clear but whose activism was limited, a dangerous influence in our country? How many Taiwanese faculty and students, in American universities are afraid to return to their homeland, lest they be subjected to interrogation at the Taiwan Garrison Command? Will their activities in America be limited by fear of later reprisal?

Most of all, why does the Taiwanese Government feel compelled to maintain martial law with rights of arbitrary arrest and detention when few on the island continue to believe in the possibility of military reconquest of the mainland? Is it not time for the Government to consider widening democratic participation on the island to give a fairer political voice to the native Taiwanese, who by at least a 6-to-1 margin outnumber the Chinese who fled the mainland in the late 1940's?

The answers to these questions may provide the only reasonable basis for understanding Dr. Chen's death and the predicament of other Taiwanese living and working here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Chen Wen-cheng was a permanent resident of the United States whose son is an American citizen. The United States has an important interest in this unfortunate case not only because of our obligations to the Chen family but more importantly because of the implications of the governmental policies in Taiwan that may have caused or contributed to Dr. Chen's death.●

## ANDREI SAKHAROV ON THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF SCIENTISTS

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

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1981

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, at a time of escalating global tensions and a dramatic increase in the nuclear arms race, it seems rare to hear a voice of calm reason. One such voice, which is all the more unique because it belongs to the father of the Soviet hydrogen bomb and a recipient of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize, is that of Dr. Andrei Sakharov.

Andrei Sakharov, who lives under house arrest in Gorky, has under great duress continued to write and speak out on human rights and the responsibilities of educated citizens. As a scientist, Dr. Sakharov has especially addressed his colleagues in the global scientific community on their responsibilities. In reading his words, I find that people in every land could benefit from them, and urge my colleagues to review the following essay:

[From Physics Today, June 1981]

#### THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF SCIENTISTS

(By Andrei Sakharov)

Because of the international nature of our profession, scientists form the one real worldwide community which exists today. There is no doubt about this with respect to the substance of science: Schrodinger's equation and the formula  $E=mc^2$  are equally valid on all continents. But the integra-

tion of the scientific community has inevitably progressed beyond narrow professional interests and now embraces a broad range of universal issues, including ethical questions. And I believe this trend should and will continue.

Scientists, engineers and other specialists derive from their professional knowledge and the advantages of their occupations a broad and deep understanding of the potential benefits—but also the risks—entailed in the application of science and technology. They also develop an awareness of the positive and negative tendencies of progress generally, and its possible consequences.

Colossal opportunities exist for the application of recent advances in physics, chemistry and biochemistry; technology and engineering; computer science; medicine and genetics; physiology and hygiene; microbiology (including industrial microbiology); industrial and agricultural management techniques; psychology; and other exact and social sciences. And we can anticipate more achievements to come. We all share the responsibility to work for the full realization of the results of scientific research in a world where most people's lives have become more difficult, where so many are threatened by hunger, premature illness and untimely death.

But scientists and scholars cannot fail to think about the dangers stemming from uncontrolled progress, from unregulated industrial development and especially from military applications of scientific achievements. There has been public discussion of topics related to scientific progress: nuclear power; the population explosion; genetic engineering; regulation of industry to protect the environment; protection of air quality, of flora and fauna, and of rivers lakes, seas and oceans; the impact of mass media. Unfortunately, despite the urgent and serious nature of the issues at stake, such discussions are often uninformed, prejudiced or politicized, and sometimes simply dishonest. Experts, therefore, are under an obligation to subject these problems to unbiased and searching examination, making all socially significant information available to the public in direct, first-hand form, and not just in filtered versions. The discussion of nuclear power, a subject of prime importance, is an instructive example. I have expressed elsewhere my opinion that the dangers of nuclear power have been exaggerated in the West, and that such distortion is harmful.

With some important exceptions (primarily affecting totalitarian countries), scientists are not only better informed than the average person, but also strive for and enjoy more independence and freedom. Freedom, however, always entails responsibility. Scientists and other experts already influence or have the capacity to influence public opinion and their governments. (That influence should not be exaggerated, but it is substantial.) My view of the situation of scientists in the contemporary world has convinced me that they have special professional and social responsibilities. It is often difficult to separate one from the other—the communication of information, the popularization of scientific knowledge, and the publication of endorsements or warnings are examples of activities with both professional and social aspects.

Similar complications arise when scientists become involved in questions of disarmament: in developing strategy for or participating in international negotiations; in advancing proposals or issuing appeals to

governments or to the public; and in alerting them to dangers. Disarmament is a separate, critically important issue which requires a profound, thorough and scientifically daring approach. I realize that a more detailed treatment is needed, but now I will simply outline a few ideas. I consider disarmament necessary and possible only on the basis of strategic parity. Additional agreements covering all kinds of weapons of mass destruction are needed. After strategic parity in conventional arms has been achieved, a parity which takes account of all the political, psychological and geographical factors involved, and if totalitarian expansion is brought to an end, then agreements should be reached prohibiting the first use of nuclear weapons, and later, banning such weapons.

Another subject closely connected to questions of peace, trust and understanding among countries is the international defense of human rights. Freedom of opinion, freedom to exchange information and freedom of movement are necessary for true accountability of the authorities which in turn prevents abuses of power in domestic and international matters. I believe that such accountability would make impossible tragic mistakes such as the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and would inhibit manifestations of an expansionist foreign policy and acts of internal repression.

The unrestricted sale of newspapers, magazines and books published abroad would be a major step toward effective freedom of information in totalitarian countries. Perhaps even more significant would be the abolition of censorship, which should concern first of all the scientists and intelligentsia of totalitarian countries. It is important to demand a halt to the jamming of foreign broadcasts that deprives millions of access to the uncensored information needed to form an independent judgment of events. (Jamming was resumed in the USSR in August 1980 after a seven year interval.)

I am convinced that support of Amnesty International's call for a general, worldwide amnesty for prisoners of conscience is of special importance. The political amnesties proclaimed by a number of countries in recent years have helped to improve the atmosphere. An amnesty for prisoners of conscience in the USSR, in Eastern Europe, and in all other countries where political prisoners or prisoners of conscience are detained would not only be of major humanitarian significance but could also enhance international confidence and security.

The worldwide character of the scientific community assumes particular importance when dealing with such problems. By its international defense of persecuted scientists and of all persons whose rights have been violated, the scientific community confirms its international mandate, which is so essential for successful scientific work and for service to society.

Western scientists are familiar with the names of many Soviet colleagues who have been subjected to unlawful repressions. (I shall confine my discussion to the Soviet Union since I am better informed about it, but serious human rights violations occur in other countries including Eastern European countries.) The individuals I mention have neither advocated nor used violence since they consider publicity the only acceptable, effective and non-pernicious way of defending human rights. Thus, they are all prisoners of conscience as defined by Amnesty International. Their stories have much else in common. Their trials were conducted in

flagrant violation of statutory procedures and in defiance of elementary common sense. My friend Sergei Kovalev was convicted in 1975 in the absence of the defendant and counsel, that is, with no possibility whatsoever for a defense. He was sentenced to seven years labor camp and three years internal exile for anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda allegedly contained in the samizdat news magazine, *A Chronicle of Current Events*, but there was no examination of the substance of the charge.

Comparable breaches of law marked the trials of Yuri Orlov, the founder of the Moscow Helsinki Group, and of other members of the Helsinki Groups and associated committees: Victor Nekipelov, Leonard Ter-novsky, Mykola Rudenko, Alexander Podrabinek (and his brother Kirill), Gleb Yakunin, Vladimir Slepak, Malva Landa, Robert Nazarian, Eduard Arutyunian Vyacheslav Bakhim, Oles Berdnik, Oksana Meshko, Mykola Matusevich and his wife, and Miroslav Marinovich. Tatiana Osipova, Irina Grivnina and Felix Serebrov have been imprisoned pending trial. (On 2 April, Osipova was sentenced to five years labor camp and five years internal exile.) Yuri Olov's lawyer missed part of the trial proceedings when he was locked up forcibly in chambers adjoining the courtroom. Orlov's wife was frisked in a crude way and her clothing ripped during a search for written notes or a tape recorder, all from fear that the court's grotesque secrets might be revealed.

In the labor camps, prisoners of conscience suffer cruel treatment: arbitrary confinement in punishment cells, torture by cold and hunger, infrequent family visits subject to capricious cancellation, and similar restrictions on correspondence.

The political prisoners share all the rigors of the Soviet penal regimen for common criminals while suffering the added strain of pressure to "embark on the path of reform," that is, to renounce their beliefs. I would like to remind you that not once has any international organization, such as the Red Cross or a lawyer's association, been able to visit Soviet labor camps.

Political prisoners are often rearrested, and monstrous sentences imposed. Ornithologist Mart Nikluis, poet Vasily Stus, physics teacher Oleksii Tikhy, lawyer Levko Lukyanenko, philologist Viktoras Petkus and Balyas Gajauskas have all received sentences of ten years labor camp and five years internal exile as recidivists. A new trial is expected for Paruir Airikian, who is still in labor camp. Within the last few days I have been shocked by the fifth (!) arrest of my friend Anatoly Marchenko, a worker and author of two talented and important books: *My Testimony* and *From Tarusa to Siberia*. Imprisoned religious believers include Rostislav Galetsky, Bishop Nikolai Goretol, Alexander Ogorodnikov, and Boris Perchatkin. Imprisoned workers include Yuri Grimm and Mikhail Kubobaka. Alexei Murzhenko and Yuri Fedorov are still imprisoned. I shall name only a few scientists deprived of their freedom; many others could be added to the list: Anatoly Shcharansky, the young computer scientist now famous around the world; mathematicians Tatiana Velikanova, Alexander Lavut, Alexander Bolonkin and Vazif Meilanov; computer scientist Victor Brailovsky; economist Ida Nudel; engineers Reshat Dzhemilev and Antanas Terleckas; physicists Rolan Kadiyev, Iosif Zisels and Iosif Dyadkin; chemists Valery Abramkin and Yuri Kukuk; philologists Igor Ogurtsov and Mustafa



Dzhemilev; and Vladimir Balakhonov. (I have only recently received word of the tragic death of Yuri Kukuk in a labor camp.)

A common violation of human rights, and one which especially affects scientists, is denial of permission to emigrate. The names of many "refuseniks" are known to the West.

I was banished without a trial to Gorky more than a year ago and placed under a regimen of almost total isolation. A few days ago the KGB stole my manuscripts and notebooks which contained extracts from scientific books and journals. This is a new attempt to deprive me of any opportunity for intellectual activity, even in my solitude, and to rob me of my memory. For more than three years Elizaveta Alexeyeva, my son's fiancée, has been arbitrarily prevented from leaving the Soviet Union. I have mentioned my own situation because of the absence of any legal basis for the actions taken and because the detention of Elizaveta is undisguised blackmail directed against me. She is a hostage of the state.

I appeal to scientists everywhere to defend those who have been repressed. I believe that to protect innocent persons it is permissible and, in many cases, necessary to adopt extraordinary measures such as an interruption of scientific contacts or other types of boycotts. I urge the use, as well, of all the possibilities of publicity and of diplomacy. In addressing the Soviet leaders, it is important to take into account that they do not know about—and probably do not want to know about—most letters and appeals directed to them. Therefore, personal interventions by Western officials who meet with their Soviet counterparts have particular significance. Western scientists should use their influence to press for such interventions.

I hope that carefully thought out and organized actions in defense of victims of repression will ease their lot and add strength, authority and energy to the international scientific community.

I have titled this letter "The Responsibility of Scientists." Tatiana Velikanova, Yuri Orlov, Sergei Kovalev and many others have decided this question for themselves by taking the path of active, self-sacrificing struggle for a human rights and for an open society. Their sacrifices are enormous, but they are not in vain. These individuals are improving the ethical image of our world.

Many of their colleagues who live in totalitarian countries but who have not found within themselves the strength for such struggle, do try to fulfill honestly their professional responsibilities. It is, in fact, essential to work at one's profession. But has not the time come for those scientists, who often exhibit their perception and nonconformity when with close friends, to demonstrate their sense of responsibility in some fashion which has more social significance, and to take a more public stand, at least on issues such as the defense of their persecuted colleagues and control over the faithful execution of domestic laws and the performance of international obligations. Every true scientist should undoubtedly muster sufficient courage and integrity to resist the temptation and the habit of conformity. Unfortunately, we are familiar with too many counter-examples in the Soviet Union, sometimes using the excuse of protecting one's laboratory or institute (usually just a pretext), sometimes for the sake of one's career, sometimes for the sake of foreign travel (a major lure in a closed country such as ours). And was it not shameful for Yuri

Orlov's colleagues to expel him secretly from the Armenian Academy of Sciences while other colleagues in the USSR Academy of Sciences shut their eyes to the expulsion and also to his physical condition? (He is close to death.) Many active and passive accomplices in such affairs may themselves someday attract the growing appetite of Moloch. Nothing good can come of this. Better to avert it.

Western scientists face no threat of prison or labor camp for public stands; they cannot be bribed by an offer of foreign travel to forsake such activity. But this in no way diminishes their responsibility. Some Western intellectuals warn against social involvement as a form of politics. But I am not speaking about a struggle for power. This is not politics. It is a struggle to preserve peace and those ethical values which have been developed as our civilization evolved. By their example and by their fate, prisoners of conscience affirm that the defense of justice, the international defense of individual victims of violence, the defense of mankind's lasting interests are the responsibility of every scientist.

#### AN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

I was born on 21 May 1921, in Moscow. My father was a well-known physics teacher and the author of textbooks and popular science books. My childhood was spent in a large communal apartment where most rooms were occupied by our relatives with only a few outsiders mixed in. Our home preserved the traditional atmosphere of a numerous and close family—respect for hard work and ability, mutual aid, love for literature and science. My father played the piano well; his favorites were Chopin, Grieg, Beethoven and Scriabin. During the Civil War he earned a living by playing the piano in a silent movie theatre. I recall with particular fondness Maria Petrovna, my grandmother and the soul of our family, who died before World War II at the age of 79. Family influences were especially strong in my case because I received my early schooling at home and then had difficulty relating to my own age group.

After graduating from high school with honors in 1938, I enrolled in the Physics Department of Moscow University. When war began, our classes were evacuated to Ashkhabad, where I graduated with honors in 1942. That summer I was assigned work for several weeks in Kovrov, and then I was employed on a logging operation in a remote settlement near Melekes. My first vivid impression of the life of workers and peasants dates from that difficult summer of 1942. In September I was sent to a large arms factory on the Volga, where I worked as an engineer until 1945.

I developed several inventions to improve inspection procedures at that factory. (In my university years I did not manage to engage in original scientific work.) While still at the factory in 1944, I wrote several articles on theoretical physics which I sent to Moscow for review. Those first articles have never been published, but they gave me the confidence in my powers which is essential for a scientist.

In 1945 I became a graduate student at the Lebedev Institute of Physics. My advisor, the outstanding theoretical physicist, Igor Tamm, who later became a member of the Academy of Sciences and a Nobel laureate, greatly influenced my career. In 1948 I was included in Tamm's research group which developed a thermonuclear weapon. I spent the next twenty years continuously working in conditions of extraordinary ten-

sion and secrecy, at first in Moscow and then in a special research center. We were all convinced of the vital importance of our work for establishing a worldwide military equilibrium, and we were attracted by its scope.

In 1950 I collaborated with Igor Tamm in some of the first research on controlled thermonuclear reactions. We proposed principles for the magnetic thermal isolation of plasmas. I also suggested as an immediate technical objective the use of a thermonuclear reactor to produce fissionable materials as fuel for atomic power plants. Research on controlled thermonuclear reactions is now receiving priority elsewhere. The Tokamak system, which is under intensive study in many countries, is most closely related to our early ideas.

In 1952 I initiated experimental work on magnetic-explosive generators (devices to transform the energy of a chemical or nuclear explosion into the energy of a magnetic field). A record magnetic field of 25 megagauss was achieved during these experiments in 1964.

In 1953 I was elected a member of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

My social and political views underwent a major evolution over the fifteen years from 1953 to 1968. In particular, my role in the development of thermonuclear weapons from 1953 to 1962 and in the preparation and execution of thermonuclear tests, led to an increased awareness of the moral problems engendered by such activities. In the late 1950s I began a campaign to halt or to limit the testing of nuclear weapons. This brought me into conflict first with Nikita Khrushchev in 1961, and then with the Minister of Medium Machine Building, Efim Slavsky, in 1962. (This is the Ministry responsible for nuclear weapons and industry in the USSR.) I helped to promote the 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water. From 1964 when I spoke out on problems of biology (at the Academy of Sciences, during a debate on the election of one of Trofim Lysenko's associates), and especially from 1967, I have been interested in an ever-expanding circle of questions. In 1967 I joined the Committee for Lake Baikal, which was organized to protect one of the purest lakes in the world from industrial pollution. My first appeals for victims of repression date from 1966-67.

The time came in 1968 for the more detailed, public and candid statement of my views contained in the essay "Progress Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom." These same ideas were echoed seven years later in the title of my Nobel lecture: "Peace, Progress and Human Rights." I consider the themes of fundamental importance and closely interconnected. My 1968 essay was a turning point in my life. It quickly gained world-wide publicity. (It was published in English by The New York Times.) The Soviet press was silent for some time and then began to refer to the essay very negatively. Many critics, even sympathetic ones, considered my ideas naive and impractical. But thirteen years later, it seems to me that these ideas foreshadowed important new directions in World and Soviet politics.

After 1970, the defense of human rights and of victims of political repression became my first concern. My collaboration with physicists Valery Chalidze and Andrei Tverdokhlebov, and later with the mathematician Igor Shafarevich and geophysicist Gregory Podypolsky, on the Moscow Human Rights Committee was one expression of

July 9, 1981

that concern. (Podyapolsky's untimely death in March 1976 was a tragedy.)

After my essay was published abroad in July 1968, I was barred from secret work and excommunicated from many privileges of the Soviet establishment. The pressure on me, my family and friends increased in 1972, but as I came to learn more about the spreading repressions, I felt obliged to speak out in defense of some victim almost daily. In recent years I have continued to speak out as well on peace and disarmament, on freedom of contracts, movement, information and opinion, against capital punishment, on protection of the environment, and on nuclear power plants.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In 1975 I was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. This was a great honor for me as well as recognition for the entire human rights movement in the USSR. In January 1980 I was deprived of all my official Soviet awards (the order of Lenin, three times Hero of Socialist Labor, the Lenin Prize, the State Prize) and banished to Gorky where I am virtually isolated and watched day and night by a policeman at my door. The regime's action lacks any legal basis. It is one more example of the intensified political repression gripping our country in recent years.

Since the summer of 1969 I have been a senior scientist at the Academy of Sciences'

Institute of Physics. My current scientific interests are elementary particles, gravitation and cosmology.

I am not a professional politician. Perhaps that is why I am always bothered by questions concerning the usefulness and eventual results of my actions. I am inclined to believe that moral criteria together with uninhibited thought provide the only possible compass for these complex and contradictory problems. I shall refrain from specific predictions, but today as always I believe in the power of reason and the human spirit.●

15317