HOSPITAL COST CONTAINMENT AND THE ELDERLY

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago several organizations representing this country's senior citizens held a local rally in which I and other Members of Congress participated to protest the continued rise in the cost of hospital care, and to express their firm support for the passage of H.R. 2626, the Hospital Cost Containment Act of 1979. While the opponents of this legislation would have us believe that rising hospital costs are not keenly felt by the American people, our Nation's elderly continue to be victimized by this insidious inflationary spiral. A majority of our citizens over 65 have hospital on fixed incomes, and are already beset by exorbitant increases in the price of other basic necessities, such as food and fuel. Now they face a 12.2 percent statutory increase in the medicare hospital deductible effective January 1. This deductible, which by law must be increased to reflect the average cost of a day in the hospital, has risen 40 percent over the past 10 years—an intolerable pace by any standard.

H.R. 2636 offers an immediate means of addressing this national problem. We cannot afford to set this measure aside before Congress can seriously consider establishment of an inclusive national health plan.

In its consideration of the bill, the House faces this challenge from President Carter: "This Congress ... must consider the increasing importance of anti-inflation and budget-saving bill the Congress will face this session. Every member of Congress in dealing with excessive inflation and wasteful federal spending will be judged—correctly—in large part by his or her vote on this issue."

NEW AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT LAND-ING CRFT

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, many Members who are concerned about the continued maintenance, growth, and technological improvement of U.S. military hardware, particularly in light of America's narrowing lead over the Soviets, will be interested in a recent news release issued by Bell Aerospace Textron noting their development of the new amphibious assault landing craft:

PANAMA CITY, FLA.—From the sea, through the surf and onto the beach at Tyn dall Air Force Base, America's largest military air cushion vehicle in an operational demonstration recently conducted here by the U.S. Navy.

The new Amphibious Assault Landing Craft (AALC JEFF/B) skimmed waves at a speed of 45 knots, topped surf and sand dunes as high as 10 feet, then continued inland to the drop point while carrying a 60-ton main battle tank, a jeep, and a detachment of a four-man crew. In addition, three technical innovations, including the use of the U.S. Marine Corps, Naval Beach Group II, Naval Cargo Handling and Port Group, Operational Test and Evaluation Force, Naval Coastal Systems Center, and David Taylor Naval Ship Research and Development Center. Additional agencies are Naval Ship Engine Center and Naval Sea Systems Command.

IN SUPPORT OF IDA NUDEL

HON. MICHAEL O. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my many colleagues in the House in representing the important role of their voices in support of Ida Nudel, the Moscow activist who is now in Siberia.

It is not necessary at this time for me to dwell on Ida Nudel's plight. Her story is well known to the Members of this body, and I am sure my fellow legislators in the Congress share my deep concern for Ida's well-being.

Ida Nudel is a 48-year-old Soviet Jew who has spent a major part of her life in constant fear for her life and without the opportunity of expressing her religious beliefs. These difficult physical and moral conditions have taken their toll on Ida Nudel and she has aged rapidly and her health has begun to fail.

This fine woman has been banished to Ekvosnoemo, an isolated and inaccessible village in Siberia, to live under term of exile. Her one request of the government is that she be granted a visa to join her sister who is now living in Israel.

I join with my friends in the House in their support of Ida Nudel's request.
TRIBUTE TO MAMIE EISENHOWER

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1979

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, Mamie had an outstanding career in the background, supportive of her husband's career. She often quipped that "Ike is my life," a fact that could not be easily overlooked. She pictured herself in the role of public emissary to her husband.

Throughout her marriage, Mamie got to know her number one. Other people who came to mind was her many years of experience as hostess for many leading European political figures while her husband was stationed abroad. As a charming hostess, Mrs. Eisenhower was famous for having an amazing memory for names and faces. When necessary, she could shake more than 1,500 guests' hands without seeming fatigued. She felt that she had an obligation to greet as many citizens who wanted to see the President's wife as she was able. Mamie managed to have something to say to each guest at the White House, always making them feel welcome. By the end of her husband's first term of office, Mrs. Eisenhower had rightfully earned the title of "Top Hostess in Washington." During her White House years, Mamie's second concern was only to her husband's fame. Her down-to-earth attitude led the press and general public to fondly refer to her as simply "Mamie." Since 1960, many first ladies have occupied the dwelling at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and all have tried to emulate Mamie's personal style that endeared her to most Americans.

In her last interview with Barbara Walters, when asked how she would like to be remembered, she responded as "just a good friend." In my judgment, Mrs. Eisenhower was truly a good friend to the American people. She will be remembered as a special part of our history during an era when our country was at its best, and through a period of our heritage to which all Americans can be proud.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE MARIE A. FITZGERALD OF PASSAIC, N.J., DISTINGUISHED MEMBER OF THE PATRON DIOCesan COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 10, residents of my congressional district, Passaic County, New Jersey will join with His Excellency, the Most Reverend Frank J. Rodimer, D.D., Bishop of Paterson, N.J.) in celebrating the following program in honor at the 35th annual convention to be held in my hometown of Wayne on Saturday, November 10.

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE PATRON DIOCesan COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

(Under the Patronage of His Excellency the Most Reverend Frank J. Rodimer, D.D., Bishop of Paterson, N.J.)

PROGRAM

Convention Chairman, Mrs. Harold Van Winkle.

9:00 a.m. Eucharistic Liturgy. Theme: "Mary, The Heart of the Family" prepared by Mrs. James Barrett, Church Community Chairman Immaculate Heart of Mary Church, Wayne, N.J.

9:15 a.m. Continental Breakfast—Wayne Manor.

10:15 a.m. Formal Opening of Business Meeting—Mrs. Thomas Bay, Diocesan President.
Scripture Reading—Monsignor John Shanley.

Salute to the Flag and National Anthem—

Entire Assembly.

11:15 a.m. Introduction of Theme: "Focus on Family." Mrs. Harold Van Winkle.

Speakers—Commission Chairman

Mrs. John McManus, Organization Services.

Mrs. Joseph Levendusky, Family Affairs.

Mrs. Jane Garrett, Church Community.

Mrs. Anthony Radioc, Community Affairs.

Mrs. Frank Bollerink, International Affairs.

Miss Marie A. FitzGerald, Legislative Information.

Chairman Remarks—Monsignor John J. Shanley.

Mrs. Thomas Bay.

Review of Exhibits—Mrs. Andrew Metzger.

Coordinator of Events—Mrs. Peter Sagan.

1:00 p.m. Luncheon—Mrs. Sal Donatiello, Chairman.

Introductions—Mrs. Thomas Bay.

Tribute and Presentation to Miss Marie A. FitzGerald by Mrs. Thomas Bay, Bishop Rodimer, Monsignor John Shanley.


Installation of Officers—Monsignor John J. Shanley.

Address—The Most Reverend Frank J. Rodimer, D.D., Bishop of Paterson.

Remarks—Monsignor John J. Shanley.

Closing—Mrs. Thomas Bay.

Executive Board of the Paterson Diocesan Council of Catholic Women.

Moderator, Msgr. John J. Shanley, Ph.D., P.A.

Mrs. Thomas Bay.

Treasurer, Mrs. Elmer Dutcher.

Director at Large, Mrs. E. T. Large.

Director of Pastoral Services, Mrs. J. O. Keefe.

Secretary, Mrs. H. de Mensa.

Pastoral Coordinator, Mrs. A. Radice.

Director at Large, Mrs. A. Radice, Mrs. J. O. Keefe, Mrs. H. de Mensa.

Pastoral Coordinator, Mrs. A. Radice.

Director at Large, Mrs. E. Dutcher, Mrs. A. Macchiarella, Mrs. A. Metzger.

Director, Mrs. F. DiBupo, Mrs. S. Zimmerman, Mrs. G. Konyak.

Moriah Cottage.

President, Mrs. J. Steward.

Moderator, Msgr. J. J. Shanley.

Directors at Large, Mrs. T. Bay, Mrs. J. McManus, Mrs. L. Tyler, Mrs. J. S. Castellano, Mrs. J. J. Shanley.

Directors at Large, Mrs. P. Chorney, Miss A. Bialouf, Mrs. P. Kaslo.

St. Anthony's Chapter.

President, Mrs. L. DeLima.

Moderator, Rev. S. B. Dabrowski.

Directors at Large, Mrs. P. Chorney, Miss A. Bialouf, Mrs. P. Kaslo.

Madison-Clatham.

President, Mrs. J. Steward.

Moderator, Msgr. J. J. Shanley.

Directors at Large, Mrs. T. Bay, Mrs. J. McManus, Mrs. L. Tyler, Mrs. J. S. Castellano.

Boonton-Dover.

President, Mrs. L. Chalfip.

Moderator, Rev. J. Doyle.

Directors at Large, Mrs. P. Dibuipo, Mrs. S. Zimmerman, Mrs. G. Konyak.

Morristown.

President, Mrs. J. Daniele.

Moderator, Msgr. C. Boucha.

Directors at Large, Mrs. A. Radice, Mrs. J. O. Keefe, Mrs. H. de Mensa.

Patanon-Hawthorne.

President, Miss A. Gearinck.

Moderator, Rev. Clampaige.

Directors at Large, Mrs. E. Dutcher, Mrs. A. Macchiarella, Mrs. A. Metzger.

Paterson.

President, Mrs. P. Sagan.

Moderator, Rev. J. Denkovic.

Directors at Large, Mrs. E. K. Kirchiner, Miss M. O'Malley, Mrs. P. Volpe.

Butler.

President, Mrs. E. Moore.

Moderator, Rev. E. McQuade.

Directors at Large, Mrs. N. Sergeant, Mrs. H. O'Keefe, Mrs. Bollerino.

Past Diocesan Council Presidents.

Mrs. Robert Donaldson, Mrs. Richard Goyette, Mrs. Michael Sebold, Mrs. Kermit Sidie, Mrs. Michael Gendolino, Miss Marie FitzGerald, Mrs. Harold Van Winkle, Mrs. Casimir Pokrywka.

TRIBUTE TO MARIE FITZGERALD

"Wisdom is more precious than corals." (Prv. 3:15)

Generous Father, we thank You for Your gift of wisdom, the thirty-fifth anniversary. Though the ancient esteemed coral, holding it as mysteriously sacred, because of its unique beauty, the ancient still may recognized that wisdom was a more precious possession.

During our thirty-five years, we have grown and branched in wisdom, through Your gift of grace. And who is wise among us? She who has been mentor, peacemaker, and tireless worker. Marie FitzGerald. Marie who has been "heart" of our Council family from its very beginning.

Lord, we thank You for Your lavish gifts to us—the gift of coral; thirty-five years of Council service; the gift of Marie, whose friendship and example of Christian living continues to inspire us; the gift of Mary, who is "heart" in every family. Father, we are grateful. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, it is most significant that this year's convention theme dedicated to "Focus on Family" has been selected to commemorate a most distinguished charter member whose faithful and active participation in the most noble endeavors of the diocese has been of indescribable advantage to all of our people.

Pope John XXIII described the family as "the first and essential cell of human society." The family is indeed the basic fabric of our society—the foundation of a healthy and vibrant communion of people—who nurture, support and care for their own members, in many different cultures, providing irreplaceable strength and shelter for one another.

Family life provides a forum for the sharing of the unique gifts of family tradition among our people. And so it is with the membership of the Paterson Diocesan Council of Catholic Women who have chosen Marie as this year's honoree to applaud her service, particularly throughout her life—time in devoted and dedicated service to her fellowwoman.

We do indeed salute a grand lady—a distinguished citizen, a compassionate leader and benefactor for the public good, esteemed friend and great American—the Honorable Marie A. FitzGerald.

His leadership in both veterans' affairs and public works will be sorely missed by the Congress. Experience is always a good teacher; and when this is combined with the qualities of leadership possessed by Chairman Roberts, it is the people of this great Nation who reap the benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs under the chairmanship of Ray Roberts since I came to the 94th Congress. He has always displayed the unusual qualities that younger members envy so much; they go about the business of learning the legislative and oversight functions required of them. When I became the chairman of the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Chairman Roberts assured me of his complete support. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what he has given me.

Under Chairman Roberts' stewardship, the veterans of this Nation have always been treated fairly. At the same time, he has never lost sight that these programs must be funded through tax revenue, and they have been contained within reasonable limits rather than becoming unrestricted as some have advocated. He has helped lead us through a most difficult period.

His retirement will mean a great loss to veterans and to the Congress as a whole. He has earned his retirement, if there is such a choice. On this occasion, I want to convey to him my sincere thanks for his friendship and the limitless assistance he has provided to me personally and to the entire Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He is a very effective leader and I look forward to working with him next year as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

URANIUM, COAL. OIL—WHICH?

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Nation must move forward now with the development of an effective energy conservation program. The benefits of energy conservation are enormous—it is economic, nonpolluting and environmentally acceptable.

The advantages and benefits of energy conservation are made clear in an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post.

The editorial sheds much light on the benefits of holding down our energy consumption to wise levels. I urge my colleagues to read this editorial.

The editorial follows:

URANIUM, COAL, OIL—WHICH?

The outlook for nuclear power is, post-Kemeny, somber at best. But burning coal through toxic gas is still a proven, cost-effective and, while technology can lower the risks to health, it cannot entirely eliminate them. Natural gas is likewise still a safer, though not necessarily better, use than firing utility boilers. As for oil, you have only to follow events in Iran to perceive that it is because the least, cruelest form of all our energy.

CHAIRMAN'S RETIREMENT

HON. RONALD M. MOTTI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. MOTTI. Mr. Speaker, it was with much regret I learned of Chairman Ray Roberts' decision not to seek reelection.

*Deceased.
Uranium, coal, gas and oil: the country’s four major sources of generating power, each lies under a shadow. Each is, for its own reasons, dangerous, uncertain or unavailing. How does the country avoid being left in the dark?

The first truth is that there is no entirely safe way to generate electricity. The load is currently rising less than 4 percent a year—hardly enough to keep public health. It’s not a matter of finding a safe solution—but of finding the safest among several choices.

The second truth is that the choices have to be made. The idea of at least a conditionally monopolistic on new reactors seems to be gaining momentum. But if you don’t like nuclear power, what kind of power do you like? The most available alternative is coal—but there is a death rate associated with the heavy use of coal. That is a thought for Congress and its constituents to keep in mind during the coming debates on nuclear regulation.

Fortunately, in most of the country, the need for new generating plants is not immediate. There is time—although not unlimited time—for reflection. It is the result, quite simply, of rising prices for power. Before the first oil crisis, six years ago, consumption of electric power in this country was rising at a rate of 8 percent a year. That percentage has dropped to a physical rate at which the total load doubles every 15 years. At that pace, utilities were under pressure to build new plants and to keep building them constantly bigger.

But in the past several years, the pattern has changed. The load is currently rising less than 4 percent a year—hardly more than half the pre-1978 rate. That’s why some companies have, temporarily, excess generating capacity. It’s also why a lot of companies have cancelled some of their construction plans. For purely economic and financial reasons, some companies have dropped off sharply even before the Three Mile Island accident. Utilities are now being pushed toward building smaller, more efficient plants and toward keeping them constantly bigger.

Low rates of increase in consumption mean less need for new plants and less pressure for power. Before the first oil crisis, six years ago, the country—a subsidiary of Exxon or Mobil, for example—was in a rush to get its baseload running, to keep the money in the United States. There was a feeling that the United States was not growing enough, that it was about to be conquered by Germany.

British objections are simple enough. Why should Britain’s bill, if passed, would prohibit American companies from participating in the development of North Sea oil fields. For Britain, as well as the United States, this would be an economic and social disaster.

“No self-respecting government of a foreign country would be likely to sit idly by while the largest oil company in that country—a subsidiary of Exxon or Mobil, for example—took government’s request on the ground that it was forbidden by the United States law to undertake such an operation. That is exactly what the British were about to be conquered by Germany.

British objections are simple enough. Why should Britain’s bill, if passed, would prohibit American companies from participating in the development of North Sea oil fields. For Britain, as well as the United States, this would be an economic and social disaster.

“Do self-respecting government of a foreign country would be likely to sit idly by while the largest oil company in that country—a subsidiary of Exxon or Mobil, for example—took government’s request on the ground that it was forbidden by the United States law to undertake such an operation. That is exactly what the British were about to be conquered by Germany.

Unfortunately, Kennedy was absent, being, perhaps, too busy fending off demands that he run for the presidency in 1980.

President Jimmy Carter’s folks were at the meeting with “helpful hands,” including an amendment to allow “transactions likely to enhance the production or development of energy.” This provides a loophole nice enough to make the law virtually worthless.

In reality there is a kind of fatalistic quality to that part of Kennedy’s proposal, similar in some respects to the catchy “food for oil” slogan earlier this summer.

Restricting foreign investment by domestic corporations sounds good as a way of promoting domestic production. It might make some sense if huge pools of untapped oil reserves were just awaiting an exploratory drill in the United States. But this hasn’t been the case for the better part of two decades. To find oil and develop oil fields, one must go where the oil is likely to be found. Right now this means taking rigs to the North Sea, the Persian Gulf, Algeria and other areas of the world.

To say by law that American companies shouldn’t participate in this quest is to try to gain energy by drilling dry wells. Kennedy should go back to the drafting board before Mrs. Thatcher slops buckets of North Sea oil over the family retreat at Hyannis Port.

HON. JACK EDWARDS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979

• Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Ways and Means Committee for their plans to hold hearings on the Social Security Act’s basis rule for estate taxes. I have introduced one of the several bills which have been sponsored this year to repeal the carryover basis provision. I urge the committee to approve that legislation.

I would also like to bring to the attention of committee members that the Southern Governors’ Association, at its annual meeting in New Orleans, December 1–3, adopted a resolution in behalf of the repeal of the carryover basis. The text of that resolution is as follows:

Repeal of the Carryover Basis Rule

Whereas, the practice of bequeathing possessions of value to one’s heirs is a cherished right of Americans; and

Whereas, providing security for one’s spouse, children and other relatives is a prime incentive for Americans to invest, thereby creating capital for business and jobs for the public; and

Whereas, the tradition of handing down property from one generation to the next is threatened by the carryover basis rule, a capital gains tax process that will greatly diminish the estates of many Americans; and

Whereas, the complexities of this carryover basis rule will place an additional costly burden on those faced with tracing the history of each asset, piece of property, and family heirloom in an estate subject to capital taxation.

It is therefore, Be It Resolved in the Southern Governors’ Association duly convened in New Orleans, Louisiana, that this Association urges all members of the United States Senate and House to support and vote for the repeal of the carryover basis rule. Be It Further Resolved that this Association, extends President Jimmy Carter to the endorsement of the bill of Congress of the United States in repealing this confiscatory, complex tax rule.

SOCIAL REFORM AMENDMENTS OF 1979

HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, although the United States is a land of great natural resources and inherent wealth, it is unfortunate that the fact of life that many Americans are in legitimate need of financial assistance. The American people have extended their hands to those of our population truly in need, and have made it a national commitment to provide them with assistance to enable them to live with some semblance of dignity.

Despite the best of intentions, however, what began as a sincere effort to help the needy has grown into one of the worst Federal-State-local boondoggles ever imagined. The welfare system that we live with is a patchwork, piecemeal program without direction or design. Most taxpayers are highly critical of how the welfare program operates—and justifiably so. They are convinced that much of their hard-earned tax dollars are being wasted through mismanagement and fraud.

Today, the Congress has the opportunity to take a giant step toward cleaning up the welfare mess. By passing the Social Reform Amendments of 1979, we will enhance the cost-effectiveness of the U.S. taxpayer’s dollar.

I believe that anyone who is capable of holding a job should not receive welfare benefits. I also believe that any benefits received should be based on the legitimate needs of the individual or family.
November 8, 1979

However, it is no secret that the welfare system is rife with fraud and abuse. This legislation is designed to drastically curtail the instances of welfare cheating. For example, benefits will be based on actual, rather than projected, income. The income of the recipients will be required to be reported on a monthly basis. The income of all people residing in the household will be taken into account when computing benefits. By standardizing and coordinating certain welfare programs, the bill will streamline administration and reduce error and fraud. In addition, the Federal Government would provide financial incentives to the States to develop computerized information systems so that they can more effectively administer their programs.

Besides curbing abuses, this bill will remove many of the work disincentives that currently exist. For some people, it is often more beneficial to go on the welfare rolls rather than the work rolls. This legislation seeks to remedy that situation to ensure that anyone who is capable of handling a job does just that. The welfare system should not be a subsidy for non-participation, and I am very pleased to see that this bill addresses this issue.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to look at the beating the American taxpayer is already taking at the hands of inflation, and then look at how many of their tax dollars are being wasted through mismanagement and fraud in the welfare system. How then can we justify not passing this bill—a bill that will give the American taxpayers more for their money?

NEWS OF THE DAY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when big oil companies announce gains in profits the story is on the front page of every newspaper.

When a certain candidate for the Presidency does so much as bend over to tie his shoelaces, dozens of reporters breathlessly watch to see how he does it.

But when Central Intelligence Agen­cies Office state in congressional testi­mony that it alone, i.e., the Soviet Union is spending about 50 percent more on military than the United States, this news just manages to make it to page 3 of the Washington Post in a wire service story.

So much for what it all means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Does not anyone care what is really happening to our Nation?

At this time I wish to insert in the Record, "Soviet Military Spending Up," from the Washington Post, November 2, 1979:

Soviet Military Spending Up

The Soviet are spending about 50 percent more on military outlays this year than the United States. Our analysts told Congress yesterday.

They predicted Soviet military spending will jump by 10 percent this year alone, through 1980 compared to 1975 despite the strain on the Russian economy.

A private analyst and two members of the Senate Armed Services Committee said they thought the CIA statistics were too low.

Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), chairman of a Senate Armed Services subcommittee, said the panel was seeking to learn if the "massive surge of unprecedented military procurement" by the Soviets in the 1970s was likely to be matched in the 1980s.

Byrd said, "we must have facts to formu­late the fiscal 1981 (defense) budget"—which, with increases promised by President Carter or demanded by sectors of Congress, may run $14 billion.

"In 1979, the Soviet total will be about $16 billion, about 50 percent higher than 1978, equating the Chief of the CIA's Military Economics Analysis Cen­ter.

Total Soviet defense activities for the 1970s, he said, exceeded comparable U.S. outlays by almost 30 percent. "Estimated Soviet defense activities "caught up with U.S. defense outlays in 1971 and have exceeded them by a widening margin in each succeeding year," Burton said.

Byrd scheduled another hearing for Thurs­day.

COMMON CAUSE: PRACTICE WHAT YOU PREACH

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, last Fri­day's Washington Post contained a most interesting article about the self-styled citizens' lobbying group, Common Cause.

While I have consistently applauded the efforts and intentions of local Common Cause chapters, I have and do seriously question whether the national headquarters accurately reflects grassroots opin­ion.

The Post article, describing a power grab by the Washington Common Cause office, calling attention to such abuses as salary discrimination based on sex and closed-door decision-making, cer­tainly adds credence to my contention.

Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of the sincerity of Common Cause's mem­bership around the nation, I deplore this hypochrletic "do as I say, not as I do" attitude on the part of the national office.

I comment the Post article to the attention of all members and ask that it be included in the Record at this point.

From the Washington Post, Nov. 2, 1979

Common Cause Racked by Conflict in Reorganization

(By Glenn Frankel)

Closed-door meetings, conflicts of interest, sex discrimination in pay scale—all those the kind of practices Common Cause, which calls itself a citizens lobbying group, has long deplored and sought to purge from government.

But in the last few weeks, Common Cause itself has been the target of charges that the leaders of the Washington-based organ­ization have engaged in those same prac­tices.

At issue is a proposal to consolidate the organ­ization's 40 state offices into a dozen or so regional offices, created out of a fear that the group's national staff contains is needed to help keep Common Cause solvent, but that state officials have been "emasculated".

"Our view is that it kills us," and Virginia Common Cause Chairman Warren Dakstrom of the proposal which was distributed to the states three weeks ago and is due for a final vote at meetings in Washington today.

"It's already had a demoralizing effect on many people," he said.

"It's being rushed through and I don't understand the reasons for that," said Michigan Chairman Stephen Carter. For someone who has been fighting for a moment of decision-making, this is awfully hard for me to swallow.

"The point is all the question of survival for an organization that struggles to keep the public interested in questions like cam­paign finance and the like. The day the right-hand man to the Secretary of State prepares to speak at the right time when pocketbook issues like inflation, energy and taxes claim a large share of the public's attention."

Founded nine years ago by former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary John Gardner, Common Cause took on "the task of opening up government," according to Common Cause Chairman Warren Dakstrom.

The group is considered to have a strong and loyal base of members. The organiza­tion has fought for open government meetings and open decision-making, this is awfully hard for me to swallow.

"The point is all the question of survival for an organization that struggles to keep the public interested in questions like cam­paign finance and the like. The day the right-hand man to the Secretary of State prepares to speak at the right time when pocketbook issues like inflation, energy and taxes claim a large share of the public's attention."

Founded nine years ago by former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary John Gardner, Common Cause took on "the task of opening up government," according to Common Cause Chairman Warren Dakstrom.

The group is considered to have a strong and loyal base of members. The organiza­tion has fought for open government meetings and open decision-making.

"The day the right-hand man to the Secretary of State prepares to speak at the right time when pocketbook issues like inflation, energy and taxes claim a large share of the public's attention."

"It's already had a demoralizing effect on many people," he said.

"It's being rushed through and I don't understand the reasons for that," said Michigan Chairman Stephen Carter. For someone who has been fighting for a moment of decision-making, this is awfully hard for me to swallow.

"The point is all the question of survival for an organization that struggles to keep the public interested in questions like cam­paign finance and the like. The day the right-hand man to the Secretary of State prepares to speak at the right time when pocketbook issues like inflation, energy and taxes claim a large share of the public's attention."

"The point is all the question of survival for an organization that struggles to keep the public interested in questions like cam­paign finance and the like. The day the right-hand man to the Secretary of State prepares to speak at the right time when pocketbook issues like inflation, energy and taxes claim a large share of the public's attention."

"It's already had a demoralizing effect on many people," he said.

"It's being rushed through and I don't understand the reasons for that," said Michigan Chairman Stephen Carter. For someone who has been fighting for a moment of decision-making, this is awfully hard for me to swallow.

"The point is all the question of survival for an organization that struggles to keep the public interested in questions like cam­paign finance and the like. The day the right-hand man to the Secretary of State prepares to speak at the right time when pocketbook issues like inflation, energy and taxes claim a large share of the public's attention."

"The point is all the question of survival for an organization that struggles to keep the public interested in questions like cam­paign finance and the like. The day the right-hand man to the Secretary of State prepares to speak at the right time when pocketbook issues like inflation, energy and taxes claim a large share of the public's attention."

"It's already had a demoralizing effect on many people," he said.

"It's being rushed through and I don't understand the reasons for that," said Michigan Chairman Stephen Carter. For someone who has been fighting for a moment of decision-making, this is awfully hard for me to swallow.
even though funding is channeled through national headquarters.

The salary disparities were one of the reasons cited by the study committee in its recent report advocating consolidation. It also cited a growing disinterest in state expenditure trends that reached at least $400,000 next year—and what it called "enormous strains between the staff and volunteers as well as between the state and national organizations."

The report, mailed to state leaders Oct. 14, has caused some reaction that New York Chairman Howard Hoffman says "has been on the verge of hysteria." States slated to lose money from the proposal are convinced the report's adoption will mean quick elimination of Goldberg and others who have offended the national staff. "They are particularly incensed by a charge that the committee drafted its final report in a closed-door session early last month in Cincinnati without notifying organization members. An Ohio Common Cause official contended that committee chairman Kathleen Sebelius told her she could not attend the meeting.

"Would Common Cause tolerate a government agency's going behind closed doors to prepare recommendations of such consequences?" asked a memo circulated to state organizations by Common Cause of Virginia.

"Does the committee feel it has the power to open or close the gates of our own governance?"

Sebelius was en route to Washington from her Topeka, Kan., home yesterday and was not available for comment.

Arthur Cecelski, another committee member who says he investigated the incident who says Sebelius told him she discounted attendance but never told anyone the meeting was closed.

Cecelski, a Springfield resident, is himself the subject of another allegation—that his participation in drafting the proposal constitutes a conflict-of-interest because his wife Dorothy is a member of the national staff, which stands to benefit if the report is approved.

Not true, says Cecelski: "I'm very sensitive to conflict-of-interest issues and I don't think this is one at all.

Most of all, state leaders say they are concerned that the proposal will be sustained through this weekend by a governing board that rarely fails to approve proposals supported by the national staff.

For example, the Common Cause President Cohen denies the proposal is part of a power play or a purge of dissidents by the national staff. But several state representatives favor the plan, which he says is necessary to maintain Common Cause's quality.

Cohen contends Common Cause has just as big a role to play in the 1980s as it did in the Watergate era.

"The question is still how to end the sour relationship between citizens and government, how to make sure government is accountable," he said. "For me, it's an exciting time."

VETERANS DAY

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, at 11 a.m. today, the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Access to Equity Capital and Business Opportunities, which I chair, held hearings September 12 and 13, on the capital formation problems of small business. One of the issues addressed was depreciation. Depreciation is generally defined as a capital recovery concept. This concept suggests that a business-manufacturer should be able to charge the amount he invests in a capital asset over the useful life of the asset. It gives the line manufacturer the capital necessary to replace his plant and equipment, to improve, to expand, and to provide more efficient productive capacity.

The major bill before the Congress on depreciation reform is the Capital Cost Recovery Act of 1979, introduced by Representatives Jones and Conable H.R. 4646. H.R. 4646 has acquired the nickname of the "10-5-3 proposal," as it provides for a 10-year writeoff for commercial buildings, 5 years for equipment, and 3 years for automobiles and light trucks.

Consistently throughout the summer and fall, national newspapers and business periodicals have portrayed the 10-5-3 bill as a consensus measure. In fact, according to a 10-year study of this issue by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the 10-5-3 bill is far from consensus. Several small business groups, however, have problems in supporting this measure as presently drafted. It was brought to light during this Congressional hearings.

The vast majority returned, war proud of their service and eager to get on with the business of living. However, in many cases the Vietnam veterans came back from military service without the acclimation and the universal gratitude of the American people experienced by their fathers and their grandfathers. We salute them, and we are determined to care for their disabilities and provide the necessary readjustment assistance to bring them all home again at full potential. Depreciation reform is a key ingredient in this.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 30 million veterans from five wars living in the United States today. Over the years our country has paid - and by those who have served in defense of the United States. The impetus behind these proposals has generally accompanied a great urge of gratitude following a period of prolonged war.

For example, on that first Armistice Day, and on V-E Day and V-J Day, all were heroes and deservedly so. Our Nation was unified in its support for those who had fought and especially for those who had paid a sacrifice of their own because of their service in defense of our country. However, from a historical standpoint, as we as a Nation go farther down the road in peace and farther away from the immediate memory of war, the priorities which once seemed so absolute in the minds of many fade with the passage of time.

The plight of our Nation's veterans is surpassed by new problems and complex exigencies of a more immediate nature. Indeed, we face many difficult problems in the years we will have to maintain our role in a world power for the first time. Later, November 11 became Veterans Day to honor all Americans who have been called to arms, so often in this century, that our country's might always remain both strong and free.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 30 million veterans from five wars living in the United States today. Over the years our country has paid and by those who have served in defense of the United States. The impetus behind these proposals has generally accompanied a great urge of gratitude following a period of prolonged war.
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850,000, and some gross $40,000. But with the closing of thousands of manufacturing properties and buildings he probably couldn’t save enough to enter this business in his lifetime. How much longer will this kind of odds, odds that are getting worse each year, how much longer will you think it will take for the enterprise United States economy will last? How will minorities and women ever attain their share of America’s tools.

Two of the proposals originally mailed to us by the committee promise real help for the small business man. The first of these good proposals is H.R. 5096, introduced by Mr. Nowak on August 2. It provides each company with the same maximum dollar expense deductions for office equipment and pollution control equipment, and allows rapid amortization for machinery and equipment and thus help close the gap between capital investment in the U.S. and foreign countries.

Second, since big business is steadily increasing its share of the Nation’s economic assets, any proposed legislation should contain measures to reverse the disturbing trend towards economic concentration by providing enough stimulus to small businesses to enable them to regain some small share of the American dream.

Fifteen years ago, small business manufacturers under $10 million in assets accounted for 20 percent of the total business assets. Today, for the first time in the same period those U.S. corporations with over $1 billion in assets increased their shares from under 50 percent of total business assets to over 50 percent of total business assets. Moreover, total United States investment in R & D and capital investment is far below most competing industrialized countries. I’m also sure that small businessmen don’t invest as much on a percentage basis as does big business.

Many of our members got into the tool and die business after rising up through the ranks as apprentices. In earlier days when a tool and die worker could save a little money and start his own business with a reasonable chance of success. Today 55 percent of the businesses in the U.S. fail within the first five years.

We have some great toolmakers in this industry.

A top toolmaker can easily earn over $25,000. A tool and die man working 20 hours will have less than $2 an hour. This is 5 percent of the incomes in the U.S. fall within the first five years.

We have some great toolmakers in this industry.


Congressional Record, January 28, 1979.


The benefits do the 1.9 million small companies with $7.5 billion in output of the U.S. economy. It’s not that we are opposed to big business. In our industry our customers are big business and we need them to grow. But we want them, and us, to grow at the expense of foreign competitors who have more favorable economic structures. The present trend has been for imports and U.S. big business both to grow at the expense of small business in this country by changes which bring a balance to it so that small business can again be competitive with imports and with the big companies. A competitive edge now held by big business could destroy the small subcontractors manufacturers and retailer dealers upon whom large concerns depend for supplies and outlets. Giant corporations would substitute their own manufacturing and retail operations. The result would be even greater economic concentration and the acceleration of the extinction of small business in this country.

This is not to say the economic principles developed in H.R. 5096 are invalid. The work of the Business Roundtable, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the NFIB should be praised.

I’ve received a key economic fact of life in this modern interlocking world economy. That fact is that the present concentration of enterprise is not only good economic sense as a buggy whip in an interdependent world trade environment. The industrial competitors must have more favorable economic incentives, whether or not they make new machinery and equipment obsolete before its installed. Businesses in other countries are investing more in capital and in research and development than the U.S. The reason for the difference is due to incentives. In the tax structure. Whether or not their mix of incentives incorporates lower tax rates or better depreciation rates, it makes no difference. The industrial competitors have a better mix of incentives and as a result invest more in capital. Since we trade openly with those countries, the failure of this government to encourage a similar level of development will spell doom for American small business and the American economy.

What is needed is an approach which combines the economic concepts developed by the Business Roundtable, the U.S. and the National Association of Manufacturers, and the NFIB approach employed in H.R. 5096 introduced by Mr. Nowak and S. 110 introduced by Sena­ tor Plotkin, S. 110, 1979. The accelerated approach employed in H.R. 5096 introduced by Mr. Nowak and S. 110 introduced by Sena­ tor Plotkin, S. 110, 1979. The accelerated approach employed in H.R. 5096 introduced by Mr. Nowak and S. 110 introduced by Sena­ tor Plotkin, S. 110, 1979.

The bill provides for excess amounts of their depreciation to the existing schedules based on useful life years or more and a basis not in excess of $25,000. Like Mr. Nowak’s bill it keeps all business. It is a modest bill whose cost could be about $300 million in 1980 rising to $2.7 billion in 1985. By settling down to an average of $250 million per year by 1985.

Another valuable point about these approaches is that they focus the benefits on the segment which creates the jobs. (It has long been acknowledged that small business creates more jobs for our economy than by big business.) Neither of these bills would foster the continuing decline of small businesses which contributed to the restoration of small business in this country.

On the other hand, H.R. 4646 will do nothing but enhance the ability of U.S. corporate giants to expand and engulf what little of the market remains for small business. The actual estimates are to be about $30.2 billion dollars. Over 75 percent of those benefits, or $22.5 billion will go to the largest 3 percent of businesses. There are the corporate giants in this country. The 98.7 percent remaining small businesses will get split among their 12 million customers. That is not how to build the benefit to the small businesses which are killing us as it is.

What good are the benefits to a small town shoe store owner when he arrives at his shop one morning and sees Kinneys building a new store on one side of him and Thom McAn on the other? What good will it do our industry when our major customers decide to use the new tax advantages to build their own captive shops? And what good will it do when 75 percent of the benefits are given to the 24,876 largest and best financed companies in the country? How much good was 25 percent of $30 billion?

It’s not that we are opposed to big business. In our industry our customers are big business and we need them to grow. But we want them, and us, to grow at the expense of foreign competitors who have more favorable economic structures. The present trend has been for imports and U.S. big business both to grow at the expense of small business in this country by changes which bring a balance to it so that small business can again be competitive with imports and with the big companies. A competitive edge now held by big business could destroy the small subcontractors manufacturers and retailer dealers upon whom large concerns depend for supplies and outlets. Giant corporations would substitute their own manufacturing and retail operations. The result would be even greater economic concentration and the acceleration of the extinction of small business in this country.

This is not to say the economic principles developed in H.R. 5096 are invalid. The work of the Business Roundtable, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the NFIB should be praised.

I’ve received a key economic fact of life in this modern interlocking world economy. That fact is that the present concentration of enterprise is not only good economic sense as a buggy whip in an interdependent world trade environment. The industrial competitors must have more favorable economic incentives, whether or not the mix of incentives incorporates lower tax rates or better depreciation rates, it makes no difference. The industrial competitors have a better mix of incentives and as a result invest more in capital. Since we trade openly with those countries, the failure of this government to encourage a similar level of development will spell doom for American small business and the American economy.

What is needed is an approach which combines the economic concepts developed by the Business Roundtable, the U.S. and the National Association of Manufacturers, and the NFIB approach employed in H.R. 5096 introduced by Mr. Nowak and S. 110 introduced by Sena­ tor Plotkin, S. 110, 1979. The accelerated approach employed in H.R. 5096 introduced by Mr. Nowak and S. 110 introduced by Sena­ tor Plotkin, S. 110, 1979.
NATO EXPERTS CONSIDER THE SURVIVAL OF THE WEST

(By Geoffrey Stewart-Smith)

The 25th Annual Assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association was held in Washington DC from 9–13 October. Some 400 delegates from more than 15 NATO nations and I was present as a British delegate. Our hosts, the Atlantic Council of the United States, arranged the official luncheon admirably and the United States Government allowed the proceedings to be held in the State Department.

The main conference was "The Global Nature of the Threat against the West", but while the consensus agreed overwhelmingly that the main threat to the Alliance came from outside the NATO area, the same consensus rather lamely conceded that our potential of power it was imperative to extend its boundaries beyond those agreed in 1949. It was felt—probably quite rightly—that the NATO nations would not agree amongst themselves politically about a joint NATO intervention outside their present treaty boundaries, and that any such intervention would have to be undertaken by one or more NATO nations acting together on their own initiative.

In his opening remarks the Chairman of the Atlantic Council of the United States, Mr. Kenneth Rush set the scene by stating: "I do believe that we must get into the habit of thinking more in global terms and that NATO, or some of its members acting together, should be ready and willing to take appropriate and cautious action in this context with our partners on a multinational level.

He went on to remind the audience that "the threat we face in the Western world is by no means limited to conventional military establishments. It has equally important political, economic and psychological aspects which we must develop further. The Russians frequently refer to the 'correlation of forces' in the world, by which they mean the various political, economic and military aspects which have disposed of a modern industrial nation. This should remind us in the West that our approach to security must be total as well as global. We all agree that we need greater strength on land, on the sea and in the air. But we also need to tackle our political and economic problems if we are to maintain a substantial and credible open-ocean power that is a guarantee of our security, and which is not just based on conventional forces."

Representing President Carter, the U.S. Vice President Mr. Walter F. Mondale attended and gave the delegates a valuable paper summarizing the reports made at this conference.

The theme of the conference was that "the NATO forces are faced with a global, not a regional, threat. When you consider the take just two of the more chilling statistics—that 'at current Soviet deployment rates there is one new SS-20 warhead deployed roughly every seven weeks' and that the "Soviets are building nuclear submarines at the rate of one every seven weeks,' you realize the grave danger the West is in."

It is my hope that all of our colleagues take the few minutes needed to read the following. It will scare you, but I hope—as was the case when I read it—it will also inspire you to do all you can to see to it that all politicians realize that we are threatened not only militarily but economically as well.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "NATO Experts Consider the Survival of the West", by Geoffrey Stewart-Smith, published by the Foreign Affairs Research Institute:
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opined "I need hardly stress the danger to the West if Moscow perceives a weak and leadership, a public indifference, a paralysis of will."

MODERNIZATION OF TNP ESSENTIAL

The new Supreme Commander of NATO, General Bernard H. Rogers, echoed this warning, which naturally concentrated on the military aspects of the Alliance. Drily he observed of the declining West if Moscow perceives a weak and leadership, a public indifference, a paralysis of will."

Today over 100 mobile SS 20 launchers with the multiple and highly accurate MIRVed missiles and relocations and capability and 90 Backfire bombers are deployed against Allied Command Europe.

"Despite the many attempts being made to turn the Alliance into a more modern organisation, which is essentially a parallel armed forces, we must proceed with the vital Alliance decision to deploy long range nuclear weapon systems, even though the parallel armed forces plan control agreement, if we are to demonstrate the cohesion and solidarity of the Alliance. For the three NATO countries these forces are the only weapon systems that will prevent the Soviet Union from taking whatever actions it deems necessary to include the deployment of appropriate long range systems—to determine for which the Soviet Union itself is responsible. Surely the West must not put itself in the position of letting the victory of the West slip from our hands or use to deter the growing threat posed by the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact.

Improvisation, unpreparedness and equivocation are provocative. Equivalence, force readiness and determination are protective.

A QUESTION OF WILL

The paper presented by Lt. General Brent Scowcroft, former Assistant for National Security to the President contained some very valuable observations on Soviet military threats.

"In the strategic field, the Soviets are well into the deployment of third generation missiles—more powerful and more accurate—than the SALT II treaty, they are preparing to begin testing on at least four new or substantially improved missile systems. Observations on the qualitative improvements planned for the currently deployed missile forces are such that within two or three years these systems, utilizing only a small proportion of their own land-based missiles, will be able to pose a mortal threat to U.S. ICBMs."

"Turning to the risk of a surprise attack in Europe, he noted "If the Soviets have developed their forces to the point where they could mount a successful surprise attack from this land (or sea) base, there is no deterrable prior reinforcement from the western militarily significant areas of the USSR, a fundamental flaw in the NATO defense system that we would receive sufficient warning of a major attack to undertake our time-consuming but essential measures of mobilisation and force deployment—is destroyed. The impact is obviously of catastrophic proportions."

"Turning to a purely purely case of the Soviets having to estimate at what point a surprise attack would risk its cities by responding strategically to an attack on Europe which appeared to be coming in the next few years. Dr. Henry Kissinger concluded that "We can take no comfort that the present situation is as much a function of Western design as Soviet design."

"General Scowcroft then described the enormous additional resources allocated to the strategic forces and revealed "The overall impact is likely to be that the Soviets will feel less deterred, more self confident, and thus prepared to escalate more. We may already be witnessing such a change in behaviour, a change which spells increased danger to us all."

"One of the most critical deficiencies in NATO's vital Center Region is the relative thinness of our widely stretched ground forces coupled with the lack of operational reserves to restore the situation. Let me tell you what we Americans are finally doing about it."

"We are spending billions today on a massive Rapid Re-inforcement Program, designed to more than double our in-place ground forces in Europe within less than two weeks, and triple our tactical airforce. To give you some idea of magnitude within two weeks we plan to deploy more US firepower than the entire German Army, European NATO's strongest ground forces, and all of the high altitude weapons of the entire HAF or Luftwaffe. This is not two weeks after the war starts but after the decision to reinforce is taken."

"This will give the NATO commanders vitally needed operational reserves to prevent a breakthrough west or forward or pitch it off if it occurs. Our technique is to provide all sets of equipment in Europe, and fly over the troops by passenger airlift, and operational efforts that would otherwise be self-deployed, all they need is enough well-stocked Allied forces to receive them, negotiations to this end are already under way."

"But timely provision of this massive reinforcement is critically dependent upon effective support for the things. First, you must provide storage sites and houses for our prepositioned equipment, collocated operating bases for our air squadron, ammunition depots to store much more ammunition at the like. . . Second, we simply cannot allow the rapid mass deployment to Europe the equally massive logistic support forces needed to back them up. Hence we have turned to the concept known as Host Nation Support, whereby our European Allies will help provide us, out of the mobile forces within which you use, our own own forces, with the airlift and seafar, and airfield reception and unloading, transport forward to the battle area, develop mobile medical facilities, fuel storage and tank trucks etc, vital to our ability to fight."

"In addition to the plans proposed a Transatlantic to its European partners, we'll deploy rapidly massive combat reinforcement to the European NATO forces and Host Nation Support to enable us to do so. If we don't, we can't."

"Again we are spending several billions to develop and deploy long range mobile cruise and battlefield forces to maintain the continum of NATO's deterrence strategy."

But it is up to Europe to agree to receive them and help support them for the common defense...

"The days of defense on the cheap for Europe are over, with nuclear parity at hand. But we need not disrupt our economies or neglect social needs either. If we are wise and practical, we can employ more effectively in the common defense."
our own defense. This would be all the more paradoxical since the Western countries have at their disposal as incomparable human and material resources as the East which is so often unsung in the debate on the question of vigilance or moral courage, they failed to take up the challenge confronting their civilization and ideals."

AMBASSADOR MIKE MANSFIELD REVIEWS AMERICA'S JAPANESE RELATIONS

HON. PAT WILLIAMS OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1979

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I urge each of my colleagues to read this address by Ambassador Mike Mansfield, former Senate Majority Leader and now Ambassador Mansfield presented this address to the Foreign and Domestic Issues Council in Tokyo on September 12, 1979.

When I first arrived in Japan in June of 1977, I felt strongly that the framework of close and friendly ties between our two countries was a stabilizing factor in the years in the U.S. Congress, and on the basis of a long and enthusiastic interest in Asia, I had concluded that our two democracies had much in common and that a U.S.-Japan partnership was vital to our mutual well-being.

There were some problems in our relationship—for example, the concern here about the defense policies of each country. There were problems in our trade, in our politics, and differences concerning the initial operation of the nuclear fuel reprocessing plant at Tokai Mura—but I felt confident that those questions could be managed and resolved with goodwill and cooperation on both sides. That confidence was well placed. We have worked out good understandings on those other issues, testifying to the basic strength of our relationship.

The success of U.S.-Japan economic relations in June of 1977, however, was not good. We were in serious difficulty. The U.S. was heading into a trade deficit. The economic situation in Japan was having record breaking surpluses. There was a long list of problems and complaints relative to the military industries. Color television exports to the U.S. were arousing strong objections from industry and labor. Some TV trade issues were being tested in U.S. courts. We had problems in our trade in special and carbon steel. The multilateral trade negotiations had been going on for four years, but had made virtually no substantive progress. The mood in the U.S. Congress was problematical and there were increasing pressures for protectionist actions which would have left serious long-term damage.

In short, while there was no doubting our strong ties of friendship and our ability to talk to each other frankly, our ties were deeply troubled by many difficult issues. The next two years, consequently, were among the most difficult period in our relationship since the end of World War II. Tasting the picture is markedly different and the change has been for the better. Our two countries have developed a broader and more mature understanding. Despite serious problems, we are cooperating actively in a growing variety of areas. The breadth and depth of our relationship is reflected by the fact that President Carter and Prime Minister Ohira met in May 2 and did not concern only bilateral issues. It mirrored and emphasized the fact that our two countries have a growing mutual concern about world issues and that our bilateral relationship is expanding to a multilateral dimension. President Carter's state visit just before the Tokyo Summit demonstrated a new maturity and balance in our relations. In addition to the very good discussions he held with the Prime Minister, and the important formal aspects of his stay, the President and the Prime Minister had the opportunity to meet and talk directly with the Japanese from all walks of life at his town meeting which dramatized the close ties and common interests which characterize U.S.-Japan relations. In some respects that visit was the highlight of the bilateral visit.

Japan seems to me to be reaching out, taking a new and more active international role—and I believe this is good, for Japan and the world. As it does so, the United States will remain a consistent partner and fellow activist, for we believe in the old saying that far more can be achieved by two nations—not working together—but only by 8 percent. When in the past a correction of the trade imbalance, but not the bilateral visit.

One of the rewarding and satisfying aspects of our ties in the time I have been here has been our U.S.-Japan security relations, which we have strengthened and made more productive. In the last two years, a number of steps have been taken which enhance Japan. Japan is going ahead with the development of fighter systems such as the F-18 fighter, the P3C anti-submarine warfare aircraft, and the B32 early warning aircraft which lend credibility to its defensive posture. Japan has contributed a substantial share to the cost of U.S. Defense Forces located in Japan for mutual security purposes. Representatives of our two governments have developed guidelines for defense planning, which will add a new and important dimension to our cooperation in the security field. We are also engaged in intensive and high-level consultations on a broad range of issues. We had a successful meeting between JDA Director General Yamashita and Defense Secretary Brown in that meeting. But perhaps the most impressive improvement has been in the area of our trade and economic relations. I think the extent of the trade change is not fully appreciated, so I would like to cite the record.

In the first half of 1979 U.S. exports to Japan were up 46 percent compared to a year ago. U.S. imports from Japan were also up, but only by 8 percent. When in the past U.S. representatives said they were seeking a correction of the trade imbalance, but not restrictions on imports, this was precisely the trend they had in mind.

Japan's global current account surplus has disappeared and Japan had a deficit of $1.8 billion in the first two months of 1979. In part that is the result of sharply higher oil prices, but it also reflects import increases across the board. But for 1979 we may well see more increases in Japanese exports, or at least stable Japan-South Korean trade, but there is no reason why the problem of burdensome Japanese surpluses should not be behind us.

Some of Japan's traditionally strong exports have declined or levelled off, at least in the first half of the year. We have our problems, but the U.S. so far in 1979 are down by 5 percent compared with the similar period in 1978. Indeed, the first half of the year was down 3.2 percent. Because of strong demand

COMMUNIQUE AGREED TO BETWEEN PRESIDENT CARTER AND PRIME MINISTER OHIRA IN 1979

In the U.S. for smaller, energy efficient cars it is certain that Japanese auto exports will rise to some extent. This trade is beneficial to both countries, and we should expect increases in response to the Japanese demand form the U.S. that they are smooth and in accord with market developments.

U.S. Agriculture continues to be a bright spot in our world trade, and Japan is our best foreign market. In 1978 we shipped $4.6 billion in farm products, up by a half a billion dollars from the year before, and the total should be over $8 billion this year. We are shipping capital goods, up 29 percent in 1978, and consumer goods which were up 33 percent.

There are many reasons for this improvement, but one of them is that we Americans are following your advice and working harder at selling in Japan. You sent a record-breaking trade development mission to the U.S. in the spring of 1979, and we reciprocated by sending a mission of over 100 members to Japan in October. This year we and the Japanese Government are cooperating in a project to use the Japanese exhibit ship, the Shin Sakura Maru, to bring U.S. consumer products to 19 port cities in Japan beginning in October for two months. One hundred forty eight U.S. companies will find local distributors for them to develop their sales in the future. U.S. products will be on display and you hope all of you will find time and visit the ship and see what we have to offer.

The successful completion of the Multilateral Trade Negotiation blueprint for reward. Japan made a splendid contribution, agreeing to lower duties on industrial goods from applied rates by 28 percent and much more from statutory rates, while the U.S. cut will be 31 percent. As a result, Japan's average tariffs on dutiable industrial goods will be 4.9 percent in 1980, down from 9.9 percent for major industrial country. Japan also contributed greatly in the negotiation of new codes governing international trade, and I hope Japan will ratify them expeditiously.

The success of the MTN and continuing benefit of all is our best answer to protectionism. As trade expands and more and more business is conducted across national boundaries, the values of a liberalized international system become more important. The Lockheed scandal which shocked Japan is an example of how such things can serve to strengthen the belief that international business is carried on in accordance with the highest ethical standards. It is a matter of pride that a major country can or should dictate what is ethical behavior in international business. Therefore, I firmly support the proposal last month for a conference of leading industrial countries to consider an international convention on business conduct. This idea is not new; the need for multilateral action is clear, and I think all industrial countries should act on this without delay.

We still have much to do. Our problems really have not all disappeared. I have heard of one example: Japanese steel surpluses have not gone away for good, but is only hiding for awhile and will soon be back. This is a problem which we have learned to balance course is a wiser course, and that all countries share the responsibility for avoiding excessive surpluses or deficits. The Carter-Ohira Communiqué of May 2 confirms that we must take a common approach which will contribute to a stable and clearly in our interest to do so.

The success of the MTN also imposes obligations on us all. In order to gain approval in the U.S. Congress has already passed our implementing legislation by an overwhelming vote. The Japanese Diet will have to act soon in accordance with international law. The MTN codes
and the agreement of June 2 between Ambas-
sador O'Neill and Iranian authorities to con-
commit both countries to clear up some dif-
ficult problems relating to import standards,
sales of tobacco to the Japan tobacco,
smuggling, oil, and the Panama Canal by govern-
ment controlled agencies, especially NTT. We must
approach these issues in a spirit of compre-
nession—of a GATT spirit, so to settle them in
a manner consistent with the principles of
reciprocity and open trade. The objective is
to assure reciprocal access and expanded
opportunities for business.
Japan also needs to develop a better image in
Japan must, in fact, do much better in
the face of initial resistance. We also need to
invest our resources and energy for bene-
fits to our fellow man. Japan wants to
recognize how damaging it can be to
them when an American is given a bad
impression at the start. American exporters
know that they must compete in the
market, sell competitive products and meet Japanese standards. They
should be given to understand that they can
expect the same kind of consideration that
Japanese export to the U.S.
Such problems can rise owing to the cul-
tural and societal differences between us. Despite our friendship, partnership and
interdependence, we are separated by cultural
gaps which have to be understood If they are
to be bridged. To help that process along
I would like to propose a program of work-
study grants to help Americans understand
Japan better. Many Japanese learn
America really works. This would represent a long-
itudinal study of many generations of Ameri-
cans who do the same
Japan needs to propose a program
involving diplomats and private citizens
of many nations. We mounted no assault
the skyjacking. We continued this protective
stance against import standards,
tobacco to the Japan tobacco
business partner. The task
of many exiles from the Ayatollah 's closest
platforms, including some of the Ayatollah 's closest
associates, once took refuge in the United States. Many may want to seek it again, from
the Ayatollah, while pressing for the release
of our own citizenry, the United States
should feel no shame in resisting outrageous
demands. A multitude of, devils swarm
in the bottle that the Ayatollah has recklessly
uncorked.
Missing from the New York Times
editorial is the idea of what to do when
Iran's revolution is perceived as
host country. In my opinion, the United States
would be wise to begin a search
for the machinery to cope with such
situations. Many of the hostages are being held
in the Embassy in Tehran by
radical Moslem students who want to
force the United States to deliver the
Ayatollah. We believe the Ayatollah's
Ruhollah Khomeini has endorsed the
students' action. We must make a
decision to storm the
Embassy. These violations of diplomatic im-
munity are part of a continuing pattern of
actions by the Ayatollah 's closest
officials. A multitude of devils swarm
diplomatic posts. Naturally, we all
remember a few years ago when the
Israelis rescued 100 or so victims from
the skyjacked Air France plane. However,
the Israeli raid on the airport in Entebbe,
Uganda was a stroke of great brilliance
difficult to duplicate. Other similar oper-
ations, such as the Egyptian mission at
Nicosia, may be far less successful. Nev-
ertheless, our diplomatic missions
must be protected. If host governments will not
prevent them, as they are sup-
posed to do by ancient usage, then we
have no alternative but to do the job
ourselves. Perhaps, this is the lesson to
be learned from Tehran.

CRACKDOWN ON IRANIAN STUDENTS
IN THE UNITED STATES
HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI
OF NEW YORK
THE LESSON OF TEHRAN
HON. LAMAR GUDGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, November 8, 1979
Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Speaker, in recent
years, American Ambassadors have been
kidnapped and even murdered in the line
of duty. In Iran today, scores of Ameri-
can diplomatic staff are
being held hostage in the Embassy in Tehran by
radical Moslem students who want the
United States to deliver the
Ayatollah. When the Ayatollah
Ruhollah Khomeini has endorsed the
students' action, we must
study a way to avoid
giving such an impression to newcomers to
Japan.
Changing our attitudes and styles of be-
havior is not easy. We Americans need to
take a longer view, not give up too
soon, or too large, do we seek to restrain them.
When that happens Japanese exporters feel
that they are blamed for being "too success-
ful". When we try to sell to Japan the most
severe problems arise after the entry of a
new company or product. Sometimes the
result is that a would-be American exporter falls
before he ever gets started. To him that
seems a failure. He had never had a chance.
We need to find a way to avoid
giving such an impression to newcomers to
Japan.
With that understanding we look for a
way to work together.
Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to
quote from the New York Times editorial
November 6, 1979, which sums up the
situation in Iran. "The American intelligence
functionaries are watching the Ayatollah
Khomeini's closest aides carefully for
any moves to use the Revolutionary Guards as a
troop of occupation forces in the
Middle East and to build up military platforms
in Iraq and France.
Whatever the merits or deprivations of the
Ayatollah for medical treatment, after discouraging his
release by the Iranians, the turmoil in
Iran requires all nations to reaffirm their
respect for asylum and immunity.
Many previous exiles from the Shah,
including some of the Ayatollah's closest
associates, once took refuge in the United States. Many may want to seek it again, from
the Ayatollah, while pressing for the release
of our own citizenry, the United States
should feel no shame in resisting outrageous
demands. A multitude of, devils swarm
in the bottle that the Ayatollah has recklessly
uncorked.

In any case, a regime bent on irrational
cornerstone is a serious threat to the
world's system. The shared purpose of the
embassy takeovers is to force
the United States to return the
Ayatollah. The Iran of is a revolutionary
jury. The deposing of the Shah
is another valued tradition that the Ayat-
ollah seems to consider diabolical now that
the Shah has been returned to
his throne.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join other Members of Congress in
expressing shock and outrage over the
capture of the U.S. Embassy in Iran. Even
more unconscionable is the fact that the
Iranian Government has refused to per-
mit American envoy entry into Iran to
negotiate the return of the
hostages.

I would be remiss if I failed to ex-
press my dissatisfaction at the response
to Iran's illegal actions to date. This crisis
The American Government must
accept the responsibility of
American hostages.
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Earlier this week a number of Iranian students occupied the Statue of Liberty in New York City, chaining themselves inside the monument for several hours. Federal Park officials were forced to close the landmark and to evacuate more than 1,000 tourists from the island.

Mr. Speaker, under title VIII of the United States Code, the Attorney General of the United States has the authority to deport these lawbreakers. Today, I have forwarded a telegram to Benjamin Civiletti, Attorney General of the United States, urging him to instruct agents of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to closely monitor the activities of these activists—within the framework of U.S. law—to determine if they are fulfilling the terms of their visas. Those that represent a danger to public welfare and safety should have deportation proceedings initiated against them.

In addition, I have contacted President Carter and urged him to join in the effort to quell these outrageous protests against our Government. The following is a copy of my telegram to the Attorney General:

KIRK BENJAMIN CIVILETTI, Attorney General Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

I am forwarding this telegram: In light of the continuing stalemate involving American hostages at the U.S. embassy in Iran and the unlawful activities of a number of Iranian students in this country, I strongly urge you to take the steps necessary to identify those lawbreakers and to deport these lawbreakers. Today, I urge you to carry out within the framework of American law to ensure that the civil rights of any individual are honored. However, the current situation demands that we use the laws to their fullest extent. The time for leniency toward these culprits has passed and the patience of the American people has reached the breaking point. It is time for the United States government to take a strong and decisive stand against lawlessness perpetrated by these temporary visitors to our great country. I urge you in the strongest terms to deport these lawbreakers. Those that represent a danger to public welfare and safety should have deportation proceedings initiated against them.

Obviously, it is imperative that this be carried out within the framework of American law to ensure that the civil rights of any individual are honored. However, the current situation demands that we use the laws to their fullest extent.

The time for leniency toward these culprits has passed and the patience of the American people has reached the breaking point. It is time for the United States government to take a strong and decisive stand against lawlessness perpetrated by these temporary visitors to our great country. I urge you in the strongest terms to deport these lawbreakers. Those that represent a danger to public welfare and safety should have deportation proceedings initiated against them.

Sincerely,

LEO C. ZEFFRETTI, Member of Congress

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

November 8, 1979

The crisis must be met both forcefully and expeditiously by the President and the State Department to ensure the safe return of these hostages. Consequently, the Immigration and Naturalization Service must make every effort to enforce all American immigration laws. Especially pertinent to Iranian students and temporary residents as a sign to the Iranian government that we will not stand idly by while this debacle in Tehran continues.

In the tradition of American goodwill toward the international community, our government has welcomed students from around the globe—including several thousand Iranian students—into our universities and into our institutions of higher learning. This privilege does not grant these temporary visitors the right to disrupt American society through unruly protests and demonstrations.

Earlier this week, a number of Iranian students occupied the Statue of Liberty in New York City, chaining themselves inside the monument for several hours. Federal Park officials were forced to close the landmark and to evacuate more than 1,000 tourists from the island. The authorities in charge of the island throughout the United States have also held disruptive demonstrations of support for the despotic acts of their government.

The VII, Subsection 1182, paragraph 27 of the U.S. Code states that aliens "shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States" if "the consular officer or the Attorney General in his discretion believes (they) to seek to enter the United States solely, principally or incidentally to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest or endangers public welfare, safety, or security of the United States."

I interpret this statute to mean that the students who occupied the Statue of Liberty can and should be deported. In addition, Immigration and Naturalization Service officials should closely monitor the activities of all Iranian activists residing in the United States to determine whether they are upholding the terms of their visas and the laws of the land. Immigration and Naturalization Service agents in Washington and in the field offices throughout the nation must be given notice to crack down on the illegal activities of Iranian demonstrators. Those that represent a danger to public welfare and safety should have deportation proceedings initiated against them.

The occupation of the U.S. embassy in Tehran and the taking of American citizens as hostages is an outrageous act of barbarism. Even more incredible is the fact that the Ayatollah Khomenei has condoned this act of terrorism through his refusal to permit American envoys to enter the country to negotiate the safe release of those hostages.

TREATMENT OF VIETNAM VETERANS A SHAMEFUL CHAPTER FOR NATION

HON. RICHARD BOLLING OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of my colleagues to a column appearing in the AFL-CIO News, October 27, 1979, written by Gus Tyler, chairman of the American Veterans Committee. As we approach the national observance of Veterans' Day, it is crucial that we recognize the special problems faced by our Vietnam veterans.

The column follows:

BY GUS TYLER

Most Americans believe that the Vietnamese veterans have been treated in a shabby, even shameful, way. Three out of four Americans believe that the Viet vets should be getting more aid and benefits and that they have a harder time adjusting to civilian life than veterans of other wars.

Two out of three Americans believe that people have not treated Viet vets as well as veterans of other wars and that we have been mean to Viet vets because the war was unpopular. These are the findings of a poll conducted by the New York Daily News.

Mr. Speaker, I have rewritten what most Viet vets feel with passion. They feel it is unjust to get under his skin to feel as feels unless you are fortunate enough to spend an hour or two with Lt. Muller as he pours out his heart on the plight of his erstwhile fellows-in-arms.

Bobby is an ex-Marine who agonized through the decimation of a platoon under his command. He is a one-man crusade to get America to understand the men—and women—who fought in Vietnam. From his wheelchair, he speaks out with fire and finely honed fury.

The Vietnam veteran is different, he insists. He was engaged in a war he never understood that was fought in a way he never understood.

There were those who said that we should just blow those Communists right off the map. Bobby spoke to the world. His name was Bobby Muller as he pours out his heart on the plight of his erstwhile fellows-in-arms.

Mr. Speaker, we must spend time and money to help these war wounded, not simply for the sake of the war wounded, but for the sake of America.

AN ENERGY VIEWPOINT FROM BANKERS TRUST

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the movement of the recent synthetic fuels legislation through the Congress, of course, raises the question about the levels of Federal and private sector investment required to develop a synthetic fuels industry. At the same time, we must also enhance our domestic oil and gas supplies.
The Bankers Trust Co. of New York last month published an energy newsletter which is a valuable contribution to the national debate over the economics of energy supply. Its conclusions are that if we are to maintain today's level of oil and gas production in 1970, give some growth in coal and nuclear for electricity, it will require much greater capital investment than we see today.

I suggest that the following two sections of this newsletter would be particularly interesting to Members in shaping the congressional pieces of a major energy policy. The report certainly raises questions about current economic policy and suggests a major change which must be made to insure financing for adequate energy supply.

The newsletter follows:

OIL AND GAS SHARE

Based on these inflation rate estimates and on the constant dollar expenditures projected earlier, oil and gas capital requirements will exceed $12 billion in 1972 and $20 billion in 1990 in current dollars. Meanwhile, total business investment would increase from $360 billion to $850 billion during those years. As a result, the oil and gas industry's capital needs in 1990 would climb to 21 percent of the nation's total investment, up from only 16.5 percent in 1970.

It is obvious that the oil and gas industry is extremely unlikely to capture such a high proportion of total business investment. If the industry actually managed to do this, all other business investment would be limited to about 1 1/4 percent real annual growth through 1990. This is completely incompatible with our fundamental assumption of GNP growing at 3 percent; a 1 1/4 percent growth in business investment cannot be expected to propel GNP at 3 percent. Our energy needs need not become the major investment sector seriously out of balance.

The Inescapable conclusion, as we see it, is that the United States must devote a larger share of its gross national product to fixed business investment, if it is to maintain its economic strength. This need not become an unbearable sacrifice as other industrialized nations can demonstrate. For example, in Germany the ratio of investment to GNP is 20 percent; in Japan it is 20 percent. If our present 10.2 percent share in the U.S. were increased by 1 1/4 percent, an additional 1.3 percent of official GNP would be transferred to the investment sector in 1990. In this case the oil and gas industry's proportion would still be 18 percent, but the remaining capital supply would be sufficient to support the predicted 3 percent real growth rate in all other business investments.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

To avoid economic stagnation during the 1970's, maximum effort both to produce and conserve energy is required in the United States. Merely to stabilize U.S. oil imports will require some growth in available capital over the next decade. New expenditures for oil and gas are increasing, but alternative expenditures for replacing capital stock to improve energy efficiency and utilize alternative energy sources will be necessary. The newsletter suggests that the investment share of GNP will have to increase to meet the balanced needs of both the energy and other industries through the coming decade.

This means more savings will be required. The government could encourage savings with tax incentives to recognize the need for more rapid depreciation rates for industrial try to cover soaring replacement costs. Moreover, tax on conservation that are already in place, may have to be increased. Personal savings could be encouraged by the repeal of income surtaxes and taxes on savings deposits. Similar treatment for dividend earnings would also be helpful.

Most importantly, because inflation discourages both business and personal savings, a greater effort to curb inflation is mandatory. This translates to explicit responsibility on the part of the Federal Government and prudent monetary growth on the part of the Federal Reserve. Voluntary actions which have not prevailed in the recent past.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TOSING A DROWNING MAN AN ANCHOR

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 8, 1979

Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed H.R. 4865, the Priority Energy Act. This Fast Track legislation would establish an Energy Mobilization Board with broad powers at all levels of Government. Soon, however, the full House will be considering the creation of yet another agency, the Energy Security Corporation. I have argued that what we really need is not more bureaucracy, but a comprehensive review of existing statutes which are perceived by many to hinder the planning and implementation of energy projects.

Recently, I received a letter from the president of the American Mining Congress in which the establishment of an EM and an ESC is seriously questioned. AMC president J. Allen Overton states that:

Mismanagement by existing federal agencies has contributed largely to the energy crisis, and to argue that creation of one more Governmental agency, whatever its form would rise from 1 to 1.2 billion would transfer to the investment sector during the period of the legislation.

He also calls for the reform of the "oppressive regulatory regime already in being." I agree with this assessment and commend the letter to my colleagues.

Recent, October 23, 1979.

Re: Energy Mobilization Board: Energy Security Corporation

HON. TOM CORCORAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: The growing dependence of the United States on foreign sources of oil is now generally recognized as perilous in the extreme. The volatility of these foreign sources poses stark geopolitical risks for our national security, while our bondage to these sources tends to fetter American foreign policy. At the same time, the rising cost of oil imports due to higher volume and prices stimulates inflation at home and undermines the economic order of the globe.

There is no alternative on the immediate horizon other than making greater and better use of energy resources domestically available, including oil, gas, coal and nuclear power. In the short term, at least for the next decade or two, expanded use of the nation's abundant coal reserves is essential.

For these reasons, the American Mining Congress favors a vigorous program of synthetic fuels development, provided it is properly supervised.

We believe the amendment offered by Majority Leader Robert Byrd and approved by the Committee, establishing a $20 billion trust fund for synthetic fuels projects, sets an appropriate level of public funding at this time.

We further believe that government funding should be restricted to assisting initial commercial-scale plants that demonstrate the fuels are economically viable. Because such loans, loan guarantees and purchase contracts. It is our view that a new Energy Security Corporation is not required to accomplish these goals.

In opposing the establishment of an Energy Security Corporation or similar type body, one of my rationales was the fear that it would pave the way for government-owned facilities, which we regard as a hindrance to the sound development of a synthetic fuels industry. This fear has been realized in the bill approved by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which would authorize up to three government-owned plants.

Similarly, both by existing federal agencies has contributed largely to the energy crisis, and to argue that creation of one more Governmental agency, whatever its form would rise from 1 to 1.2 billion would transfer to the investment sector during the period of the legislation.

He also calls for the reform of the "oppressive regulatory regime already in being." I agree with this assessment and commend the letter to my colleagues.

Recent, October 23, 1979.

Re: Energy Mobilization Board: Energy Security Corporation

HON. TOM CORCORAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: The growing dependence of the United States on foreign sources of oil is now generally recognized as perilous in the extreme. The volatility of these foreign sources poses stark geopolitical risks for our national security, while our bondage to these sources tends to fetter American foreign policy. At the same time, the rising cost of oil imports due to higher volume and prices stimulates inflation at home and undermines the economic order of the globe.

There is no alternative on the immediate horizon other than making greater and better use of energy resources domestically available, including oil, gas, coal and nuclear power. In the short term, at least for the next decade or two, expanded use of the nation's abundant coal reserves is essential.

For these reasons, the American Mining Congress favors a vigorous program of synthet
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External threat We still have heroes in America, although we only sense of national heroes. We only put ourselves in with painting, I think, for the past Western democracies is fading. There's still best we can hope for is to. We don't mean universal heroes. I don't think of show-business and sports figures as heroic, except in the case of Ali, who actually represents a great deal more than a sportsman. I think there would be a great flood of heroes coming up if we really thought the country was in danger.

It seems easy to go backwards in the arts I look upon the arts as one of the areas that requires our attention. We often think there's going to be progress in every area. In fact, it seems to be very easy to go backwards in the arts. I'll just mention two areas that I'm personally interested in.

One is caricature. I do a page of caricature every month in Harper's magazine, and I'm always aware that caricature has reached its ebb in the last hundred years. The reason is that most artists today are no longer trained in the kind of line work that were—In anatomy, architecture and land­scapes, just to mention three.

Those who couldn't make a go of it in the higher forms of painting would make a living doing caricatures and illustrations. They tended to be satirically good at it because you cannot do caricature well unless you can deal with human form, human ramification and the traps of language and buildings. Now many art schools do not emphasize such broad studies, and the result is that we have a very sad lot of caricaturists, over all.

The Last Little Obedient Colony of Europe In literature, something similar has happened. Realism in fiction was mainly an invention of the 18th century, when writers began to portray the everyday life of all types of people with detailed attention to dialogue and natural surroundings. It turned out to have a power that no other written literatures has. The best British critic of his day, Lord Jeffrey, confessed to having broken down and cried upon reading the death of Little Will in The Old Curiosity Shop. Dickens.

Now, you don't have to like Dickens or The Old Curiosity Shop to see the power of a form using realism that can actually move people to tears. But many writers have given up realism in the novel. That is like an engineer saying: "We've been using electricity for a hundred years. We're going to do something else from now on."

Since the second World War, there's been a fashion for the kind of writing, where most writers come from, that has turned away from realism and has begun what I think of as the "new realism." In that form, you tell modern fables, usually nihilistic in tone. There are many talented writers operating in this area. Perhaps the best is John Barth and Thomas Pynchon. I think they've put themselves in a corner. They're using a tenth of the wattage that is available with realism.

I'm just getting ready to write a sequel to The Fat Man, which will deal with architecture and serious music, and a little with dance and philosophy. In all of these areas, as with the past, the people who are 40 to 60 years artists have been devoting all of their talents not to some vision that they themselves have had but to theoretical con­cepts that usually came from Europe. When it comes to the arts, we're the last little obedient colony of Europe. In fact, for example, we have often looked toward Europe for almost any kind of innovation.

Ethnic and racial heroes exist today. All you have to do is look at closed-circuit tele­vision of a Muhammad and you will quickly find out that he is a real hero to colored peoples of all sorts.

We don't have universal heroes. I don't think of show-business and sports figures as heroic, except in the case of Ali, who actually represents a great deal more than a sportsman. I think there would be a great flood of heroes coming up if we really thought the country was in danger.

We have been told so often that capitalism is a danger to the arts. We're the last little obedient colony of Europe. In fact, for example, we have often looked toward Europe for almost any kind of innovation.

The European intellectuals who fled to the United States in the 30s have, now turned down to—like white gods in jungle movies of that period. This country, which seemed so maverick and self-confident in almost every other area, was intellectually timid in the arts.

There is no more radical-chic society. The people who were involved in what I call radical chic were always much more inter­ested in the chic part than the radical part. They were not anxious to endure the heat if it became unpleasant. They were quite ready to jettison the Black Panthers of the Weatherman or any of those groups when it became known that they were support­ing those causes.
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States became the most powerful country on earth militarily, the wealthiest country on earth, the country with the atomic bomb, and except for their atomic bomb, they also became the world's most inaccurate, most dishonest, most irresponsible country. There is a critical need to bring to the American public the truth about this country from 1945 until the present, and to bring a movement of the American people to the realization of the American public's power to make a change in the country we live in, one where the truth is the basis for all governmental actions.

As a citizen of this country, I believe that it is my duty to bring to the American public the truth about this country and to bring a movement of the American people to the realization of the American public's power to make a change in the country we live in, one where the truth is the basis for all governmental actions.
the subject a new, highly emphasized position in the curriculum— at all grade levels from kindergarten through high school.

Accordingly, schools across the United States are now gearing up to meet the new mandates to strengthen their classroom nutrition education programs— and school administrators and curriculum specialists acknowledge they need help with this challenge—from all appropriate sources—from both the public and private sectors. Indeed, the degree of help that will be forthcoming from the public sector is defined and limited, and so support from the private sector, if appropriate and educationally sound is eagerly sought and willingly accepted.

Weight Watchers “Garden of Eating” program gives me hope that other responsible American business will undertake appropriate support of the curriculum in similar fashion. Indeed, a number of companies and trade organizations already are doing so. Obviously, neither Weight Watchers nor any other corporation is in a position to take on the sole responsibility for providing nutrition education materials for all grade levels and all schools. They are not even in a position to do that for a single grade level. Nor, in my judgment, would it be appropriate for any company to take on a continuing burden of that dimension. But it seems to me that what the Weight Watchers nutrition education program does is a forerunner of the kinds of other public service efforts— is to point the way in which corporations working cooperatively with educators can share in meeting our schools’ curriculum needs. These needs are large but so is business capacity. The challenge today is to motivate the private sector to take on responsibilities in this arena.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Friday, November 9, 1979

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Brademas.

**DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:—

**November 8, 1979.** I hereby designate the Honorable John Brademas to act as Speaker pro tempore on Friday, November 9, 1979.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.*

*Therefore we will not fear, though the earth be removed, and the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea.*

*The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.*—Psalms 46: 1–3, 7.

Bless our Nation, and all the people, O Lord, and may Your spirit give us confidence and patience in the face of adversity. We pray for all those who are anxious or have special need that You will comfort them by Your presence. Encourage them with the promise of hope and the abiding assurance of the unity of our people. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

**THE JOURNAL**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof. Pursuant to clause 1, rule 1, the Journal stands approved.

**A MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

**S. 668.** An act to permit the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians to contract with the United States for the purposes of any claim such band could have filed with the Indian Claims Commission under the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049).

**ACTION URGED TO COUNTER IRANIAN THREAT TO U.N. CHARTER**

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

**Mr. HUBBARD.** Mr. Speaker, as the Ayatollah Khomeini- incited revolutionaries continue to threaten and hold hostage 60 Americans in Tehran, at this point we do need to give President Carter what he asks of us regarding this tragic crisis—the continued support of the American people.

Yes, I admit I am humiliated and very angry about the events in Tehran. Iran is in obvious violation of the first principle of the United Nations Charter—that force or the threat of force should not be used to achieve national political objectives.

When will the world leaders of the United Nations take strong action against Iran's current mob rule—a dangerous affront to the U.N. Charter? I have never been impressed by the ability of the United Nations to solve crises, but it would be refreshing to see the United Nations prove now they are capable of intervening to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Iran.

**FURTHER DEMONSTRATIONS SEEN AS THREAT TO LIVES OF HOSTAGES IN TEHRAN**

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

**Mr. BROOMFIELD.** Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned at reports that District of Columbia officials may permit anti-American demonstrations today by Iranian students.

At a time when every American is deeply concerned about the lives of those U.S. Embassy employees being held hostage in Tehran, such a decision is not only ill-advised but dangerous.

While I am vitally concerned about preserving every citizen's right to free speech, the potential for violence in such demonstrations could only further inflame the situation, hinder the President's diplomatic efforts and endanger the lives of those American hostages.

I am much more concerned about preserving the rights—and the lives—of those Americans held hostage in Tehran than I am about the rights of those Iranian noncitizens who are, after all, guests in our country.

The President is to be commended for the restraint he has shown in dealing with this difficult situation. He clearly has placed the safety of the hostages ahead of all other considerations and I fully support the diplomatic initiatives he has undertaken to win their freedom.

There are indications that those efforts may now be making some progress and we all have a responsibility to make certain they are not upset.

**ANOTHER PERSONNEL RESHUFFLING AT SSA**

(Mr. CONABLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

**Mr. CONABLE.** Mr. Speaker, Social Security Commissioner Stanford Ross recently announced his resignation, after barely a year on the job.

Serious questions can be raised about such short tenure in such an important post. But an overriding question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the Social Security Administration can stand another reorganization, which a new Commissioner understandably might wish to effect.

Reflecting on the past 5 years, this agency has been through three different reorganiza-