

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## HORNED TOAD TRADITIONS

## HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, at a time in this Nation's history when many would have us forget our heritage and give up our traditions, I am glad to report that one tradition is alive and well. On May 17, just a few weeks ago, I had the honor of participating in the Annual Horned Toad Festival and the Horned Toad Derby Parade in Coalinga, Calif.

First begun in 1935, in the midst of the Great Depression, this festival has continued and prospered in spite of the decline in population of the horned toad—for reasons other than the festival, I might add—for which it is named.

When the State of California made it illegal to commercially trap desert wildlife, a special exemption was sought and granted for Coalinga's festival. Now, thanks to the efforts of an industrious woman in the Antelope Valley area of California, horned toads are captured for the race, flown to Coalinga, and then returned to their native habitat a few days later.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that tradition continues. I think more people should keep and practice their own traditions. To that end, I would like to insert a recent article from the Los Angeles Times further describing tradition as practiced in Coalinga.

## A SMALL LEAP FOR COALINGA

WOMAN HELPS KEEP ALIVE HORNED TOAD FESTIVAL

(By Charles Hillinger)

ANTELOPE VALLEY.—Around these parts she's called "Tennessee Pat" but in Coalinga 150 miles to the north, she's known as "The Horny Toad Lady of Antelope Valley" and she's something of a heroine.

Her true name is Pat Hargrave.

She is a heroine because almost single-handedly (she gets a bit of help from her two young sons) she's keeping alive a grand old tradition in the little town of Coalinga, which has a shortage of grand old traditions.

Hargrave is the sole supplier of the ugly little creatures that give name and fame to the annual Horned Toad Festival and Horned Toad Derby Days in Coalinga.

Horned toads (genus *phrynosoma*) are affectionately known as "horny toads" because of the horn-like protuberances that distinguish their reptilian complexions.

Since Hargrave now is the only supplier of horned toads to the horned toad festival she is called the "Horny Toad Lady."

Behind that unique title is this story:

Once upon a time, horny toads were common in Coalinga. So common, in fact, that lacking anything else to celebrate, the

townfolk of Coalinga began in 1935 to celebrate horned toads. It was a depression year, remember.

Over the years, the festival became pretty near the biggest event in town. And over the years, the horned toad population went into decline.

In 1972, special legislation prohibited the commercial trapping of desert wildlife like the horned toad. The festival seemed doomed.

For some years before the horned toad shortage developed, Hargrave had been making a living as a trapper of desert wildlife in the Antelope Valley, selling to pet stores around the nation. With the 1972 legislation, she was out of business.

But the folks in Coalinga had heard about Hargrave's horned toad skills and worked out a deal with the state Fish and Game Department.

Hargrave would be granted a special permit to capture horned toads, but *only* for the Coalinga festival, and only if the animals were treated humanely and returned to their desert homeland after the event.

That's the way it has been ever since. Hargrave—now aided by her sons, Tim, 13, and Robby, 8—patrols the desert country of Antelope Valley rounding out horned toads. Usually the boys act as lookouts, riding on the trunk of her car as she cruises the back roads. When the boys spot a likely specimen, mom stops the car and they move in for the capture.

By today, Hargrave and sons will have collected 75 horned toads and Coalinga City Councilman Keith Scrivner will fly his private plane to the Antelope Valley to pick them up.

On Friday and Saturday, the toads will race their hearts out in Coalinga City Park. On Monday, Scrivner will fly the toads back to the Antelope Valley where Hargrave will set them free.

For all this, Hargrave will be paid \$112.50—or \$1.50 for each toad.

"It is not a money-making proposition for me and my kids," she says. "But I just love to run the desert looking for the critters."●

## SPIRIT OF HELSINKI VIGIL FOR 1980

## HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a participant in the Spirit of Helsinki Vigil for 1980, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the case of Tatiana Shchipkova, a Russian professor of French language and literature who lost her teaching position because of her religious convictions.

Tatiana, 49, was arrested in September 1979, and convicted last January of "malicious hooliganism," which carried a 3-year sentence in a concentration camp. The real reason for Tatiana's arrest was her participation in

a Christian seminar, at which she and other Christians discussed their religious beliefs, shared their views, and reported on their reading. As a result of participating in the seminar, and of admitting her Christian faith to the KGB, Tatiana was dismissed from her teaching post at the Smolensk Pedagogical Institute and was stripped of her doctorate.

In a letter dated April 12, 1979, which was translated by the Human Rights Committee of the Congress of Russian Americans, Tatiana said:

We have no aggressive intentions, we fabricate no bombs, we do not even print leaflets, we do not agitate to rebel. We simply want not only to attend liturgy but wish to live in Christ, that is live together, help each other, pray and reflect together, practice our faith and speak about Christ—not with just anybody, but with those who desire this. Are we so dangerous? Obviously we are, since they persecute us.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the Helsinki agreement, let us be reminded of the Soviet Union's suppression of those who attempt to exercise their religious beliefs, and its many other violations of human rights.●

## SIMON SHNIRMAN AND IGOR GUBERMAN

## HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, last year I joined my colleagues in participating in the "Spirit of Helsinki Vigil," a concerted effort by the Congress to draw attention to all refuseniks and prisoners of conscience. Today, we must continue to speak out against the Soviet Union's repressive tactics toward a number of its citizens. I wish to draw our attention to two such individuals at this time.

Simon Shnirman was one of eight Soviet Jews arrested in the spring and summer of 1978 on trumped-up criminal charges. He was sentenced on June 27, 1978, to 2½ years for "draft evasion."

Simon first applied for a permit to rejoin his father in Israel in July 1977. His application was rejected on the grounds that he had not completed his schooling at a technical institute. Five months later, Mr. Shnirman reapplied, only to be refused, once again, in February 1978. This time, he was told that it would be inexpedient for him to emigrate as his mother and sister never asked to leave the Soviet Union. At the same time, he was threatened with conscription into the Soviet

Army. Soon after his family submitted a visa application, Simon was arrested on May 31 and tried 1 month later, charged with "evasion of army service." It is hopefully anticipated that his term of imprisonment will end in December of this year.

Igor Guberman, an author of popular books and articles on science for young people, was affiliated with the Union of Soviet Writers since 1965. When it became clear to him that all ways of artistic self-expression were closed for a Jew in the Soviet Union, he applied for permission to emigrate to Israel in December 1978. Igor had been actively involved in the Jewish movement in the Soviet Union for several years. His main contribution was to the unofficial publication, *Jews in the U.S.S.R.*, a journal devoted strictly to cultural and historical aspects of Jewish life in the Soviet Union. Soon after submitting this application, he was approached by KGB agents who wanted him to "keep an eye on emigrating Jews and to denounce and prepare provocations against Jewish activists." He refused. To punish Guberman, the KGB arrested him on August 13, 1979, on false charges of illegal purchasing and selling of icons. He has been collecting medieval relics for many years, which is not forbidden by Soviet law.

Since his arrest, Guberman has not seen his wife. Only a lawyer was permitted to see him in January 1980. According to the latest information, he was tried on March 11 and sentenced to 5 years imprisonment in a strict regime labor camp 50 miles from Moscow. It is important to note that the only evidence against Guberman, who was charged with "acquisition or marketing of property known to have been criminally acquired," is that of the testimony of two criminals who were previously sentenced for stealing icons.

These men are just two examples of the vast numbers of individuals who are denied their basic freedoms. Despite the pronouncement that a record number of Soviet citizens are applying for visas, it is a sad but true fact that less people are free to emigrate. This situation will get increasingly worse as the Soviets plan the Olympic games in Moscow, ultimately denying emigration status to all Soviet citizens. As we all know, the true measure of oppression is not the number of Jews who eventually make it out of the Soviet Union but, rather, it is the number of those individuals trying to get out of the country.

According to the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, 11,000 Soviet citizens have been allowed to emigrate. While this number may sound encouraging, we must keep in mind that over 51,000 people left the U.S.S.R. in 1979. For the month of April, 2,400 Soviet citizens were given permission to emigrate. One can compare this small number to the 4,300 individuals who

left the Soviet Union in April 1979. Moreover, visa offices within certain regions of the U.S.S.R. are closing as mandated by Soviet authorities. I am afraid that many individuals will never be allowed to leave, if they so desire.

As a signatory of the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights and as a party to the Helsinki Final Act, the Soviet Union had indicated its commitment to internationally recognized human rights. It is up to us, as Members of Congress, to raise our voices and to fight for the freedom of all repressed citizens of the Soviet Union. Let us not forget the plight of Simon Shnirman and Igor Guberman. May they be allowed to join their loved ones in freedom. ●

#### THE PEOPLE ASPECT OF OUR DEFENSE SYSTEM

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, annually, as we discuss the defense authorization bill, we focus on weapon systems, billion-dollar figures, and the ominous threat we face. But at times we tend to overlook the fact that the military means people, too. Our Armed Forces are made up of our sons and daughters. They are the ones who make the tanks roll, the ships sail, and the airplanes fly. Strangely enough, though, the people aspect of our defense system gets little attention, and that only when we hear of the ship that cannot get underway for lack of sufficient qualified personnel.

In a short article for the *Armed Forces Journal*, former Navy Under Secretary R. James Woolsey discusses the consequences of this neglect, and I commend his thoughts to my colleagues.

The article follows:

#### THE ART OF HELICOPTER MAINTENANCE

(By R. James Woolsey)

NEWSMAN. "Who was the officer in charge of preparing the checking for mechanical malfunction on the helicopters? \* \* \*

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE BROWN. "I'll take responsibility, \* \* \*

True, Harold Brown's answer, a principled answer, is not the whole story of the failures in the Iranian desert. But much of the search for a more complete answer is likely to be pointed in the wrong direction. Whatever the specific causes of the malfunctions in the three RH-53D's turn out to be after the agonizing review is done, there is a dimension to the problem that is masked, not illuminated, by a search for some specific problem with equipment or some individual mistake.

In *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*, Robert Pirsig leads us from an examination of modern man's reluctance to try to understand even the simpler machines that serve him, through Aristotle and Kant, and toward an understanding of care, craftsmanship, and quality. His metaphor of discovery

is a motorcycle trip west by the narrator and his young son through the high country of the Rockies and Sierras and, as Pirsig puts it, also through "the high country of the mind." But there is a sour note throughout the book—the contrast between the narrator's extraordinary insights about man, machinery, philosophy, and life, and his cool insensitivity to his son. He gets along with the boy and generally provides for his most basic needs, but there is no real sense of caring. When the boy has bad stomach cramps, for example, the father's main reaction is to be irritated at the inconvenience it causes. Finally, in the last pages of the book, Pirsig lets us know that the father begins to understand that love is to a relationship between people, what craftsmanship and quality are to a man and a difficult welding job.

The military Services are, above all, people—our sons, largely. We've been on a long trip with them since Vietnam. Sometimes we give them shiny machines to ride on, sometimes not. We've grudgingly taken them along, but we've told them in innumerable subtle ways that we don't really want to be bothered with them: look soldier, when I want you, I'll tell you—in the meantime, sit there in back and keep your mouth shut.

As the truth slowly begins to dawn on us that we need them, that there's no one between them and the goal line, we'll first give them better machines. We know how to do that, and it primarily demands only money. Besides, it means more jobs in a number of places, and Congress likes that. Next we may stop cutting Harold Brown's request for operations and maintenance money by many hundreds of millions of dollars, as Congress did last year. (Within a day or so after the failure of the raid, you can be sure that a number of Congress' 20,000 or so staff members began nervously to review the hundreds of operations and maintenance budget cuts they recommended to their bosses and the voluminous Committee reports that describe them. It was important for them to be able to assure themselves quickly that they could argue that their cuts should have had no impact on the relevant equipment failures if the stupid military had just done its job right.) Finally, we may even start decently paying the enlisted men and officers who volunteer to work hundred-hour weeks and to fly hundreds of miles on the deck into dark and unfriendly deserts.

But last of all, we civilians will come to the hardest understanding. We will come to realize that the armed Services aren't primarily machines, that they need more than a fee-for-service relationship with the society they are defending. "Who was responsible for helicopter maintenance on board the *Nimitz*?" We will ask that question petulantly and then, by the time we come to the last pages, we will—like Pirsig's narrator finally think of our sons, and look in the mirror. ●

#### THE CRIES OF SMALL BUSINESSES

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, of the numerous letters I have received recently from owners of small businesses, I feel the following is an accu-

rate summation of the frustrations felt by the many discouraged and threatened small business owners. At this time, I insert the text of a letter from Ronald L. Pinchback, president of Pinchback Volkswagen-Mazda, Inc., of Lexington, Ky.:

"HELP! I know you hear that a lot lately, but I mean HELP! The high interest rates are about to put us small businessmen completely out of business. If this country is to continue as a democracy, the small businessmen must have help.

I would like you to bear with me as I share some specifics with you to demonstrate my problem. Last year at this time I was paying 13.25% on each new car in my inventory and my floor plan costs were approximately \$3,900.00 per month.

Today I am paying 19.50% on my new inventory and my monthly floor plan cost is \$14,500.00 per month. The factory continues to pressure me to order more new cars and trucks. I am fast approaching the point where I must decide whether to put my personal assets on the line (I can get nothing more from the bank) or close my doors and lay off my 65 employees. I have already cut my payroll by 5 employees since January first.

My fellow dealers and I desperately need HELP to solve a problem which is not of our own making. We did not initiate these interest rate increases. We are a vital part of our Kentucky as well as our national economy. As an alternative to direct aid, I would like to see a moratorium on all state usury laws, at least as they apply to new and used motor vehicle loans. Sales have almost come to a complete halt because customers wanting to buy cars cannot get financing.

In closing I would only repeat that we need HELP immediately and hope that you will give our problem special consideration."

Sincerely yours,

RONALD L. PINCHBACK,  
President. ●

#### APRIL HANDGUN DEATH TOLL REACHES 520

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the handgun war continues across the Nation. Easily concealable and easily misused handguns are used in murders, suicides, and accidental deaths. During the month of April, for instance, at least 520 Americans died as a result of handgun misuse, bringing the total for 1980 to 2,294 dead.

The handgun body count which I am inserting into the RECORD is a list of media-reported handgun deaths compiled by Handgun Control, Inc.

Handgun control legislation is a necessary and pressing concern of the Congress. Hearings are likely to be scheduled in the near future on this issue. I call on my colleagues to investigate the problem of handgun misuse in this country and to endorse the many excellent legislative proposals that are pending before this body to curb the availability of handguns. The handgun body count follows:

#### THE AMERICAN HANDGUN WAR DEAD, APRIL 1980

##### ALABAMA (13)

J. Carmichael, A. Hill, W. Martin, L. McCoy, C. Nash, C. Speakman, E. Speakman, E. Speakman, J. Thomas, K. Thomas, A. Tyre, S. Van Antwerp, R. Woods.

##### ARIZONA (6)

J. Glasco, D. Howell, L. Kriley, S. Liggins, B. Martinsen, J. Romero.

##### ARKANSAS (15)

J. Badger, R. Barnes, D. Black, B. Callaway, J. Defoure, C. Dowdy, J. Jones, C. Pilcher, J. Pool, M. Roland, A. Shavers, D. Simons, B. Thompson, A. Watts, C. Winston.

##### CALIFORNIA (76)

P. Adams, W. Ashford, A. Atchley, W. Bateman, R. Bell, R. Betts, H. Booth, O. Borrero, E. Boysen, R. Boysen, R. Broomfield.

L. Capi, J. Castro, K. Copenhafer, D. Diaz, L. Dokos, R. Dubrini, R. Flores, M. Fonteno, A. Frauspo, G. Gaston, R. Goodall, S. Grabl.

K. Hill, M. Holmes, D. Hopper, G. Jackson, A. Johansen, M. Johnson, T. Jones, E. Lujan, N. Lujan, G. Luther, G. Massey, S. Miller, M. Modrigal.

M. Nunez, A. Papiano, F. Paul, D. Reible, D. Remington, J. Ruando, W. Ryan, J. Salazar, J. Sanabria, R. Saunders, S. Shalom, S. Shirley, P. Smith, J. Starr, D. Stroh.

J. Teding, H. Thomas, R. Thomas, J. Torres, W. Upshaw, M. Valdez, A. Villa, W. Webb, S. Westbrook, T. White, A. White, R. Windbush, A. Yomchinda, C. Zavala.

Unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified female, unidentified female, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified female, unidentified female, unidentified female.

##### COLORADO (16)

J. Anderson, S. Holley, M. Horta, A. Lefree, F. Lopez, M. Mitchell, M. Naye, R. Naye, E. Perez, A. Perreira, J. Snell, E. Sommers, M. Tromcoso, E. Trujillo, W. Wilson, M. Zambrano.

##### CONNECTICUT (6)

G. Batson, S. Blackwin, D. Brown, D. Telesha, V. Vega, J. Washcalis.

##### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (2)

R. Bland, J. Clay.

##### FLORIDA (35)

G. Beeler, H. Bell, D. Billard, V. Cata, R. Degroot, A. Diaz, V. Harris, G. Huff, N. Huff, P. Ianuzzi.

E. Jones, F. Lebaron, T. Lopez, C. Mathis, M. Matthews, S. Orteo, E. Regan, M. Rivera, E. Rosalin, J. Rueda.

M. Schlindwein, P. Schlindwein, R. Smiley, F. Stallings, N. Streeter, D. Sutton, J. Tillman, G. Turner, J. Urdaneta, L. Velasquez, P. Williams.

Unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male, unidentified male.

##### GEORGIA (19)

M. Bishop, T. Brunner, Sr., B. Carver, R. Cornett, J. Cox, K. Culpepper, H. Duncan, G. Grant, H. Hale, E. Hale.

M. Kuzel, S. Lowe, A. Passeur, M. Powers, S. Sawyer, R. Smith, J. Tisdale, F. Williford, Jr., unidentified male.

##### HAWAII (2)

E. Galla, Sr., R. Mantor.

##### IDAHO (1)

G. Johnson.

##### ILLINOIS (12)

C. Amos, L. Chavez, J. Cooper, R. Dennis, R. Evans, K. Fisher, V. Mack, J. Martiniz, C. Milton, R. Saucer, L. Shotwell, C. Sudduth.

##### INDIANA (10)

D. Britton, R. Burdge, M. Cole, J. Fuston, L. Gillen, J. Hill, J. Jenkins, W. Johnson, G. Santa, P. Schalliol.

##### IOWA (4)

L. Cullor, M. Curtis, R. Curtis, K. O'Neal.

##### KANSAS (3)

D. Howard, W. Kryst, D. Ramirez.

##### KENTUCKY (5)

C. Dunn, M. Holden III, D. Plank, B. Randolph, R. Tolson, Jr.

##### LOUISIANA (13)

J. Carter, J. Griffin, R. Harmon, G. Island, R. Johnson, C. Lacour, K. Ozols, U. Ozols, M. Robinson, Jr., S. Theriot, G. Washington, M. Woods, L. Wyatt.

##### MARYLAND (12)

J. Brown, L. Gary, L. Chaney, D. Conley, I. Fluharty, W. Fluharty, J. Green, M. Johnson, D. Maith, E. Owens, C. Robinson, S. Witcher.

##### MASSACHUSETTS (5)

R. Achramowicz, L. Litif, J. McKinney, J. Wagenbach, unidentified male.

##### MICHIGAN (3)

R. Mallard, C. Neely, H. Sella.

##### MINNESOTA (5)

E. Beebe, K. Fredericks, K. Hummel, D. Milan, M. Young.

##### MISSISSIPPI (5)

H. Andress, J. Grice, D. Purvis, F. Riggle, L. Starkey.

##### MISSOURI (11)

R. Andrews, L. Erwin, D. Geisler, C. Mason, W. McFarland, J. Reester, J. Tucker, Jr., M. Walsh, P. Whiting, G. Williams, unidentified female.

##### MONTANA (1)

H. Rock.

##### NEBRASKA (1)

B. Green.

##### NEVADA (8)

D. Brooks, M. Brooks, P. Favato, N. Mills, L. Nebeker, C. Spaight, Unidentified female, Unidentified male.

##### NEW JERSEY (6)

A. Alexander, U. Alexander, C. Hicks, M. Llano, W. Rivera-Rosa, R. Sherman.

##### NEW MEXICO (7)

S. Anaya, R. Gomez, R. Kuhn, J. Macotela, C. Manual, B. Tellez, L. Watson.

##### NEW YORK (28)

E. Bell, R. Dillingham, M. Doherty, J. Edwards, O. Frazier, P. Georges, A. Greca, N. Henderson, T. Henderson, L. Johnson, S. Kent, H. Lugo, M. McCann, M. Meclino, M. Panzer, R. Penigian.

R. Sorrentino, J. Sullivan, C. Torres, J. Torres, E. Williams, P. Zilimbinkis, Unidentified male, Unidentified male, Unidentified female, Unidentified female, Unidentified male.

##### NORTH CAROLINA (13)

R. Hoernlen, N. Lloyd, J. Lynch, A. McClain, R. McCormick, Jr., A. Miller, E. Spencer, J. Spruill, I. Teague, J. Thompson, F. Wade, R. White, D. Womack.

##### OHIO (22)

W. Banks, Jr., C. Davis, M. Farr, Jr., E. Germany, A. Harris, R. Hawkins, J. Howard, C. Hughes, E. Hurry, B. Katz, J. Limle.

C. Maxey, M. Price, M. Satterfield, M. Siedlecki, B. Skaggs, R. Smith, C. Tyes, R. Vibert, V. Walker, W. Williams, T. Wooden.

##### OKLAHOMA (6)

L. Grayson, R. Milligan, C. Robles, R. Tipton, S. Valenti, unidentified male.

## OREGON (10)

D. Almond, W. Armstrong, Jr., C. Debellis, P. Debellis, C. Hamilton, P. Ice, M. Kowalchuk, W. Kowalchuk, R. Lewis, R. Modrell.

## PENNSYLVANIA (9)

D. Bertone, J. Cruz, J. Gordon, Jr., L. Gordon, A. Kiefer, P. Markus, J. Phenneger, K. Rich, C. Watson.

## SOUTH CAROLINA (5)

K. Corley, R. Dawkins, R. Eudy, H. Hill, L. Nicholas.

## TENNESSEE (32)

U. Adams, D. Anderson, R. Barton, T. Binbow, C. Bond, F. Bond, W. Clark, G. Coursey, J. Curry, L. Cutshaw.

T. Ellington, M. Giron, L. Jackson, A. Jones, B. Jones, M. Jones, J. Knapp, E. McBride, L. McBride, G. McCant, S. Moore, E. Morris.

F. Nichols, J. Pierson, A. Putnam, J. Ray, F. Romanoli, A. Sloan, J. Sparks, M. Stephens, R. Wallace, B. Williams.

## TEXAS (75)

G. Acreman, M. Beavers, O. Bevel, R. Blakeney, B. Bosvaldo, H. Bowens, S. Brewster, A. Briscoe, J. Broussard, B. Brown.

C. Cook, A. Conrad, M. Crouch, F. Crump, R. Cruz, D. Davis, S. Davis, C. Dismuke, L. Dodd, D. Dolezar, S. Drouet, R. Engfurtner, W. Farmer, R. Fontenot.

C. Gallagher, J. Gonzalez, E. Herbert, J. Herrington, E. Higgason, J. Jimenez, G. Johnston, S. Jones, A. Kahn, R. Lee, S. Lopez, M. Luna.

D. Mann, S. Martinson, O. McGregor, A. McLaughlin, I. Medrano, A. Mendez, J. Menninger, M. Menninger, W. Mesker, R. Morris, K. Pendergraf, H. Polk, M. Ponce, E. Pruitt, M. Pruitt.

C. Raborn, S. Randall, E. Rangel, E. Roberts, A. Rodriguez, R. Rosales, D. Sanabria, T. Sledge III, C. Smith, M. Stone, O. Trotter, R. Vazquez, J. Villareal.

D. Walker, J. Walker, A. Watts, L. Wheeler, L. Wheeler, C. White, R. Whitehead, H. Zavala, S. Zavala, unidentified male, unidentified male.

## UTAH (1)

R. Archuleta.

## VIRGINIA (7)

K. Dixon, J. Fleming, A. Mallin, A. Millar, C. Pritchard, K. Robinson, R. Vermillion.

## WASHINGTON (5)

M. Buckingham, D. Burke, G. Hicks, V. Peterson, R. Schlewitz.

## WISCONSIN (4)

G. Barker, A. Kulinski, D. York, M. York.

## WYOMING (1)

J. Kimball.

## PREVIOUSLY UNREPORTED

January: L. Black, E. Hamby, G. Mercer, B. Phillips.

February: V. Gowin, A. Rodriguez, O. Roldan, D. Valdez.

March: P. Brown, C. Broxie, G. Flores, S. Green, C. Hardison, G. Journey, L. Kohllefel, G. Monahan, C. Royals, W. Stanley, V. Stegall, W. Watson, unidentified male.●

## MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS

## HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, former Congressman William J. Ran-

dall, my predecessor in the U.S. House of Representatives, recently delivered the Memorial Day address at the Woodlawn Cemetery in Independence, Mo., under the sponsorship of the Patriotic Council of Independence.

The speech is a thorough discussion of our defense needs. I urge my colleagues to read it, as Mr. Randall is a former member of the Armed Services Committee of his body.

A copy of his address is as follows:

## MEMORIAL DAY 1980—A TIME TO HONOR THE PAST AND THINK ABOUT OUR FUTURE

Thank you for the invitation to be your speaker. It's a privilege and an honor. You should congratulate yourselves for your presence here, not because of any wisdom you will hear from me but because you are observing Memorial Day as it was intended. This day was set aside to be a solemn holiday rather than the recreational use so prevalent today.

Most Memorial Day speeches give a history of the day, reciting that the day was first known as Decoration Day. The first observance was in the South by such organizations as the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Observations spread northward under the leadership of General Logan, First Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Memorial Day is appropriately a time to pause to pay tribute to our dear departed. It should also be a time to think of patriotism, and consider the condition of our nation. It should be a time to take inventory of ourselves and look at what appears to lie ahead—in the future.

You've asked me to speak at a difficult period in our history. It's hard to correctly analyze current events. It's equally hard to make an accurate and somewhat intelligent appraisal of the impact or consequences of today's happenings. I'll do my best under the circumstances.

Before I make any further comments let me emphasize that anything I say or any references to our government is not intended to be partisan. National defense is too important for partisanship.

We're living today in a dangerous and perilous world. There are hazards on all sides. Nothing seems to be safe or secure anymore. All at once everything has become unraveled. Most of us thought Murphy's Law, which holds that "Everything that can go wrong will go wrong", applied only to the lives of individuals. Now it seems the so-called law applies to our Nation and particularly our foreign policy. Troubles have descended upon us at the time we find we are unprepared to cope.

It is sad, but it is true. We simply do not have the muscle to do much about Iran. When the President asked the Secretary of Defense recently about our military capabilities in the Middle East, the Secretary responded to say we could move a Brigade of Marines there for a short term presence, but that it would be exceedingly difficult to sustain this presence for a long duration.

As a starting point for an analysis of our serious problems in foreign affairs and military preparedness—we should carefully consider the consequence of a trend which when put into words cannot be successfully challenged or refuted, namely: *The Soviet Union is engaged in the greatest sustained peacetime military build up in all history.*

The next step this morning, is to try to settle any arguments or differences of opinion about the state of our military preparedness in comparison with that of the Soviet Union. Are we superior? Are we on a parity? Or are we in fact inferior? So that you will

not have to rely on hearsay or any but a high authority—I quote from testimony given by Secretary of Defense Harold Brown before the House Armed Services Committee early this spring. I quote, "The United States has already slipped into a position of relative inferiority in the important area of strategic forces and also in tactical nuclear capability."

There you have from the highest authority—the Secretary of Defense, a statement which should leave no doubt. This is the first official admission by a high ranking government official that we are inferior to our major adversary.

How did we fall behind? When did it happen? The answer is we began our slippage and started the decline into inferiority shortly after Vietnam. We poured ¼ trillion dollars into military resources—for Southeast Asia. Translated—that's \$250 billion. Sadly most of what we bought is still there in the jungle. During that same timeframe the Soviets spent over ½ trillion or \$600 billion on hardware or weapons systems. They still have theirs—ready to use.

Just after the Vietnam war we embarked on a course of gradual unilateral disarmament. We labeled it "detente". We announced we were going to show the world our genuine interest in peace. We hoped the Soviet Union would emulate our course. We expressed a willingness to be content with military equality or military parity with the worlds other great super power.

Our diplomatic vocabulary was filled with such words as "cooperation", "negotiation", "mutual understanding", "relaxation of tensions". We were confident there would be no more "strained relationship between nations". All the while the Soviets continued new military build up.

I'll cite just a few statistics concerning the comparison of military strength of the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union: In manpower the ratio is 4 to 1; They have 4 million troops—we have 1 million; In tanks—its 55,000, Soviets, to 11,000 United States; In Intercontinental Ballistic missiles the numbers are 1,400 Russian to 1,000 United States. The ratio of fighting ships is 1,800 (Soviets) to 450 United States. In merchants cargo ships the count is Soviets 1,700—Americans 1,100. Only in the category of helicopters do we have supremacy 7,800 to 3,800.

Without any more statistics, but to illustrate the sad condition of our armed forces, I'm sure you read recently that a missile-landing frigate could not muster enough trained naval personnel to sail out of port at Newport News, Virginia. Then just within the last two weeks—the media reported that the Commanding General over all the National Guard when asked about the combat readiness responded, "the combined Guard does not have enough fire power to defeat Snow White and the seven dwarfs."

Well, what can we do about our deplorable military posture? The only sane, sensible response is to hurry to renew, replace, rebuild and increase our military hardware in the shortest possible time. Such a response leads us directly to the matter of priorities.

My own judgment of the sequence of priorities would be:

(1) Increase strategic capability by building the new M-X land missile and also the cruise (airborne and submarine borne) missile.

(2) Add the new XMI main tank to our inventory.

(3) Build up our navy with new guided missile destroyers, patrol frigates, Trident submarines and cargo ships for the RDF (Rapid Deployment Force).

(4) Order new F-14, F-15 and F-16 fighter aircraft and also some A-10's.

(5) Increase funding for maintenance and some adequate funding for gasoline and ammunition to allow continued training.

(6) Modify the present Volunteer Army into what has been proposed as a so-called zero draft.

(7) \$1 billion a year for Civil Defense.

If I were required to pick out one or two of the very highest priority needs—I believe I'd single out the urgency for a build up of our navy. The Soviet Union has built a large Blue-water navy in the last ten years. We have very little naval power to checkmate this new Soviet Naval strength. The new Russian Navy has been likened to an anaconda, which is the giant South American snake that squeezes its victims to death. The Soviet Union plans to squeeze the "Narrows" of the world. The power that controls the narrows—controls the adjoining land masses. The most important "narrows" are: the North Sea, Straits of Gibraltar, Suez Canal, Straits of Hormuz, the Mozambique Sea Lane, Straits of Malacca, and the Panama Canal.

As a surprise to some—I'd put very high on my list—with a most urgent need—heavier funding for Civil Defense. In 1972 both the United States and the Soviet Union entered into the ABM Treaty—banning hereafter all antiballistic missiles. The result was that each population was made hostage to the missiles of the other nation. We were hostage to their ICBM's and we thought they would be hostage to our ballistic missiles. But the Soviet Union set out to immediately develop an elaborate civil defense system coupled with compulsory dispersal of industry. Our intelligence estimates our major adversary can now absorb the strike of a substantial portion of our ICBM's and save from 60 to perhaps as much as 70% of their population. Our own Congressman Ike Skelton is to be commended for his interest and work on civil defense. He has been successful in his efforts to increase funding for civil defense. We need at least \$1 billion a year for direct funding of civil defense and to be accompanied by an enactment that would make compulsory training in civil defense from high school age to 60 years of all of our entire civilian population for at least once every week.

The problem of military personnel or rather the lack of quality personnel in our present voluntary army must be addressed at an early date if we are serious about any kind of catch-up with the Soviet Union.

I'm aware this is a controversial subject. I'm mindful to talk about modification of the volunteer army is like entering a political thicket. But if you could see and study the I.Q. tests of our present voluntary army you'd agree there must be some change. The armed services simply can't compete in the market place for men willing to face the hazards of a war. You can't expect volunteers to always be of a level of intelligence to operate our new sophisticated weapons. In the market place you have to pay a minimum of \$25000 a year to get a steeplejack to climb our tallest buildings. We simply can't pay every private \$25000 a year. As it is, we put out over 60% of our defense budget for military personnel. That does not leave very much for sophisticated weaponry. The worst feature of our volunteer army is that it is now made up for the most part from the underprivileged segment of our society—whereas the army should be composed of a cross section of society.

The proposal called "zero draft" would enact the draft and the selective service system. It would make use of a lottery system. Those with a high lottery would do 3 months of basic training provided they joined the National Guard or the Reserves on completion of that 3 months. If the choice was to decline service in the Guard

or the Reserves, those with high lottery numbers would be drafted for one year and then take membership in the Guard or Reserve. The word "zero" contemplates very few or nearly zero-numbers would wait to be drafted for 1 year.

What about women? My answer is they are still ladies. They should not be forced into combat. On the pay level after modifications away from the volunteer army concept—I would propose a minimum wage level of pay with graduated categories of pay for experienced technicians.

All of the priorities I have listed will be costly. To catch up with the Soviet Union in military strength will cost 1 trillion dollars a year for the next 5 years. To comprehend the magnitude of a trillion dollars is to write the numeral one and then add 12 zeros to the right. One trillion is the same as 1,000 billion. That is a ton of money.

Can we afford such a price tag? The answer is "yes" according to some of our leading economists including Paul McCracken. In 1979 we spent 4.6% of our gross national product on defense. In the past we've spent over 10% of GNP without any strain on the economy. The Soviets spend between 16-18% or maybe even 20% of their GNP on defense. We are not sure because they never let the world know their expenditures for their military.

A question that I think must be faced and answered is: Do we have the will to continue to spend what is needed to move out of the status of inferiority in comparison with the Soviet Union? I would hope the answer would be "yes" but I must say the true answer could be "maybe".

In the House of Representatives on May 1st an amendment was proposed to add \$5.1 billion to the defense budget. It suffered an unexpected defeat, 164 ayes to 246 nays. I'm glad to be able to report my successor in the House, Ike Skelton voted "aye". He was one of the four in the Missouri delegation who recognized that the only way we can make up for lost time or close the gap between our state of military preparedness and that of the Soviets is to start now. I applaud him. I salute him. You should take the time to thank him for a courageous vote.

On the broader struggle within the budget between "guns and butter", or the contest between dollars for defense and dollars for social programs—we should recognize that some social welfare programs are needed and on the other hand some are not. But one thing we should never forget is that the most important social program of all—with the very highest priority, is self survival. Without a free country, all social welfare programs are meaningless.

The situation in Norway during the first years of WW II should be an example not to be forgotten. Norway had national health insurance, cradle to the grave. There were all kinds of housing subsidies from the government. Many of the industries were nationalized. Then came WW II. The Nazi war machine walked into Norway and subjugated the country in two days because the country had no defense to prevent the invasion. All of the social programs were of no help.

There is a postscript to the story, as chairman of the NATO subcommittee I had occasion to visit Norway several times. There I learned that when the good Norwegians had time to think—while under the Nazi yoke—they realized their misery was due to the benevolence of the national legislature. They began to see that members of that legislature in order to be re-elected, provided the country with popular social programs to the total neglect of Defense. They had time to think and to carefully assess and assign the blame for their suffering. It was not long until the bodies of several members of

the legislature were found hanging from trees.

Within the last forty years our country has built up its Defenses in three instances—at the time of WW II, Korea, and then Vietnam. After all three emergencies were over we promptly dismantled our military. We disarmed ourselves. Our level of preparedness within the last forty years has gone up and down like a column of mercury in a thermometer, or like a yo-yo on a string.

My late chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, said repeatedly—"there is no education in the second kick of a mule." The American people have been badly kicked in several instances but they never seem to learn the lesson of the necessity for constant preparedness.

The late Chairman Rivers was also responsible for the quotation, "There is no second prize in National Defense." The late John F. Kennedy in 1963, not long before his assassination, made a similar statement, "There is no first and second place in terms of military power or defense deterrence, only first and last. We cannot afford to be last, because then there is no one left to be leader of the free world." Another great American, Teddy Roosevelt, said in 1913, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Today, we've reversed that admonition. Now we talk tough and threaten what we will do—when we have a very small stick—not at all adequate in today's world.

The dear old gentleman, Uncle Carl Vinson, now 88 years of age, who was Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee for many years, said before his retirement—"The most expensive thing in the world is a cheap army and navy. History clearly show—weakness invites attack."

For my own part I've always believed in the old cliché, "you get what you pay for." This has been proven true because our present military impotence or lack of overall preparedness has been bought by the stingy defense budgets of the past decade.

During the debate on the House floor on May 1st this year, Mr. Henry Hyde (R. Ill.) made a pronouncement that was in my judgment most accurate—"to deceive ourselves that we can save money and thus turn our swords into plowshares, as long as the spiritual descendants of Ghengis Kahn roam the world, is expressing our own death wish. Unilateral disarmament is such a great folly, it could spell the end of America and therefore the end of freedom."

If I have sounded a note of pessimism during these remarks—or if I have seemed to hint that nuclear exchange with the Soviets is not too far off, let me correct that impression. The recent successes of the Russians indicate that the last thing they want is a war. Why should they? They seem to be achieving their goals without any losses except perhaps a few now in Afganistan.

We must all realize there is no way we can quickly catch up with the Soviet Union. Weapons have to be designed before they can be made, and all of this must come before deployment. The new Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee Sen. Fritz Hollings (D.-S.C.) commented recently—"We should put the idea out of our minds that we are equal to the Soviet Union in Defense and that we are trying to run up the score. The truth is we will be playing 'Catch up' ball for a long while."

Senator Pete Domenici (R-N. Mex.) Ranking Minority member of the Senate Budget Committee, on the point of whether we can afford a strong defense said on the Senate floor the following—"With a country as great as ours, with 3 to 3½ times the pro-

ductive capacity of the Soviet Union—we should be ashamed of ourselves to be behind the Soviets in all kinds of conventional weaponry—planes, tanks, Navy and just about everything else”—

What, then, should we do or rather what do we have to do when we are so inferior to our major adversary? The answer is to work—work very hard. Figuratively speaking we must roll up our sleeves. I think we will have to realize we will have to do the job ourselves. Our allies know we have fallen behind. They know our protection is unreliable. They will be careful not to annoy or antagonize the Soviet Union. We may have to be patient with them. For our part we will have to make smarter use of our diplomacy. There will have to be a deft handling of touchy situations. We must be skillful to avoid provocation of the Russians to the point of military action. Good advice was offered recently by Senator Scoop Jackson (D-Wash.) when he commented "We must lower the decibel level of our rhetoric. Issuing tough statements and then backing down is no way to deal with the Russians. In Moscow actions speak louder than words"

There is no doubt that we are in a protracted struggle. We must work and work to become strong again—just as fast as we can. The hour is dark. Yet there is still time. Twenty-five hundred years ago Athens was about to be overrun from the north by Phillip of Macedonia. In 500 BC, Demosthenes, the greatest orator of all time, said something to the Athenians that applies to ourselves in 1980—"Oh Greeks, black as is the peril, you are not defeated. Your greatest fear is that you have not bestirred yourselves. If you do better yourselves, the enemy does not exist who can conquer a free people. When you become ready to defend yourselves, your peril will pass."

If we begin now, without delay, to work hard and fast to build a strong defense, pray God it may prevent a third world war.●

GARY H. RABINER

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1980, Gary H. Rabiner, a prominent Cincinnati businessman and leader in the Jewish community, will be honored at the Cincinnati B'nai B'rith's "Guardian of the Menorah" luncheon.

Mr. Rabiner is a member of the board of overseers of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati. He also serves on the boards of the Cincinnati Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Jewish Community Relations Council, the Cincinnati Chapter of Technion, the Jewish National Fund, the Cincinnati Jewish Hospital, and the Rockdale Temple Brotherhood, having also served as its president. In addition, he has served as a member of the executive committee of the Jewish Federation, volunteer chairman of the United Appeal for Amberley Village, president of the Culver Club in Cincinnati, and as trustee for the United Israel Appeal and a member of the executive committee of the United Jewish Appeal.

Mr. Rabiner and his wife, Letty, have been honored by the Jewish National Fund by the creation of the Gary and Letty Rabiner Family Forest in Jerusalem. He is also a member of the Israel Bonds Prime Minister's Club.

His involvement in all of these programs indicates how deeply he cares for his fellow human beings. As a member of B'nai B'rith Cincinnati Lodge No. 4, he is an active supporter of the B'nai B'rith youth services program. Funds raised in his honor help to support the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization for teenagers and the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation for youth at college.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Gary Rabiner's many friends in Cincinnati and across the Nation in saluting his achievements and his well-deserved tribute as "Guardian of the Menorah."●

#### INTERVIEW WITH UAW PRESIDENT FRASER

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. Gordon Dillon, editor and publisher of the Virginia Observer, of Norfolk, Va., recently printed an article quoting from an interview which he had had with Douglas A. Fraser, president of the United Auto Workers.

Mr. Dillon sent me a copy of the article, and because Mr. Fraser has raised some interesting points, I am pleased to share this information with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD. The article, from the Friday, May 16, 1980, Virginia Observer, follows:

#### TAX FOREIGN CARS TO EQUAL U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS

NORFOLK.—In an exclusive interview with the Virginia Observer, United Auto Workers President Douglas A. Fraser said the U.S. Congress should place an import tax on foreign cars and products to equal the environmental costs incurred by American industries \* \* \* costs that are escaped by foreign firms who export their goods to the United States.

Fraser said he was in "agreement" with a LaFollette like tax to "equalize the costs at the water's edge".

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has demanded that the Norfolk Ford Assembly Plant, which has a \$15 million dollar book value, to install \$187 million dollars in controls to reduce paint fume emissions. Similar demands are being placed on all other U.S. manufacturing facilities.

The 55 year old Fraser said, "Obviously, I think (the Congress) must look at the competitive disadvantages" American industry faces because of costly controls. He added, "And I think it is within reason" for the Congress and the people "to look at some sort of tax to equalize the foreign competition".

Fraser's controls are similar to the late Republican U.S. Senator Robert LaFollette's advocacy of import fees on imports

equal the difference between U.S. and foreign wages.

Fraser would have only the costs of controls to be the import tax factor on foreign imports.

While printed reports claimed that the UAW warned the U.S. Auto Industry to switch to small cars back in 1974, the erudite union leader blamed "the sudden, dramatic switch to small cars" because of the March-June gas cutoff and long lines of 1979.

He said "no one could have predicted the mad change in buying patterns in 1980", because "people were still buying (standard sized) cars \* \* \* 14 months ago".

He said that the American auto industry could meet the challenge from foreign imports. He added, "What we are advocating is that the Japanese restrain themselves (by limiting imports) between now and 1983, and then we'll compete with them head to head once our industry is converted" to producing smaller, lighter, fuel-efficient cars.

He warned that the U.S. auto industry needs from now to 1983 to turn it around. You can't turn on a dime. It takes an enormous amount of lead time" to switch production facilities, change car designs, switch to "transaxles" for front-wheel drives and "four cylinder engines."

Fraser praised the Ford Motor Company for its willingness to install \$8 million dollars in devices to reduce paint fumes at its Norfolk plant.

The EPA has set a 30 percent reduction in hydrocarbon emissions in the Tidewater area by 1982. The Ford reduction of 40 percent exceeds the local dictate.

Fraser said, "It seems to me that Ford is doing its fair share to reduce the emissions" \* \* \* in the Norfolk area. He indicated that the EPA should approve the Ford plan rather than imposing impossible controls.

He said that while some in the UAW are advocating that Datsun and Toyota build plants in the U.S. \* \* \* he doubted whether or not the EPA would approve the construction.

Fraser said, "The same EPA standards must apply to them, and some people are suggesting that this is why" the Japanese "are delaying making a decision" to build U.S. plants.

He said he was familiar with the VW and GM cases.

Volkswagen was delayed by the EPA from opening its Pennsylvania plant for over two years because of "paint fumes."

General Motors sought to build a new, modern plant in Pontiac, Michigan, and Fraser said the plant was "blocked" by the EPA environmentalists, not because of pollution, but because they say it will destroy what they call "the landscape."

He added, "Well, then you have to make a decision \* \* \* which is most important? To see a rolling hill or have 7,000 jobs?"

Answering his own question, he said, "That decision is clear. Seven thousand jobs are more important."

While saying that he wanted to protect the environment, Fraser said that the standards should be set by the Congress by their laws, and not left up to EPA bureaucrats who can issue rules and regulations, which have the effect of laws.

Fraser said, "I believe in the legislative process. The important decisions of the day should be made by people who are elected rather than people who are appointed. That's a fundamental democratic concept."

Fraser also called for the development of domestic energy sources.

He said he was familiar with President Jimmy Carter's \$10,000 investment in a process that turned peanut shells into oil.

Carter's investment is now worth over \$150,000.00.

Fraser said the UAW is pushing oil from U.S. shale deposits. He added, "We are pushing shale oil. It has great possibilities. I would certainly be for developing shale rather than depending on OPEC for the rest of my life".

He dismissed claims that vapor carburetors could give 100 miles per gallon, or that redesigned transmissions could give 70 mpg.

Fraser said such claims "ought to be looked at with a jaundiced eye", because "they are never as they are claimed to be".

He said that if the inventions were proven, the desperate Chrysler Corporation would "grab" the patents to save itself.

Fraser concluded that if the inventions existed, "we wouldn't have any more worries in terms of importing oil."

"It would correct our balance of payments. It would reduce inflation." He said, "The answer is that there isn't any such animal", like a 70 mile per gallon car or a 100 mpg carburetor.

Fraser was in Norfolk last week to address a meeting of the United Community Fund, where 50 union members received graduation certificates as trained UCF counselors.

Fraser also visited the Norfolk Ford Plant, met with the UAW Local 919 executive board and addressed retired members of Local 919.●

#### ENERGY POLICIES

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a cogent essay from the April 11, 1980, edition of Science magazine by Philip H. Abelson, the editor of that magazine, entitled "Energy Policies of the United States and U.S.S.R." The essay points out that our "decade-long self-centered energy policy that has ignored legitimate needs and interests of the rest of the world" and our "abdication of world leadership with respect to nuclear energy" are much more enduring factors in our national deterioration than the "inept day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs" under the Carter administration.

The article confirms the conclusions I have arrived at during my energy discussions with our allies and adversaries around the world. In the 15 countries I have visited, it is crystal clear that we have lost billions of dollars of sales for American industry and the related influence we might have on their nuclear affairs. We can no longer treat ourselves as an energy island. If we are unwilling to assert ourselves as the leader of the free world for energy matters, the vacuum may be filled by an ally but more likely by the Soviet Union. Abelson points out that the Soviet Union is supplying Austria, Switzerland, northern Italy, southern Germany, and southern France with natural gas and that Poland is now shipping coal to France, Austria, Belgium, Finland,

France, Spain, Sweden, and West Germany have obtained or are obtaining separated uranium from the Russians. Even the Argentinians have purchased fuel cladding machinery from the Russians. Thus, the Russians have the ability to make these nations freeze in the dark; is it any wonder that American initiatives in foreign policy are getting lukewarm support from our allies? It is time that we admitted that the Carter administration antinuclear, no-growth energy policy is not only naive, but also involves not-too-subtle threats to our national interest and security.

The complete text of the Abelson essay follows:

#### ENERGY POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND U.S.S.R.

The prestige of the United States has declined sharply during the past few years. In some circles these losses have been attributed to inept day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs. But there are other, more enduring factors behind the deterioration that have received little media or political attention. One factor is a decade-long, self-centered energy policy that has ignored legitimate needs and interest of the rest of the world. Another factor is abdication of world leadership with respect to nuclear energy.

During the 1970's the United States massively increased its imports of oil, and this was a major cause of a tenfold increase in world oil prices. In 1972 imports of oil and its products were 4.5 million barrels per day; in 1973, 6.2; in 1977, 8.8; and in 1979, 8.1. In contrast, the Soviet Union did not compete for oil but instead became a supplier of energy to Western Europe.

Energy has become crucial in diplomacy and national well-being. We have become aware that we are vulnerable to a partial interruption of oil imports. For us imported oil represents only 19 percent of total energy consumption. Many other countries are far more dependent on energy imports. In 1976 the total energy dependence of France was 78 percent; West Germany, 54 percent; Italy, 81 percent; and Japan, 86 percent. In large measure their dependence rests on imports of oil from the Middle East. When other countries adopt policies toward the U.S.S.R. and Arab countries that are different from those of the United States, one should not be surprised.

Oil is not the only energy import of Western Europe. Two years ago, while in Austria, I visited an impressive energy installation not far from the Czechoslovak border. The facility is the control center for the major pipeline that transports natural gas from the Soviet Union to Western Europe. Natural gas is dispatched to Austria, Switzerland, northern Italy, southern Germany, and southern France. Some gas is stored underground in Austria, but if the Russians stopped the flow of gas at the beginning of a heating season, many homes would be without heat.

In an effort to lessen dependence on oil, some of the countries of Western Europe—notably France—have begun to replace oil by coal. France has little coal, and what it has is expensive to mine. So coal must be imported. A major source of this coal is Poland.

Efforts of the Carter Administration designed to curb nuclear proliferation, while having a desirable goal, have been counterproductive. For many years the United States was practically the sole supplier of partially separated uranium for use as fuel

in nuclear reactors. But in 1977 the Administration attempted to enforce regulations that other countries found onerous. Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Italy, Spain, Sweden, and West Germany have obtained or are obtaining all or part of their separated uranium from the Russians.

Understandably, the French do not enjoy being vulnerable to sudden changes in policy of others and they have urgently sought to lessen their energy dependence. They have programs for conservation and solar energy, but have concluded that they must rapidly expand their use of nuclear energy. They have progressed far with a total nuclear program that includes a major isotope separation plant, many light-water power reactors, successful breeder reactors, successful commercial fuel reprocessing, and radioactive waste disposal. The isotope plant, which is already partially on stream, will have a capacity equal to that of our Oak Ridge facility. In the breeder reactor program the French have had several years of successful operating experience and are world leaders.

The United States has lost leadership in nuclear energy and much of its ability to influence the nuclear energy policies of others. We have opened the door wide for an enhancement of Russian influence in Europe. Simultaneously, our drain on world oil has caused severe financial problems for us and even greater ones for the rest of the world. It is time that we considered where such a performance is taking us.●

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN BREAUX (D., LA.), CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, CONSERVATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT, ON A BILL TO IMPOSE A TARIFF ON IMPORTED SHRIMP

HON. JOHN B. BREAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. BREAUX. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill to impose a tariff on imported shrimp. I believe that this measure will fairly and equitably assist U.S. shrimp fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico who are suffering severe economic hardships.

The plight of our gulf shrimpers, who last year contributed \$324 million to our national economy, fully 24 percent of our domestic harvest, is principally a result of the importation of foreign shrimp. These imports come first and foremost from Mexico, where shrimpers pay about 17 cents per gallon for fuel. A rate that must represent a direct or indirect Government subsidy.

Our shrimpers, on the other hand, pay over 95 cents per gallon. They have testified before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, which I chair, that they cannot compete with the subsidized foreign imports. At least 75 percent of our shrimp fleet of some 4,000 vessels are tied to the dock. Many of our shrimpers face financial ruin. Unemployment is soaring. The Federal Government may confront up

to \$36 million in defaults on vessel mortgages it guarantees under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

I have introduced H.R. 7039, the American Fisheries Promotion Act, which is intended to provide, among other things, short-term financial assistance for the most heavily impacted fishermen, not only in the gulf, but also in other regions where fuel prices, soft markets, and other economic conditions are creating serious difficulties for the fishing industry. However, this solution is not enough. Recent hearings before my subcommittee demonstrated that a more focused effort is essential to assist the gulf, where import pressures are said to be particularly devastating. Therefore, the bill I am introducing today would impose a 5-percent duty on imported shrimp. This would help to offset the unfair economic advantages of foreign fishermen, particularly of the Mexican shrimpers.

Other U.S. fishermen may also be facing severe difficulties as a result of subsidized imports. They should regard my proposal as a signal to bring their problems to the Congress.

I am requesting hearings on my proposal before the Ways and Means Committee at the earliest possible time. I believe that swift action is needed. ●

#### UPDATE ON COAL AND AMERICA'S ENERGY FUTURE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that with the recent House-Senate agreement on plans for a major American synthetic fuels program, the key elements of the energy program called for by President Carter last July 15 are nearly in place.

After a week's retreat at Camp David, the President outlined in a nationally televised speech a number of key energy actions. Working together, the executive branch, Congress, and the American people have made significant progress.

The recent highlights include:

##### WINDFALL PROFIT TAX

Signed into law, this tax on profits which result to oil companies through no effort of their own will raise \$227 billion over the next decade, primarily to be used for energy research and development of energy programs.

##### SYNTHETIC FUELS PROGRAM

This represents a potential commitment of \$88 billion over the next 12 years to turn coal and other products into oil. It will use loan guarantees and price supports and call on private industry to develop the technology that will allow America to use its own energy resources.

##### ENERGY MOBILIZATION BOARD

In its final stages of approval, this plan would give an exclusive Government Board the authority to speed up energy projects vital to our country. The Board could cut through redtape and bureaucratic delay with authority to make the decisions themselves if the Government fails to act. In a key agreement by the House and Senate, projects switching public utilities from oil to coal will automatically be eligible for the "fast track" through the Government. Finally, the Board will have the power to recommend specific project environmental changes to Congress and the President if required to stimulate a key project.

##### CONSERVATION

The President called on Americans to conserve, and they have. For the first 4 months of 1980, total demand for petroleum products was down 9.1 percent from the same period a year ago. Coupled with increased production in the United States, oil imports were down by an estimated 12.1 percent for the first quarter of the year. That conservation must continue and increase because we are still dependent on too high a level of foreign imports, still held captive by OPEC. Also, we must face a fact which became clear in a poll I conducted of the 12th Congressional District last year: Americans are conserving primarily because of higher prices, not because of a conservation ethic. The conservation gains we must make are likely only as the price of fuel increases.

##### ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For the middle-income taxpayer, Congress approved new authority for the Secretary of the Treasury to add to the list of conservation items around the home eligible for a tax reduction. For the poor and aged living on small, fixed incomes, Congress approved a program of aid to persons who simply could not afford the winter fuel to heat and cook. Last winter it saved thousands of families. It has some rough spots that need reforming, but the principle is correct.

Coupled with the first national energy plan passed in 1978 which freed new supplies of natural gas, stimulated building conservation, and started a new program of electric rate reform, we have come a long way in a very few years.

Key steps, of course, remain to be taken. A year after Three Mile Island's incident, we remain unsettled as a Nation on the future course of nuclear energy, and no real energy plans stretching for the decades ahead can be made prior to that decision. We have not totally coped with the energy-economic combination which has severely affected our national economy and our individual checkbooks. We have not moved fast enough on improving mileage of American-made cars, although without the auto mileage demands passed by Congress, the industry would be to-

tally devastated today. Commitments to mass transit in many large cities still need emphasis. Other examples can be found.

But clearly the next key is coal. The recent MIT independent study showed clearly that coal must be used and can be used, in fact, will be more economical than other options and can be used safely and environmentally. With 7 months remaining in 1980, what should our coal priorities be?

##### 1. UTILITY CONVERSION

As one of the 18 original cosponsors of the administration's plan for converting electric utility plants to coal from oil, I firmly believe this is the top priority. It is our best short-range hope for getting miners in the Northeast back to work. It is our best hope for a quick displacement of large additional supplies of imported oil. It must be done with Government backing, and it must be done with a firm commitment to the highest environmental standards, but it must be done. Let there be no mistake, the course through Congress will be a tough one as many of my colleagues have very legitimate concerns about the proposal, but I am confident these problems can be worked out.

##### 2. EXPORTS

I have written to Deputy Secretary of Energy John Sawhill requesting an enlarged program to sell our coal overseas. Many European nations rely on coal and are dwindling their supplies of easy-to-reach coal. Our export program must be vigorous. In the 12th Congressional District of Pennsylvania we recently signed a contract with South Korea to open new metallurgical grade coal mines. Exports represent another potential quick solution to coal unemployment.

##### 3. ACID RAIN

Those of us who support coal cannot ignore the very real environmental concerns, particularly relating to acid rain. The synthetic fuels bill contains new authority for acid rain research. I have written to Environmental Protection Agency Director Doug Costle asking for a firm agency commitment to solving this problem. I have also asked the Energy Department for investigation of a plan proposed by Penn State Mines and Mineral Industries, Dean Charles Hosler to solve acid rain problems.

##### 4. TRANSPORTATION

The height of irony would occur if we are ready to burn coal and cannot move it to market, but that possibility exists. We must begin now to lay the transportation network to move future coal supplies. A bill I support, approved by the House Surface Transportation Subcommittee, would use some of the windfall profits tax revenue to build and repair energy impacted roads, such as coal haul roads. Governor Thornburgh and Conrail officials are working with us to improve the Port of Philadelphia as a major

coal export terminal. Rail transit remains inadequate, and we need a firm, long-range plan in place.

## 5. RESEARCH

In the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I offered amendments totaling \$34.9 million to add to the budget for coal research. We must continue to study the most efficient, effective, and productive ways to mine, move, and burn coal. The total budget for fossil fuels research reported by the subcommittee totals about \$750 million.

## 6. STRIPMINING

I have held several meetings with officials of the Office of Surface Mining and local coal operators to work out problems with administration of the system. Congress is most unlikely to pass amendments to the law this year. That means we must continue to work to improve administration and urge Pennsylvania to pass the necessary legislation to assume primacy, to direct enforcement of the law.

We have done a great deal in a relatively short time. We have an ambitious program ahead of us. I am very disappointed the progress on coal has not been faster. I ache over the unemployment I see each week in central Pennsylvania coal fields, and its effects on families who are my long-time friends. The energy plan for the Nation is developing, it is falling into place. Now, the next step is more work on coal—we must move decisively and firmly; it is essential for the 12th Congressional District and the Nation. ●

**AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION SUPPORT OF SENSENBRENNER-VOLKMER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5200**

**HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a part of the RECORD this letter, dated May 30, 1980, from the American Farm Bureau Federation stating support of the Sensenbrenner-Volkmer amendment to H.R. 5200.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, D.C., May 30, 1980.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER,  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SENSENBRENNER: The American Farm Bureau Federation, representing over 3.2 million member families, is concerned about a provision in H.R. 5200, the bill to amend Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which we believe provides unwarranted land use control by the federal government.

This provision is Sec. 811 which establishes, within HUD, an Administrative Law Tribunal to review cases of alleged discrimination.

Farm Bureau has two concerns regarding this provision:

(1) Sec. 811 would affect local zoning and land use practices by involving HUD in deciding cases of alleged discrimination by such local decisions. We oppose federal intervention in local zoning and land use practices; and

(2) We believe there are ample remedies for discrimination cases in the present judicial system. The HUD Tribunal would not provide a better system, but would only provide more government bureaucracy. In addition, the Tribunal would not serve victims of discrimination since it could not award damages.

Farm Bureau has strongly opposed land use control efforts in the past and we urge support for your amendment to strike Section 811.

Sincerely,

VERNIE R. GLASSON,  
Director, National Affairs Division. ●

**CHOLESTEROL DOES COUNT**

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I introduce for printing in the RECORD an editorial on the continuing debate on cholesterol.

[From the Washington Post, June 2, 1980]

**CHOLESTEROL DOES COUNT**

"Toward Healthful Diets," the new report of the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences, not only has increased public confusion over proper diet. It has also soiled the reputation both of the board and of the academy for rendering careful scientific advice.

Its key topic is fat and cholesterol consumption. Offering no new evidence or analysis, the report draws an opposite conclusion—that Americans should not try to lower their saturated-fat and cholesterol intake—from that reached by virtually every other major medical and public health organization. Though it is nowhere noted, this contradicts the board's own report of just a few months ago—"Recommended Dietary Allowances"—which urged that total fat intake "be reduced so fat is not more than 35 percent of dietary energy." Dietary energy means calories and, on average, Americans get 40 percent of their calories from fat.

Why the contradictions? Atherosclerosis—thickening of the arteries—and its complications (together known as cardiovascular disease or coronary heart disease) are the leading causes of death in this country. A large body of evidence strongly suggests that high levels of cholesterol and a related type of fat known as LDL in the blood are often associated with atherosclerosis.

It is generally agreed—until this latest report, it was unquestioned—that the amounts of saturated fats (those from animal sources) and cholesterol in the diet are related to the levels of cholesterol and LDL in the blood, and that reducing the one will lower the other. Experts are puzzled that this report casts doubt on that relationship, or they flatly disagree. Countless patients who have seen their own cholesterol and LDL levels fall as they follow a doctor's prescribed diet are baffled, too.

True, while all the evidence points in one direction, the key link is still not proven: whether alterations in the diet will definitely reduce the incidence of atherosclerosis and coronary heart disease. Nevertheless,

doctors and government agencies must constantly make recommendations on the basis of just this kind of incomplete but suggestive evidence, and there is a consensus on what to do. Even when the precise cause of a disease is unknown, if a certain change in behavior will statistically lower the risk of it, and if the change does not entail new risks or unacceptable economic costs, it should be recommended.

The Food and Nutrition Board agrees with the general principle: "In our present state of knowledge, sound medical and public health practice should be aimed at reducing the known risk factors to the extent possible." But, inexplicably, in the specific it fails to adhere to its own standard. Worse, it follows a double standard, recommending—on the basis of equally inconclusive evidence—that Americans lower their salt intake because excessive salt is a risk factor for hypertension.

So how many eggs should we eat, and how much salt should we sprinkle on them? Notwithstanding the Food and Nutrition Board, prevailing medical opinion still is that for the average American it is prudent to lower intake of both. Saturated fats and cholesterol (usually found in the same foods) should be lowered so that fat is no more than 35 percent of total calories.

This moderate reduction involves no known risks. However, a large increase in polyunsaturated fats, though recommended by some groups, may be risky. Reducing fat consumption is also important because fat has twice as many calories per gram as either protein or carbohydrate, and the commonest form of malnutrition in this country is obesity. Obesity—being 20 percent above proper weight—is in itself a significant risk factor for hypertension, diabetes, gall bladder disease and coronary heart disease.

A final note: heredity plays a major role in determining likelihood of both coronary heart disease and hypertension. But doctors cannot yet predict which individuals are at risk because of their genes. So particularly those who have a family history of heart disease, but probably everyone, including children, should have blood cholesterol and fat levels determined at least once in the course of a general physical examination. ●

**CUBAN REFUGEE PROBLEM**

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the arrival in Florida of more than 90,000 Cuban emigres, with the possibility that many tens of thousands more will follow, is more than just another refugee story. Whether you believe in the "Open Arms Policy" enunciated by the President on May 5 or the "Closed Doors Policy" enunciated by the President 9 days later, we can all agree that the resources of the United States are being taxed, the welfare of millions of citizens in Florida affected, and the very lives of the emigres are at risk.

Clearly, this is a situation where advance notice from intelligence sources could have made an enormous difference. In that regard, I have good news and I have bad news to report.

The good news is that the Central Intelligence Agency was on its toes and provided well reasoned, well supported analyses, clearly warning of the situation which has now developed, and that the Agency did this as early as last January.

By January 31, the CIA concluded, and so reported, that Cuba was likely to resort to massive emigration, on the scale of 100,000 or more persons. CIA believed that in this way, Castro could relieve political pressures building up as a result of Cuba's miserable economic conditions. The CIA reported:

The Castro regime may again resort to large-scale emigration to reduce discontent caused by Castro's deteriorating economic condition.

On four other separate occasions, the CIA reported similar views, using as its vehicle a variety of intelligence publications, such that one way or another word reached every rank of reader from working level to the President.

By early February, the State Department learned that the Cuban Government was considering resorting to massive emigration if the United States did not move faster to process the backlog of former political prisoners awaiting exit to the United States, and deal effectively with the question of Cuban boats being hijacked to Florida.

There is no question that the U.S. Government was adequately warned.

The bad news is that the U.S. Government never took advantage of its leadtime, conducted a relatively weak defensive diplomatic strategy, and failed to organize for the human flood it should have known was coming. The administration recognized that the consequences of opening the doors wide would be "catastrophic"—but rather than mobilize, the United States simply suggested to Cuban officials that if they would only wait a few months until the new Refugee Act of 1980 was in place, we would begin to move people out at the rate of perhaps a thousand a month.

During March, there were more Cuban threats both public and private, about a wave of emigration. On March 8, Castro stated in a speech:

We hope they will adopt measures so they will not encourage the illegal departures from the country because we might also have to take our own measures. We did it once \* \* \* We were forced to take measures in this regard once. We have also warned them of this. We once had to open the Camarioca port \* \* \* We feel it is proof of the lack of maturity of the U.S. Government to again create similar situations.

The CIA also reiterated its assessment. The U.S. Government, however, bet all of its money on the fondest hopes—Cuban agreement to our proposal—and did virtually no planning to hedge against the predicted outcome—Cuban decision to release a flood of emigrants.

The only interagency planning sessions the Government called on the subject was on April 3—a full 2 months after the first CIA warning. That meeting ratified our effort to get the Cubans to be reasonable and to let us process people under the 1980 law, but it did nothing to plan for what would happen if the policy failed, as it in fact did. Even after the Peruvian Embassy was mobbed on April 4, U.S. planning continued along the course already laid down, and the interagency machinery seems to have been locked on a course no longer aimed at the problem.

Not until the moment Castro did what he had threatened to do, and what the CIA had forecast he was being forced to do out of economic and political necessity, did the U.S. Government prepare to face the reality.

Mr. Speaker, Time magazine's May 19 edition says:

Even though Castro has twice previously opened the gates for Cuban refugees, his latest announcement that anyone could leave Cuba came without warning. There was no immediate guidance from the highest levels.

Only one of those sentences is correct.

What could we have done had the administration made better use of the warning the intelligence community provided?

First, the administration could have defined its own policy better. We could have avoided the embarrassment of the administration's sequence of closed-door / open-door / closed-door pronouncements. We have alternatively tried to bluff the Cuban-American community into foregoing the effort to rescue their relations, and the Cuban Government into thinking that we were prepared to go the limit. Every time our bluff has been called, we changed policy.

Second, we could have done a better job of trying to hold back the floodgates. As a first step, we could have addressed the complaints that the Cubans were privately making to us. We should, in fact, have speeded the processing of the backlog of former political prisoners who were out of jail, with nothing to anchor themselves to and no place to go unless they were accepted by other countries; and we should have found some reasonable response to the problem of the hijacking of Cuban vessels by persons seeking to get to Florida—just as we demanded in the 1960's that Castro do something about the hijacking of American planes to Cuba. If we had acted in a fast, concrete way to deal with these issues, it is arguable that we might either have defused the problem or at least denied Castro a pretext for what he did.

Third, we could have developed a well-prepared publicity campaign. Given what has happened, the United States should be looking a lot better and the Cubans a lot worse. Our posi-

tion should have been clear and reasonable from the beginning, with no changes of course. We could have tried to take the initiative from Castro starting from the earliest hint that he might be planning something like this. Instead, we relied entirely on quiet diplomacy, and allowed him to seize the initiative. We could have tried to steal a march on Castro: Smoke him out; get him to pin himself down by statements denouncing as inaccurate assertions that things in Cuba were getting so bad that he might have to export a percentage of his populace.

Fourth, we should have been ready for the arrival of thousands of refugees. Even while we were playing the game of diplomacy, a scenario for handling a mass of people should have been put together. We should have been ready to receive and process them in an orderly way, and to screen them quickly—getting out a good deal more information about the kinds of people coming over so we could deal with Castro's effort to blacken the reputation of these new arrivals by seeding them with undesirables.

Fifth, we could have had a better international effort to mobilize other countries. Once events were already white-hot with the Peruvian Embassy jammed with 10,000 people, we moved fast and lashed together an international approach. But it has been overwhelmed. Castro, at will, has broken our effort to make this an international issue and has converted it, to his benefit, into something between him and us. We might especially have tried to generate concern in Latin America by sharing some of our information and analyses with them. Expressions of concern should have been hitting the Cuban Government right and left, before matters broke out of control, in an effort to take some insurance against a Cuban initiative.

Mr. Speaker, in the past there have been instances of intelligence failures leading to bad U.S. policy. In this case, we have had an intelligence success that nevertheless seems to have made little impact on the consequent behavior of our Government. The reasons for this are outside the responsibility of an intelligence oversight subcommittee—but the question deserves an answer.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO AGRICULTURE

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial appearing in the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal the importance of agriculture to our Nation's economy was again underscored.

Too often we find those who scoff at the importance of agriculture and are willing to sell our Nation's family

farmers and ranchers short for the misguided policies of cheap food.

As this editorial tells us, only a mere 2 percent of the Nation's population is involved in agriculture, with this group of people producing a \$15 billion positive food trade balance.

Because I think that this editorial sums up the feelings of many of our Nation's agriculture producers, as well as serving as a reminder for those who downgrade the importance of agriculture, I request that the text of this editorial be entered into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

[From the Rapid City Journal, May 11, 1980]

**AMERICAN FARMERS DESERVE RESPECT OF NATION**

American housewives might get a better perspective on food costs if supermarket carts were divided right down the middle with only groceries packed in the left half and everything else on the right.

The side of the cart devoted to "everything else" would include all sorts of HaBas—"Health and Beauty Aids" in the jargon of the grocery business.

Until recent years, those were things you never found in grocery stores. Before they came along, a person could look at their supermarket slip and have a pretty close idea as to just how much they were spending on food from week to week.

It's not that way any more. And the HaBas account for a good deal of the difference.

A typical shopping cart today has the milk, cornflakes and hamburger pretty well buried under shampoo, dental floss, hair spray and paper plates.

But when the housewife shopper frowns at the amount of the check she writes, she simply scribbles "food" on the check stub. And the American farmer has caught another haymaker in the middle of his image.

No matter what the shaving cream and paper cups cost, high quality food is still a bargain in America.

To demonstrate that, the Agricultural Council of America is distributing a world food globe disc which shows the American farmer's contribution to our overall economy and that Americans are the best fed at the lowest price of anyone in the world.

The disc reveals that only 2 percent of the U.S. population is involved in agriculture. Farmer productivity permits the nation to spend only 14 percent of disposable income on food and gives the nation a \$15 billion positive food trade balance.

The Soviet Union depends on 18 percent of its population to produce food and devotes 35 percent of disposable income to food. Russia cannot supply its own food needs and has an \$8.1 billion negative food trade balance.

An American works 16 minutes to buy a pound of beef, 4 minutes for a pound of bread and 6 minutes for a dozen eggs. A Russian works 60 minutes to buy a pound of beef, 8 for a pound of bread and 71 for a dozen of eggs.

While these figures for other major nations of the world vary, none approach those of the U.S. for high productivity and the low percentage of income spent for food.

The statistics again demonstrate that American farmers deserve the respect and affection of the entire nation.●

**TRIBUTE TO IRMA REESE**

**HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor Irma Reese, an outstanding and warm-hearted person who has been actively improving the quality of life for senior citizens in Santa Clara County. On May 8, 1980, the Campbell Chamber of Commerce honored Ms. Reese with a dinner to thank her for all her contributions to our community.

Irma is the founding director of the Campbell Progressive Seniors. This organization is designed to assist low-income seniors in finding help when they need it. The original focus was on assisting seniors with their transportation needs. The program has since expanded to include an onsite nutrition program as well as a nutrition program for shut-ins. The Campbell Progressive Seniors also operate a senior center that provides recreational activities and classes, a tax preparation service, and a regular escort service that will take seniors grocery shopping, to meetings, or to appointments.

In 1973, Irma was named "Woman of the Year" by the Campbell Business and Professional Women's Club, and in 1978, the Campbell Police Department honored her with their annual "Citizen of the Year Award."

Irma recently retired as the director of the Campbell Progressive Seniors but she is continuing to be a guiding light for the elderly, helping them to help themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Irma Reese for all her hard work and contributions toward making our community a better place in which to live.●

**TORRENCE, CALIF., UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT RETIRING EMPLOYEES RECOGNIZED**

**HON. CHARLES H. WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, each year the Association of Torrance School Administrators of Torrance, Calif., hosts an employee recognition banquet. At this banquet retiring employees of the Torrance Unified School District are recognized for their accomplishments over the years. This year, the ninth annual banquet was held on May 8, 1980.

The education of our children is of utmost importance to any community. These are the people who have spent their lives committed to furthering the education of young Americans.

Without such commitment and sacrifice, our country would not be where it is today. For this reason, I feel it only appropriate to recognize each and every one of these employees for a job well done.

**RETIRES—1979-80**

Mrs. Lydia Alvarez, Mr. Lindsay C. Archibald, Mr. Walter Armantrout, Mrs. Lila Lee B. Barnes, Mr. Garth H. Belknap, Mr. Gordon D. Brannon, Mrs. June F. Brennan, Mrs. Muriel M. Briney, Mr. John H. Bush, and Mrs. Betty H. Canales.

Mrs. Daphene J. Cardwell, Mrs. Jean Carter, Mrs. LaRane B. Christenson, Mr. Earl K. Chumley, Mrs. Mary F. Clayton, Mr. Robert L. Clements, Mr. Francis Colclasure, Mr. Lester C. Cook, Mrs. Patricia Cowan, and Mrs. Evelyn F. Cramer.

Mrs. Evangeline C. Crews, Mr. Joseph Delonti, Mr. Edgar W. Derbyshire, Mrs. Mary T. Deseree, Mr. W. F. Dewey, Mrs. Mary Di Luzio, Mr. Hugh H. Dooley, Mrs. Rowena B. Edwards, Mrs. Helen B. Ellis, and Mrs. Eloise Enger.

Mr. Frank P. Farias, Mrs. Lucile C. Flowers, Mr. Lester I. Foster, Mrs. Shelly O. Foster, Mr. Clifford R. Graybehl, Mrs. Ellen Guyan, Mrs. Irene W. Harter, Mr. Paul A. Heronime, Mrs. Betty N. Hickman, and Mr. Edward J. Holak.

Mr. George F. Horvath, Mr. Orville D. Hoy, Mrs. Kathryn M. Huggard, Mr. Melvin R. James, Mr. Stanley R. Keller, Mr. Utah H. Kemp, Mr. Joseph F. Kling, Mrs. Cora Koozer, Mr. Joseph Krivonik, and Mr. Edward C. La Londe.

Mrs. Jennie M. Lathrop, Mrs. Margaret L. Lennon, Dr. Kathryn H. Lewis, Mrs. Betty L. Lightbody, Mrs. Lucille Lilore, Mr. William R. Magnuson, Mr. Ludwig E. Marjala, Mrs. Mildred McBee, Mr. Alvin B. McEwen, and Mr. Bert P. Meyer.

Mr. John D. Morgan, Mrs. Elmyra C. Murray, Mr. John J. Nardiello, Mr. Ralph D. Nelms, Mrs. Barbara J. Ohlson, Mrs. Lidia Paldino, Mr. Alfonso M. Pardo, Mrs. Elodie K. Pearson, Mr. Peder O. Pederson, and Mrs. Helen E. Redman.

Mrs. Edith M. Reynolds, Mrs. Alison L. Rhodes, Mrs. Carol N. Roscoe, Mr. James L. Rugg, Mrs. Alice M. Rynhart, Mrs. Fern M. Scheel, Mrs. Pearl M. Schmidt, Mrs. Geneva S. Shelton, Mr. John Shepherd, Mr. Neil W. Short, and Mr. J. Donald Shriber.

Dr. James G. Sibert, Mr. Francis J. Snyder, Mrs. Elizabeth C. Stabilepszy, Mr. Arlo M. Sullivan, Mrs. Matha Thompson, Mr. Charles A. Waring, and Mrs. Evelyn B. Zickefoose.

**PERSONNEL WITH 30 YEARS OF SERVICE—1979-80**

Mr. Leonard Lifton, Mrs. Geraldine McCalman, Mr. Cletus Nestlerode, Dr. Lloyd Reist, Mr. Don Sturges, and Mrs. Phaidor Trezise.●

**TRIBUTE TO PLATO PAPPS**

**HON. PHILLIP BURTON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, with great sadness I learned of the death on May 29 of Plato Papps, one of the outstanding labor attorneys of our time.

Plato E. Papps, who won numerous landmark legal decisions during his 29 years as general counsel of the Inter-

national Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers (IAM), died unexpectedly at his home. He had been recuperating from major surgery. He was 62.

Papps, who began his worklife as a busboy and rose to eminence as a nationally renowned labor attorney whose counsel was sought by some of the most widely known lawyers in the Nation, typically had been making plans to return to work when the final tragedy struck.

"Death has stilled a keen mind and a strong voice in the labor movement," commented William W. Winpisinger, international president of the International Association of Machinists:

Next to his family, Plato's first and only love was this union and the members he diligently and wisely served for nearly three decades. Plato's family lost a great father and husband. The IAM lost a great lawyer. The world lost a great man. So many of us lost a great friend.

Papps received his law degree from Columbus University Law School in 1947 after serving as a first lieutenant in World War II where he took part in the invasion of Okinawa.

He began his lifelong battle for working men and women early in his legal career as an attorney in the U.S. Department of Justice's Antitrust Division which investigates abuses by the corporate state.

In 1949 he was appointed a legal assistant to James J. Reynolds, member of the National Labor Relations Board who later served as Under Secretary of Labor.

Papps' ability soon came to the attention of the IAM and he was appointed general counsel in 1951. Over the years he had found time to serve as a member of the Advisory Panel on Labor-Management Relations Law to the U.S. Senate and as chairperson of the American Bar Association's Section of Labor Relations Law in 1970 and 1971.

Although he won numerous landmark decisions, including a U.S. Supreme Court decision in favor of the IAM on a major case involving protecting seniority, Papps always considered his biggest case the National Airlines victory.

He worked in that case from January 1969 until 1971, first to win reinstatement in 1970 of 1,200 airline mechanics who had lost their jobs during a work rules dispute and then 14 months longer for their back pay.

The case ended with a \$6.5 million settlement for the IAM-represented mechanics. But Plato Papps was most proud that he had won "justice for 1,200 people—workers who otherwise would have been denied that justice."

Papps is survived by his widow, Helen, and two sons, Harrison and Christopher, and a sister, Mrs. John Kirkwood of Washington, D.C. The family asks that in lieu of flowers contributions be made in his name to the American Heart Association, 7320

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Greenville Ave., Dallas, Tex. 75231 or to your local chapter.●

### EIGHTY-TWO YEARS OF SERVICE IN THE TULSA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

#### HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize three educators who have served the Tulsa public schools system for a combined number of 82 years. Mr. Lewis D. Cleveland, Mrs. Sydney Powell, and Mr. Malcolm Craig are retiring at the end of this school year, and their work will be sorely missed by our entire community.

Mr. Cleveland has served in the school system in various capacities for the past 27 years, and he now concludes his illustrious career as the associate superintendent for business services. Mrs. Powell, the coordinator of guidance counselors, has served in the school system for the past 29 years. Mr. Malcolm Craig, director of purchasing, has been a member of the Tulsa public schools system for the past 26 years.

It is the misfortune of Tulsa and of the entire education community to lose such persons to retirement. Their achievements, however, will be continued through the students they have influenced over the past decades. Their goals and dreams have shaped their students' futures, and all of us in Tulsa have benefited from their hard work and true public service.●

### WE SHOULD ALL READ SOLZHENITSYN

#### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor of the Illinois Journal-Register, written by one of my constituents, Mr. Robert A. Norton, Jr., of Springfield, Ill., is a very significant one. Its compelling message regarding the inhumanity of the Soviet system and the danger of American apathy toward the oppressiveness of that system is one which I feel important to share with my colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. Norton makes his points in reference to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's article, "Misconceptions About Russia Are a Threat to America," which appeared in the spring 1980 issue of Foreign Affairs. This article, excerpts of which follow, is indeed, as Mr. Norton notes in his letter, one which we should all read in its entirety:

DEAR EDITOR: The Spring 1980 edition of the Foreign Affairs Journal contains an article entitled "Misconceptions about Russia are a Threat to America" by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. I feel this is an extremely important article and one that should be carefully provided by the United States government in light of recent events in Africa, Cuba and Afghanistan. This article clearly illustrates the misconceptions that have been held not only by the American public but also by the government. It further points out the object effect these misconceptions have not only on the U.S. but also the world as a whole.

One important point that must be carefully distinguished is that the Russian people are not the same as the Soviet government. So often when we say "the Soviet Union" we have carelessly jumbled the communist government with the Russian people and have equated them both with danger.

The people of Russia need liberation from the Soviet government as much as we of the west need to realize, that it is not the Russia people we should fear but rather the system which enslaves them. We must also realize that the communist system threatens us more with our own creeping apathy toward its inherent dangers than with any military threat that system might offer. The danger lies then in our closing our eyes to the inhumanity that is inflicted upon the people confined within its structures.

We must not mistake the communist cause as some noble undertaking that seeks to better the condition of the common man for such a view is simplistic in its assumption and totally incorrect in its application.

The key word then is power, for the communist government sets for itself one goal—the concentration of power within its hierarchy. This is accomplished through the systematic destruction of the governed people in order that that destruction would concentrate further the governments control on all aspects of social, political, economic and religious life.

I must urge everyone to obtain a copy of this article by Solzhenitsyn. I would also urge that all legislators and Congressmen be contacted. Until the United States truly recognizes who its enemies are, can we even hope for a lasting peace? I think not.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. NORTON, JR.

### MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT RUSSIA ARE A THREAT TO AMERICA

(By Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn)

Anyone not hopelessly blinded by his own illusions must recognize that the West today finds itself in a crisis, perhaps even in mortal danger. One could point to numerous particular causes or trace the specific stages over the last 60 years which have led to the present state of affairs. But the ultimate cause clearly lies in 60 years of obstinate blindness to the true nature of communism.

I am not concerned here with those who cherish, glorify and defend communism to this day. To such people I have nothing to say. Yet there are many others who are aware that communism is an evil and menace to the world, but who have nevertheless failed to grasp its implacable nature. And such individuals, in their capacities as policy advisors and political leaders, are even now committing fresh blunders which will inevitably have lethal repercussions in the future.

Two mistakes are especially common. One is the failure to understand the radical hostility of communism to mankind as a whole—the failure to realize that communism is irredeemable, that there exist no

"better" variants of communism; that it is incapable of growing "kinder," that it cannot survive as an ideology without using terror, and that, consequently, to coexist with communism on the same planet is impossible. Either it will spread, cancer-like, to destroy mankind, or else mankind will have to rid itself of communism (and even then face lengthy treatment for secondary tumors).

The second and equally prevalent mistake is to assume an indissoluble link between the universal disease of communism and the country where it first seized control—Russia. This error skews one's perception of the threat and cripples all attempts to respond sensibly to it, thus leaving the West disarmed. This misinterpretation is fraught with tragic consequences; it is imperiling every nation, Americans no less than Russians. One will not have to await the coming of future generations to hear curses flung at those who have implanted this misapprehension in the public awareness.

I have written and spoken at length about the first of these errors, and in so doing have aroused considerable skepticism in the West, but agreement seems to be increasing with the passage of time and as the lessons of history are assimilated.

The present essay is mainly devoted to the second fallacy. \* \* \*

Many present and former U.S. diplomats have also used their office and authority to help enshroud Soviet communism in a dangerous, explosive cloud of vaporous arguments and illusions. Much of this legacy stems from such diplomats of the Roosevelt school as Averell Harriman, who to this day assures gullible Americans that the Kremlin rulers are peace-loving men who just happen to be moved by heartfelt compassion for the wartime suffering of their Soviet people. (One need only recall the plight of the Crimean Tatars, who are still barred from returning to the Crimea for the sole reason that this would encroach upon Brezhnev's hunting estates.) In reality the Kremlin leadership is immeasurably indifferent to and remote from the Russian people, a people whom they have exploited to the point of total exhaustion and near extinction, and whom, when the need arises, they will mercilessly drive to destruction in their millions. \* \* \*

Long years of appeasement have invariably entailed the surrender of the West's positions and the bolstering of its adversary. Today we can assess on a global scale the achievement of the West's leading diplomats after 35 years of concerted effort: they have succeeded in strengthening the U.S.S.R. and Communist China in so many ways that only the ideological rift between those two regimes (for which the West can take no credit) still preserves the Western world from disaster. In other words, the survival of the West already depends on factors which are effectively beyond its control.

These diplomats still fall back on their precarious assumptions about an imaginary split within the Soviet Politburo between nonexistent "conservatives" and "liberals," "hawks" and "doves," "Right" and "Left," between old and young, bad and good—an exercise of surpassing futility. Never has the Politburo numbered a humane or peace loving man among its members. The communist bureaucracy is not constituted to allow men of that caliber to rise to the top—they would instantly suffocate there.

Despite all this, America continues to be fed a soothing diet of fond hopes and illusions. Hopes have been expressed of a split in the Politburo, with one particular version claiming that it was not in fact Brezhnev who occupied Afghanistan! Or else leading

experts have offered the fancy that "the U.S.S.R. will meet its Vietnam," be it in Angola, Ethiopia or Afghanistan. (These experts and their readers may rest assured that the U.S.S.R. is at present quite capable of gobbling up five more such countries, swiftly and without choking.) And again and again we asked to set our hopes on détente despite the trampling of yet another country. (There is indeed no cause for alarm here, for even after Afghanistan the Soviet leaders will be only too happy to restore détente to the status quo ante—an opportunity for them to purchase all that they require in between acts of aggression.)

It goes without saying that America will never understand the U.S.S.R. or fully grasp the danger it poses by relying on information from diplomats such as these. \* \* \*

It is high time for all starry-eyed dreamers to realize that the nature of communism is one and the same the whole world over, that it is everywhere inimical to the national welfare, invariably striving to destroy the national organism in which it is developing, before moving on to destroy adjacent organisms. No matter what the illusions of détente, no one will ever achieve a stable peace with communism, which is capable only of voracious expansion. Whatever the latest act in the charade of détente, communism continues to wage an incessant ideological war in which the West is unfailingly referred to as the enemy. Communism will never desist from its efforts to seize the world, be it through direct military conquest, through subversion and terrorism, or by subtly undermining society from within.

Italy and France are still free, but they have already allowed themselves to be corroded by powerful communist parties. Every human being and any society (especially a democracy) tries to hope for the best, this is only natural. But in the case of communism there is simply nothing to hope for: no reconciliation with communist doctrine is possible. The alternatives are either its complete triumph throughout the world or else its total collapse everywhere. The only salvation for Russia, for China and for the entire world lies in a renunciation of this doctrine. Otherwise the world will face inexorable ruin.

The communist occupation of Eastern Europe and East Asia will not come to an end; indeed, there is an imminent danger of a takeover in Western Europe and many other parts of the world. The prospects for communism in Latin America and Africa have already been clearly demonstrated; in fact any country that is not careful can be seized. There is of course the hope that things will turn out differently: that the communist aggressors will ultimately fail, like all aggressors in the past. They themselves believe that their hour of world conquest has arrived and, scenting victory, they unwittingly hasten—to their doom. But to achieve such an outcome in a future war would cost mankind billions of casualties.

In view of this mortal danger, one might have thought that American diplomatic efforts would be directed above all toward reducing the threatening might of these imperialistic "horsemen," to ensuring that they will never again succeed in bridling the national feelings of any country and drawing upon the vitality of its people. Yet this path has not been followed; in fact, the opposite course of action has been pursued.

American diplomacy over the last 35 years presents a spectacle of sorry bumbling. The United States, only recently the dominant world power, the victor in World War II and the leader in the United Nations, has seen a steady, rapid and often humiliating erosion

of its position at the U.N. and in the world at large. It has continually declined vis-à-vis the U.S.S.R.: a process which even its Western allies have come to condone. Things have reached the point where American senators make apologetic visits to Moscow in order to ensure that the debates in the Senate are not taken amiss in the Kremlin. The whole thrust of American diplomacy has been directed to postponing any conflict, even at the cost of progressively diminishing American strength.

The lesson of World War II is that only desperate, pitiless circumstances can bring about any cooperation between communism and the nation it has enslaved. The United States has not learned this lesson: the Soviet and Eastern European governments have been treated as the genuine spokesmen of the national aspirations of the peoples they have subjugated, and the false representatives of these regimes have been dealt with respectfully. This amounts to a rejection—in advance, and in a form most detrimental to American interests—of any future alliance with the oppressed peoples, who are thereby driven firmly into the clutches of communism. This policy leaves the Russian and the Chinese people in bitter and desperate isolation—something the Russians already tasted in 1941. \* \* \*

Today Afghanistan, yesterday Czechoslovakia and Angola, tomorrow some other Soviet takeover—yet even after all this, how good it would be to go on believing in détente! Could it really be over? "But the Soviet leaders haven't repudiated it at all! Brezhnev was quite clear about that: it was in *Pravda!*" (Thus Marshall Shulman and other like-minded experts.)

Yes indeed, the Soviet leaders are quite prepared to carry on détente, why shouldn't they be? This is the same détente that the West basked in so contentedly while millions were being exterminated in the jungles of Cambodia. The same détente that so gladdened Western hearts at a time when a thousand men, including 12-year-old boys, were being executed in one Afghan village. (And this was surely not a unique case!) We Russians immediately recognize an episode like this. That's the Soviet way of doing things! That's the way they slaughtered us too from 1918 on! Détente will continue to stand Soviet communism in very good stead: for the purpose of stifling the last flicker of dissidence in the Soviet Union and buying up whatever electronic equipment is necessary.

The West simply does not want to believe that the time for sacrifices has arrived; it is simply unprepared for sacrifices. Men who go on trading right until the first salvo is fired are incapable of sacrificing so much as their commercial profits: they have not the wit to realize that their children will never enjoy these gains, that today's illusory profits will return as tomorrow's devastation. The Western allies are maneuvering to see who can sacrifice the least. Behind all this lies that sleek god of affluence which is now proclaimed as the goal of life, replacing the high-minded view of the world which the West has lost.

Communism will never be halted by negotiations or through the machinations of détente. It can be halted only by force from without or by disintegration from within. The smooth and effortless course of the West's long retreat could not go on forever, and it is now coming to an end: the brink may not have been reached, but it is already the merest step away. Since the outlying borders were never defended, the nearer ones will have to be held. Today the Western world faces a greater danger than that which threatened it in 1939 \* \* \* ●

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CETRONIA AMBULANCE CORPS

**HON. DON RITTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday I will have the honor of joining the members, families, and friends of the Cetronia Ambulance Corps in my district as the corps celebrates 25 outstanding years of service to the people of the western part of Lehigh County.

Founded in the spring of 1955 by a group of 20 Cetronia citizen volunteers, incorporated as a nonprofit organization in 1962, and moved to a newly constructed headquarters in 1967, the Cetronia Ambulance Corps has shown a remarkable ability to grow and change to meet the new challenges of ever-changing times. Membership has increased to over 130 volunteers, the ambulance fleet has increased to 6 vehicles, and expansions and improvements have continually been undertaken. Throughout the 25 years, emergency calls to the corps have steadily increased—doubling in one 5-year period, for example.

Yet throughout the increasing need for its services, the dedicated volunteers of Cetronia Ambulance Corps have never faltered in their performance. Day in and day out they have faithfully met the needs of their fellow citizens. They have continually updated their training and equipment and worked to raise the necessary funds to pay for their operations. Whether standing by at a sporting event, transporting patients from one facility to another or responding quickly to emergency calls in all kinds of weather, the members of the corps have always shown the highest standards of dedication and caring for their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in paying tribute to these fine men and women. The Cetronia Ambulance Corps is continuing proof that this is still a Nation where our communities can be made better places in which to live through the hard work and unselfish contributions of very special local volunteers.

My warmest personal congratulations and thanks go out to the Cetronia Ambulance Corps, along with my wishes for many more years of service.●

TWO MODERATES APPOINTED TO NICARAGUAN JUNTA OF NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION

**HON. MICKEY LELAND**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Arturo Cruz Porras, a member of the

Nicaraguan Government Junta of National Reconstruction is visiting the United States at this time and I wish to extend to him my welcome and hope that his visit will be beneficial.

Many of my colleagues have recently made speeches on the floor or have had inserted into the RECORD numerous allegations that Nicaragua has been lost to communism. The evidence to support these allegations most often cited is Nicaragua's communiqué with the Soviet Union and the resignation of the two moderate members of the ruling junta, Violeta de Chamorro and Alfonso Robelo Callejas.

In light of events in Nicaragua over the past few weeks, I am convinced that Nicaragua has not become a Soviet dependency and more important, I remain convinced that it is all the more urgent for the United States to extend aid to Nicaragua.

First, if communiques with the Soviet Union are evidence of being lost to communism, then, we too have been lost for some time now. Indeed, virtually all of the world is lost by having some sort of trade agreements with the Soviet Union. Clearly, being friendly toward any superpower is no criterion for defining communism nor is it sufficient evidence for repudiating aid to a country. Why is it so frequently claimed that countries are lost to communism if they are friendly to the Soviet Union, but we do not consider every country which is friendly toward us or has trade with the United States to have been won over to the democratic and free enterprise system?

Mr. Speaker, Nicaragua's domestic policies also reveal that it is far from communistic. In response to extreme leftists demands for a more complete and immediate revolution, the regime has jailed some Trotskyites and Communist Party members for "sabotaging the economy" and it has urged workers to temper their wage demands.

In response to business demands the regime has lifted the state of emergency under which the Government enjoyed wide discretionary powers, ended confiscations, and promulgated a law protecting citizens from abuses of authority. And, La Prensa, the nation's most respected newspaper, reopened and one of its first editorials was a long critique of Castro's Cuba.

Most importantly, the Government announced last week the appointments of Rafael Cordova Rivas and Arturo Cruz Porras to fill the two vacancies of the five seats on the junta. Mr. Rivas, a Conservative Party leader, and Mr. Porras, president of the Central Bank are two widely respected moderates.

I have to admit that the resignations from the junta of Violeta de Chamorro and Alfonso Robelo Callejas caused me great concern. I feared that the balanced, pragmatic mix of the Nicaraguan Government was deeply threatened, but my fears proved unfounded. The appointment of Mr. Cor-

dova and Mr. Cruz confirms the Sandinistas' recognition of the importance of a government of cooperation and coalition of all sectors of the Nicaraguan people.

The Nicaraguan Government has also begun to deliver on one of its most important promises—universal literacy. None of us here can truly understand what it is like to grow up in a country where over 50 percent of the adult population is illiterate. Beyond the obvious resulting inability to read street signs or conduct daily business that we take for granted, the illiteracy greatly limits the future of these people and their country. Progress and Western civilization are fundamentally based upon literacy. How could equal justice under the law be meaningful without literacy? Pragmatically, contracts are only binding when both parties are literate and can understand what they are signing. The evolution of science and technology proceeds through the exchange of knowledge through literacy.

Nicaraguan peasants, or even most Americans, may not have these grand thoughts in mind when they think of reading and writing, but we must admit that self-perpetuating development simply cannot take place without a literate, educated populace. Nor should we overlook the simple, direct joy that comes from an individual's ability to read and write. Although we may worry about the ideological content of some of their lessons, I am certain that the Nicaraguan people are grateful for this first ever opportunity to learn how to read and write—some 450 years after that country's original colonization. The Sandinista government has assumed the task of the equal distribution of one of civilization's most basic goods—literacy.

The problem of equal distribution of goods is central to a clear understanding of the forces which brought the Sandinistas to power and their continuing wide support. Under Somoza, Nicaragua was not without wealth, it was not without development, nor was repression completely ubiquitous. But, Somoza did use repression with the principle aim of unequally concentrating wealth within his own hands and those of his close associates. The root cause of the revolution was the obvious injustice in the distribution of goods and the Sandinistas commitment to overcoming such inequality will provide them with a base of popular support. The Nicaraguan Government's commitment to reconstruction and redistribution makes a strong government presence in the economy as inevitable as was the violent revolution. We should keep the Government's involvement in the economy in perspective by realizing that it still is far less than in Latin America's two most developed countries, Brazil and Mexico.

We must be very careful not to label these trends as communism and turn

our backs on people's legitimate desires and needs. If we turn our backs, we create a self-fulfilling prophecy. If we make cooperation with the most important country of the capitalist world impossible, close alliance with the Soviet Union and Cuba is inevitable. The domino theory will prove correct if we persist in viewing Central America as a battleground of the cold war. On the other hand, if we recognize the realities of the inequities inherited from centuries of colonialism and underdevelopment, we will extend humanitarian aid and help establish an independent Nicaragua. ●

#### MINNESOTA SCHOOLS GO TO SCHOOL ON ACCOUNTABILITY

##### HON. ARLEN ERDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Speaker, with local education budgets becoming tighter, taxpayers are insisting on more education for their tax dollar. A variety of methods are being used in different States to assess the quality of education. In Minnesota, a system called planning, evaluation, and reporting was established in 1976. I submit an article from the May 26, 1980, New York Times briefly describing how this system is working in Minnesota and what a few other States are doing in this field:

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1980]

#### MINNESOTA SCHOOLS GO TO SCHOOL ON ACCOUNTABILITY

MINNEAPOLIS, May 25.—In Winona, Minn., school officials have added a writing course at the high school and doubled the writing requirement for graduation.

In Eveleth, Minn., teachers are trying to promote good work habits and self-esteem among their students.

And in Battle Lake, Minn., officials have tried to stamp out faculty profanity in the classroom.

Those and many other changes are just now coming about through a school-improvement system created in 1976. The system is called Planning, Evaluation and Reporting. Usually known by its initials, P.E.R. is similar to programs in several other states that were developed in response to public demands for accountability in education.

Underlying the program in Minnesota and elsewhere is a fairly straightforward philosophy: The public must know what is going on in the schools and take part in making improvements.

#### LAW PASSED IN SOUTH CAROLINA

South Carolina passed an accountability law in 1977. It ordered all districts to determine the needs of their students each year, draw up plans to meet those needs, conduct assessments and tell the citizens how their money was being spent. California created a program in 1977 to encourage schools to set up "School Site Councils" to involve the public in planning improvements. About half of the state's 7,000 schools take part.

These "school improvement" systems are a milder form of accountability than minimum-competency testing programs, which

many states initiated in the late 1970's to insure the functional literacy of every high school graduate. Some states, like California, have both.

In Minnesota, minimum competency was proposed in 1978 by the Department of Education, but it was dropped after local superintendents protested that they were already under too many state mandates, including P.E.R., which they said would do roughly the same thing.

In casting the plan into law, the Minnesota Legislature told all 435 local school districts to take certain actions: Set goals, determine whether the goals have been met, make improvements in weak areas and tell the public all about it.

#### DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The public, in fact, is supposed to be involved at every step, and nearly every district has some advisory committees so that the public can work with educators. An estimated 14,000 people have taken part directly or indirectly.

The changes have come somewhat slowly. It took several years to set up the committees and the goals and to conduct the evaluations, and about half of the districts have not yet reached the stage of improving their weak areas. For some, it was a big step to divulge achievement test scores, let alone do anything about them.

The architect of the program is Carl Johnson, a 46-year-old farmer and state legislator from St. Peter, Minn.

"I hoped that it would strengthen the support for education as a final goal," Mr. Johnson said recently, "and that that would happen by people's involvement and better understanding of what's going on in their schools, that it would happen through their opportunity to decide on rearranging the emphasis on certain courses and on the mission of their school."

No one knows whether the plan has actually increased public support of the schools, but it has clearly made some changes in what the schools are doing.

"It has given better direction as far as the curriculum is concerned," said Carroll Hopf, school superintendent at Winona, in the southeastern corner of the state. "It has isolated things we should be concerned with and probably should have been concerned with earlier."

In Winona, 21 goals were established, seven of them to be attempted in the first year. Later, high school seniors were given a battery of tests to see whether the goals were being met in such areas as the desire for lifelong learning and proficiency in reading and writing.

The seniors did well on most of the exams, but they showed weakness in the mechanics of writing. So the writing course offerings and requirements were changed.

Eveleth, a northern Iron Range district, decided that its students were already doing well in the basic skills, so the local P.E.R. committee turned to other goals, such as personal character, self-respect and pride in work.

A variety of approaches were tried. An elementary class spent an afternoon playing games with nursing home residents. Some secondary students made self-portraits, moving from the realistic to the abstract, emphasizing features they liked about themselves and minimizing the ones they did not like.

In the Battle Lake district in west-central Minnesota, a survey of citizens told school officials that teachers were using profanity, "certain words that probably weren't right," according to Harold Ness the high school principal. "So we emphasized it at teacher

meetings in the fall and I don't think there's a problem any more." ●

#### AIRLINES DEREGULATION

##### HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, in 1978 when Congress passed legislation to deregulate the airlines, this body, the President, and the general public were enthusiastic about its prospects. Vastly improved service and lower prices were forecast, once the airlines were unhindered by Government.

Now, 2 years later, many areas of the country have had service disruptions and transportation gaps as airlines jockeyed for implementing new service and discontinuing old routes. I feel confident that the Civil Aeronautics Board is overseeing the deregulation process as well as can be expected—though there were several major problems in the early stages—and ultimately I feel that the level of service needed by an area will be met.

However, I am concerned about the cost of air service. Where competition between cities is keen, airlines are outdoing each other with supersavers and other discounts. Where there is only one airline, connecting a small or medium-sized city with a major metropolitan area, fares are considerably higher. As an example—San Francisco to Chicago is \$99 one-way, while Fresno to Chicago is \$133. The mileage is not that different, but the competition is.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it was the intent of Congress to discriminate against small and medium-sized cities as far as pricing of air transportation goes, when it passed deregulation legislation. I would urge my colleagues to read the following editorial from a recent edition of the Fresno (Calif.) Bee, and then consider what might be done to correct this inequity:

#### THE LACK OF COMPETITION

It wasn't enough that United Airlines drastically reduced its Fresno-San Francisco-Los Angeles service. It wasn't enough that United discontinued its service to Visalia, Modesto and Bakersfield. Now United is adding insult to the injury by offering lower prices on direct fares to Chicago from San Francisco than from Fresno—a clear way of shouting out that because there is competition for the San Francisco-Chicago flight, the price can be lowered to \$99, while with no competition on the Fresno-Chicago flight, the bargain fare is \$133.

Airline deregulation, the term used to describe the reduction in federal airline regulations that began in 1978, has had a strong adverse impact on the San Joaquin Valley. Once United Airlines was the valley's principal mass transportation link to the major cities of California and the rest of the nation. Now, United Airlines takes only the cream from the valley by offering direct flights from Fresno to Denver and Chicago and only a couple of flights a day to San Francisco and Los Angeles.

We grant that airline deregulation may have been good for United Airlines, which has been losing money lately—because of a strike last year, heavy increases in fuel costs and a dramatic slowdown in the nation's economy which has reduced both business and pleasure air travel. And deregulation may be good for some of the commuter airlines that have stepped in to pick up the commuter business United has been abandoning. But we had hopes in the beginning that deregulation would mean more and better service for the valley, certainly not a lower quality service at a higher price.

Our hopes may have been lifted too much in June 1977 when President Carter, in backing a Senate bill proposing the so-called deregulation, declared that fewer restrictions on airlines would open up air travel to many Americans who then could not afford it. The General Accounting Office estimated the deregulation would save consumers about \$1.5 billion a year and everybody felt good about that.

We have to admit that passengers in San Francisco who can get to Chicago for \$99 or to New York for \$149 are saving money because of the competition between the airlines. But we in the valley definitely have a lower quality of service as a result of deregulation.

If deregulation means those in the major cities get better and cheaper service, and those in smaller cities get poorer service at higher prices, then deregulation is not working the way it was intended. Too many people are being hurt. It is time for Congress to take a new look at deregulation. There must be a way to distribute the quality of airline service more equitably.●

#### MORE REASONS FOR BOYCOTTING THE OLYMPICS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for a long time now, well before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, I have been concerned about the cross-politicization of the Olympic ideal by the Communist countries. I have objected to their use of professional athletes against our amateurs. I have protested Soviet terms of television rights which insured that TV coverage of the Moscow games would propagandize Soviet life. I have been troubled by the Communist practice of pumping up their athletes with steroids.

Adrian Karatnycky and Alexander Motyl have given us "More Reasons for Boycotting the Olympics." Read their article in the May/June 1980 issue of Freedom at Issue, publication of Freedom House, the highly respected human rights organization.

The article follows:

#### MORE REASONS FOR BOYCOTTING THE OLYMPICS

(By Adrian Karatnycky and Alexander Motyl)

Even if Soviet troops had never invaded Afghanistan, there would still be more than enough reason to boycott the Moscow Olympics. Indeed, for those seeking both moral and political arguments in support of a boycott, it would be far wiser to pose the

question in terms broader than President Jimmy Carter's.

#### A POLITICAL/IDEOLOGICAL CONCEPT

From the very moment of the USSR's entry into Olympic competition, its entire conception of the Games has been inherently political and ideological. The Soviets have made no secret of this. As far back as 1973, one year before the International Olympic Committee chose Moscow as the site of this year's Games, one USSR journal claimed: "The propaganda of the apolitical nature of sports—'sports without politics'—is nothing other than one of the methods of ideological diversion of imperialist circles directed against the countries of the socialist camp." More recently, in January 1979, I. Novikov, Chairman of the Soviet Olympic Organizing Committee, pointed out exactly what propaganda points the USSR hoped to score with the Moscow Olympics: "For the first time the Games will be held in the capital of a socialist state, where the noble ideals of the Olympics are fully supported. Peace, equality, fraternity, and international cooperation—these concepts are inseparable from the life of Soviet society and are grounded in the Constitution of the USSR. Thus, holding the Games in Moscow opens a qualitatively new stage in the Olympic movement."

In line with this inherently ideological conception, the more than 10,000 Soviet interpreters who will be employed during the Games are, according to a Soviet journal of higher education, obligated to take courses in "general political issues such as 'The Leading and Guiding Role of the Communist Party in the Building of Communism,' 'The Construction of Communism,' 'Basic Advantages of a World Socialist System,'" and the like. The emphasis that is being given to conveying a proper political line is also illustrated by the fact that the Soviet Olympic Organizing Committee refused to utilize foreign interpreters who might have helped allay the expected shortage of qualified translators.

Robert J. Kane, president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, may be right to claim that "any nation where the Games are held probably uses them for propaganda purposes." Yet even he must surely realize that the propaganda machine of the USSR is, as Novikov himself implies, "qualitatively" different from that of nontotalitarian states. One would certainly be hard-pressed, for example, to find a government official in a democratic state making the same self-serving claims the Soviets are making; claims which re-echo Herr Goebbels words of forty-four years ago: "Germany is your friend! Germany strives only for peace, and only Germany is capable of guaranteeing peace."

Perhaps Soviet society is indeed "inseparable" from the concepts of peace, equality, fraternity, and international cooperation? But the USSR's record against Novikov's own standards is common knowledge:

Peace: The invasions of Hungary in 1956, of Czechoslovakia in 1968, and Afghanistan in 1979; the training and arming of terrorists; the spending of 13.5 percent of its budget (according to estimates of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency) on military hardware; the development of atomic weapons far more powerful than needed for parity with the United States—all of this speaks eloquently about the USSR's devotion to peace.

Equality: As Robert Kaiser and Hedrick Smith pointed out in their books on the USSR, party members, KGB agents, and state apparatchiks have the cushy jobs, consumer goods, and country dachas, while the

ordinary Soviet citizen must deal on the black market to make ends meet. The many institutions, among them trade unions and people's councils, that are supposed to enhance the citizen's equality and protect his interests are usually rubber-stamp bodies that carry out the will of the elite. Below the average citizens and even the criminal offenders is a sub-group, lacking all rights: the prisoners of conscience, the political, national, human-rights, and religious dissidents, such as the Helsinki Monitors Anatoly Shcharansky, Mykola Rudenko, and Yuri Orlov.

Fraternity: If fraternity means fraternal relations between people and nations, then how shall we account for the USSR's thirty divisions in Eastern Europe; for its brutal repression of the movements of Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Armenians, and other nationalities to increase national rights and to oppose the government policy of Russification; or for the USSR's official anti-Semitism?

International cooperation: Soviet obstructionism in the Middle East, and its veto of U.S. efforts to win United Nations sanctions against Iran in an effort to free the fifty U.S. hostages held in Tehran, speak for themselves.

#### CONCEALING THE REALITY

The Soviets are not unaware of their internal shortcomings and have taken substantial measures to keep them hidden from the Western tourist. An immense number of cultural events have been planned for the Games. Visitors will have a choice of 150 operas and ballets, 450 plays, and countless concerts and recitals. This serves a dual purpose: to promote the attainments of Soviet culture and to limit unsupervised leisure time. By skillfully combining the Olympic events with sightseeing excursions and cultural events, the Soviet authorities will be able to control effectively the access visitors have to the less praiseworthy features of Soviet society. A mop-up of dissidents is currently also under way, with, most notably, Andrei Sakharov having been sent into internal exile in Gorky, a city off-limits to the Western press and tourists.

It is clear that the Soviets intend to isolate the Western tourist from Soviet reality. And lest the tourist prove to be too inquisitive, the Soviets have already suggested how he will be regarded. E. A. Shevardnadze, the first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party and a member of the Politburo, was quoted in one Soviet newspaper as saying: "There are forces in the world that are intensively preparing not only for sports contests but also for political and ideological skirmishes and subversive activity. Groups hostile to the Soviet Union are intent on using the Olympic Games for ideological subversion and hostile attacks."

The journal of the USSR Ministry of Justice meanwhile ominously noted:

"It is already time to take the necessary organizational measures and, in particular, to determine how many volunteers working together with the police will be required to ensure that public order is exemplary at all Olympic grounds, along the routes traveled by athletes and guests, and in areas where there are historical monuments and other sights. The most noteworthy, experienced, and highly recommended persons should be selected for this task. Special courses should be organized for the public-order volunteers, according to a carefully worked-out program that takes the specific nature of activities during the Olympics into account."

Sports journals have also gotten into the act. A leading Soviet monthly, *Physical Culture and Sport*, which enjoys wide circula-

tion, printed a serialized account of the preparations of foreign agents who it claims will arrive in the USSR under the guise of sports journalists. And at a time of heightened East-West tensions, can anyone assure Western visitors that they will not be unjustly charged with illicit activities by zealous secret-police agents and a Soviet government eager to score propaganda points against an America they claim is ever interfering in the Soviet Union's internal affairs?

Symbolic of the Moscow Olympics is that their preparations involve about 240,000 people. Some are freely volunteering their labor, while others, prisoners in concentration camps, are being forced to produce Olympic souvenirs. One former political prisoner, Mykola Scharegin, a Ukrainian imprisoned in the USSR for ten years and allowed to leave for Great Britain last year, testified recently, at the International Sakharov Hearings, that "Misha," the teddy-bear mascot of the Moscow Games, is produced at forced-labor prisons in Vasilyev Mokh near Kalinin. According to Mr. Scharegin, other prisoners produce Olympic souvenir pins and emblems intended for Western tourists, who will buy them this summer in Moscow, unaware of the human misery behind their manufacture.

#### RETHINKING THE OLYMPIC IDEA

Should the United States support the Moscow Olympics, knowing that they are intended as a smoke screen for the USSR's totalitarianism? The physicist Valentin Turchin, a former Soviet dissident who now lives in New York, makes the following argument:

"In the final analysis, your attitude toward a boycott in human-rights matters depends on your acceptance of totalitarian rule as a phenomenon. . . . If you see totalitarianism as a horrible threat to mankind, and your mind rebels at what the Soviets are doing to Orlov and others, you will certainly not reject a boycott. . . . If you accept totalitarianism (maybe not for yourself and your kin, but for those strange guys with 'mysterious Slav souls'), you will see Orlov's case as a sad but natural matter, something in the nature of an automobile accident."

Irrespective of whether the Summer Olympics are held, the Olympic movement and the Olympic idea are under serious attack from a number of fronts.

Critics argue that Soviet and Eastern-bloc athletes are not true amateurs, but rather professionals employed by their states to engage in sports. American and Western athletes are concerned with the unfair advantage they feel Eastern-bloc athletes derive from steroids and other forms of biological manipulation. Human-rights activists urge boycotts of sports events involving teams from repressive regimes.

Ultimately, sports exchanges are part and parcel of the general fabric of relations among nations. In an era of détente and good will, such exchanges are possible and desirable. But in the final analysis they are simply a reflection of the international *status quo*.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has not been responsible for the collapse of the Olympic idea; it has merely served as a catalyst for processes that have been going on for years. A boycott will not undermine the Olympic movement; that movement has long been disintegrating. It may, however, sound the call for a real examination of the basis of the Olympic idea: peace among nations, true amateurism in sports, and athletic competition rid of the taint of governmental propaganda. ●

## HINTS OF SOVIET PRESENCE IN CUBA

### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, increasingly, reports from Cuba describe greater Soviet influence and presence on that island 90 miles from American shores.

The latest reports give further cause for alarm because it suggests the Soviets are once again trying to establish nuclear arms in Cuba.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the June 1 commentary by Jack Anderson describing the evidence of Soviet missiles in Cuba. I believe that a full investigation should be conducted on these reports and I am writing the Secretary of State requesting an assessment of a Soviet offensive nuclear missile presence in Cuba.

The article follows:

#### EVIDENCE HINTS RUSSIANS HAVE NUCLEAR ARMS IN CUBA

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—There is disturbing evidence that the Soviets, encouraged by Jimmy Carter's tepid leadership, may be preparing another Cuban missile crisis for the United States.

The appearance of Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962 brought a nuclear showdown between Nikita Khrushchev and John F. Kennedy. With cold courage, Kennedy faced down Khrushchev, who never recovered from the loss of face. Now with Carter in the White House, the Kremlin czars apparently think they can win a new Cuban confrontation.

Here's the background: American intelligence experts, after painstakingly putting together bits and pieces of evidence, informed the White House last year that there was a Soviet combat brigade in Cuba.

President Carter, with his eye on public opinion polls showing that he was regarded as a weak, ineffectual leader, rushed off half-cocked and announced with chest-thumping bravado that the presence of 2,600 Russian troops in Cuba was "unacceptable."

The Kremlin disdainfully dismissed Carter's saber-rattling as empty rhetoric, and when the Soviet combat brigade suddenly became "acceptable," Soviet strategists were confirmed in their suspicion that Carter was no tiger, but a pussycat.

The president's humiliation over the Soviet brigade issue was lost sight of by the American public within a matter of weeks, swallowed up in the greater crisis over the hostage seizure in Iran.

Now, less than a year after the combat brigade fiasco, U.S. intelligence analysts have compiled truly alarming evidence that the Soviets are secretly developing a nuclear capability in Cuba—may, in fact, already have introduced nuclear weapons into their satellite outpost 90 miles from Florida.

The reason the American public has not heard of this genuinely ominous development is that the intelligence community is afraid to so much as suggest a nuclear presence in Cuba. The pragmatic men in the intelligence agencies fear the disclosure would touch off another international crisis—one which Carter is ill-equipped to handle.

There is, of course, the possibility that the evidence is misleading—that the bits and pieces of incriminating information all have an innocent explanation. But the accumulation of data from various sources points to a "worst-case" projection that the Russians are indeed creating a nuclear arsenal in Cuba—and worst-case scenarios are the only safe ones to assume when dealing with the Kremlin.

Some of the evidence I have already reported. Other information has only recently been interpreted by intelligence analysts.

One of the most disturbing developments was reported by a high level Cuban defector, who until recently was being trained by the Russians to command a SAM-2 (surface-to-air-missile) site. He told his intelligence debriefers that the Soviets have modified their Cuban missiles by adding three booster rocket motors that increase their range threefold.

Intelligence sources told my associate Dale Van Atta that the Cuban defector had been informed that the purpose of the SAM-2 modification was to give it a surface-to-surface capability. In other words, it can now be used for attack as well as defense. The defector reported that the modified SAM-2s in Cuba can reach targets in Florida.

What alarmed the intelligence experts even more was the defector's report that he was told the new missiles' twin warheads were "very powerful" and required Soviet personnel to activate them. He was told the warheads are so powerful, in fact, that they were to be detonated only at maximum range.

The defector assumed from these hints that the missile warheads were nuclear. What he didn't know was that the Soviets had tested nuclear warheads of up to 25 kilotons on SAM-2s as long ago as 1961, and that three are SAM-2s deployed in the Soviet Union which are nuclear-armed.

Intelligence sources also noted gloomily that the Russians routinely describe their nuclear weapons as simply "immensely powerful" to disguise their nuclear reality from the troops who handle them. So the defector's reports add up to the distinct possibility that Soviet nuclear missiles are in position in Cuba at this very moment.

Another recent development adds to the ominous overall picture. In 1978, President Carter expressed concern at the appearance of 20-odd Soviet MiG-23s in Cuba. But the intelligence experts determined that they were for Cuban defense only.

What the American public was never told was that the Russians can rewire a MiG-23 to carry nuclear weapons in approximately two days. Furthermore, I can report also that the Soviets have constructed about 50 hardened shelters for the MiGs in Cuba—an unusual precaution for a climate as mild as Cuba's. Analysts suggest that the strong shelters are intended to protect the MiG force from surveillance or attack by U.S. aircraft and missiles.

Perhaps the most alarming evidence of Soviet military preparations in Cuba is the construction that has been taking place at Matanzas, not far from Havana. I reported in April that large holes in the Matanzas area were "strikingly similar" in size, shape and construction to those that are known to house missiles in the Soviet Union.

The intelligence analysts have learned more since that first report, and it's not encouraging. Initially, the activity around Matanzas was nearly dismissed as "suburban construction." But it now appears that what the Soviets are building there is indeed an underground bunker and/or silo for surface-to-air missiles. With the known nuclear ca-

pability of Soviet SAM-2s, and the threefold increase in the missiles' range reported by the Cuban defector, this adds up to another Cuban missile crisis.

Almost as a footnote, it should be mentioned that the Soviet brigade itself was interpreted by some Pentagon experts as possibly constituting a "special mission" force. One of the special missions the Russians use such brigades for is protection and security for nuclear weapons installations.●

NCOA FETES USMC 1980 TOP  
SQUAD LEADERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 22, 1980, I was privileged to join the Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A. (NCOA) in hosting a luncheon honoring the Marine Corps 1980 top squad leaders.

The affair was held in the Rayburn Building and attended by such distinguished colleagues as CHARLES DOUGHERTY, ELDON RUDD, and DICK WHITE, all former marines; Maj. Gen. Harold Hatch, USMC, representing the Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps Leland D. Crawford, USMC.

Joining in the salute were members of the staff of Senators BOB DOLE, BILL ARMSTRONG, HARRISON WILLIAMS, Congressmen DAN MARRIOTT and J. KENNETH ROBINSON, as well as my office.

Also on hand were representatives of the Marine Corps and various private Marine Corps and veterans organizations.

Special guests were Michael A. Watson, member of President Carter's White House staff, and Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard Hollis B. Stephens, USCG.

Acting as master of ceremonies was C. A. "Mack" McKinney, NCOA vice president for Government affairs and a retired Marine sergeant major. He introduced General Hatch, Sergeant Major Crawford, and me, and each of us offered appropriate remarks. The sergeant major and I assisted Mack in presenting framed certificates of achievement to each squad leader from NCOA president Normand M. Gonsauls of San Antonio, Tex.

The top squad leaders, nine sergeants in all, were at Marine Corps Base, Quantico, Va., competing their units against one another for the title of "1980 Top Marine Corps Squad." The sergeants were from the corps infantry regiments assigned to the United States, Hawaii, and Okinawa.

There were five events in this year's competition. They included marksmanship and weapons employment, combat endurance survivability skills, night patrolling, testing the preparation, planning, patrol order, and conduct of the patrol, helicopter-borne as-

sault, movement to contact, and the squad attack of a fortified area, movement to the forward edge of the battle area, troop leading steps, and conduct of the defense and withdrawal. The competition between the squads was intense, highly spirited, and displayed the tremendous esprit and personal commitment of all squad members.

On the following Friday, the corps recognized the competitors at an evening parade at Marine Barracks, Washington, D.C. Sgt. Robert M. Campbell's squad was named as the top squad and each member received gold competition badges from Gen. Kenneth McLennan, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps. Second- and third-place winners were presented silver and bronze badges respectively.

Besides Sgt. Campbell, 9th Marine Regiment, other squad leaders were:

Sgt. W. E. Perry, USMC, 1st Marine Regiment.

Sgt. L. Kocian, USMC, 7th Marine Regiment.

Sgt. R. R. Schwartz, USMC, 8th Marine Regiment.

Sgt. J. M. Willis, USMC, 2d Marine Regiment.

Sgt. J. D. Nason, USMC, 6th Marine Regiment.

Sgt. R. L. Prim, USMC, 4th Marine Regiment.

Sgt. D. S. Bradford, USMC, 5th Marine Regiment.

Sgt. R. J. Bullock, USMC, 3d Marine Regiment.

Cohosts for Thursday's luncheon were R. P. "Bob" Saverig, Assistant Director for Military Relations; Richard W. Johnson, Jr., Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs; and C. R. "Chuck" Jackson, Veterans Service Officer, all of NCOA.●

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S INTER-  
VENTION IN A PRIVATE ANTI-  
TRUST SUIT

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Justice Department took the unprecedented step of intervening in a private antitrust suit on behalf of the Governments of Australia, Canada, France, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. Associate Attorney General John Shenefield, in a letter to Federal District Court Judge Prentice Marshall, urged the judge to consider the foreign policy implications before imposing sanctions on foreign firms refusing to comply with subpoenas issued in the uranium cartel case. If the Justice Department's view prevails and no sanctions are imposed, it would deal a severe blow to the Tennessee Valley Authority's suit and their attempt to secure access to information contained in the files of the foreign uranium producers.

This is a highly unusual move, which underrates the ability of the judge to balance the views of the foreign governments against the antitrust charges. I believe it also calls into question the Justice Department's commitment to the antitrust laws if short-term diplomatic goals are allowed to override the need to end the insidious effects of cartel activity.

Because of the importance of this issue, I thought my colleagues would be interested in seeing Associate Attorney General Shenefield's letter to the district court judge. In addition, listed below is a letter I sent to Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti in an unsuccessful attempt to stop the Justice Department from intervening. Lastly, I am enclosing a reply from Mr. Shenefield further clarifying his letter to the judge:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE ATTOR-  
NEY GENERAL,

Washington, D.C. May 6, 1980.

Re: *Westinghouse, Inc. v. Rio Algom, Ltd., et al.*, No. 76 C 3830

HON. PRENTICE H. MARSHALL,  
U.S. District Judge, U.S. District Court,  
Northern District of Illinois, Chicago,  
Ill.

DEAR JUDGE MARSHALL: This letter constitutes a formal statement of interest by the United States in the above-captioned litigation. The case implicates foreign policy concerns of both the United States and foreign governments. Australia, Canada, France, South Africa, and the United Kingdom have all expressed serious concern at what they see as the exercise of the United States jurisdiction over activities of foreign persons outside the territory of the United States challenging their authority to establish national policies for corporate activity in their countries. The recent adoption of administrative and legislative measures by some foreign governments in response to the initiation of this lawsuit testifies to the intensity and authenticity of their respective interests. The views and representations advanced by these foreign governments are entitled to appropriate deference and weight in resolving legal questions that turn, at least in part, on considerations of international comity. See, e.g., *Societe Internationale v. Rogers*, 357 U.S. 197 (1958); *Timberlane Lumber Co. v. Bank of America*, 549 F. 2d 597 (9th Cir. 1976); *Mannington Mills, Inc. v. Congoleum Corp.*, 595 F. 2d 1287 (3rd Cir. 1979); Section 40 of the Restatement (Second) of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States.

Foreign governments may perceive particular federal litigation to which they are not parties as threatening to their sovereign interests. At one time, it was customary for foreign governments to communicate such concerns through diplomatic notes, delivered to the federal courts by the Department of State. In 1978, however, the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court notified the Solicitor General that a foreign government that desired to present its views to the federal courts on a pending case should do so by way of a brief *amicus curiae*. Accordingly, since that time, both the Department of State and the Department of Justice have consistently encouraged interested foreign governments to submit their positions directly to the courts as *amici*. It would be improper, therefore, to discount the importance of international comity in a particular case simply because

foreign governments have expressed their views to the court without the intercession of the Department of State.

Finally, the United States urges that it would be inappropriate, in the absence of bad faith, to inflict punishment against a defendant in the above-captioned case for inability to comply with a discovery order of the court because of a contrary foreign criminal law; the consequences of the absence of complete discovery should be assessed by reference to the multiple factors identified in *Societe Internationale v. Rogers, supra*.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN H. SHENEFIELD,  
Associate Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1980.

HON. BENJAMIN R. CIVILETTI,  
Attorney General, Department of Justice,  
Constitution Avenue, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CIVILETTI: It is my understanding that in the next few days you will be asked to sign a letter on behalf of the Justice Department to intercede in a private antitrust case currently pending in the U.S. District Court in Chicago involving the uranium cartel. I would like to urge you not to sign this letter and to do everything you possibly can to stop any intervention into this private litigation.

One of the plaintiffs in this action is the Tennessee Valley Authority which seeks a redress of injuries suffered by an alleged conspiracy to violate U.S. antitrust laws by 13 foreign and domestic uranium companies. While there is no dispute that the cartel existed and that it was able to manipulate a seven-fold increase in uranium prices over a four-year period, the defendants are disputing the extent of its impact on U.S. commerce. The defendants contend that the cartel specifically excluded the U.S. from the cartel marketing arrangements.

In an attempt to prove their case, TVA sought discovery of information relating to the defendants' actions in the United States. A number of foreign governments have sought to frustrate that discovery order by enacting non-disclosure or secrecy laws.

Judge Prentice Marshall of the U.S. District Court in Chicago is now considering motions for sanctions against the defendants for their failure to comply with the discovery order. In his deliberations Judge Marshall will be aided by amicus briefs filed by the Governments of Canada and Great Britain.

I have been informed that high-ranking Justice and State Department officials recently met with the plaintiffs and informed them that they intend to send a letter to Judge Marshall requesting that he look favorably on the views of the foreign governments. The decision was said to be imminent, and in all likelihood will cross your desk in the next few days.

I believe that intervention by the Executive Branch in this matter is ill-advised and improper. It raises troublesome questions as to the commitment of the federal government toward effective enforcement of the antitrust laws. The uranium cartel suit must turn on questions of law and should not be dictated by short-term political and diplomatic efforts. To be effective and enduring, our judicial system must be free of political pressures in resolving private grievances between private parties.

I have given this issue my close personal attention for nearly four years. In 1977, the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee,

on which I serve, documented the activities of the cartel and its impact on U.S. commerce. In an effort to give U.S. courts a stronger role in enforcing our antitrust laws against international cartel activity, I introduced legislation which would narrow the scope of the defense used by cartel members who have hidden behind the skirts of foreign governments. I have come to the conclusion that we can and must do more to strengthen the tools of government to deal with the insidious effects of cartels. I have been terribly disappointed in the government's efforts to date, and especially the Justice Department's decision last year to drop its investigation of the Gulf Oil Corporation, an active cartel member, in return for a \$40,000 misdemeanor information charge. The possibility that State and Justice would intercede on behalf of cartel members in a private suit is absolutely the wrong signal to send to multinational corporations at this time.

What is interesting in the matter pending before the Chicago court is that it does not involve the delicate inquiry into the legality or the validity of cartel actions taken by foreign governments. TVA is not seeking extraterritorial application of U.S. laws. It is seeking to redress grievances suffered right here in the United States which adversely affected TVA and the U.S. uranium market. TVA is attempting to hold private parties responsible for actions taken in the U.S., totally outside the scope of any foreign governmental mandate. None of the defendants have been able to show why the foreign secrecy laws should prohibit disclosure of marketing information relating to U.S. commerce. While I believe intervention by Justice and State is highly inappropriate in any event, it is especially true here where no direct conflict of laws can be found.

Recently former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was stung by allegations that he tacitly assisted the Shah of Iran's efforts to raise OPEC oil prices after the 1973 Arab embargo. It was alleged that he believed higher oil prices were needed to give Iran sufficient funds to build an arms oasis to fight Russian expansionism in the Middle East. While the stakes are not as high, the principal involved in this case is precisely the same. The U.S. judicial system is attempting to enforce our antitrust laws and to protect U.S. consumers, and yet the State Department and the Justice Department are apparently attempting to block those efforts for diplomatic reasons. The result is to condone and encourage cartel activities. If this policy is allowed to predominate, it will cripple efforts to enforce the antitrust laws against multinational corporations.

I urge you to give these views your very careful consideration, and I thank you in advance for your time.

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE, JR.,  
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1980.

HON. ALBERT A. GORE, JR.,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GORE: I have been asked by the Attorney General to respond to your letter of May 7, 1980 concerning the Uranium Antitrust Litigation (No. MDL 342) now pending in United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. As you are by now aware, on May 6, 1980, I wrote to Judge Prentice H. Marshall notifying him of the interest of the United States in the referenced litigation. The letter, a

copy of which is attached, does not request that the Judge "look favorably" on the views of the foreign governments. The letter does indicate the concern of the United States government, in light of the circumstances of this case, that Judge Marshall have proper regard for the foreign policy implications of any action he may take.

Such a conveyance of views by the Executive Branch, while entirely proper and in this case quite important to the foreign relations of the United States, should not be thought by anyone to mean that the United States is taking a position on the substance of the matter which favors either side.

It is important to be clear, however, that there is a direct conflict of United States and foreign law present in pending motions before Judge Marshall. The United States believes that any Rule 37 sanctions imposed upon a defendant in these circumstances ought to avoid any implication that punishment is being inflicted by a United States court upon any party to a litigation by reason of the failure of that party to violate the law of another sovereign nation. To be as clear as I can, this position is not intended to convey either the opposition or the favor of the United States toward sanctions in this case. Rather, I believe it is obvious that a court faced with the inability of a party to provide evidence has discretion to take the actions necessary to effective judicial management of the pending law suit that flow from such inability.

To reiterate, our action in communicating these views to the court should not be taken as favoring either side or as an attempt to dictate the outcome. We are simply urging the court to give careful consideration to the principles of international comity in fashioning its orders.

I look forward to seeing you Monday.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. SHENEFIELD,  
Associate Attorney General. ●

#### WEB-PROGRESS CONTINUES

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the South Dakota congressional delegation recently presented the administration with a proposal aimed at insuring continued water resource development in South Dakota.

This proposal seeks to obtain administration support for the construction of the Walworth-Edmunds-Brown (WEB) rural water system, in return for the South Dakota congressional delegation's commitment to move forward with an Oahe deauthorization package that will be acceptable to both the administration and the people of South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we will be able to begin the drafting of that proposal sometime in June when the House Interior Water and Power Resources Subcommittee will hold hearings on the Oahe deauthorization issue.

I insert the entire text of the South Dakota congressional delegation's letter to the administration in the RECORD at this time:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C. May 12, 1980.

GUY R. MARTIN,  
Assistant Secretary for Land and Water Resources,  
U.S. Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GUY: We appreciated your consideration in meeting with us and a delegation from South Dakota last week to discuss the prospects of securing expedited development of the WEB Water Development Association's proposed pipeline project. We also appreciated your candor in visiting with us about the Administration's position concerning the concurrent deauthorization of the Initial Stage, Oahe Unit.

As you know, we very much want to see WEB get underway. Because there appears no other avenue left open to us, we feel we must accept the Administration's offer.

We are writing you to detail our understanding of the Administration's offer and hope we can together proceed in the year ahead to secure the construction of the WEB project and deauthorize Oahe in a manner acceptable to us personally, to the Administration, and to the people of South Dakota.

It is our understanding, based upon your letter of April 23 cosigned by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Alex Mercure and from your comments during the meeting last week that the Administration will "not object" to amendment of the Rural Development Policy Act to authorize construction of the WEB pipeline, that you will, in fact, support our efforts in Congress both to authorize and to fund the project for fiscal year 1981.

We accept your innovative suggestion that the Administration's interest in deauthorization of Oahe be accomplished through alteration of our amendment to include a provision that no funds for WEB can be appropriated beyond fiscal year 1981 unless deauthorization of Oahe has been accomplished.

The text of our proposed revision of our amendment to the Rural Development Policy Act follows. We are prepared to support this in the House of Representatives. We understand the Administration would, upon acceptance of this offer, similarly support its passage.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT

On Page 28, after line 9, insert the following new section:

SEC. 7. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$1,900,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981; and there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior such additional sums as may be necessary in subsequent years upon the deauthorization of the Initial Stage, Oahe Unit, James Division, Missouri River Basin project, South Dakota, authorized by the Act of August 3, 1968 (Public Law 90-453; 82 Stat. 624), and the Act of October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92-577; 86 Stat. 1265), including necessary administrative expenses, which shall be used to plan and develop in portions of, but not limited to, Walworth, Edmunds, Brown, Campbell, Potter, McPherson, Faulk, Hand, Spink, and Day Counties in South Dakota a rural water treatment and distribution system which will furnish water for domestic and other purposes, hereafter referred to in this section as the WEB Pipeline Project, as generally proposed by the WEB Water Development Association, Inc. Any funds appropriated under the authorization contained in this section shall remain available until expended.

(b) Any funds appropriated under the authorization contained in subsection (a) shall be transferred by the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture when such funds are appropriated. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative memoranda of understanding as may be required with the Secretary of Agriculture to provide services to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall use any funds transferred pursuant to subsection (b) for necessary administrative expenses, and to provide financial assistance to plan and develop the WEB Pipeline Project under the terms and conditions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) and under rules and regulations promulgated by the Department of Agriculture under the authorities contained in that Act. Such funds shall be expended in the ratio of 75 percent grants and such loans as may be necessary.

This language will enable initial funding of the WEB project in recognition of the "timing problem" confronting us. You will note, however, that it expressly ties further funding of the project to actual deauthorization of the Oahe Unit.

We understand you desire our assurance that we will immediately introduce and make a good faith effort to obtain enactment of legislation deauthorizing Oahe as a condition of Administration support of this amendment. We are hereby assuring you we will make such an effort contingent upon the Administration's active support of fiscal year 1981 funding of the WEB project and in expectation that such funding will ultimately be provided.

As you know, we've jointly sought a hearing on the deauthorization of Oahe before the House Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources. Indications are that such a hearing will take place in June. Upon your confirmation of the Administration's agreement to this proposal to secure active support for fiscal year 1981 funding for the WEB project, we will attempt to secure a similar hearing in the Senate. We will also be willing to introduce "by request" Oahe deauthorizing legislation we understand you are preparing, if you feel such introduction would be useful.

We want to ensure that South Dakota views are heard on this important matter and that our constituents have ample opportunity to properly and fully present their views. It may be possible that at some point in this process formal legislative language or report language setting forth additional agreements which will have a bearing upon the deauthorization of Oahe and possible additional considerations for the State in return for Oahe's deauthorization may be posed for the consideration of Congress.

While we must "agree to disagree" upon the extent of the Federal commitment to our State contained in the Flood Control Act of 1944, we believe the compromise which you have proposed and which we are accepting provides a proper and effective means by which we may proceed with WEB and with Oahe's deauthorization concurrently. It protects the legitimate interests of the people of South Dakota by ensuring consideration of their viewpoints by the Congress and by ensuring the Oahe Unit won't be deauthorized before their viewpoints have been considered. Similarly, it protects the Administration's position by not providing anything more than minimal "start up" money for the project unless and until the Oahe Unit has been deauthorized. It also assures an Administration voice in the deauthorization process in hearings before Congress.

We want to emphasize again that we will take every possible step to expedite this process so as to ensure the actual deauthorization of Oahe on a basis acceptable to all parties concerned. We realize that failure to deauthorize the project will foreclose any future funding for the WEB pipeline. This is assured by the language of the amendment we have provided you.

This proposal, then, revolves on the following conditions:

1. The administration can and will support the authorization and funding of the WEB pipeline for fiscal year 1981.

2. The South Dakota Congressional Delegation is willing to accept legislative language which will terminate further funding for the WEB project beyond fiscal year 1981 unless Oahe is deauthorized by the appropriate date.

3. The South Dakota Congressional Delegation has already obtained a commitment for a House hearing on Oahe's deauthorization and will upon Administration acceptance of this proposal seek similar hearings before the Senate. We will also introduce "by request" the deauthorizing legislation drafted by the Administration, should you feel this to be useful.

4. The Administration will be protected against adoption of "unacceptable" Oahe deauthorizing legislation by the existence of legislation tying completion of WEB to deauthorization by its participation in every phase of the Congressional deauthorization process, and by its inherent right to veto any deauthorizing legislation to which it objects.

5. The people of South Dakota will have an opportunity to present arguments concerning Oahe's deauthorization in hearings before Congress before the project is actually deauthorized.

6. WEB cannot proceed further unless Oahe is deauthorized by Congress.

We hope you can understand the sacrifices we are asking our constituents to make in accepting an agreement which sets in motion the process of Oahe deauthorization—a prospect which is abhorrent to many of them. We also hope you understand that their acceptance of this is directly dependent upon the Administration's ability to deliver support for the authorization and funding of the WEB project.

While not a part of this agreement, nor a condition of our acceptance of it, we would expect the language deauthorizing the Initial Stage, Oahe Unit would gain the Administration's support in expediting consideration of other worthwhile South Dakota water resource development projects and assuring an available water supply for South Dakota to develop its resources, while assuring the actual completion of the WEB project.

We hope you'll view our acceptance of your proposal as a first step toward recreating the kind of local, State and Federal cooperation you described at our recent meeting as being the key to future successful water resource development in South Dakota. Continued cooperation is absolutely vital. In accepting this proposal, we feel we have gone as far as we possibly can to promote such cooperation. We know you have done the same in offering it as a possibility in resolving this matter.

For us to ask more by demanding completion of WEB without Oahe's deauthorization, or for the Administration to ask more by demanding our acceptance of detailed terms of Oahe deauthorization prior to our constituents enjoying the opportunity to offer the kind of local voice in decision making which has been the centerpiece of the Administration's water policy would in-

dicate a lack of serious commitment on each of our parts—to Oahe, to WEB, and to the cooperation we both seek.

In view of the extreme time constraints under which we are now operating, we request your earliest possible written confirmation of this agreement.

Sincerely,

JAMES ABDNOR,  
TOM DASCHLE,  
Members of Congress.  
GEORGE MCGOVERN,  
LARRY PRESSLER,  
U.S. Senators.●

#### THE SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE COMMENTS ON ENERGY PROGRAM

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, putting together a coherent energy policy for the United States has not proved an easy task.

Given the magnitude and complexity of the problem and the wide diversity of attitudes toward energy policy in the United States, this difficulty should not have surprised anyone.

Congress and President Carter have, however, been making significant progress on shaping an energy policy for our country.

Recognition of this progress is contained in the following thoughtful editorial in the June 1, 1980, issue of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, published in the congressional district I have the honor to represent.

The editorial follows:

#### AN ENERGY PROGRAM

An energy program for this nation was never so simple that a staff of bureaucrats could just sit down and work one out. It has been a nagging problem, one that was sensed even in the heydays of waste in the 1950s and the 1960s.

What was needed to make a program possible was a goal, the old management by objective technique. And this was provided by the Arab oil boycott of the early 1970s. The goal was to be independence of the need for foreign oil.

But this still presented a cloudy picture. And it has not been until recently, after a great debate involving elected officials, government staff people, environmentalists, and industrialists and businessmen, that the form of a program became apparent.

Finally, it appears that an overall, coherent system is emerging. It lies mainly in three pieces of legislation, one passed and two about to be, and in a variety of lesser bills and regulations. But even though the form is apparent, the way still is threatened.

The foundations of the program are the \$227 billion "windfall profits" tax on domestic oil revenues for the next 10 years, a provision that now is law; the creation of an energy mobilization board, with the power to speed up key projects, which awaits passage; and the creation of a synthetic fuels corporation to increase production of synthetic fuels, a bill also awaiting final action.

The legislation still not passed has overcome the most important barriers, and the expectation is that both will soon be law.

The major victory was passage of the windfall profits tax, because it provides money to make the others work, in the case of synfuels to induce private industry into this development field.

President Carter has defined the goal a bit more, which is good because total independence of foreign oil is impossible in the near future. He has called for a 50 percent reduction in imports by 1990.

With these tools to use, a parcel of programs is springing up: Conservation, controlled now mainly through price; getting oil from such plentiful and minable products as coal and shale; distilling fuel from farm products and other renewable sources; setting national heating and cooling standards; tax credits for the use of solar heating equipment.

But, almost as fast it seems as these programs fall into place, pressures threaten to overcome them. An effort to build up a two-year contingency store of oil is threatened by Saudi Arabia, which may either cut down its exports or raise the price or both if such a safety measure is carried out.

And the Department of Energy has called for smaller spending to encourage solar power and more for nuclear power, whose future has been dimmed by the accident at Three Mile Island. President Carter's plan to add 10 cents to the federal gasoline tax has been stymied in Congress.

Even as the plan evolves, it will take a talented and tough administrator to make it work. President Carter deserves credit at this point for putting the package together. Making it do the job will be a major challenge for whoever is President for the next four years.●

#### CONGRESSMAN SILVIO CONTE RECEIVES HONORARY DOCTOR OF LAW DEGREE FROM TUFTS UNIVERSITY

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of his many friends and colleagues will want to see the magnificent citation received by Congressman SILVIO CONTE on May 25, 1980, when he received an honorary doctorate of law from Tufts University.

The citation follows:

TUFTS UNIVERSITY, May 25, 1980.

SILVIO O. CONTE

Silvio Conte, as a lawyer and lawmaker, as a State senator and as a beloved Member of the Congress of the United States, you have represented the people of your district and your State with humanity, integrity, and vigor, in your unswerving commitment to the improvement of health care and education, protection of the environment, and safe and efficient transportation, you represent the interests of all Americans. In gratitude and admiration, Tufts University awards you the degree of doctor of laws, *honoris causa*.

I know also that Members of the House and all of the admirers of Congressman CONTE will want to read the address which Congressman CONTE gave at the commencement of the

Fletcher School of International Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University in Medford, Mass., on Sunday, May 25, 1980.

Congressman CONTE's address makes several perceptive and wise comments about the necessity of clearly distinguishing between the role of a diplomat and the function of the political leader.

Congressman CONTE's thoughtful address follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE SILVIO O. CONTE AT THE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BEFORE THE FLETCHER SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND DIPLOMACY, TUFTS UNIVERSITY, MEDFORD, MASS., SUNDAY, MAY 25, 1980

Good afternoon. It is both an honor and a pleasure to be here today to address this distinguished group of graduates.

Although it is quite usual for a commencement speaker to include a warning to members of a graduating class that they may face many challenges, I regret that my remarks to you today must be almost totally devoted to that type of very serious message.

I have never been known as a theorist. I have been more widely—and probably more accurately—known as a pragmatist. For that reason, I assume that I was invited here to give my own assessment of the issues of concern to you; and, for that reason, my remarks will include candid observations, which I expect to be interpreted—which I hope will be interpreted—as words of warning. If you live up to the fine history and tradition of the institution from which you are graduating, I am certain you will accept them as words of challenge.

I wish I could give you a cheerier address, but these are not times for fond reminiscence or wistful speculation. There have been few times in our nation's history when the need for diplomatic expertise has been so critically apparent. America today yearns today for a new generation of leadership, a rekindling of spirit and respect in world politics.

Instead, we see assaults on our embassies, the Assassination of our Ambassadors, burning of our libraries, and desecration of our flag. In response to the crises in Iran and Afghanistan we see our allies reluctant to support American initiatives on behalf of the free world. Argentina balks at curtailing its grain shipments to Russia; Mexico closes its door to sanctuary for the Shah; Japan agrees to purchase Iranian oil at inflated prices. The litany goes on. America, the home of the brave, is no longer America, the leader of the free world.

Reflective of the decline of American prestige abroad, of course, is the hostage crisis in Iran. Never before has there been such an extended, vitriolic outpouring of anti-American feeling than that which we watched daily on our television screens. Never has our sense of frustration been greater as we find ourselves unable to prevent the kidnaping of our Embassy or force the release of our citizens.

Doubts about our leadership and foreign policy resolve have emboldened the Soviet Union and its surrogates to make significant advances in Africa, the Middle East, Asia and other troubled regions of the world. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is the only most blatant in a series of Soviet actions to prove and take advantage of the weakness of the West. Even close to home—in the Caribbean and Central America—our

prestige has waned, providing opportunities for our adversaries to increase their influence.

What has caused this continuing loss of American influence and prestige, and what can be done to set a new course?

The Vietnam War preoccupied the United States for a decade, diverting our attention from other priorities and dividing America domestically. Vast expenditures of money and manpower in a remote Asian war we could not or chose not to win tarnished our international image.

Compounding the lack of direction in foreign policy in the 1970's was a breakdown in ethics in national leadership. A president was forced to resign from office; Congressmen were indicted for taking bribes from a foreign state; and a new president was elected in a campaign marred by funding irregularities. In the eyes of the world, America's moral fiber was hardly apparent.

On the economic front, foreign perception of our vitality has been on the eclipse. The dollar has steadily weakened and no longer holds a dominant international strength. Inflation, declining productivity, inadequate savings, and too little capital formation have come to characterize our economy. Excessive dependency on petroleum imports has enabled oil exporting countries to escalate oil prices with impunity. Our balance of trade has moved heavily into the red until, today, our unmitigated appetite for oil may bring us to the point where shortly, we may be paying more for foreign oil than we spend on national defense.

Finally, the world has become far more complex than ever before. No longer are we the only wealthy and powerful country as was the case at the end of World War II. Europe and Japan are highly developed. The major oil exporting countries are bloated with oil profits. Rapid economic development in such other countries as Mexico, Korea and Brazil has created states more confident of themselves and less needful of American friendship and resources. At the same time, international interdependence has increased.

In addition, new weapons developments have far outpaced new security arrangements. We are the first generation in the history of the world capable of destroying ourselves through misuse of weapons of mass destruction. Not only have nuclear weapons become the province of seven countries—two of which are very poor (China and India)—but in the last year poison gas has once again found a place in the arsenal of modern war. We hear allegations that the Soviets have used lethal chemical weapons against Afghan insurgents, as have the Vietnamese in Laos and Cambodia.

If the international community does not join together to place curbs on the nuclear arms race and augment the Geneva protocol with a new convention prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, civilized society could cease. We could all be reduced to living the kind of presocial existence the 18th Century Philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, described as "Solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short". Government was instituted to uplift men from this self-destructive environment; but it appears that governments themselves are a prime factor in taking the civilization out of Twentieth-Century Science.

What, then, is America's responsibility in the decades ahead? We must begin by recognizing the twin values of restraint and preparedness, and the twin necessities of continuing detente where possible, but establishing, through alliance and sacrifice, bar-

riers to aggression. At home, we must expect less from Government and more from ourselves. Rebuilding international respect and reducing the likelihood of war requires the revitalization of our economy, greater energy independence, enhanced diplomatic and military capabilities, and perhaps, most importantly, a competent and visionary national leadership.

Last year, George Ball, the highly-respected former Undersecretary of State, appeared before a House Subcommittee to discuss the management of American foreign policy. Ball vigorously criticized what he called "Showbiz Diplomacy".

Referring to Henry Kissinger's famous practice of shuttle diplomacy in the Middle East in 1973 and 1974, Ball spoke of the world as being "Entertained by America's 'Miracle Worker' flying like Superman between Middle Eastern capitals, while press and television breathlessly reported" his every move.

And, in recent years, Ball noted, we have seen two examples of the "Prima Donna as Diplomat" as representatives of the Administration publicly displayed their disdain for accepted diplomatic practice.

The service of the former American Ambassador to the United Nations was hallmarked by frequent indiscreet public remarks. At the time of his dismissal in August, he admitted that he had deliberately misled the Secretary of State on his meeting with the PLO observer to the United Nations. He said he hadn't lied, but just didn't tell the whole truth. Diplomatic truth, he implied, has no bearing to real truth; nor to Administration loyalty. His actions reflected the frustrations of politician turned Diplomat. They are not unique.

President Carter's former envoy for Middle East negotiations confided to reporters aboard his aircraft last August that he had been assigned a "Mission Impossible". He let it be known that he had opposed the instructions for his visits to Egypt and Israel but had been overruled by the President on the advice of the Secretary of State and the National Security Advisor.

If he was unhappy with policy, he, like the U.S. Ambassador, should have resigned rather than so severely undercut the authority of the President and the Secretary of State. Amateurish efforts to undertake personal diplomacy perplex other governments, leaving them to wonder not only who is in charge of our Foreign Policy but sometimes in doubt as to what our Foreign Policy is.

I, like many of you, was shocked and surprised over the recent aborted attempt to rescue the hostages in Iran—not so much because an attempt was made, but because of its timing. Our diplomats around the world were negotiating with our allies and friends, trying to convince them to join in the economic sanctions. I, myself, had just returned from a trip to Yugoslavia, Morocco, and Portugal—a trip I cochaired with Speaker O'Neill. I recall very well how we personally urged Portugal to join us in the sanctions. Shortly after we returned, Portugal, at great economic risk to herself, joined in the sanctions.

I gave a speech on the floor of the House praising Portugal for her action, especially in light of the fact that 21% of her oil came from Iran. Shortly thereafter, while diplomatic negotiations were underway with other nations, the Administration attempted to use force and free the hostages. Is it any wonder that other nations refused to follow Portugal's lead?

In January, Brzezinski went to Pakistan after Secretary of State Vance had been

there. He managed, in the eyes of the world press, to undercut Vance's assurance to Pakistan of U.S. support and aid, and, while achieving this, he managed to have his picture taken—automatic rifle in hand—with Afghan and Pakistani guerrillas.

American national interests are better protected when diplomacy is institutionalized within the Department of State, and the Secretary of State preeminent in managing Foreign Policy. There is an inherent danger when our diplomatic activities are fragmented among several Foreign Policy spokesmen and special interests.

There have been too many examples in recent years of special envoys and the President's National Security Assistant working independently of the Department of State. Most recently, the press has entertained us with sketchy accounts of Hamilton Jordan serving as Ambassador without portfolio—the President's personal emissary in discussions with Quasi-Governmental intermediaries concerned with the Iranian hostage issue. But, as you here at the Fletcher School know full well, speaking Georgian is no substitute for the discipline of learning foreign languages and cultures.

Reflecting on his experience as one who worked the system both ways, Henry Kissinger recently acknowledged before a House Subcommittee hearing that there are dangers in the Department of State not having full authority in Foreign Affairs. He testified that negotiators should be under the direction of the Secretary of State and that the National Security assistant should act as a "Traffic Cop" for the President, and not as somebody "That foreign governments perceive as a rival source of influence."

With today's rapid communications jet travel, we have forgotten the virtues of traditional diplomatic negotiations. Experienced diplomats can often mediate, maneuver and negotiate with considerably more success than can a high-level political envoy. A traditional diplomat can work away from the glare of media attention and devote the time necessary to troublesome negotiations outside the confines of press deadlines. He or she can quietly propose initiatives which, if turned down, can serve as a constructive basis for later agreement.

Personalized diplomacy, on the other hand, too easily lends itself to high stakes response if it fails. Like poker players whose bluff was called, Kissinger and Nixon were psychologically forced to escalate the war in Vietnam in a costly effort to force the North Vietnamese to complete negotiations.

Unfortunately, instead of utilizing quiet diplomatic tools, we have in recent years too often engaged the prestige of the President or one of his principal advisors in meetings with foreign leaders when the results of negotiations were far from certain. In the process, our ambassadors have been turned into mere messengers and social secretaries for visiting dignitaries. The in-depth knowledge of the country, its language and leaders, that they and their career staffs possess has been overshadowed by the influence of domestic politicians and pressure groups and the egos of political personalities whose sense of self-esteem and concern for electoral survival carries greater weight than the national interest.

A case in point is the recent Cuban crisis. Incompletely evaluated intelligence relating to Soviet activities in Cuba was preemptorily released by a Senator foundering in his reelection campaign. President Carter mistakenly personalized as well as legitimized the issue, and in failing to cause the Soviets to back down, produced a diplomatic debacle. The U.S. preeminence in the Caribbean

has effectively been undercut by our leadership, not by any substantive change in power relations.

The personalizing of diplomacy contributes to the politicization of foreign policy. It exacerbates the tendency for Senators and Congressmen—as well as non-elected leaders—to think they are ambassadors, and for politicians to act out diplomatic drama before nationwide television audiences.

The ultimate practitioner of personal diplomacy has probably been Henry Kissinger. His clandestine visits to Peking, Moscow, and Paris were at times arranged without the knowledge of either the State Department or our diplomats on the scene. The highly publicized disengagement agreements he helped negotiate between Israel and Egypt required 12 trips to the Middle East and resulted in very substantial American monetary, military and political commitments to both countries at little cost to either.

While he still defends his shuttle diplomacy in the Middle East, even Kissinger now claims he is against overuse of this technique. He recently described shuttle diplomacy as risky because "if you fall at it, you have produced a major setback."

One of the reasons, it seems to me, for such visible involvement of our political leaders in international negotiations comes from the desire of Presidents and their principal representatives to leave their personal mark on international affairs. Richard Nixon so wanted to end our isolation from Mainland China that he ordered Kissinger to Peking without consulting our most important Asian ally, Japan. Jimmy Carter properly placed peace in the Middle East at the top of his foreign policy agenda, but with enormous naivete originally demanded a single comprehensive solution, with the Soviets allowed to play a principal role at the bargaining table. And in a rush to recognize Mainland China, he forgot to give notification of intent to Taiwan, thus shaking the confidence of a long-time ally.

While personal presidential involvement in Foreign Policy has sometimes benefited American interests, this has not always been the case. The scurry to fill up a chapter in the history books with personal "firsts" often dictates short-term solutions to complex issues which require protracted efforts to resolve.

At a time when the predominant role of the United States in the world is so desperately being challenged, America needs more than ever to have a strong, well understood diplomacy.

Diplomacy, like politics, is the art of the possible. But what is possible depends on the quality of our diplomatic techniques as well as our diplomats.

What we need are fewer politicians turned diplomats and more diplomats turned statesmen.

As is obvious from some of my remarks here, I am a politician, not a diplomat. But I hope the candor and sincerity of my observations will help you and your colleagues in your quest of statesmanship.●

#### SHIPBUILDING PROBLEMS

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that the President's shipbuilding request for fiscal year

1981, though a slight improvement over those of the recent past, is still not enough to replace ships lost through retirement, let alone begin building the Navy of our future.

Events in the Middle East and our response to these events painfully point out just how thinly our naval forces are stretched, and how desperately we need to expand the size of our fleet.

Former Secretary of the Navy, J. William Middendorf II, and John J. Spittler, national president of the Navy League of the United States, have made an exhaustive study of our needs, and the following article—the results of that study—sets forth a clear course for us to follow, if we are to maintain our present slim lead over the Soviet Union in seapower.

I include an article about their program as presented in Seapower magazine earlier this year.

#### AN ALTERNATE NAVY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

The Defense Department budget which was sent to the Congress by President Carter at the end of January includes funding for 17 new-construction ships (plus two conversions) for the Navy. The cost of those ships will be an estimated \$6.1 billion.

Neither the number of ships requested (although an improvement over the 12 ships funded last year for fiscal year 1980), nor the amount of money requested for SCN (shipbuilding and conversion, Navy) comes close to meeting the real needs of the Navy and the nation.

The five-year shipbuilding plan which the President also sent to Congress calls for construction—during the FY 1981-85 period—of 97 new-construction ships, plus five conversions. Again, while that figure represents a substantial improvement over the 67-ship total projected last year for the FY 1980-84 period, it still falls far short of what is needed by the U.S. Navy to retain supremacy on, and under, the high seas, and to carry out all its assigned missions for the foreseeable future.

We believe both the FY 1981 shipbuilding program and the five-year FY 1981-85 plan should be substantially increased. We therefore urgently recommend to the administration and to Congress adoption of a new program which would provide:

In FY 1981, 27 new-construction ships, plus two conversions, at a total cost of \$8.8 billion.

In the five-year FY 1981-85 period, 156 new-construction ships, plus five conversions, at a total cost (in "then-year" dollars, rather than "constant," FY 1981, dollars) of \$70.2 billion.

A corollary five-year aircraft procurement program which would provide, during the FY 1981-85 period, funding for 1,870 aircraft, including 200 in FY 1981, for the Navy and Marine Corps, rather than the 104 presently requested for FY 1981 and the 1,212 projected for FY 1981-85 procurement.

At a time of continuing double-digit inflation which adversely affects every American individually, and which has escalated the cost of new ships and aircraft astronomically, we do not make these recommendations lightly. But, as recent events in Iran and Afghanistan have made abundantly clear, the United States is today in mortal danger, and very strong measures must be taken to reverse the decline of our nation's naval and military forces.

If we do reverse that decline—and we must, but the hour is late and the time is short—Afghanistan may well prove to have been the giant hinge upon which the Free World swung from a state of apathy to a state of alert.

To some, the recent calamities abroad, and the U.S. reaction to them, represent—and are deplored as—"a return to the Cold War." A more realistic and, in the long run, more optimistic view—one which we share—is that the crises in Iran and Afghanistan should serve as the catalyst needed to reawaken the nation and make our citizenry, as well as our elected leaders in Congress and the administration, aware of the urgent need to repair and strengthen our too-long-neglected defense capabilities—not to begin the Cold War anew, but to prevent that Cold War from ever escalating into a world-destroying Hot War between the superpowers.

The sad fact is, the dangers facing the nation today are due as much to American—and allied—apathy and neglect of the Free World's defense capabilities as they are to Soviet adventurism. If we had taken the necessary hard steps several years earlier to maintain our previous naval and military supremacy, it would not be necessary today to embark on a crash program of inefficient and costly "quick fixes" such as those which are now being urged upon us.

Many of those "quick fixes" are nonetheless needed, and should be acted upon by the President and the Congress at the earliest possible time. A renewal of registration for the draft is absolutely mandatory, as is, we think, a renewal of the draft or initiation of a program of universal national service. Military pay should be increased across-the-board in order to solve the horrendous recruiting and retention problems facing all of our armed services. The nation's airlift and sealift assets must be massively and swiftly upgraded and augmented—and that means paying more than lip-service to the development of a strong and economically viable U.S.-flag merchant fleet.

Within the field of defense "hardware," major additional increases in RDT&E (research, development, test, and evaluation) for all the services are necessary, as is additional funding for the important but often neglected O&M (operations and maintenance) category. More spending is also needed for a wide variety of Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps, as well as Navy, weapons procurement programs.

It is above all essential that there be no repetition of the practice in recent years of "robbing Peter to pay Paul"—in other words, reducing funding for one service in order to provide more money for the needs of another service. All of the U.S. armed forces are today grossly underfunded. They must all be upgraded and modernized. Our focus here on the Navy's shipbuilding program stems from the fact that: (a) The Navy's general purpose fleet is, in relation to the missions assigned the Navy in peacetime as well as in time of conflict, the weakest component of the U.S. defense establishment; and (b) Ships take longer to build than any other weapons "system," and that makes it mandatory that the rebuilding of the fleet begin immediately.

To put the fiscal year 1981 defense budget in perspective, consider the following:

The total obligational authority of \$158.7 billion which is requested represents a seeming increase of \$20.1 billion over the \$138.6 billion appropriated last year for the FY 1980 defense program. When inflation is taken into account, however, the real increase (in constant FY 1981 dollars) is only

\$8.3 billion. Funding for personnel costs increased from FY 1964 to FY 1981, in constant FY 1981 dollars, from \$61.6 billion to \$70.7 billion. During the same time frame, however, funding for "investment" programs (ship, aircraft, and weapons procurement as well as RDT&E) actually decreased, from \$64.6 billion to \$47.7 billion—a \$17.2 billion cut.

The Soviet Union, in contrast, increased its "investment" spending substantially during the same period, and eventually spent an estimated \$240 billion more for military hardware over the last decade than did the United States.

In fiscal year 1981, the United States will spend about 5.2% of its gross national product (GNP) for defense programs. The Soviet Union, according to the authoritative International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), is spending an estimated 11-13% of its gross national product for defense programs.

The United States clearly can spend more for defense, without extreme sacrifice—and in the past has, in fact, spent a much greater share of GNP on defense: 6.7%, on the average, during the FY 1970-74 period, for example, and 8.4% during the FY 1960-64 period. The very large increases in spending for Navy shipbuilding and aircraft procurement which we here recommended, and other increases in defense spending which we would also endorse, would still leave defense spending, as a share of GNP, well below the level of earlier years, and should be considered in that light.

Massive increases in defense spending will not, of course, do much to alleviate present dangers. They are absolutely mandatory, however, if the nation is to avoid future dangers and be ready, in time of crisis, to meet those dangers, if necessary, head-on with a reasonable hope of success. Major upgrading of the United States defense program will send a clear and unmistakable signal, to our allies as well as our adversaries, that the United States has finally begun to reverse course, and is determined never again to slip into a position of naval or military inferiority.

Of all of our defense hardware programs, shipbuilding has suffered the most from past-year reductions, and has also—as Defense Secretary Harold Brown has pointed out—been the most severely affected by inflation.

To illustrate: In 1974, then-Chief of Naval Operations Admiral James L. Holloway III provided Congress a five-year shipbuilding plan which called for, among other things, funding for 40 ships in fiscal year 1980, at a cost of \$6.2 billion (in then-projected FY 1976 dollars). In its final action on the FY 1980 defense budget, as it turned out, Congress last year appropriated \$6.7 billion for construction of only 12 ships.

Ships are not only the most costly single "weapons system" in the entire Defense Department hardware inventory, they are also the most likely to be cut from the defense budget in any particular year. This is so for two reasons: (1) Reduction of two or three ships from the SCN plan can make a substantial difference in the budget—a difference of perhaps a billion dollars or more. At a time of continuing very large budget deficits, cutbacks in shipbuilding represent a severe temptation to our nation's leaders, both in the administration and in Congress. (2) Conversely, reductions in shipbuilding will not, except in very rare cases, immediately affect the state of the nation's defenses. Ships take several years to build. Hence, cutting ships from the FY 1981 budget, for example, would not directly affect the national defense posture until the mid-1980s or so.

The problem facing the Navy and the nation today, however, is that the very large SCN cutbacks which have been imposed almost annually for the past decade have finally produced a cumulative deficit in ship numbers and so seriously weakened our naval forces that, were war to start, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the U.S. Navy to carry out all of its presently assigned combat missions worldwide.

Again, consider a few facts and statistics: In 1968, at the peak of the Vietnam War, the U.S. Navy had in its active inventory some 976 ships. Today, the Navy's active fleet has been reduced to less than half that number, 462 ships. In contrast, the Soviet Union has continued to build surface ships and submarines at an unprecedented rate and today has in its active fleet an estimated 1,764 ships of all types. It is true that the Soviet ship numbers include several hundred coastal and patrol craft. But the U.S.S.R.'s true oceangoing "blue water" navy is also by any other measurement substantially larger than the U.S. fleet. Last year, according to defense Secretary Brown, the U.S.S.R. had 270 general-purpose submarines—90 of them nuclear-powered, 180 conventionally-powered—as well as 271 major surface combatants, and 91 amphibious warfare ships. The United States, in contrast, counts in its general-purpose fleet only 81 submarines (76 nuclear-powered), 66 amphibious ships, and 211 surface combatants.

Soviet ships are, although usually smaller, generally heavier-armed than U.S. ships (but without as great a reload capability). They are also increasingly sophisticated, and thus rapidly narrowing the former U.S. qualitative advantage which used to offset the huge "numbers gap" in favor of the Soviet Union. In certain aspects of naval warfare—deployment of anti-ship cruise missiles, for example—the U.S.S.R. is far ahead of the United States. In other fields, such as sea-based naval aviation and amphibious warfare capabilities, the United States still has the clear advantage—but those fields are no longer U.S. monopolies.

In almost any conflict scenario imaginable, the U.S.S.R. would have a first-strike advantage.

In contrast to the United States, which has let the U.S.-flag merchant marine deteriorate to the point where it now carries less than 5% of the Nation's two-way foreign trade, the Soviet Union has consciously and conscientiously built up the Soviet-flag merchant marine (now the second largest in the world), and closely coordinates the operations, movements, and deployment of the Soviet merchant, oceanographic, and even fishing fleets with the U.S.S.R.'s naval and defense needs.

Finally, the U.S.S.R., which is virtually self-sufficient in raw materials, and enjoys land lines of communications with all of its major allies (except Cuba and, more recently, Vietnam), has virtually no need for either a Navy or merchant marine, and could get along very well without either, in wartime as well as in time of peace. ●

#### ARAB REFUGEES IN 1980

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. Maxwell M. Hoffman, has sent me an article, "Arab Refugees in 1980" by Marie

Syrkin, reprinted from *Midstream* magazine. Dr. Hoffman believes that it is a viewpoint which deserves the attention of Members of Congress. Therefore, I wish to share it with my colleagues.

#### ARAB REFUGEES IN 1980

(By Marie Syrkin)

In a world full of authentic refugees, whose grim fate occupies the media, a conspiracy of silence surrounds the continued financing by UNRWA, the international agency for the relief of Arab refugees, of the Arab camps. On the one hand, the PLO rejects the term "refugee" in favor of "Palestinian" so as to assert a political right to a Palestinian state; on the other hand, refugee status is claimed for the descendants of Arabs who lived in Palestine for two years before the Arab onslaught on the newly established State of Israel in 1948. How long is a refugee a refugee? At the present time, starving Cambodians and the "boat people" of Vietnam qualify all too tragically for the designation of refugee and consequently for world sympathy and assistance. No one has to make a case for their needs. In Africa, four million refugees are currently in flight from their homelands because of tribal wars and political conflicts that continue to rend that continent. International relief officials have estimated that of the eight and a half million refugees in the world nearly half are to be found in Africa.

The turmoil in Africa within the last few years has resulted in flight and migration on an agonizing and massive scale. A few statistics, as reported in a recent survey (*Los Angeles Times*, December 16, 1979), indicate the extent of displacement: one million refugees from Ethiopia have crowded into impoverished Somalia, and the number keeps growing. Thousands of Ugandans have fled to the Sudan. The guerrilla war in Rhodesia accounts for the daily flight of hundreds to neighboring countries. Tribesmen from the Western Sahara flee the battles of the Polisario rebels against Morocco. Add to this the periodic wanderings of Africans to escape drought or famine and the figures multiply.

A recent United Nations report on refugees has indicated the acuteness of the problem: "Unless African governments learn how to create institutions capable of solving differences and conflicting views without necessarily resorting to the use of the gun, the refugee situation will get worse." Apparently, scant attention is being paid to the plight of these millions, and the United Nations Relief Agencies provide minimal relief even when they intervene to offer assistance. In most instances, no organized efforts to rehabilitate the refugees or to grant elementary subsistence are in operation. The All-African Conference itself has now launched a campaign to draw attention to the appalling situation of Africa's refugees.

The horror in Cambodia and Vietnam has at last aroused international indignation and efforts, frequently aborted by political considerations, have been under way to allay in some measure the greatest human catastrophe since the Holocaust. The intensity of these needs makes all the more puzzling the diversion of sizable funds for the continued maintenance of so-called Palestinian refugees. The annual report of UNRWA for 1979 makes clear how much the United States in particular has contributed for the upkeep of the Arab refugee camps. Since 1949, the United States has given a total of \$816,164,592—close to a billion dollars. The Soviet Union, despite its vociferous espousal of the Palestinian cause, has resolutely refrained from making any

donation, though it has been overgenerous in supplying the PLO with missiles and up-to-date arms of all descriptions. The oil-rich Arab states, while arming the PLO at a handsome rate and making military bastions of the refugee camps, have been notably modest in their relief contributions. Compare Saudi Arabia's total of less than \$40 million with the staggering American contribution for the same period. And bellicose Libya has managed to come up with less than \$10 million in the course of 29 years. The other oil-producing Arab states have been even more chary of their petrobillions.

Now there appears to be a crisis. The commissioner general of UNRWA has announced that the agency has a deficit of \$52 million and that prospective contributions for 1980 are some \$50 million short of the required \$185.3 million. The commissioner admits that he could cut down expenses by closing some schools—half the agency's budget is for education—and making other economies. However, he warned that "Closure of the agency's preparatory schools would lead to serious disturbances . . . since the refugees would interpret this action as another move by the international community to abandon the Palestinian people." He also indicated that economies such as freezing the pay of the large staff maintained by UNRWA would not meet with favor.

This again raises the question how long is a refugee a refugee? In the case of the millions of refugees created by the upheavals and deracinations in the wake of World War II, the accounts have long been closed. Who remembers the treks across Asia and Eastern Europe of uprooted millions who rebuilt their lives without the benefit of UNRWA? Any help given had a time limit. That the Arab states deliberately refused to allow the natural absorption of the some 550,000 Palestinian Arabs who fled from one part of Mandatory Palestine—the part that became Israel—to another part is a familiar story. It was conscious Arab strategy to maintain the refugees as "the dynamite" with which to demolish Israel. In retrospect, the political astuteness of this move, if constant belligerence rather than the peace and well-being of the region was the objective, must be applauded. As a tactic, though bloody and unscrupulous, it worked. We know the results in human costs for Jew and Arab. The only reason for raising the subject again at this late date is the continuing request of the United Nations agency for increased funds for 1980 and the unconcealed threat of disorders should the United States fail to provide, as before, the major portion of the budget.

Olof Rydbeck, the Swedish diplomat who is the commissioner general of UNRWA reported that opposition both from refugees and host governments has prevented the application of a "means test" to determine how many are still entitled to benefits, which have been extended to the third generation: "It is relatively simple to identify the destitute among refugee families, but lesser degrees of need are generally indeterminate . . . because the refugees and governments are opposed to investigation of income." The report goes on to state that if eligibility could be checked, "Many refugee families in east Jordan, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip where full or virtually full employment prevails" could be taken off the refugee lists, and so relieve UNRWA of a burden "increasingly beyond its capacity."

An even more touchy question remains: how many of the nearly two million individuals now being sheltered, fed, and educated by UNRWA are bona fide refugees or de-

scendants of authentic refugees? As early as 1949, United Nations documents made it clear that relief recipients included a by no means negligible proportion of local Arabs for whom the modest surroundings of the refugee camp spelled an improvement in their living standards. Indigent or unemployed local Arab residents, as well as seminomadic Bedouins, managed to get on the relief rolls since identity checks were not only difficult to carry out but were discouraged by the local authorities. The Clapp Report of the United Nations for 1949 estimated that as many as 160,000 nonrefugees had succeeded in achieving refugee status for the purpose of being listed in the relief rolls.

Since then, the inhabitants of the camps, whatever their original status, continue to multiply. An Israeli census in September, 1967, of refugees on the West Bank and Gaza disclosed a total of 443,000, though the UNRWA rolls counted 628,000.

Apart from the dubious eligibility of a large proportion of those on the relief rolls, one must raise the additional question of the duration of a legitimate claim for assistance—does it include proliferating families with numerous grandchildren and even great grandchildren? One of the characteristics of the Arab refugee situation has been that, unlike the refugees of other origins whose sufferings included physical decimation because of the conditions of their existence, Palestinian refugees have enjoyed one of the highest rates of natural increase in the world. This, in addition to the uncontested padding of relief rolls, explains the presence of several million Palestinians who claim descent from the original 550,000.

A graver question is the function of these camps. The pretense that the camps exist primarily as a welfare operation for the incontestably needy has worn thin. The PLO spokesmen who have made the camps their bases have for some time abandoned this subterfuge. The camps are the acknowledged headquarters of the PLO and avowed training-centers for terrorism. Vanessa Redgrave's movie, *The Palestinians*, filmed in a refugee camp in Lebanon, gave viewers an opportunity to see the workings of such a camp presented by an ardent supporter of the PLO. Certainly Redgrave had no interest in producing a Potemkin village of spurious well-being. So we may assume that the attractive, healthy, well-dressed children she interviewed, as well as the very personable PLO spokesmen, were representative of the camp population. Nor were the physical conditions depicted in this camp exceptionally favorable. If anything, since the picture was filmed after the devastation of the Lebanese civil war, the camp must still have borne marks of the fighting between the Christian Lebanese and the Palestinians. Nevertheless, the impression was one of a tightly knit, active community united by a common purpose. The destroyed camp of Tel Zataar, whose memory was evoked by those interviewed because that camp had fallen to the Christian Lebanese in the course of a prolonged siege, must have included many comforts not usually associated with bleak refugee existence. A sympathetic reporter of the *Los Angeles Times*, who described the looting by the Lebanese victors, enumerated color TV sets and other elaborate furnishings that he had seen carried away. Few Arab villagers outside the camps could boast of such luxuries.

In the Redgrave film ample attention was given to the training and education of the children and youth. How large a role education plays in the camps may be gathered from Commissioner General Rydbeck, who

reported that 55.5 percent of the agency's present budget went for the maintenance of schools. Needless to say, this education, as we know from many documents and actual texts, is primarily slanted to creating and nurturing a Palestinian identity and indoctrinating the youth with a patriotic hatred of the Zionist invader. Though the facts of the history taught may be the reverse of the actual record, bias in instruction is not subject to censorship; it is the privilege of any group that views itself aggrieved, and it would be silly to expect an objective appraisal of the rights and wrongs of the Arab-Israel conflict in the camp schools. Such self-critical teaching might be looked for in a progressive Israeli kibbutz, hardly in an Arab refugee camp.

However, while the virulent anti-Israel slant of the school curriculum must be taken for granted, one major aspect of camp "education" is inexcusable. As the Redgrave film unflinchingly demonstrates, the supposedly pitiful refugee camps are full-fledged military training centers for the children and youth. Drills and war exercises form the core curriculum. This is no revelation. UNRWA officials are well acquainted with the nature of the education for which funds are demanded. But in view of the demanded increase for the 1980 budget, the American taxpayer, who will be required to foot the major portion of the bill, may well ask if the training of terrorists is his rightful obligation. Incidentally, UNRWA's projected budget for 1980-81 indicates an unforeseen growth of enrollment in the agency's schools from 311,084 to 319,000. Should the increase in funds be granted, this will mean that education will account for 59 percent of the total budget. Such devotion to schooling would normally be viewed as admirable, however, in the PLO controlled curriculum, it would be useful to determine how much goes for reading, writing, and arithmetic as well as more advanced subjects, and how much time and instruction are spent on immediately relevant practice in the arts of war and terrorism. The lithe scholars who demonstrated their assorted skills in the Redgrave film left no doubt as to their agility and physical fitness nor as to the purpose of their diligence.

United Nations officials and American donors have known from the outset how their monies were being spent. Long after the immediate crisis of 1948, when relief had to be given to those dislocated by the Arab attack, became a matter of history, UNRWA continued to close its eyes to the obvious misuse of funds. They continue to do so. Nor has the United States government, though it is the chief contributor, chosen to rock the boat for fear of the "serious disturbances" threatened by Rydbeck. The result of this complaisance has been that the United States has indirectly and unwillingly, but not unwittingly, become a partner in the support of a network of PLO bases. The camps are not only recruiting and training centers but the points from which terrorist attacks into Israel are frequently launched. Then, in a variant of the case of the matricide who pleads for mercy because he is an orphan, the PLO protests when its launching pads within the camps are in turn attacked by Israel.

Perhaps the time has at last come when the United States, instead of meekly picking up the bill for these extraordinary refugee camps, should insist on stricter bookkeeping to discover if any actual refugees remain after 30 years. The subsidiary purposes for which the Arab states and now the PLO have insisted on keeping Palestinian Arabs in readily manipulated concentrations have

little to do with philanthropy. Israel demonstrated 30 years ago how an equivalent number of Jewish refugees from Arab countries could be absorbed and welcomed.

In what measure the camps also serve as training centers for assorted members of the terrorist internationale is an additional matter of concern. By now, the central role of the PLO in aiding the education of volunteers from the Bader-Meinhoff Gang, the Japanese Red Army, the Italian Red Brigade, and even the IRA is familiar. Various alumni of the PLO schools have testified to the connection and have provided the world with demonstrations of their murderous expertise. At present, it is believed that among the "students" who engineered the capture of the American embassy in Teheran were a core of PLO instructors. They were given credit for mining the embassy grounds. In view of these activities, it becomes debatable whether more is lost than gained by American fears of further inflaming a combustible situation by a refusal to continue contributions. The provision of convenient headquarters for the PLO, with food, lodging, and pedagogy thrown in, has not made for tranquility. On the contrary, the PLO has been subsidized with an ideal ground for its nurturing. Possibly in the absence of American dollars, the Arab states would have made up the slack, just as they have had no difficulty in providing huge sums for rock-

ets and missiles. But the wisdom of asking the American taxpayer indefinitely to support the barracks of the PLO becomes increasingly questionable. International philanthropy, if not the Arab fraternal states, could easily meet the needs of the small number of genuine claimants to refugee status that might be found. Israel has repeatedly offered to compensate any real refugee for loss of property abandoned in Israel, and the United Nations Relief Agencies would be better advised to concentrate their efforts on the tragedies of Africa, Vietnam, and Cambodia rather than on maintaining the military strongholds of the PLO.●

JOHN HAMILTON SHEA

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 3, 1980

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Missourian from my hometown of Lexington recently passed away. John Hamilton Shea for many years was a community leader well known across our State.

Mr. Shea was born March 24, 1913, in Macon, Mo. He graduated from the University of Missouri School of Journalism in 1935 and was a member of the Sigma Chi fraternity. Serving for 5 years in the U.S. Navy during World War II, Mr. Shea was discharged with the rank of lieutenant.

From 1936 to 1947 he served as managing editor of the Cleveland Newspaper Enterprises Association. Mr. Shea published his first issue of the Lexington-Advertiser News on June 12, 1947, and served as the publisher for 12 years.

He was also the president of the Anderson House Foundation and president and director of the Columbia Missourian Board, and a member of the United Methodist Church in Lexington.

John Shea was a superior journalist and an active member of his community. He will be missed by his many friends. I wish to extend my sincere sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Doris D. Shea, and to his daughter, Mrs. Susan Hinman.●