

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RETHINKING THE
UNTHINKABLE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, much of the current debate about national security has been concerned with budget questions. But questions of basic strategy are of even more importance because if we do not know what we want to do with our weapons no amount of budget increases—or cuts—will help us to do the right thing.

One question that has recently been addressed is the failure of the United States to convince our NATO allies to have enhanced radiation weapons (ERW) based in Europe. The theory of "flexible response" which is at the heart of NATO's defense posture would suggest that ERW's are absolutely necessary to the defense of West Germany and to the survival of American troops based there. Pershing missiles may not be the right weapons to have at certain points during an Eastern bloc attack on NATO because theoretically they are best used to expand and not stop a war in Europe.

Samuel T. Cohen recently wrote about this question in the pages of Policy Review, a publication of the Heritage Foundation. Cohen raises some important questions concerning the ERW and even suggests one nation where they would not only be useful, but welcome—South Korea.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD "Rethinking the Unthinkable" by Samuel T. Cohen, in Policy Review, Fall, 1981.

RETHINKING THE UNTHINKABLE
(Samuel T. Cohen)

Just two weeks after the Reagan administration came into office, a second neutron bomb debate suddenly erupted. Thus far, it has borne striking similarity to the debate which began in June 1977, and it has ended in essentially the same way—namely, another U.S. decision to postpone the deployment of enhanced radiation weapons (ERW) in Europe.

At first contemplation, the decision not to decide on deployment seems to be reasonable enough as well as politically expeditious. The neutron warheads would be produced and stockpiled in the U.S., and therefore, at least be available for incorporation in the missiles when the need arose. Were European governments, which are currently resisting ERW deployment (in particular West Germany) to relent at a later time, they could then be deployed. Or if a prolonged crisis arose, of sufficient severity to break down NATO European resistance, there would be ample time to fly the warheads

over to the location of the delivery units. Or, if a war were to begin with a surprise nuclear attack on NATO's nuclear weapon facilities (the stated first-priority Soviet target system), a decision not to deploy the weapons during peacetime could prove to be perversely fortuitous. NATO's battlefield nuclear warheads are stored in only a limited number of stockpile sites (fewer than 100) which, in all probability, would be destroyed. In this case, the U.S. could have the dubious advantage of not having the neutron warheads destroyed along with the warheads stockpiled in Europe.

However, the case for storage of the components in the United States may be less convincing. For in yielding to European domestic political problems, the U.S. may also have yielded too far in not asserting what its commitment to NATO is all about—the military defense of Europe. The U.S. also may have yielded too far on another, more fundamental commitment—the security of its own combat forces in Europe.

Beginning in 1961, with the Kennedy administration, a new defense policy was established which, in effect, rules against achieving discriminate tactical nuclear capabilities, such as ERW for NATO. (The use of tactical nuclear weapons in other areas, e.g., Northeast Asia, effectively was rejected irrespective of weapon characteristics. For these areas, it was assumed that conventional defense was feasible and overwhelmingly preferable to nuclear defense.) In fact, in 1963, when a very successfully tested ER warhead was proposed for Army battlefield missiles, the Kennedy administration openly argued against such production. Although there have been changes in official rhetoric affecting ERW since that time, including Secretary of Defense Weinberger's positive remarks early this year, for all intents and purposes the U.S. policy attitude has persisted.

Moreover, because of NATO's basic policy governing the employment of nuclear weapons—the so-called Flexible Response policy—it has been extremely difficult to convince European political leaders that ERW should be incorporated into NATO's battlefield nuclear arsenal.

FLEXIBLE RESPONSE

There is no room here to debate the efficacy and credibility of NATO's Flexible Response policy, which conceptually is now more than twenty years old. It will be briefly summarized, however, as it relates to nuclear weapons policy and the role of ERW in this policy context will be examined. Flexible Response assumes, for planning purposes, a war scenario something like this:

1. After extensive preparation, giving NATO ample time to prepare its defenses, the Soviet/Warsaw Pact armies invade Western Europe with conventional forces. (No nuclear weapons are employed by the Soviets.) In this initial phase of the war, NATO will defend only by conventional means.

2. If NATO's conventional defenses fail and deep enemy penetrations into West Germany seem imminent and unavoidable, battlefield nuclear weapons now come into play to prevent such incursion and the over-

running of NATO forces. (It is assumed here that the Soviets still will not employ their own nuclear weapons.) This will involve some number of these weapons, ranging from tens to perhaps a couple of hundred, used against the forward enemy armored echelons to neutralize these forces and bring the attack to a halt. Whereupon, it is expected that the Soviets will choose to end hostilities and move to the conference table.

3. If this tactical nuclear gambit does not succeed in bringing hostilities to a halt and the Soviets persist, then, in accordance with its long-standing pledges, the U.S. will broaden the war to include nuclear attacks against the Soviet Union itself. The expectation is that such drastic reprisal will bring Soviet aggression to an end, if indeed the threat of such action hasn't already succeeded in this purpose.

It is in this second phase that ERW comes into the perspective of official thinking. The U.S. government has maintained that using ERW in this battlefield role—in the context of the Flexible Response scenario just described—will enable highly effective attacks to be made against forward enemy armored echelons, while at the same time significantly abating the danger to friendly defending troops and substantially reducing the extent of civil damage in West Germany. On this basis, ERW would seem distinctly preferable to the currently-stockpiled battlefield nuclear weapons. Former President Jimmy Carter made this preference very clear, when he argued for ERW in 1977:

It must be recognized that NATO is a defensive alliance which might have to fight on its own territory. An aggressor would be faced with uncertainty as to whether NATO would use nuclear weapons against its forward echelons. For these purposes, the capability for discrete application of force—which the ER weapons may provide—present (at least in this sense) an attractive option.* * *

The ER weapons, then, would be designed to enhance deterrence, but if deterrence fails, to satisfy dual criteria:

First, to enhance NATO's capability to inflict significant military damage on the aggressor.

Second, to minimize damage and casualties to individuals not in the immediate target area, including friendly troops and civilians.¹

Despite these advantages, NATO Europeans, most importantly the West Germans, have made it clear that they do not want these weapons deployed on their soil. No matter that the battlefield fission warheads they long have accepted (and will again accept with the new fission warheads—devoid of neutron components) will neutralize Pact armies through prompt nuclear radiation effects just as ERW do; for domestic political reasons—totally lacking in technical and military logic—ERW are rejected.

However, there is a U.S. side to this problem, with its own domestic political considerations, which complicates the issue. The

¹ Letter from President Jimmy Carter to Senator John Stennis, July 11, 1977.

territory West Germany wants to spare from nuclear weapon employment also happens to be occupied by almost 200,000 troops that the United States has provided to help protect Europe.

The President may feel obliged by Treaty to help protect NATO Europe by keeping U.S. troops in Germany to honor Alliance commitments, and, for the sake of Alliance harmony, to cater to European political sensitivities. At the same time, however, he also is obliged to protect these American forces with the best possible military means to prevent their defeat and capture in the event of war. Thus, if ERW are perceived to represent a means of accomplishing this objective,² then from an American standpoint, in all due deference to European opinion, the President should want to have them deployed at least by U.S. forces in Germany.

EUROMISSILES

But a higher priority is apparently placed on installing so-called Euromissiles (ground launched cruise missiles and Pershing-II ballistic missiles) in Europe. It should be realized however, that in the context of NATO's preferred war scenario described above, the use of such weapons would have little direct military effect on stopping the Soviet/Warsaw Pact armored forces. It is possible that, by striking targets in eastern Europe and western Russia, they might have a beneficial effect in the event that the war were to be prolonged. But by themselves they would hardly represent a nuclear means to prevent NATO ground forces from being overrun on the battlefield. They represent rather an escalation toward general nuclear war in the event that battlefield nuclear weapons fail in their intended purpose.

These missiles properly belong to the third phase of Flexible Response in which the United States invoked its strategic nuclear pledges to NATO. In this respect, they represent an intra-war deterrent threat following a military disaster to U.S.-NATO ground forces. But the actual employment could bring disaster to the U.S. itself if the Soviets were to respond to Euromissiles by directly attacking the United States.

DEFENSE OF NATO EUROPE

At least symbolically, the current revival of the ERW issue represents a fundamental conflict of belief between Europe and America over Europe's defense. Is NATO Europe seriously willing to defend itself against ground invasion, or does it prefer to use the strategic nuclear guarantees of the United States as a reason (or rationalization, as many see it) to avoid establishing a credible ground defense? Will the Alliance choose to continue a defense policy (and its corresponding military capabilities) which is decreasing in credibility—as the Soviet conventional and nuclear forces continue to increase and exceed those of the West? Or will the Alliance change course toward a more realistic solution?

While the United States may continue to feel obliged to perpetuate the NATO Alliance, it also has fundamental obligations to itself. These may have been neglected for too long in a period when expanded Soviet ground and strategic threats have placed both U.S. forces in Europe and the U.S.

² This seems to be the Administration's view: "When you look at the number of Russian tanks and the other items, the enhanced radiation warhead could do quite a lot to restore some kind of balance there." Caspar Weinberger, Interview, February 11, 1981.

itself in increasing jeopardy. From an American standpoint, the idea of bowing to European resistance to deployment of a weapon, whose use might save American ground forces from defeat, may not be too acceptable. More important, for the U.S. to have gained European acceptance for Euromissiles at the expense of a credible battlefield nuclear capability (whose employment might forestall or even prevent the escalation of war to strategic nuclear proportions) may be even less acceptable to Americans once it is fully understood.

Underlying this difficulty is the inherent difficulty of selecting a credible scenario for possible NATO/Warsaw Pact conflict. How such a conflict might begin and progress is almost anyone's guess (although some guesses are more logically founded than others.) But, whatever the unfolding scenario turns out to be, what is essential is that the United States take every measure during peacetime to ensure maximum military capabilities for its own forces in Europe should war come. If ERW represent the best nuclear weapons for battlefield defense, as the Defense Department has maintained, these weapons should enter the European inventory for U.S. use at least.

The principle of forward deployment of battlefield nuclear weapons long has been established by NATO—witness the thousands of such weapons now positioned in Europe. Yet, there has been a haggling over the alleged price that must be paid to gain European acceptance. The U.S. has apparently decided that the price is too high in terms of threatening Alliance solidarity. But in so doing, it may have paid another price: risking the security of its own forces in Europe and the survival of America itself.

ERW AND SOUTH KOREA

It is strange that, in both recent neutron bomb debates, the United States has argued with allies who plainly preferred not to see ERW deployed on their soil, while apparently paying no attention to allies who might have been greatly appreciative of such deployment and in need of weapons to keep their territory from being devastated by war. Why has the Reagan administration not moved toward discussions with South Korea on ERW deployment to this Asian ally? Considering the low ebb that U.S.-South Korean relations reached during the Carter administration, it is understandable that no such move was made. But one of the first foreign policy steps taken by the new administration was to reaffirm the U.S. commitment to South Korea. Why had ERW not been considered as part of this commitment?

Contrary to the claim made by the Carter administration that ERW were designed solely for European deployment, the truth of the matter is that the original neutron bomb concept was formulated in 1958 primarily with Asian limited war scenarios in mind. For the Korean War and all its frustrations was fresh in everyone's minds.

Today, moreover, there are good reasons for using ERW to defend South Korea:

First, the U.S. has sizable military forces in South Korea—about 40,000 troops. (Very recently, President Reagan pledged to keep these forces there.) If the U.S. has a requirement to best protect American troops in Europe the same surely holds true in Korea.

Second, contrary to European repugnance for ERW, the South Koreans would almost certainly welcome its deployment on their soil. Augmenting Korea's defense with ERW—the alleged battlefield "super weap-

ons"—could substantially strengthen an alliance which has seen considerable tension and divisiveness in recent years.

Third, the introduction of these weapons by the U.S. would, without doubt, greatly enhance the deterrence of aggression by the North.

Fourth, should deterrence fail and, as happened in 1950, war occur, Seoul, which is only twenty-five miles below the DMZ and a vital economic and political artery for South Korea, may again become a major battleground. Were ERW available for Seoul's defense, the almost total devastation of the first Korean War could be avoided.

If, indeed, the issue of ERW deployment has not been broached to the South Koreans, then one might again ask: Why not? Surely, the U.S. ought to prefer to conduct its nuclear diplomacy with allies and friends who are more sympathetic to U.S. military objectives for their defense. Or is it that the U.S. still prefers to provide battlefield nuclear defense for allies who don't want it?●

ROSE AND AL POSTAL CELEBRATE THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, Rose and Al Postal of North Miami Beach celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary with a gala dinner party at the Deauville Hotel.

The Postals came to Miami 3 years ago when Al retired as an orchestra leader and manager of Stephen Scott Music, a music and entertainment bureau.

Rose and Al live in Mar-Len Gardens and participate in their condominium's clubs and activities. Al, for example, recently staged and produced the Mar-Len Gardens Follies while Rose designed costumes and makeup. The Postals are dedicated people who are fulfilling their retirement years through service to their neighbors.

I congratulate Al and Rose on this joyous occasion and wish them many more happy years together.●

THE CONVENTION OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIAN ARABIC ORDER NOBLES OF THE MYSTIC SHRINE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues were not in Washington during the August recess. Those that were away from the Nation's Capital during August really missed a treat. The traditional unbearably humid August weather in Washington seemingly bowed in salute to the convention of the Ancient Egyptian Arabic

Order Nobles of the Mystic Shrine and the women's auxiliary, the Daughters of Isis.

Mr. Speaker, not only did the Shriners bring a bit of color and festive flavor with them during their 7-day stay in Washington, but also a unique brotherhood. I am proud to be a member of this great organization and El Hasa Temple No. 28.

The estimates run as high as 35,000 people in attendance at the convention in Washington this summer. That translates into over \$12 million for local businesses and the city of Washington as a result of the Shriners' convention.

Mr. Speaker, even though some people think that the Shriners are only a festive and fun-loving group of people, the brotherhood and goals of this organization go much deeper. The Shriners have a long history of community and civic involvement on both the local and the national levels.

The Shriners, Mr. Speaker, are major contributors to such worthy causes as the Howard University Sickle Cell Anemia Research Fund, cancer research, the United Negro College Fund, and the NAACP. During the convention in August, they honored one of the former Members of this body and my friend, the late Congressman Adam Clayton Powell.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share some of the respect that I have for my fellow nobles in the Shrine with my colleagues who were unfortunate enough to miss them during their convention here in August. At this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post on the Shriners' convention.

HELLO, SHRINERS: 7,000 MEMBERS OF TOP MASONIC ORDER STRUT DOWN AVENUE
(By Athelia Knight)

When the 7,000 participants in the Prince Hall Shriners' parade strutted down Pennsylvania Avenue at midday yesterday, they were led by one of their newest members—D.C. Mayor Marion Barry. He had been "created," as they say, just a few days ago.

Surveying the array of marchers in their colorful robes and uniforms from the reviewing stand in front of the District Building, Barry said, "It's great to have the Shriners in town. They brought a lot of people and a lot of money."

Before they leave Saturday after their week-long convention, the 35,000 Shriners, their wives, girl-friends and family members will have spent more than \$12 million, organizers estimate.

They call themselves the Nobles of the Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order Nobles Mystic Shrine of North and South America and Its Jurisdictions, Inc.

They give their leaders titles like imperial potentate. They belong to temples with such names as Sheik Temple No. 98 of Riverside, Calif., El Hasa Temple No. 28 of Cleveland, and Kadesia Temple No. 135 of Colorado Springs.

The men wear red fezzes, and some sport dangling earrings that look like shields. But these men with their secret handshakes and

good-time-at-the-fraternity-house spirit also give to charities. They award scholarships. They contribute to hospitals and medical research.

The predominantly black organization counts among its 50,000 nationwide membership Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, Mayors Tom Bradley, Maynard Jackson and Coleman Young of Los Angeles, Atlanta and Detroit, and musicians Count Basie and Lionel Hampton. Founded in 1893, the black Shriners are not affiliated with the predominantly white Shriner groups in the country.

Their presence here this week marks the first time the Prince Hall Shriners have convened in Washington in 10 years, and yesterday was their day on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Simon Peter Burkes is the oldest Shriner here. He's 102. He joined the Prince Hall Masons in Bainbridge, Ga., 73 years ago after his father told him that the only organization worth belonging to was the Masons.

Being a Mason is the first step to becoming a Shriner. But before attaining Shrinerhood, you must be at least a 32nd degree Mason. Burkes is a 33rd degree Mason and is attending his 26th Shriners convention.

He calls the Shriners "the playhouse for the Masons and their families. It's where the boys just have fun."

Leaning on his cane and peering over his wire-rim glasses, Burkes is the wise man of the convention. He says he has never remarried since his wife died 40 years ago because "you only get another one like her in heaven." He credits his long life to "never eating too much and eating less meat."

Weldon Willis, a member of El Hasa Temple No. 28 in Cleveland, has been a Shriner for 15 years. His grandfather was a Mason. His father was a Shriner.

He plans his vacation every year for the third week in August so he can attend the annual convention. One year, he drove some 42,000 miles to participate in various activities of his Masonic brothers in various cities.

"It becomes very expensive," he said. "But, it's worth it. You become a member. You get very dedicated to the whole cause. Your vacation, everything is centered around the activities that are going on. Your really must be dedicated to do these kinds of things."

The public's view of the Shriners is limited to their charitable work. They refuse to discuss their secrets, like the secret handshakes, the secret code words and the secret initiation ceremony called "The Creation."

"We are an organization with secrets," said Archie Anderson, deputy imperial promotion director from Denver, Colo. "But we let you know who we are. We give to hospitals, cancer research, sickle cell research. Just yesterday we gave \$30,000 to the NAACP."

Even the women's auxiliary of the Shriners, called the Daughters of Isis, is secretive. "I like the work of the Daughters of Isis," said Susie Elliott, past commandress of Al Zabir Court No. 141, Daughters of Isis, of Kalamazoo, Mich.

What is that work? She hesitated. "It's kind of a secret thing," she said. "However, we do a lot of charity work."

Washington businesses welcome the Shriners, who have booked rooms at 16 hotels in the city.

The Sheraton Washington hotel is headquarters for the convention. "It's a nice piece of business for the city and for us," said John Alden, Sheraton manager. "My

typical image of the Shriner was a good time and drinking. But I found them to be very [well] behaved. We are very pleased to have them."

City officials estimated 40,000 people lined Pennsylvania Avenue yesterday to watch the Shriner parade.

"I haven't seen anything this colorful since the Madri Gras," said Nevers Jefferson, as he watched a drum-and-bugle corps adorned in red, yellow and green uniforms.

The parade disrupted traffic, which had to be rerouted. Cabbies were irked. Many bus riders complained that they had to wait nearly an hour for a bus.

"It's a mess," said one Northwest Washington woman who finally gave up waiting for a bus and took a cab home.

"It's an inconvenience, but it's our own fault," said James Gough, who had brought his family to town from Virginia to visit the Museum of Natural History, but ended up watching the parade instead. "We should have listened to the radio first. I think everyone has a right to parade. If you can't do that in the nation's capital, where can you do it?"

ENERGY CONSERVATION DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, later this week my bill, H.R. 4437, will be up for consideration on the floor of the House. The Energy Conservation Daylight Saving Time Act was reported out of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce by a bipartisan vote of 31 to 8, without amendment.

This energy-saving measure was originally introduced by Congressman CARLOS MOORHEAD and myself, and has since been cosponsored by 17 other Members. I would like to add that, due to the bill being reported out of full committee in such a timely fashion, the last seven cosponsor's names do not appear on the printed version. These cosponsors are: Representatives NORMAN MINETA, MARY ROSE OAKAR, JOHN PORTER, BILL HUGHES, STENY HOYER, DAVID DREIER, and MICHAEL BARNES.

H.R. 4437 is a way to save 100,000 barrels of oil per day, without Government regulation, expense, or danger to the public. It is my hope that my colleagues in the House will join us in passing this much needed legislation.●

UNITED STATES HAS PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES TO SOVIET GAS

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1, along with Congressman NELLIGAN and Senator GARN sent a

letter—cosigned by nearly 50 Members of Congress—to President Reagan expressing concern that construction of the Soviet Yamal natural gas pipeline would pose a clear and present danger to Western security. It was our judgment that, by significantly increasing Europe's dependence on the Soviet bloc for natural gas and other sources of energy, the Yamal pipeline would clearly provide the U.S.S.R. with tremendous economic and political leverage over NATO, leading to the potential "energy blackmail" of Western Europe.

Just as significant, however, is the fact that the Yamal project presents the West with a tremendous opportunity to develop the vast energy resources of the free world, particularly in the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

For nearly a decade, the United States has "fiddled" to the marching tune of OPEC. Since the 1973 oil embargo, the United States has been unable to formulate an energy policy. Almost in spite of everything—gas lines and all—the United States has been content to "muddle through."

Nevertheless, should the United States establish a comprehensive energy policy—the 1980's equivalent of the space program—it could become the principal source of energy in the free world, with the following results:

The United States would have more energy available for domestic use at a more reasonable cost than is presently the case.

The United States would be able to supply energy abroad and satisfy West European need for diversifying sources.

The United States could break the OPEC energy cartel.

The impact on jobs in the United States would be tremendous, with new plants, railroads, harbors, ships, and so forth being required.

The price of energy would once again be on a supply-demand basis, with the United States being able to establish the balance.

The United States would be in a stronger position to conduct foreign policy.

There would be stimulus to emphasize new-technology energy.

The international balance of payments would become more favorable to the United States.

In short, the Yamal pipeline could be the turning point for the United States. If we fail to act, Europe could gradually become an unreliable ally and move closer to the Soviet orbit. But, if we accept the challenge, new broad vistas of opportunity could emerge.

It was with these objectives in mind that I and Congressman NELLIGAN introduced House Concurrent Resolution 159 on July 21. On October 7, Senator GARN introduced a companion

resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 41.

Recently, I spoke on this subject at a seminar on the Soviet pipeline sponsored by the International Public Policy Foundation. This symposium brought together two dozen experts to discuss the "Geopolitical Ramifications of Soviet Energy Development and the Implications of the Siberian Pipeline." One of the discussants, Mr. Leonard Keller, president of the Methacoal Corp., reviewed the possibility of using methacoal technology as a practical alternative to Soviet gas. He argued that this technology could provide Europe with sufficient energy to substitute for Soviet natural gas within the next 3 to 5 years, before the Soviet pipeline could be constructed.

Moreover, should the United States respond to West European needs for energy diversification with methacoal, America's marine transportation industry, shipbuilding industry, lending industry, chemical processing equipment industry, heavy plant construction industry, and all associated industries would be revitalized.

I commend the following statement by Mr. Keller to my colleagues:

METHACOAL FOR WESTERN EUROPE: A PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVE TO SOVIET GAS

There is now a very practical and economical alternative available to Western European countries, so that they can avoid becoming committed to and dependent upon Soviet natural gas. Instead, they may receive their fossil fuels and their chemical and petrochemical feedstock materials from their Allies in North, Central and South America, Australia and New Zealand, and Africa.

The Soviet Union proposed and is firmly moving toward commitments in Western Europe for \$10 billion in loans to purchase the equipment and materials for a 3,000 mile gas pipeline from Northern Siberia to the Bavarian border, and for commitments to purchase 1.4 trillion cubic feet of natural gas per year. Thus Western Europe would be paying at least \$7 billion per year to the Soviets for gas, or whatever higher price they may demand.

This paper presents a practical and economical alternative for the West European countries, which may be of critical importance to the entire Free World, and particularly to Western Europe and the United States of America. That alternative is for Western Europe to purchase and import from their principal Allies and from third-world, (or developing), countries sufficient Methacoal to supply the energy and feedstock requirements which are proposed to be met by the Soviet natural gas imports.

The 1.4 trillion cubic feet of natural gas would provide 1.4 billion Mcf (thousand cubic feet) of natural gas, or 1.4 billion, MM BTU's (million BTU's). Sixty-five million tons of Methacoal, made from reasonably good grade coal, would provide the same heating value as the 1.4 trillion cubic feet of Soviet natural gas.

Methacoal is a fluid fuel which can be shipped in crude-oil type tankers or super-tankers, or in barges, rail tank cars, trucks or pipelines.

Methacoal is made primarily from coal, with natural gas providing about one third of the BTU's used and with those being converted to a liquid carrier called Crude Methanol. The coal and crude methanol are used to produce Methacoal, a slurry, or suspensoid, of tiny coal particles, alcohols, and water.

Methacoal, therefore, converts both the coal and the natural gas into easily and economically transportable, storable and useable fluid form. The fluid may then be delivered great distances at very minimal cost. This, of course, would revitalize the marine transportation industry, the shipbuilding industry and the associated lending industries.

The chemical processing equipment industries and the heavy plant construction industries and all associated industries would be revitalized. Many new mines would be required as well as reopening many existing but shut down mines.

Fifteen new 5,000 ton per day crude methanol plants would be required, plus several relatively small and short natural gas pipelines to deliver natural gas to the alcohol plants at or near the coal sources and the Methacoal manufacturing plants.

Methacoal pipelines would be required to move the Methacoal to the seaport storage and shiploading facilities. Tankers or super-tankers would deliver Methacoal to European seaports, where it could be transferred to barges for delivery to users.

The total capital cost for all of these plants, mines, pipelines, seaports, etc. will be much less than the capital cost to the Soviets for the pipeline system they propose. The capital investments can be predominantly in politically stable areas, and spread over several countries.

Where could the Methacoal be produced? The bulk of it could be produced in the Eastern U.S. coal fields, the Central U.S. coal fields and South Central Alaska. What about quantities? All of this Methacoal could be produced from proven gas and coal reserves in Alaska alone, for many decades. Producing in these three plus Canada, Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Venezuela, Australia, New Zealand, Nigeria, South Africa, etc. is recommended.

Initial production can begin in about three years or less in some areas, four or five years in others. There is virtually no limit, within reason, to the amount of Methacoal which could be produced in the non-communist countries of the world. The fuel can be produced and delivered in less time than by long distance gas pipelines from Siberia to Western Europe.

Methacoal would cost about \$4 to \$5 per million BTU delivered to Europe from most of the areas suggested. The cost can be contracted for long term with reasonable escalation provisions.

Methacoal can be burned as received as a fluid replacement for fuel oils in modified oil-fired boilers, furnaces, kilns, etc. It can be separated to form a dry, powdered carbon fuel (called CHC Fuel) for burning in previously coal-fired facilities or for use in producing low-cost synthesis gas for use as chemical and petrochemical feedstock. The cost for such CHC Fuel would be less than for imported pulverized coal in most, or perhaps all, cases.

The condensate liquid fuels, (called CLF Fuels), recovered from producing CHC Fuels from Methacoal can be marketed for a number of uses. They can be burned, as is, as fuels for Otto cycle, Diesel cycle or Brayton cycle (gas turbine) engines. They can be

refined to produce anhydrous alcohol fuels and chemical byproducts. The anhydrous fuels can be used as gasoline or diesel fuel additives. A low grade of methyl alcohol can be produced from CLF Fuels if desired. A long list of chemicals and intermediates can be produced from CLF Fuels which are composed mostly of methyl alcohol.

To summarize, this West European situation presents an unique opportunity for broad industrial revitalization of the United States and Western Europe as well as a number of other countries of the Free World.

It seems most regrettable, indeed, that our Allies in Western Europe may become irrevocably committed to serious and increasing dependence, both economically and perhaps politically, on the Soviets, without realizing that they had another, much preferable option, of which they simply were not aware.●

THOMAS ALVA EDISON

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago yesterday, October 18, Thomas Alva Edison, America's pioneer of technology, died in West Orange, N.J. Although his death marked the end to a brilliant lifetime of technological accomplishments and advancements, his work lives with us and has become part of our daily lives.

When one considers all that was included among Edison's 1,093 patents, his genius and remarkable facility for the practical application of technology is even more overwhelming.

Edison's first invention was an electrical vote recorder that he demonstrated before a congressional committee in Washington, D.C. But his first commercial success was on Wall Street, with a stock ticker and high-speed printing telegraph. Fortunately, for the rest of the world, Edison's genius was not confined only to those in Washington or on Wall Street. This pioneer of technology found widespread commercial acceptance for his inventions.

In 1874, he invented the quadruplex telegraph which allowed four messages to be sent simultaneously over the same wire. In 1876, he set up his own laboratory in Menlo Park, N.J., and there he set to work upon improving Alexander Graham Bell's telephone. That year he markedly increased the telephone's audibility with the carbon transmitter. In 1877, he invented the phonograph which was considered a monumental achievement in the communications field. After having viewed an exhibition on candlepower arc lights in 1878, Edison announced he would invent a safe and inexpensive light to replace the gaslight. Many scientists were quite skeptical about Edison's chances of succeeding at this, but sure enough, in October

1879, Edison demonstrated his newest invention, the carbon filament lamp.

Edison's laboratory at Menlo Park was probably this Nation's first invention factory, and was imitated 20 years later by giant corporations in Europe and the United States. Edison promised that he would turn out a minor invention every 10 days and a "big trick" every 6 months. Before long he was making inventions to order and was applying for 400 patents a year.

In later years, Edison opened the first central power station on Pearl Street in New York City, and made many advancements with the phonograph and with motion pictures. His Edison General Electric Co. was merged into General Electric Co. in 1892. During World War I, America's inventive genius headed the Naval Consulting Board, directing torpedo mechanisms and antisubmarine devices. And it was Edison who took it upon himself to convince Congress of the need to establish a Naval Research Laboratory.

Thomas Alva Edison achieved greatness during America's industrial revolution. He was a product of an innovative and free society which encouraged creativity. Edison never stopped dreaming of what could be. He took advantage of the opportunities that exist in our country, profited from his labors, and in doing so he made life a lot easier for the rest of the world. His success, as he would say, came from "2 percent inspiration and 98 percent perspiration." All he needed was an idea—an inspiration—and once he had this, nothing was impossible.

Today, our Nation's productivity is lagging and people sense that we are losing our technological edge. We can reverse this trend if we follow the example of Thomas Edison. He is a symbol of the creativity and innovation that our Nation has had and of the advancements we can achieve if we put our minds to it. Edison showed us that by devoting our time and energy to an idea we can translate that idea into a reality.

Fifty years ago we lost a technological genius and a great American. But we must never lose his innovative spirit, his creative instincts, and his knack for making the impossible a reality. And we must never lose sense of his simple formula for success—that genius is 2 percent inspiration and 98 percent perspiration.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, October 14, I was recorded as having voted against the Findley

amendment to H.R. 3603, the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981. I had intended to vote for the Findley amendment, rollcall No. 258, since I have consistently supported efforts to cut back the dairy support program. During earlier action on H.R. 3603, I had voted for the Frank amendment, which was similar in purpose to the Findley amendment.●

MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

HON. IKE ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the ERISA Amendments Act of 1980 has caused significant problems for a number of industries who participate in multiemployer pension plans. Representatives of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., have brought to my attention two articles outlining the severity of the situation. It appears that the act is inadvertently discouraging participation in multiemployer pension plans.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Jerry Geisel in the September issue of Business Insurance magazine. I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House:

NO CLEAR SOLUTION EXISTS TO SOLVE ILLS OF MULTIEMPLOYER PLANS
(By Jerry Geisel)

Washington.—Who should pay for the massive unfunded liabilities of multiemployer pension plans?

Employers, Congress answered last year when it passed the Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendments Act of 1980.

After years of debate and complex negotiations, Congress decided that an employer that withdrew from a multiemployer plan would have to pay a share of the plan's unfunded vested benefits.

That was a dramatic change from the previous law that allowed an employer to drop out of a multiemployer plan and escape paying liabilities if the plan did not collapse within five years of the company's withdrawal.

Employers now are finding out just how expensive withdrawal liability can be. When two trucking firms in North Carolina and Indiana withdrew from the Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Teamsters' pension fund, they were hit with withdrawal liability claims that were more than double their net worths.

Those firms, Johnson Motor Lines Inc. of Charlotte, N.C., and Transport Motor Express Inc. of Port Wayne, Ind., are suing the Teamsters, charging, among other things, that the multiemployer law is unconstitutional because it allows the taking away of property without a trial.

Trade associations, too, are beginning to take the offensive against the new law. Several employer groups will meet in Washington this month to discuss how to work together to seek changes in the Multiemployer Amendments Act.

Those trade associations, who admit in some cases that they didn't understand the implications of the law when it was passed last year, are under mounting pressure from their members to lobby for changes in the law.

Employers, particularly trucking companies, are asking how Congress could pass a law that overnight made them responsible for enormous pension liabilities.

Congress passed the Multiemployer Amendments Act, with considerable support from big business groups, because it saw no alternative but to end the system that encouraged pension irresponsibility.

That system, in most cases, limited an employer's liability to a negotiated contribution to the plan. Multiemployer plan trustees, half of whom are appointed by employers and the other half by the union, set the benefit levels.

As a result, employers had an interest in keeping contribution levels low, while union representatives fought for high benefit levels.

The result was financial disaster.

Because employers' contributions failed to match the benefits promised, many of the multiemployer plans are badly underfunded; the Central States Teamsters' fund alone has \$3.5 billion in unfunded vested liabilities.

Those unfunded liabilities caused few worries during the 1950s and 1960s, periods of great economic growth. Experts reasoned that an increasing flow of contributions from new employers joining the plans would pay for retirement benefits when the promises came due.

But that reasoning began to come apart in the 1970s. Entire industries began to die.

For example, people stopped wearing hats; with no new employers entering the field and existing ones dying off, the multiemployer plan for millinery workers suddenly found itself in dire financial straits. Multiemployer plans in other declining industries, such as hard coal, faced similar problems.

More recently, industry deregulation has posed new problems for multiemployer plans. Hundreds of trucking companies, for example, are expected to close their doors in the next few years, unable to survive in the new competitive environment created by deregulation.

As a result, employer contributions to the Teamsters' plan could trail off, posing new financial burdens for the plan.

Surviving employers have no interest in inheriting the pension liabilities of firms that leave the plans. They oppose a weakening of withdrawal liability penalties.

But the pressure on Congress to reduce withdrawal liability costs is bound to increase as more employers who leave multiemployer plans are hit with astronomical unfunded liability bills—the bitter fruit of previous pension irresponsibility.

All the choices confronting Congress are unpleasant. Keeping a company's withdrawal liability at the current stiff levels could further weaken multiemployer pension plans by causing new employers to shun them.

Easing withdrawal liability could mean a return to the old system of pension irresponsibility that caused the original problem of poorly funded multiemployer plans.

Reducing benefit guarantees would force retirees to bite the bullet. That would be unfair, some experts say, since retirees played no role in pension-funding decisions.

The Multiemployer Amendments Act may be, as one Washington attorney puts it, a

very bad law—but no one has come up with a better one.●

RICK JAMES

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 9, 1981

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to introduce to my colleagues in the House a superstar—my second cousin Rick James. Mr. Speaker, I do not call him a superstar simply because I am a supportive family member.

The family has not crowned him a musical success. The fans and the record charts attest to his overwhelming success and popularity in the music business and make him unequivocally a superstar the likes of Stevie Wonder or Diana Ross. He has, as musicians frequently say, "paid his dues," on the way to the top of the music world.

Mr. Speaker, a few of my colleagues may not be readily familiar with Rick James by name. However, I can guarantee them that they have heard at least one of his songs on many occasions, whether it was from a car radio or from the rooms of one their children. He is a music idol with proven staying power.

Mr. Speaker, Rick James' staying power and superstardom is not limited to the often unpredictable music business. It is based on his solid family allegiance. Rick James personifies this allegiance during every interview and concert he gives.

Mr. Speaker, Rick James, an intelligent young man, is acutely aware of his roots and how he reached stardom. This family superstar quite openly notes that the brightest star in his life is his mother and my first cousin, Mrs. Betty Johnson.

Betty worked tirelessly to educate all of her children. Accordingly they all have done well in their respective fields. The success that they enjoy today is a lasting tribute to her diligence and the great job she did in raising them.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that superstar Rick James pays his mother, his shining star, a touching tribute every time he is interviewed is only one facet of the tight bond between them. He has seen to it that his mother will not have to toil anymore. Thus, all her years of hard work and sacrificing for her children have paid off.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the extraordinary musical talents that make Rick James a superstar. He is a superstar at home as well as on stage. We are all extremely proud of him.

At this time, it is a pleasure for me to introduce my cousin, the superstar, Rick James to my colleagues in the House. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the

RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post on Rick James:

PUNK'S FLASHY FUNKSTER—RICK JAMES: BRAIDED AND BRASSY SUPERSTAR FINDS ALL THAT GLITTERS TURNS TO PLATINUM

(By Richard Harrington)

Punk-funk superstar Rick James sat in his Capital Centre dressing room Saturday night, fingering his Masai warrior's braids. Every once in a while he would tug at them, as if to prove they were real. They are, and James is planning on doing some clipping of his own: He has filed a \$450 million lawsuit against several concert promoters who attached his equipment at a Dallas concert in August.

James *minged* having to cancel the next night's concert, and he *minged* having to play the next night on borrowed equipment; but mostly James seemed to mind newspaper reports that had him ditching those trademark shoulder-length braids to escape sheriff's deputies who wouldn't be looking to serve papers on a "bald man."

"They seized my equipment—illegally—and then they defamed [sic] my character and professionalism saying I had a *bald head*," James fumes, spitting out the last two words. "I'm not a criminal; I've never stolen anything. They were wrong and they're going to suffer for it. That tears down my character anybody says I got a *bald head*. There's people out there that believe that kind of s---. The braids are important, the whole group wears them. If I'm *bald*, then the whole group is *bald*; and if we're all *bald*, it means we're plastic people up there."

The only plastic in James' life right now is the round kind that goes under a needle. His current "Street Songs" album has held the No. 1 spot in the Black Album Charts since early summer and next week will tie the record for that position—20 weeks held by Stevie Wonder's "Songs in the Key of Life"—flitting around in the pop Top 10 for much of that time as well. James is the top black concert attraction in America; he drew more than 35,000 to two shows at the Capital Centre.

His message is simple—funkt it up. It's a message delivered by a 13-piece band that, like James, looks as if it came to the stage directly from a Star Trek convention: silvery thigh-high boots, skin-tight lamé body suits, a generous dose of silver glitter on the braids. In the last three years, all that glitter has turned to platinum for James and company.

The 28-year-old superstar seems in cautious control of his success, his conversation sprinkled with stories of glitter gone dull through excesses.

"In my head I've always been a superstar, even when I was broke," James says matter-of-factly. "But I didn't make it until 1978, and I was able to watch Sly and Steve Stills fall, watch Jimi Hendrix and others die. Had I made it in the '60s, I might have been blown away, too. The music business is an unnatural business. You come off that stage believing that you're a god . . . It's unnatural."

The on-stage and offstage Jameses are as different as night and day, a conscious division that he has only recently started to talk about. The mythic, public James is a flashy funkster and party-giver. The real-life, private James lives quietly on a ranch in Upstate New York with his mother and his horses and has started trying to cool that hot image, even though it could affect his popularity.

"I don't care if it's dangerous or not. In all my years of following musicians—Jagger, the Beatles—they always managed to keep their image and art a separate thing. It's not completely not me, I'm not totally devoid of that stage image . . . it's about 50 percent offstage," James says tantalizingly.

James' references tend to be toward white rock musicians. Until he stepped into the realms of funk, his "roots were basically blues and folk, and of course R&B. What I played over the years as I struggled to live and eat was folk and rock."

In the '60s, the Buffalo native led a Canadian group, the Mynah Birds, that also featured Neil Young; there was also a jazz-rock group called White Cane that recorded a quickly forgotten album for MGM. There are tapes of the Birds, but James laughs at rumors of a group reunion with Young. "I see Neil. I think he'd like the tapes out. He sees them as nostalgia. I do, too."

James' entrance into the funk world after a decade on the peripheries of the record business was partly a reaction against what he saw as the silly sci-fi mindlessness of George Clinton and Bootsy Collins.

Clinton, the creative center of the intergalactic Parliament/Funkadelic empire, "didn't do anything that Sly didn't do. It's all been done, all been said, all been played before. The Beatles didn't do anything that the Isley Brothers didn't do, they just took it to a higher ground, the way I took George's stuff to a higher plateau. The babble that existed on top of their music was out of this orb. I just added sensible—and sexual—lyrics and entendres and innuendoes; it made more sense to me. The world is so promiscuous any * * * ing way that a lot of writers, like myself, just put it in there. If you don't get sexy, you might not sell a lot of records."

Ironically, now that he is selling so many records, James finds himself the object of white media attention, much of it choosing to accent his rock roots and crossover potential in a rock field that hasn't had a black superstar since Hendrix and Sly Stone.

"I'm already a rock 'n' roll star," James says testily. "When you get a top three pop album, you are a rock 'n' roll star. I have a lot of rock albums in me, but they wouldn't be accepted by black people * * * and that's my first allegiance, musically. They're the ones that made me. Having to go out there knowing that white and black crowds generally don't mix like they did in the Sly days makes a very strong impression on one."

"The Commodores got off into that," he says of the dangers of crossover. "They've gotten away from their black base on the record level. Then you have to come back when you have to go out there and work. If you're black and you don't have black people out there to see you, you're not going to sell any tickets."

Which isn't a problem for Rick James in 1981.

A few weeks ago thousands of young people jammed the Capital Centre for one final, funky fling before school bells sounded a discordant note. Friday night Rick James called recess.

James, the self-anointed high priest of funk-punk, presided over a sold-out celebration of outrageous party music. Outrageous may be too mild a word for it. James admitted on stage that his biggest thrill in life was "to hear a woman scream in ecstasy," and his whole show is designed to elicit the same response from a crowd. He seldom fails.

James moved from the raunchy to the tender and back again with blinding speed.

One moment he was smelling a rose and whispering French; the next he was bumping and grinding away to "Bustin' Out" or stroking Teena Marie in a particularly suggestive duet. The Stone City Band provided some chunky dance rhythms, but it was James' blatant sexuality and preening that delighted the crowd most.

Also appearing was Carl Carlton. Shirtless, Carlton left no muscle unflexed.●

A TRIBUTE TO RABBI GERALD RAISKIN

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Rabbi Gerald Raiskin, the spiritual leader at Peninsula Temple Shalom for 25 years, who was honored by his congregation September 20 at a testimonial dinner. This man of God has given so much of himself to his temple that now is the time for the congregants to show their love and appreciation.

After serving as an infantryman with the 80th Division in the European Theater of Operations and earning two battle stars and the Combat Infantry Badge, Rabbi Raiskin graduated from Brooklyn College with a degree in psychology and sociology and was ordained at the Hebrew Union College of New York. Upon returning from a year in Israel, Rabbi Raiskin served as a director of the Chicago Federation of Temple Youth where he began his deep involvement with young people. He and his lovely and giving wife Helen, have both continued to place an emphasis on being with and teaching young people. Both Rabbi and Mrs. Raiskin have joy written all over their faces when the children's choir and the students of the religious school or the Hebrew School participate in the services. It is indeed a beautiful sight to see 40 to 60 children singing beautifully under the skillful direction of Mrs. Raiskin with the Rabbi happily singing too.

The love that Rabbi Raiskin has for his flock is shown on his smiling face upon entering the temple. Each person, who is a temple member, feels that "Jerry" is their own personal Rabbi and their good friend. The children of the Sunday school look forward to being greeted personally by the Rabbi as they start their day at the religious school. Rabbi Raiskin is never too busy to help a youth who might be having a difficult time learning Hebrew become more adapt in the beautiful language of the Torah. The growth of the temple from 40 families to almost 700 is mostly due to the warmth and affection given so freely by Rabbi Raiskin as he embraces each new member to his heart.●

DO NOT BE TRICKED BY THE SIERRA CLUB

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the American people must not be fooled by the manipulative use of the mass media by foes of Interior Secretary James Watt. Yesterday's presentation of a million petitions demanding the immediate dismissal of President Reagan's Interior Secretary was a staged media hoax perpetrated by the Sierra Club. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we not be tricked into believing, as the Sierra Club would have us believe, that most Americans favor removal of Interior Secretary Watt.

The Sierra Club's presentation of their petitions to Congress yesterday was not a spontaneous display of grassroots popular support favoring the ouster of James Watt. Instead, it was a highly organized and sophisticated media blitz organized by the Sierra Club. A confidential memorandum written by the leadership of the Sierra Club several weeks ago provides the proof for this claim. The confidential memo details the Sierra Club's master plan for maximizing media exposure in opposition to Secretary Watt.

This memo is further indication that the Sierra Club's tactics against the Secretary are only a symbol of the Sierra Club's efforts to expand its own membership and donations. The memo clearly states that one of the primary goals of yesterday's petition presentation was to enhance the credibility of the Sierra Club as a strong grassroots organization.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a recent article by the Sacramento Bee which describes the secret battle plan for this week's antilobby effort staged by the Sierra Club. I think this article highlights the true objectives of the Sierra Club.

[From the Sacramento Bee, Oct. 10, 1981]

SIERRA CLUB HAS A "SECRET"—DUMP WATT

(By Leo Rennert)

Acting in utmost secrecy, the Sierra Club has mapped a battle plan for a lobbying assault on the nation's capital that has all the trappings of an undercover KGB or CIA exercise.

The point of the maneuver is to dump on the steps of the House of Representatives Oct. 19 more than 1 million petitions calling for the firing of Interior Secretary James Watt.

The cloak and dagger preparations, however, may be more exciting than the event itself.

They involve careful orchestration to extract extensive media coverage and maximum political impact while the public gets the impression that it's witnessing a fairly spontaneous "grassroots" demonstration.

It is vital that this plan remain absolutely confidential, the national Sierra Club office in San Francisco advised its chapters a few weeks ago.

For maximum impact what we are planning must remain closely guarded until we are ready to launch it.

"If word of this plan and its timing gets out, it will be possible for Watt and his supporters to take counteraction which could seriously blunt the political and media impact we are seeking."

The "confidential" eight page master plan, of which the Bee has obtained a copy, was drafted by Sierra Club President Joe Fontaine and Federal Affairs Director Doug Scott after a July "retreat" of the board of directors.

It calls for chapters throughout the nation to send representatives to Washington for a weeklong anti-Watt demonstration with an eye on exploiting local and national coverage to the fullest.

The strategy includes carefully staged airport departure news conferences that should produce local headlines like "Sierra Club leader Jane Doe presents 1 zillion anti-Watt signatures."

At the Washington end, the simultaneous arrival of chapter representatives should trigger a second wave of publicity—"Mighty nationwide Sierra Club assembles volunteer leaders in Washington with 1 million plus petitions against Watt policies."

Timing is critical. Chapter officials were told that the payoff will be "big play in Saturday evening papers and on Saturday evening televisions . . . and in Sunday papers."

According to a cover letter, the hush hush plan was developed on the basis of "careful political soundings and inside advice from Capitol Hill."

Before leaving for Washington, delegates are supposed to meet privately with State Republican Party chairmen to show them the stacks of anti-Watt petitions.

"This would be an off-the-record visit to convey the message that we are a bipartisan group, but that there is very strong grassroots sentiment against Mr. Watt and the policies of the Reagan administration he symbolizes," the plan advises.

There also are supposed to be "courtesy calls" on governors that should get a "ripple-down political impact."

In line with the club's tactic to hold off advance public announcements until the last moment, press kits about the anti-Watt project will not be mailed until next week.

However, Larry Williams, an organizer in the Washington office, acknowledged the secrecy strategy is beginning to crumble. The White House has known about plans for the Washington rally for "at least a week," he said, and the event also has been reported in the *Doodlesbury* comic strip this week.

Asked why club representatives had to be instructed in supersecret discipline, Williams replied, "You're dealing with lots of volunteers. You must take a hard-line approach; otherwise, they tend to run off in different directions."●

NEW JERSEY'S OUTSTANDING YOUNG FARMER

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, a young man from my congressional district recently had the distinct honor of being named "New Jersey's Outstanding Young Farmer" by the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture. J. Wilson "Jay" Hughes, Jr., a 34-year-old resident of Aura, N.J., is the recipient of this commendable award.

A statement made by Mr. Hughes, "having new areas of challenge and the chance to overcome them is always welcome," is reflective of his can-do attitude. A third-generation fruit farmer, Mr. Hughes is vice president and assistant general manager of Broad Acres Farm, a family corporation.

In addition to his farming achievements, Mr. Hughes has contributed much time and effort to civic and farming organizations. He is a member of the Aura Volunteer Fire Company and Rescue Corps, and a member of the Elk Township School Board.

Mr. Hughes' selection for this honor was based on such factors as management, efficiency, and innovative farming practices.

His philosophy is to develop farming into "a profession, not an archaic vocation."

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Hughes on this outstanding accomplishment and entreat my colleagues to do likewise.●

ARTICLE HONORS CLAUDE PEPPER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we all recently enjoyed the festivities surrounding the 81st birthday of our esteemed colleague, CLAUDE PEPPER.

I thought, however, that this article, which appeared in the *Tallahassee Democrat* recently, helps capture the history and color which has surrounded Mr. PEPPER's career and I happily share it with you today.

PEPPER AHEAD OF HIS TIME

(By Howard Jay Friedman)

He didn't know me and we hadn't met. But in 1946, Claude Pepper helped me get a job on *The Democrat* and on my way to 35 years of writing in and about Florida.

As a transplanted New Yorker, I knew all about him. He may have been the senator from the state of Florida, but Florida was the second state for thousands of New Yorkers who spent their winters here, and they considered him their senator, too.

He was a liberal. But, more important, he was an ally of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, helping to turn this nation around after its worst depression.

I've forgotten what the issue was, but a *Democrat* editorial in 1946 criticized him. I disagreed, and wrote a letter to the editor about it. The letter was published and I received a nice "thank-you" note from the senator, with an autographed picture, both of which, unfortunately, I can't find anywhere.

That letter led to other letters to the editor, which led to a daily column, which led to a job in the Department of Education—and which, in one of those twists of fate, has now led me right back to *The Democrat*!

I guess I saw Claude Pepper in person two or three times when he was senator. Al Block introduced me to him at a Rotary Club luncheon in the Floridan Hotel. The senator flattered me by remembering my name.

I saw him again one afternoon shopping at Christo's 5-and-10 cent store. Now, that may not mean much to many of you, but you can live all your lifetime in many states in this country and never see anyone in public office in person, much less a U.S. senator, in the dime store. He waved "hello" across the counter and I was impressed.

In 1950, George Smathers challenged him for his senate seat, in what became one of the bitterest campaigns in the state's history. It's unfortunate, but for some people Pepper will be remembered for losing that campaign, rather than for his contributions to government.

Yes, I was, and still am, upset about it. I think he got a raw deal from many of his former "friends." They called him "Red" Pepper and painted him nearly a traitor, although he was neither.

They distributed that infamous photograph of him standing alongside Paul Robeson, who was a great singer but an admitted communist. But Pepper's sin was not only that Robeson was red, but that he was black.

Folks who didn't like blacks, and there were lots of them, didn't like Pepper.

Pepper, you see, had supported President Harry Truman's Fair Employment Practices Commission, which was aimed at getting jobs for blacks in government and industry.

But I think doctors hated Pepper worst of all. Pepper had supported government help for the payment of medical bills. His opponents called it "socialized medicine" and succeeded for many years in turning that program into a dirty word.

That campaign, incidentally, gave me my first look at some of the ugliness of politics: a group of local Smathers' supporters, flushed with victory, driving their cars over the front lawn of the senator's home on Wilson Avenue, blowing their horns and shouting swear words.

But Claude Pepper lost like a winner.

He didn't return to Miami, his home town, with his tail between his legs, a beaten man. Nor did he do as others did before and after him, and move to Washington to lobby for the "fat cats." He went back to his first love, the law, practicing in Miami with Jack Orr, and here in Tallahassee with Earl Faircloth and, later, Lawrence Renfroe.

But he needed the stimulation of government. So in 1962 he returned to Washington as a newly elected freshman congressman from Dade County, one of only a handful of lawmakers who ever returned in a lesser capacity. He has been in Washington ever

since, re-elected by his Dade constituency over and over again by overwhelming majorities. He is now the recognized leader in the fight for the rights and needs of the elderly.

Pepper was ahead of his time. The two principal issues that led to his Senate defeat were his support of "socialized medicine," which we now know as Medicare, and his interest in fair employment practices, which became the issue of civil rights. He favored both too early.

History will mark him as a courageous and outstanding lawmaker. And, without being too bitter, I think he will be remembered a lot longer than his former friend who beat him out of his Senate seat and then didn't stay around long enough to do anything we can remember.

Claude Pepper, son of an Alabama sharecropper, a Tallahassee neighbor, will be 81 years old in just a few days, on Sept. 8. Happy birthday, friend. And thanks. ●

THE AWACS DEBATE IN CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the pending proposed sale of military equipment to Saudi Arabia is the most important foreign policy issue now facing Congress. Due to the serious nature of the issue, and the high level of public interest, I feel it incumbent upon me to place in the public record a statement outlining the reasons for my decision to vote for the sale and against House Concurrent Resolution 194, the resolution of disapproval adopted by the House on October 14.

Accordingly, at this point in the RECORD I insert the following column, which is to be distributed to my district later in the week.

The article follows:

THE AWACS DEBATE IN CONGRESS

Certainly the most controversial foreign policy issue of the 97th Congress to date continues to be the proposed sale of the AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System Aircraft) and other military equipment to Saudi Arabia. President Reagan agreed to sell the Saudis a package of 5 AWACS, 101 sets of conformal fuel tanks to extend the range of the 60 F-15 fighters we sold the Saudis in 1978, 1,177 AIM-9L Sidewinder air-to-air missiles to give the Saudis an advantage in aerial battles because the Sidewinders can be fired head-on, and 6 KC-707 aerial refueling aircraft. The cost of the package, including training and spare parts, totals \$8.5 billion. Under a law governing foreign military sales in excess of \$25 million, Congress has until October 30 to disapprove the sale. While the House voted to do so on October 14, the vote in the Senate is considered too close to call.

The decision on AWACS is a difficult one because the United States has partially competing objectives to reconcile. On the one hand, we have a moral and political commitment to the security and survivability of Israel. I publicly stated when the debate on AWACS began earlier in the year that I would not support anything that

would significantly impair Israel's ability to launch a preemptive strike to maintain its security. On the other hand, Saudi Arabia has very legitimate defense needs. Saudi Arabia has relatively few citizens (under 6 million) yet must protect a land area about the same size as that portion of our own country east of the Mississippi River. Within the country lies the strategically and economically important oil fields on the Persian Gulf. The Saudis are surrounded by potential adversaries. Libya, Ethiopia and South Yemen have banded together to threaten Saudi Arabia by moving through nearby North Yemen. Libya's terrorist leader, Colonel Qadhafi, has threatened to destroy the Saudi oil fields unless the Saudis support Libya's demands for higher OPEC oil prices. Certainly, Qadhafi's threats cannot be taken lightly, what with his bombing of the Sudan and his invasion of Chad.

The AWACS radar planes are designed to improve Saudi defenses by providing the Saudis with an advance warning of enemy attack. At its operating altitude of 30,000 feet, an AWACS can detect enemy aircraft within a range of about 200 miles—more or less—depending upon weather and terrain conditions. The advance warning would provide sufficient time to scramble the F-15's engage the enemy with AIM missiles, and defend the oil fields.

The two principal objections to the sale—but by no means the only concerns—are that the AWACS pose a threat to Israel, and that should the Saudi government fall from power, the equipment might fall into the wrong hands and compromise U.S. security. I sincerely and carefully weighed these considerations when studying the issue. From the written material I reviewed and the briefings I attended, I concluded the following:

In order to monitor Israeli airspace, the AWACS would have to operate in one of two small areas in the far northwest corner of Saudi Arabia, hundreds of miles from the oil fields. Thus, any shifting of the AWACS to those areas would leave the oil fields vulnerable because it will take 5 AWACS to provide around-the-clock protection of the Persian Gulf area. In addition, the concentration of air traffic over the dense Israeli air space would make it difficult for the AWACS to distinguish between routine and attack aircraft. Further, the AWACS cannot detect such things as troop or tank movements.

The second possible threat to Israel stems from the ability of the AWACS to serve as a control and command center to coordinate air battles. On this point, the Defense Department has provided assurances that all of the most sensitive gear for this function will not be included in the version sold to the Saudis. The Israeli Air Force will retain a decided superiority over the Saudis, or other nations in the region. The United States certainly retains the option of selling Israel such equipment as may be necessary to maintain this level of strength.

There is always the possibility that equipment will fall into the wrong hands whenever the U.S. transfers technology to other countries, regardless of the location. However, in this case the need for the equipment is so great, that we must manage any risks that present themselves rather than use these risks as reasons to block the sale entirely. I am convinced that the arrangements reached between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia are more than adequate for this purpose. Specifically, there will be complete

data sharing with the U.S., there will be no sharing of information with other countries without our prior consent, there will be no operation of the planes outside of Saudi airspace, and extensive security measures will be taken in the selection of personnel and the storage of equipment. A further safeguard is provided by the fact that the planes would not be delivered until 1985-86, U.S. personnel will be involved in flight operations until training of Saudi crews is completed in 1990, and the need for spare parts and ground assistance will guarantee an American presence into the 1990's. Finally, the truly sensitive portion of the AWACS is the computer "software"—the programming—and not the "hardware" or actual physical equipment, which is actually widely known, and is what would fall into enemy hands in the unlikely event of any capture.

It is unfortunate that this important issue became embroiled in as much symbolism as substance. The sale does not represent a disabling threat to Israel, and for that reason I was able to support it. Although my position did not prevail in the House, this was largely due to the absence of any lobbying by the White House. This lack of effort was a mistake. At issue here is the ability of the President to shape foreign policy, the willingness of the U.S. to stand by its allies—both Israel and Saudi Arabia, and in the process help the process of peace in the Middle East. ●

COMMEMORATION OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute this month to the great Polish patriot and leader, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who bravely volunteered his services to the Continental Army during the American Revolution, helping the cause of freedom.

Casimir Pulaski was born in Lithuania, Poland, in 1748. His early efforts for the cause of independence in Poland proved unsuccessful. After his exile from his native land, he served in the Turkish revolutionary movement. He later met with Benjamin Franklin in France, and soon thereafter joined the American cause for freedom. Upon his arrival in America in 1777, he organized a corps of cavalry and light infantry at Valley Forge, which later became known as the Pulaski Legion. Successful reorganization of the Continental Army's cavalry led to his distinction as the "Father of the American Cavalry." Pulaski commanded the American and French legions at Savannah, where he was fatally wounded and died on October 11, 1779.

I think it is especially fitting to remember General Pulaski in this time of decision for the Polish nation. To a large degree, the ideals of General Pulaski fought for in America are now being debated in his native land. More

than 200 years after his death, the Polish Solidarity movement has raised some of the same basic issues of human freedom for which Pulaski sacrificed his life. They have bravely stood up against the forces of oppression, and laid claim to the heritage which Pulaski sought to create and preserve.

I join with Americans of Polish descent in the 11th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent, in honoring Gen. Casimir Pulaski. ●

TUBERCULOSIS: ACTION IS NEEDED

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that during the consideration of H.R. 4560, the measure appropriating funds for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, it was not possible for me to be present on the floor. I particularly wanted to be present in order to rise in support of an amendment which was offered by my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. WEISS, which would have increased the appropriation for the preventive health services program of the Centers for Disease Control by an additional \$5 million, moneys which would have been earmarked for the treatment of tuberculosis.

I was sorry to learn that this body did not adopt the amendment, and do want to go on record as to why I believe it was necessary.

Tuberculosis, thought to largely be a disease of the 19 century, is regrettably once again on the rise in our Nation. In 1980 there was an actual increase in new cases. Statistics of the American Lung Association reveal that 27,983 cases were reported last year, a rise for the first time since 1963.

In the District of Columbia alone new cases totaled 361 in 1980 as opposed to 324 the year before. Particularly disturbing is the fact that a large number of these cases were diagnosed in children under the age of 14 which is an indicator that the infection is recent. It is well known that tuberculosis occurs more frequently in the nonwhite population of our country. Referring again to my district, over 90 percent of the newly reported cases were among blacks. The rate of incidence among blacks in the District of Columbia was five times higher than that of its white population.

Tuberculosis is a disease which can both be prevented and cured. But the drugs and other items necessary for treatment must be available on a certain basis and for the duration of time

required to be successful. It is not unusual for a tubercular patient to require treatment for up to 1 year.

Tuberculosis preys upon those in our society who find themselves at the lower end of the national income scale. At a time when we are witnessing reductions in programs which serve the needy, and when combined with the crisis situation in housing where we are seeing individuals living in crowded conditions out of economic necessity, this dread disease can only be expected to increase.

Five million dollars would have been a very small additional amount to appropriate, particularly when weighed against the positive impact such an appropriation would have had on the health of our fellow citizens.

Again, I regret the action taken on the proposed amendment, and hope that when an appropriate opportunity presents itself, this body will reverse its decision. ●

VOLUNTARISM IN AMERICA

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, voluntarism has always been one of the great strengths of America. All of us have observed the enormous benefits to our communities and the country from voluntarism. Perhaps nowhere are the benefits more apparent than in our nonprofit hospital.

Voluntarism can take many forms, but I would now like to comment on two forms of voluntarism: the work performed by volunteers in hospitals and voluntary philanthropic gifts to assist hospitals in their good works.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the letter that appears below, sent to my attention by Mr. Joseph L. Kunec, president-elect of the National Association for Hospital Development, a professional organization of over 1,200 members, nearly all of whom are hospital administrative staff across the country charged with raising donated funds for not-for-profit hospitals. Mr. Kunec is a constituent of mine, and the hospitals and institute he serves as director of development—St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital, Texas Children's Hospital, and the Texas Heart Institute—in Houston, have been of exceptional service to my community and far beyond for many years.

He expresses his concern, and that of his association, about a regulation which was written some years ago setting for the administration regarding certain provisions of the Social Security Act. Mr. Kunec makes an excellent case that this regulation sets a trap for the "unwary donor" to a hospital,

which effectively negates the voluntary nature and prime intent of his/her gift. The argument is complex, and I urge my colleagues to study the letter which appears below, and to urge with me that the administration change this regulation which is an unnecessary and counterproductive burden on those who desire to make gifts to the hospital of their choice.

I also call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the recently passed tax legislation benefited those who make voluntary contributions to all charitable institutions. It would have been useful to the hospitals and similar institutions of this Nation if a bill I cosponsored H.R. 768, would have been included in the tax legislation. It has been cosponsored by over 200 Members. Essentially, this bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the standard mileage rate for use of a passenger automobile which may be used in computing the charitable contribution deduction, shall be the same as the standard mileage rate which may be used in computing the business expense deduction. Clearly, this would be of distinct value to the voluntary efforts for hospitals, and I urge my colleagues to work for that legislation also.

The letter of Mr. Kunec follows:

PAUL R. WILLGING, PH. D.,
Deputy Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DOCTOR WILLGING: We are writing you on behalf of the National Association for Hospital Development (NAHD) to request the deletion of 42 C.F.R. §405.423(c)(2) from the Medicare regulations. NAHD is a professional organization of over twelve hundred members, principally consisting of hospital development officers, who are charged with raising donated funds for not-for-profit hospitals.

The prime reason for our request is that such a deletion would remove from the regulations a provision that acts as an unwarranted trap to the unwary charitable donor to non-profit hospitals and other medical care providers. The current provision is not mandated, and is inconsistent with the intent of the Social Security Act.

Section 405.423 provides that funds that are designated by their donor for covering hospital operating expenses will reduce the reasonable costs otherwise reimbursable to the provider. Thus, for example, if a donor were to make a donation to a hospital to be used toward nurses' compensation, a portion of the donation—nationally averaging approximately 50 percent—would reduce Medicare cost reimbursement for nursing expenses.

The Medicare regulations provide their own internal rationale for the adoption of such a rule. They state:

"If such costs (reimbursable costs) are not reduced, the provider would secure reimbursement for the same expenses twice; it would be reimbursed through the donor-restricted contributions as well as from patients and third-party payers including the Title XVIII health insurance program."

The above result is not required by any provision of the Social Security Act. Indeed we believe a fair reading of the Act and its underlying intent would produce a contrary result. We also do not believe that this provision is in the interest of the nation's health care system.

The history of the health care in the United States is dominated by the commitment of not-for-profit hospitals to serve the sick. Prior to the Medicare program and other Government subsidized programs, not-for-profit hospitals bore virtually the entire financial responsibility of caring for those that could not pay their medical bills. Charitable gifts helped defray some of these costs. Even after the enactment of the Medicare program, not-for-profit hospitals continued to serve the nation's elderly and poor at the hospitals' "costs" without increment for operating margin or other return on investment to allow providers to protect themselves from increases in costs due to inflation and increasing sophistication of medical care and equipment.

Private philanthropy is the primary source from which not-for-profit hospitals may accumulate equity funds to bridge the inflationary gap and make fully possible their "cutting edge" mission in health care. Taxing charitable donations by reducing Medicare reimbursement by the amount of a donation, which in essence is what is done in 42 C.F.R. § 405.423(c)(2), makes no sense and is counter-productive to the interests of the health care system.

There is nothing in the Social Security Act or in its legislative history that requires the result established in the regulations. Section 1814(b) of the Social Security Act requires that providers be reimbursed for the lesser of the reasonable cost of services performed on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries or the customary charges for such services. There is absolutely no indication in the statute that the Government, which has committed itself to pay all the reasonable costs of treating Medicare beneficiaries, should benefit from the unintended subsidy of donors.

Section 405.423(c)(2) of the regulations has been productive of one thing: the literature and teachings of hospital development officers invariably contain the caveat that proposed donations restricted for operating purposes should be discouraged. Thus, it is the usual practice for hospital development officers to explain to donors that any such proposed donation will reduce government reimbursement, and thus, will not bring as great a benefit to the hospital as other types of gifts. Donors are encouraged to change the gift designation to non-operating purposes, such as for capital or equipment, or to make their donation unrestricted altogether. It is not the donor's intent to subsidize the Medicare program; rather, he or she had intended to benefit the hospital and the provider's patient care services. In a recent survey conducted by NAHD of its members, few examples of gifts designated for operating purposes were revealed.

Yet, the fact that such mistakes are few does not make them any less regrettable. It is unfortunate, for example, for an unexpected gift by bequest to come to a hospital designated for operating purposes, because unlike the direct gift, made by a living person, there is no opportunity for the donor to be notified and the uninformed restriction removed. Moreover, even in the case of such a direct gift, uninformed designations can pass unnoticed. For example, in Provider Appeal Dec. No. 00-77-37, CCH

Medicare and Medicaid Guide, Paragraph 28,845, a donor agreed to pay the telephone company charges associated with a hospital's coronary care unit's remote monitoring equipment for a period of two years. Presumably, upon subsequently learning that such a gift merely reduced the reimbursable costs of the hospital, the donor sought to revoke his or her designation retroactively and "de-restrict" the gift. The hearing officer concluded that the donor's efforts to de-restrict the gift were distinctly tardy and that the intermediary's decision to reduce the hospital's reimbursement by the amount of the gift was correct. While, as a matter of interpretation of current regulations (the limits of the hearing officer's authority) the decision was probably correct, it nevertheless underscores the very reason we are making this request for your consideration. The donor in the case had intended to benefit the provider and/or the provider's coronary care patients by providing a supplementary source of funds to use for additional health services to the community. Instead, the gift is partially used to reduce the amount Medicare would pay for services to its beneficiaries—thus reducing the benefits as originally intended by the donor.

If the donor in the above case had been properly knowledgeable about the intricacies of Medicare regulations, he or she could have made an unrestricted gift to the hospital in the same amount, the hospital could have used the donation for the same purpose, and Medicare would have paid the "reasonable costs" of providing this service; and the donation would have resulted—as was intended by the donor—as a source of supplementary funds for the hospital.

In other words, § 405.423 serves only as a trap for the unwary donor, who cannot be expected to be fully aware of the intricacies of Medicare regulations to carry out the intent of their donations. The provision serves no other logical purpose. The law should seek to protect such donors by deleting § 405.423(c)(2)—a provision that has come to be referred to by hospital development officers as the "unwary donor rule"—from Medicare regulations.

In 1980, included in Public Law 96-449, the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1980, was section 901, a provision strongly supported by NAHD, to assure that most charitable contributions would continue not to be detrimentally affected by Medicare reimbursement. Included in the House version of the bill was a provision which would have legislatively mandated the repeal of the "unwary donor rule." While the provision received broad bi-partisan support, it was ultimately deleted from the final provision because HHS identified a revenue cost of \$67 million, and in the setting of budget cutting, such a cost was adjudged too high.

NAHD strongly questions the accuracy of this estimate. As mentioned previously, NAHD's recent survey of its membership showed only a negligible number of gifts designated for operating purposes. Accordingly, we suggest the Department of Health and Human Services develop revised cost estimates. However, even if this estimate is correct, we hardly believe that such an amount should impede the repeal of a regulatory rule that makes no sense. At this time of reduction of government funding of some health care programs, including the Medicaid program, the importance of encouraging private philanthropy is underscored. The Reagan Administration has stood for the enhancement of philanthropy.

This worthwhile goal can be implemented in an important manner by the deletion of § 405.423(c)(2) from the regulations. Such a deletion would, in our view, be wholly consistent with the requirements of the Social Security Act.

Representatives of NAHD would be delighted to meet with you to further discuss this matter should you wish such a meeting, or to supply you with further information at your request.●

**"CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL,
1981"—THE PLIGHT OF THE PELAKHS**

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this opportunity to participate in the "Call to Conscience Vigil, 1981." The vigil, sponsored by the Union of Councils for Soviet Jews on behalf of the Soviet Jewish families, gives me a chance to express my concern for Jews being detained in the Soviet Union as a result of that government's repressive emigration policies.

Since signing of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, which provided for the pursuit of policies consistent with the basic principles of human rights, it has become increasingly apparent that the Soviet Union has disregarded the human rights provision. Included in the provision is the reunification of divided families whose members live in different countries, for humanitarian reasons, and free travel between countries.

The more liberal approach taken by the Soviet authorities throughout most of 1979 has given way to a renewed harassment of Jewish applicants for emigration. This is the case of the Pelakh family, which I bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress. The Pelakhs first applied for an exit visa in May 1977. Viktor, Margarita, and their son, Boris, have been continually refused since then. No official pretext was given for their refusal.

Following the initial refusal for repatriation to Israel, both Viktor and Margarita were unable to continue their professional work as chemical and electronic engineers. Neither served in the armed forces nor did they have security clearance or engage in classified work. However, they have been denied an exit visa on the pretense that they know some secret information.

In 1978, the Pelakhs applied for another visa. They were informed their visas would be granted if they sat quietly. They were ordered to sign a promise to be silent, not to write protest letters, and not to appeal to any authorities, especially abroad. Their

request was refused. Again in 1979 they applied, only to be denied their exit visas. Unofficially, Viktor was told that the reason for refusal was because of the work of his brother living in Omsk, Siberia. Ironically, Viktor has not seen this brother in 20 years.

Meanwhile, the Pelakhs are trying to learn Hebrew in Kishinev and participate in seminars of Jewish culture. They await the day their visas will be granted, and they are able to join all of Margarita's family, who are already in Israel.

We must continue to speak out for human rights, for as long as there is injustice anywhere its presence threatens justice everywhere.●

A TRIBUTE TO ABE VICKTER

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Abe Vickter. It is a great pleasure for me to pay tribute to this extraordinary individual. On November 25, the Gateways Hospital Men's Club will declare Abe Vickter the 1981 "Man of the Year," in recognition of his services and dedication to the community. There is no doubt that he richly deserves this award.

Abe is the epitome of a self-made man. A member of an impoverished family, he was raised in the slums of New York. The hardship and adversity he encountered, instead of breaking him down as it has so many others, made him all the more determined to succeed. Every obstacle he faced he conquered with ingenuity and perseverance. As a teenager he was forced to quit school to help support the seven children in his family, and that was the beginning of his remarkable career. He organized a retail produce business, and by the time Abe was 20, he employed 23 persons and had become a wholesale produce broker. This was a great accomplishment for a child of the slums, but Abe did not stop there. Moving West in 1949, he established the Giant Penny's Stores and the Giant Sales Co., distributors and marketers of variety gifts and sundries. He built these interests into an operation grossing in excess of \$5 million annually, but Abe was still not finished. While a distributor, Abe has become interested in real estate construction, and decided to concentrate his remarkable energies in this area. In 1959 he sold the Giant companies. Since then he has constructed more than 400 homes, 15 apartment houses, and 4 shopping centers in the San Fernando Valley, and is currently involved in real estate finance, investments, and managements.

For all his success, however, Abe Vickter did not forget his roots. Perhaps because of his impoverished youth, Abe is keenly aware of the great range of human problems, the value of seeking solutions to these problems, and the enormous potential of each individual. Throughout his career, he has devoted a substantial portion of his time and energy to seeking ways to improve the human condition and tap this enormous potential. In addition to his membership in the Gateways Hospital Men's Club, Abe holds memberships and is a contributor to the Masonic Old Age Home, the Shrine Hospital for Crippled Children, ADL, the United Way, ORT, UJA, the Heart Foundation, Westwood Shrine Club, B'nai B'rith, and is a founding member of Temple Beth Jacob, in west Los Angeles. He has served on numerous committees for these and other religious and charitable organizations.

Mental illness is a condition of particular interest to Abe, who has devoted a great deal of time and effort to help assure that the mentally handicapped are afforded the opportunity to live normal lives. As he puts it:

Studies show that mental illness strikes one out of every four families in America. The problem is of vital importance and, under conditions in today's world, there is no more personal satisfaction than actively seeking to alleviate it.

This is by no means the first time this remarkable person's contributions have been recognized. In 1969, the President of the United States presented Abe Vickter with the Meritorious Achievement Award for his many services to his fellow man. I know that you will all join with me in saluting this "Man of the Year."●

SOCIAL SECURITY RIGHTS ACT

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would impose mandatory time limits on the processing of benefit claims for social security applicants, and expedite payment of benefits for approved claims.

The bill, which I have introduced in every Congress since the 94th Congress, would require initial and reconsideration decisions to be made within 90 days, and hearings and appeals decisions to be made within 120 days. The legislation would also give claimants the right to request and to receive emergency payments within 10 days, in an amount based on their earnings record, if they have not received notification of decisions on their claims within 120 days of filing an appeal with the Appeals Council, or

if their claims have been approved but their benefit payments delayed. Such payments would not be subject to repayment provisions of the Social Security Act.

I am introducing this legislation to provide this Congress with a way to assure social security applicants timely notice on decisions concerning their benefit applications. Currently, the logjam of requests for hearings is at an alltime high. As of August, 128,551 requests for hearings were pending before the Hearings and Appeal Board, and the average application took 168 days for completion. This is a national average; in some areas of the country it takes even longer. The situation we are experiencing now in the social security hearings and appeals process is even worse than the crises which required emergency legislation in 1975, when 111,000 requests for hearings were pending.

The hearings and appeals process delays are particularly significant to the tens of thousands of individuals who resort to it since 60 percent of the applications for benefits which were originally denied are approved at the hearings and appeals level. Most of the victims of the delays are applicants for social security disability benefits, who often use up all their savings and end up on welfare while they wait for final decisions on their claims. The frustration and confusion of these persons is understandable, since most of them have contributed to social security with every paycheck, and they deserve to have their cases considered in a timely manner.

Other social service programs, such as aid to dependent children and the food stamp program, already require decisions on applications for benefits to be made within a fixed period of time. Certainly social security applicants deserve similar treatment. Census Bureau statistics show that approximately 25 percent of families with incomes below the poverty level are social security recipients. The individuals who apply for these benefits generally do so because they need the benefits to help make ends meet, and the fact that so many people persist through the lengthy hearings and appeals process is an illustration of that need.

Now that Congress has imposed restrictions and limits on the amount of social security disability benefits which individuals and families may receive, I think it is time we also extended these people the right to timely decisions to their claims. Previous efforts to beef up the number of administrative law judges have simply failed to solve this problem; and the Social Security Administration has not succeeded in solving the problem by self-imposed deadlines which remain unrealized. We have waited long

enough—indeed too long. It is time to impose mandatory time limitations on processing these claims. That is what my legislation would do, and I hope it receives the support of the House. ●

GYPSY MOTH

HON. CLEVE BENEDICT

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. BENEDICT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues, a problem which affects not only the bulk of my constituents, but possibly many other individuals who reside in the other States on the eastern seaboard. The problem I refer to is created by the Gypsy Moth.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article written by the West Virginia Agriculture Commissioner, Gus Douglass, which serves to explain the problem caused by the invasion of these pests. With the anticipated deluge of Gypsy Moths in West Virginia, as well as Virginia, Maryland, and other nearby States, it would appear that it is about time that the USDA take the necessary action to control the caterpillars that have already caused so much damage to the woodland in the Northeastern States.

GYPSY MOTH

The Gypsy Moth, since its accidental release in Massachusetts in 1869, has overcome obstacle after obstacle in its relentless invasion of more and more acreage each year. Preliminary estimates indicate that this pest ate the leaves off of more than 10 million acres of trees in the northeastern states in 1981, and it increased its range more than in any other single year. Hundreds of the moths have been collected in the eastern counties of West Virginia this summer; so it's probably only a matter of time until it builds up and creates similar havoc here.

I'm very concerned. This insect's favorite food is oak leaves, and more than half of the trees in West Virginia are oaks. A recent investigation in another state shows that about 13 percent of the trees in the study area were killed by the caterpillars; but on poorer sites, such as the shaley soil of our eastern counties, the rate could be much higher.

Many years ago, actually 1967, it was pointed out that officials in then infested states were beginning to throw up their hands. In the next several years, the problem began to intensify; and officials from several states formed an Advisory Council to seek action. The problem was assessed, and the research establishment was asked for answers. The immediate need was said to be money for an accelerated research program; thus, the Council appointed a committee to lobby Congress. The money was provided, almost immediately, for a five-year (later extended) program; and we were presumably off to the races—but time has shown that we were not. I'm familiar with the situation because I had several staff members involved.

The program didn't work, in my opinion, because government researchers didn't develop a "sense of urgency"; because they resisted being told what to work on; and because a lot of the funding was diverted to existing studies instead of being used for new ones. This "nickel and diming," combined with universities' skimming up to 50 percent or more off of the top of grants for overhead, had quite an effect. Research was clearly secondary to personal and institutional feelings and benefit. Also, in-house politics involved other forest insects—the southern pine beetle and pine tussock moth—in the increased funding and thereby further diluted the effort.

I was amazed to read recently that USDA scientists cannot say with assurance why the Gypsy Moth did so well in 1981. "They think it may be the result of the mild winter weather, which may permit more eggs to survive until spring." Surely such an elementary question as the cold hardiness of the eggs was answered years ago, or, if not, should have been during the accelerated research program.

Perhaps the statement that makes me the saddest is by a USDA scientist who was actually involved in the accelerated research. He said, "There was a little spurt of activity. We went through the paces. Some good things came of it, and then it stopped. That's all I can say." Another quote cites only three major accomplishments for the program—finding new parasites, registering a Gypsy Moth virus with EPA and learning to synthesize an artificial attractant . . . all of which were ongoing and rather well-financed projects before the accelerated research program ever began.

There's little doubt in my mind that the Gypsy Moth will sweep the country and that the continuing annual damage will be in the billions of dollars. I'm more or less resigned to the fact that our woodland is going to be stripped naked time and time again in the coming years, that many thousands of our trees will ultimately die and that West Virginia citizens will have to tolerate millions upon millions of crawling caterpillars each year. We plan to continue surveying and to do everything we possibly can to inhibit the population buildup. I believe, however, that the insect will be a serious problem from now on; and I believe even more firmly that it just didn't have to be. ●

SEPARATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY FROM THE BUDGET

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to remove the social security trust funds from the unified budget. Enactment of this legislation would put to rest criticism that benefit cuts are being made to decrease the deficit, thereby aiding the drive to make the necessary reforms of the system. Separation would also help restore public confidence in the future vitality of the system by placing it back on a strong, independent foundation.

A financial crisis is likely to soon endanger the very existence of the social security system. Continued delay in

confronting this threat will make the costs of reform increasingly high. Currently the legislative progress toward achieving that reform has been locked by avoidable political obstacles. In particular, the debate over social security has mixed together the two separate issues of making needed budget cuts and saving the social security system. Separation will help us hurdle those political entanglements and tackle one of the most important issues facing this or any Congress: restoration of the social security system to long-term financial soundness. ●

AMERICA'S PAST WEAKNESS EXPLAINS QADHAFT'S PRESENT STRENGTH

HON. JOHN LeBOUTILLIER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. LeBOUTILLIER. Mr. Speaker, who was responsible for the tragic death of Anwar Sadat?

Reports immediately following the assassination pointed to the Organization for the Liberation of Egypt, led by retired Lt. Gen. Saadeddin Shazli, chief of staff during the 1973 Yom Kippur war. According to informed sources, this organization has received \$3 million from Libyan leader Muammar Qadhafi via Syria, and has received the backing of the anti-Sadat Steadfastness and Confrontation Pact. This pact—consisting of South Yemen, Algeria, the Palestine Liberation Organization, Syria, and Libya—was formed to overthrow the Sadat government and to block the Egyptian-Israeli peace process.

Since that time, the blame has shifted to Moslem extremists belonging to the secret organization known as Takfir wa Hijra (Repentant and Holy Flight), involved in earlier terrorist activities against the Sadat regime. One of the assassins was a member of this group.

Overlooked, however, is the responsibility past U.S. policies must bear for this tragedy.

For the past 15 years, the United States has acted irresponsibly, and has both encouraged and allowed the U.S.S.R. to develop its present position of global power. Vietnam, détente, Watergate, and SALT—all have made significant contributions to the present American weakness as a world power.

The Soviet Union, emboldened by a consistent and sustained deterioration of American will, took advantage of this situation and in 1975 launched a worldwide geopolitical offensive, focusing first on Angola.

What followed was a series of decisive Soviet actions: Soviet and Cuban support of Ethiopia against Somalia; the Soviet buildup in South Yemen;

the Shah's overthrow in Iran; the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia and Laos; the destabilization of Rhodesia by Marxist forces; the derecognition of Taiwan; the giveaway of the Panama Canal; giving of assistance to a Cuban-inspired Marxist regime in Nicaragua; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; and continued intimidation of the freedom movement in Poland. This unfolding series of events—threatening the security of the free world—continues. Cuban troops range throughout 17 countries in Africa and every country in Central and South America. Moreover, reports indicate that Cuban troops are participating with the Soviet Union in the rape of Afghanistan.

Following Sadat's assassination, Henry Kissinger said:

If Libya had been taken care of two years ago, last year, this year, Sadat would probably be alive today.

This is true. The larger question, however, involves a decade-long U.S. unwillingness to care for its vital interests.

Having allowed the Soviet Union to achieve strategic and conventional superiority over the United States, America now finds itself confronted with a seemingly endless chain of proxy wars, terrorist attacks, and disinformation efforts. In short, the United States finds its interests under attack around the globe by small countries, terrorist organizations, and political operations, which operate freely and with impunity, and are protected all the while by a committed, determined, and hostile Soviet military machine.

Left to his own resources, Qadhafi means little in the large scale of events. It is America's "retreat from power" which has accorded him an impact upon international affairs immensely disproportional to his actual power. In short, Qadhafi's influence would not be significant were it not for a decade-long deterioration of American will and leadership.

In an editorial appearing in the October 8, 1981, Wall Street Journal, entitled "The Qadhafi Problem," the significance of American decline as a world power is discussed. As the editorial states, the trend must somehow be reversed.

To defend its own interests—and the causes of freedom and human rights—the United States has to learn to strike. We have to think seriously again about covert action in support of coups, about military force to aid the Sudan, about guarantees against Soviet retaliation if Egypt decides to move against Libya. If we cannot find a way to deal with the Qadhafi problem, Western interests and Western values are likely to suffer the death of a thousand cuts.

I commend the editorial as follows to my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, October 8, 1981]

THE QADHAFI PROBLEM

"If Libya had been taken care of two years ago, last year, this year, Sadat would probably be alive today."

Henry Kissinger's words in the wake of President Sadat's assassination take on an added poignancy because the role of the United States was to stop Sadat from taking care of Libya. The persistent report has been the U.S. twice blocked Egyptian plans, to invade Libya. The report that it happened at least once has now been attributed directly to President Carter by New York Times correspondent Leslie Gelb, who ought to know since he was himself a high official in the Carter State Department. In short, the United States restrained—effectively blocked—its ally from doing what he thought necessary to his own self-defense.

No such restraint was placed on Col. Muammar Qadhafi, the Soviet-backed madman who runs Libya. The Soviets have stuffed Qadhafi's Libya with several times the military equipment his army could possibly employ, and provided Russian pilots for his planes and East German bodyguards for his personal security. This has left him free to send assassination squads after Sadat, fund terrorism around the world, invade and conquer Chad, go on to attack the Sudan, shoot at American planes over the Mediterranean and—according to intelligence reports recently circulated within the U.S. government—issue specific assassination threats against President Reagan.

Now Sadat lies dead while Qadhafi continues to attack his neighbors. How can you escape the conclusion? As Mr. Kissinger put it, "It's too dangerous to be associated with the United States—that is the fundamental problem." Or as a Saudi Arabian official told our Karen Elliott House, "Being America's friend in the Middle East is fatal."

Now, we are quite aware that no direct link has been established between Qadhafi and President Sadat's assassins. The conventional wisdom, indeed, seems to be instantly accepting the Egyptian Defense Minister's preposterously premature denial of any such connection. We view his statement as the start of a familiar cycle that precludes serious investigation of international terrorism.

The notion of an outside connection is first denied for what are essentially domestic political reasons—to calm the nation, to smooth the transition, to proclaim the loyalty of the army, to defend the competency of internal security forces and so on. Then the tacit job of the investigators becomes confirming political reality. Then the bureaucracy acquires a vested interest in this confirmation, and spends its time inventing defenses of it and demanding impossible levels of proof whenever doubts are raised. Thus we have learned little about the international travels of the Pope's assassin, and are likely to learn nothing definitive about Sadat's assassins.

Yet as we understand what Mr. Kissinger was saying, it makes little difference who actually pulled the trigger. If Qadhafi had been overthrown, the whole pattern of events would have been dramatically altered. President Sadat would have been stronger with his own people. And the forces of terror and assassination would be everywhere less confident and weaker. Mr. Kissinger pointed out that Qadhafi runs a nation of only two million people, and observed that if we "cannot find a way to get such a rogue criminal under control, then

we're living in a world in which all restraints have disappeared."

The difficulty is that this particular rogue enjoys the support and protection of the Soviet Union. Under the umbrella of nuclear deadlock, the Soviets have made huge strides through subversion and war by proxy. Despite the denials it becomes increasingly apparent that they have cultivated terrorism to destabilize our friends; the quarter of a billion dollars worth of weapons confiscated from terrorists in Turkey did not come from disaffected Armenians. We have been unable to compete in this kind of warfare, particularly since our decimation of the CIA. Worse, we have acquired a record of destabilizing our friends—sanctioning a coup against Diem in South Vietnam, hectoring the shah about human rights in Iran, stopping Sadat's invasion. It seems the only way to survive as an American ally is to be willing, like Menachem Begin, to bear American opprobrium for acting in your own interest.

To defend its own interests and the causes of freedom and human rights—against this kind of warfare, the U.S. has to learn how to strike back. We have to think seriously again about covert action in support of coups, about military force to aid the Sudan, about guarantees against Soviet retaliation if Egypt decides to move against Libya. If we cannot find a way to deal with the Qadhafi problem, Western interests and Western values are likely to suffer the death of a thousand cuts.●

HOUSE EXPORT TASK FORCE HEARS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE DISCUSS THE NATIONAL COAL EXPORT POLICY

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 19, 1981

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 7, the House Export Task Force members and staff aides attended a meeting at which the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Trade Development, William H. Morris, Jr., spoke on the national coal export policy. The meeting was organized by the Congressional Coal Caucus. Mr. Morris is Chairman of the Interagency Coal Export Task Force, established in the spring of 1980 to study the problems associated with the exportation of U.S. coal and to make appropriate recommendations.

Coal represents an enormous export potential for the United States. We have 457 billion tons of recoverable coal—the largest of any nation in the world. In addition to improving our balance of trade, coal exports will provide thousands of jobs for American citizens.

Coal exports will bring security to our allies who are solely dependent on oil imports. On a recent visit to Japan, for example, Ambassador Mansfield told me of the great interest the Japanese have in buying U.S. coal. Moreover, they are willing and interested to

make a financial investment in our coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, a number of issues need to be discussed and problems solved before we can actively begin exporting coal, including port development and expansion, user fees, encouragement of foreign and domestic investment in the U.S. coal industry, and convincing foreign buyers that the United States is a reliable supplier and that their purchases will not be subject to embargoes except in a national emergency. While many of these concerns were raised in our meeting with Mr. Morris, one that I find most disconcerting is the administration's proposal for full cost recovery waterway user taxes. The imposition of these taxes will be detrimental for a number of reasons: Inflation will be fueled as the price of domestic goods and imports transported by water will be pushed higher; products for exports will be easily diverted to Canadian ports which are free of taxes or fees; exports, especially bulk commodities, will be reduced because higher transportation costs make them less competitive in world markets and will thus adversely affect the U.S. balance of payments. There are but a few problems that would result from the proposed user fees; the broader negative effects are evident.

As chairman of the House Export Task Force, I have targeted coal as one of two resources that demand our immediate attention so that we may pursue an active and aggressive export program. I am keenly interested in coal exports, but hope that in formulating a policy to promote U.S. coal exports, we do not harm other industries, regional economies, or relations with our trading partners.

A number of hearings are taking place or will be scheduled in the near future that have a direct impact on our coal export policy. I urge my distinguished colleagues to take an active role at these hearings and in our coal export policy. It is in our national interest. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information

for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 20, 1981, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 21

- 8:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1674, modifying provisions of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands and providing certain other authorities affecting the territories and possessions of the United States.
3110 Dirksen Building
- 9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the current acquisition process in the Department of Defense.
3302 Dirksen Building
- Select on Intelligence
Closed briefing on intelligence matters.
S-407, Capitol
- 9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 1686, S. 1703, S. 1720, and S. 1721, bills promoting competition among certain financial institutions, expanding their range of services, and protecting the depositors and creditors of such institutions.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Clinton D. McKinnon, of California, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.
357 Russell Building
- Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on certain activities of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
224 Russell Building
- 10:00 a.m.
*Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on the nominations of Susan M. Phillips, of Iowa, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Everett G. Rank, Jr., of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and on other pending calendar business.
324 Russell Building
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 1233, establishing a service industries development program in the Department of Commerce.
235 Russell Building
- Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1692, providing for the operation, maintenance, and construction of deep-draft channels and harbors.
4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
To resume hearings on S. 326, prohibiting a refiner, other than an independent or small refiner, from operating a gas station in the United States, and making it unlawful for a supplier to practice price discrimination in the sale of motor fuel.
2228 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the impact of marihuana on youth, focusing on the areas of health and education.
4232 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education Subcommittee and Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold joint oversight hearings on the implementation of vocational education and youth employment programs.
1224 Dirksen Building

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider Senate Resolution 222, authorizing supplemental expenditures for fiscal year 1981 by the Committee on the Judiciary; Senate Resolution 225, authorizing supplemental expenditures for fiscal year 1981 by the Select Committee on Intelligence for the procurement of consultants; and other legislative and administrative business.
301 Russell Building

Joint Economic
To hold hearings to examine whether the economy is in a recession, and to discuss a preliminary report on the Gross National Product for the third quarter.
2118 Rayburn Building

1:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1554, proposed Ball Reform Act.
6226 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1018, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1986 for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife resources along the coastal barriers of the Atlantic and gulf coasts.
4200 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 22

- 9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 1686, S. 1703, S. 1720, and S. 1721, bills promoting competition among certain financial institutions, expanding their range of services, and protecting the depositors and creditors of such institutions.
5302 Dirksen Building
- Governmental Affairs
*Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Government Processes Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on certain activities of the Office of Surface

Mining Reclamation and Enforcement,
Department of the Interior.
3302 Dirksen Building

*Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcom-
mittee

To resume hearings on proposed revisions to the immigration and naturalization laws of the U.S., focusing on temporary worker programs of the Federal Government.
2228 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on activities relating to affirmative action of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor.
4232 Dirksen Building

Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting.
Room S-407, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Forestry, Water Resources, and Environment Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 705, authorizing the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands.
324 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 115, approving the President's recommended waiver of law for the Alaskan natural gas pipeline pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act (Public Law 94-586).
3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
*Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the early detection of juvenile crime.
5110 Dirksen Building

Joint Economic
Economic Goals and Intergovernmental Policy Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the effects of defense spending on the economy.
2212 Rayburn Building

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation appropriating funds for fiscal year 1982 for foreign assistance programs.
Room S-126, Capitol

Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
5110 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 23

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Energy and Agricultural Taxation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax proposals.
2221 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To continue hearings on S.J. Res. 115, approving the President's recommended waiver of law for the Alaskan natural gas pipeline pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act (Public Law 94-586).
3110 Dirksen Building

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee
To hold hearings to discuss the recent report of the violent crime task force of the Department of Justice.
2228 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Separation of Powers Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1647, restricting the power of Federal courts in matters of court-ordered school busing.
5110 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the proposed Pell Grant Family Contribution Schedule, providing assistance to college students from low income families.
4232 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 26

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings on the use of Defense Production Act authorities to stimulate domestic production of cobalt.
5302 Dirksen Building

*Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1662, establishing a Federal program for the interim storage and permanent disposal of high level nuclear waste from civilian powerplants.
4200 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To resume hearings on S.J. Res. 115, approving the President's recommended waiver of law for the Alaskan natural gas pipeline pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act (Public Law 94-586).
3110 Dirksen Building

*Judiciary
*Juvenile Justice Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1688, proposed Career Criminal Life Sentence Act.
2228 Dirksen Building

1:00 p.m.
Finance
Estate and Gift Taxation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1695, repealing the generation skipping transfer tax, S. 649, amending current estate tax laws to ease the burden of inheritance taxes for the heirs of artists, and reversing the decline in donations of art to nonprofit institutions, S. 851 and S. 852, bills increasing the amount artists may deduct in taxes for their charitable contributions, and S. 1733, providing a procedure for determining the fair market value of certain assets for estate tax purposes, and providing for declaratory judgments relating to installment payment of estate tax.
2221 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 27

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine the acquisition process of the Department of Defense.
3302 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume hearings on S. 1686, S. 1703, S. 1720, and S. 1721, bills promoting competition among certain financial institutions, expanding their range of

services, and protecting the depositors and creditors of such institutions.
5302 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 1483, proposed Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.
4232 Dirksen Building

Small Business
To hold oversight hearings on implementation of the Small Business Administration's direct loan program.
424 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Sonia Landau, of New York, and R. Kenneth Towery, of Texas, each to be a member of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
235 Russell Building

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1516, to expedite exploration and development of geothermal resources.
3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the nominations of Robert A. Jantzen, of Arizona, to be Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, and Carlos C. Campbell, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.
4200 Dirksen Building

Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
2228 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold oversight hearings on merger policy in the private sector.
2228 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 28

9:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To continue hearings on S. 1686, S. 1703, S. 1720, and S. 1721, bills promoting competition among certain financial institutions, expanding their range of services, and protecting the depositors and creditors of such institutions.
5302 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings on alleged corruption in the International Longshoremen's Association's influence and control over the waterfront industry along the east and gulf coasts.
3302 Dirksen Building

*Judiciary
Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee
To hold hearings on granting amnesty to certain illegal aliens.
2228 Dirksen Building

*Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee
Business meeting, to consider S. 1182, improving the administration of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by removing certain inequities, reducing incentives for fraud and abuse, and assuring immediate compensation benefits and compe-

tent medical treatment for injured employees.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To receive a briefing from Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block on the administration's soil conservation policy.

324 Russell Building

**Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, disapproving the Federal Trade Commission Trade Regulation Rule relating to the sale of used motor vehicles.

235 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 864, to require each executive agency to submit an annual report to the President on the adequacy of its internal accounting and administrative control systems.

Room to be announced

OCTOBER 29

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 1686, S. 1703, S. 1720, and S. 1721, bills promoting competition among certain financial institutions, expanding their range of services, and protecting the depositors and creditors of such institutions.

5302 Dirksen Building

**Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade and Tourism Subcommittee**

To hold hearings on S. 1256, to regulate interstate commerce by protecting the rights of consumers, dealers, and end users.

235 Russell Building

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings on alleged corruption in the International Longshoremen's Association's influence and control over the waterfront industry along the east and gulf coasts.

224 Russell Building

Judiciary

Courts Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the future income of individuals claiming bankruptcy.

5110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Immigration and Refugee Policy Subcommittee

To continue hearings on granting amnesty to certain illegal aliens.

2228 Dirksen Building

Special on Aging

To hold hearings on the Federal role in promoting greater opportunities for older workers

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 625, revising the boundary of Voyageurs National Park in the State of Minnesota.

3110 Dirksen Building

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

Governmental Affairs

To resume oversight hearings on the congressional budget process.

3302 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

***Energy Regulation Subcommittee and
Water and Power Subcommittee**

To resume joint oversight hearings on hydroelectric development and related licensing procedures.

3110 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 30

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on S. 1686, S. 1703, S. 1720, and S. 1721, bills promoting competition among certain financial institutions, expanding their range of services, and protecting the depositors and creditors of such institutions.

5302 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 3

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 4

9:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Affairs Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on fiscal disparities within the Federal budget system.

357 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 110, Senate Joint Resolution 17, Senate Joint Resolution 18, and Senate Joint Resolution 19, measures amending the Constitution to establish legislative authority in the Congress and the States with respect to abortion.

2228 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1541, proposed Retirement Income Incentives and Administrative Simplification Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

Small Business

Advocacy and the Future of Small Business Subcommittee

To resume hearings to examine effects of government competition on small business.

424 Russell Building

NOVEMBER 5

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 709, requiring a refund value for certain beverage containers, and prohibiting the sale of metal beverage containers with detachable openings.

235 Russell Building

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1541, proposed Retirement Income Incentives and Administrative Simplification Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery's implementation of the Office of Management and Budget's circular A-76, providing for the contracting out of certain government services.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

***Energy and Natural Resources**

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of title I, establishing wellhead prices for natural gas, of the Natural Gas Policy Act (Public Law 95-621).

3110 Dirksen Building

Judiciary

Juvenile Justice Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the impact of media on juveniles.

6226 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 6

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 110, Senate Joint Resolution 17, Senate Joint Resolution 18, and Senate Joint Resolution 19, measures amending the Constitution to establish legislative authority in the Congress and the States with respect to abortion.

2228 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

***Energy and Natural Resources**

To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of title I, establishing wellhead prices for natural gas, of the Natural Gas Policy Act (Public Law 95-621).

3110 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 9

9:30 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the use of Defense Production Act authorities to stimulate domestic production of titanium.

5302 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 10

8:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on America's role in the world coal export market.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the implementation and effects of the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-448), reducing ICC regulations of the railroad industries and providing opportunities for railroads to improve their financial viability.

1318 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources

To resume hearings on S. 234, to encourage the establishment of home health

care programs and to provide expanded coverage of home health services under the medicare and medicaid programs.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

*Governmental Affairs

Energy, Nuclear Proliferation, and Government Processes Subcommittee

To holding hearings on S. 1226, establishing the National Nuclear Property Insurance Corporation, and providing supplemental insurance coverage for certain cleanup costs following damage to nuclear powerplants.

Room to be announced

NOVEMBER 11

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1541, proposed Retirement Income Incentives and Administrative Simplification Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 12

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 110, Senate Joint Resolution 17, Senate Joint Resolution 18, and Senate Joint Resolution 19, measures amending the Constitution to establish legislative authority in the Congress and the States with respect to abortion.

2228 Dirksen Building

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 1541, proposed Retirement Income Incentives and Administrative Simplification Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 101 and S. 751, bills to eliminate or establish an alternative to the exclusionary rule in Federal criminal proceedings.

5110 Dirksen Building

2:00 p.m.

Judiciary
Criminal Law Subcommittee

To continue hearings on S. 101 and S. 751, bills to eliminate or establish an alternative to the exclusionary rule in Federal criminal proceedings.

5110 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 13

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

*Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on America's role in the world coal export market.

3110 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 16

1:30 p.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 110, Senate Joint Resolution 17, Senate Joint Resolution 18, and Senate Joint Resolution 19, measures amending the Constitution to establish legislative authority in the Congress and the States with respect to abortion.

2228 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 17

9:30 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1541, proposed Retirement Income Incentives and Administrative Simplification Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

4200 Dirksen Building

NOVEMBER 18

9:30 a.m.

*Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the effects of the use of Agent Orange.

412 Russell Building

10:00 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

3110 Dirksen Building

JANUARY 13, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To hold hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

JANUARY 14, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To continue hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

JANUARY 20, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

JANUARY 28, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 4, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 11, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 18, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

FEBRUARY 25, 1982

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings to discuss the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and on proposed legislation to extend for an additional 10 years the automatic application of the preclearance provision, and to extend certain other provisions for an additional 7 years.

2228 Dirksen Building

CANCELLATIONS

OCTOBER 22

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1554, S. 1253, S. 482, and S. 440, bills to amend the Federal Criminal Code with respect to the circumstances under which a person charged with or convicted of a

24424

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

October 19, 1981

crime may be released on bail or personal recognizance.

Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To resume oversight hearings on the congressional budget process.

3302 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 26

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Courts Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 653, proposed Habeas Corpus Procedures Amendments Act.

2228 Dirksen Building

OCTOBER 30

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Copyright Act of 1976, focusing on section 101 relative to cable TV policy.

2228 Dirksen Building