

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 126—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1980 TO JANUARY 30, 1980

(PAGES 3 TO 1378)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 14, 1980

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we open our hearts to You in prayer and petition, seeking Your favor and grace. Grant that Your word may so enlighten us that we may not walk in darkness, but that we may go through difficult days with the knowledge that You are with us, Your rod and staff do comfort us.

Specially we pray for all in need, those who are hungry, alone, or uncertain about the future. Give all Your people the strength to believe in Your abiding power and the promise of life eternal. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 232, 96th Congress, the approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings will be postponed until January 22, 1980.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my 10th term I will say a fond farewell to the House of Representatives.

The citizens of my district have afforded me the highest possible honor in allowing me to serve them for 20 years, and for that privilege, I offer them my undying gratitude.

When I end that service at the close of my present term, I shall do so with a feeling of deep appreciation for the tremendous and unflinching support I have received and with a sense of immeasurable personal fulfillment.

No district could have given to any man so many opportunities, responsibilities, and such continuous support.

I have enjoyed the challenges offered by public service, and I shall miss this great deliberative body.

I shall not seek reelection in 1980.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, if Martin Luther King, Jr., had not been murdered in 1968, if he were still alive, he would celebrate his 51st birthday tomorrow.

That seems surprisingly young, considering the passage of almost 12 years since his death.

He was young, in fact, at the time he was killed, only 39.

He was deprived of the great and good years of what we call "middle age," and that loss is no less sad in light of his willingness, often expressed, to risk death in the fight for justice and freedom.

It is equally sad that the Nation and the world have been deprived all these years of the presence, the voice, and the wisdom of Martin Luther King, Jr.

I know that I still miss his voice of inspired leadership, as deeply now as during the first months after his death.

But I also believe that the immense contributions of Martin Luther King, Jr., to the Nation and to humanity all live on.

The faith I expressed almost 5 years ago at a meeting of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference endures for me. I said then and fully believe now:

They shot down the man—and they snuffed out his life—and the man died. But they could not shoot down his dream. For his dream was stronger than life and more powerful than death—and the dream lives on.

The man, Dr. Martin Luther King, was the embodiment of an idea that armies cannot penetrate nor defeat, and which at this very moment is as alive as our memory of Dr. King and as powerful as the message he spoke and the cause he led.

His message was vibrantly and eloquently articulated many times, perhaps most powerfully when he stood at the Lincoln Memorial on August 28, 1963, and ended his description of his dream this way:

Let freedom ring, for when we allow freedom to ring from every city and every hamlet, from every state and every city we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black and white, Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Catholic, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, "free at last, free at last; great God almighty, we are free at last."

That was the essence of his dream. It lives now in this land. And it will continue to live—if we devote our unwavering respect to the man who had the faithful vision to describe it.

Tomorrow, January 15, is the anni-

versary of the birth of Martin Luther King, Jr. Many of us, as individual citizens, will renew our commitment to the fulfillment of his dream by reflecting on his magnificent life and work.

On Friday, January 18 the Black Heritage Parade Committee of Newark will celebrate the memory of Dr. King at its first annual Scholarship Award Dinner. The members of the committee, through their support of the Black Heritage Scholarship Fund, are helping to keep alive the dream of Martin Luther King, Jr. He told the youth of America that the message they should look to is not "burn baby burn," but "learn baby learn."

I am proud of the efforts of the committee's members toward the achievement of Dr. King's dream. It is fitting that this event for the scholarship fund is taking place in the week of the anniversary of Dr. King's birthday.

I hope that after action by the Congress, all of us as a nation will be able to honor him by observing Martin Luther King, Jr. Day—a national holiday.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HORTON) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 60 minutes, on January 22, 1980.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KILDEE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RODINO, for 10 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 232, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 17, 1980, at 12 o'clock noon.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 6071: Mr. BEILENSEN.

H.R. 6072: Mr. BEILENSEN.

H.R. 6109: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. COUGHLIN.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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

In spite of this oppressive yoke, Ukrainians have never accepted this foreign domination and are continuing their struggle for Human Rights, Freedom and National Independence. A new breed of adamant fighters for Human and National Rights gives us hope that Ukraine will be free again.

We would like to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to the President of the United States, to the U.S. government and to all the members of the Senate and Congress for their untiring efforts in bringing many freedom fighters and dissidents, from Soviet prisons, to our great country and giving them assylum here. God bless you all!

The Ukrainian people, in the free world, are celebrating the memorable January 22nd as their greatest holiday. For many years, the 22nd of January has been proclaimed, Ukrainian Independence Day, in American cities and states from coast to coast.

Therefore, it is in the common spirit of liberty, faith and justice that the American people, and especially the U.S. Congress, join Ukrainians all over the world in giving moral support to the Ukrainian people in their struggle for Human Rights, Freedom and National Independence.

We appreciate, very much, your support and concern for the welfare of the Ukrainian people.

Sincerely,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President.●

**DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S
BIRTHDAY: A DAY FOR NATIONAL OBSERVANCE**

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1980

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1980, concerned citizens from all over Orange County joined together at the New St. Paul Baptist Church in Santa Ana, California to celebrate the 51st birthday of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Unfortunately, I was unable to attend this event due to official business here in Washington, D.C. However, I joined my fellow citizens in Orange County and all around the country in a moment of prayer honoring this great American, whose dream has given millions hope, guidance and inspiration for nearly two decades.

Seven years ago, another great American, who had fought so hard for the cause of civil rights, wrote a letter to Mrs. Coretta Scott King expressing his feelings on the occasion of her husband's birthday. Hubert Humphrey wrote:

Let us not soon forget the lessons that he taught. Let us use this event to celebrate his having been with us. However, more importantly, let us thank him for bringing us together as individuals that we might redouble our efforts to bring about human freedom and dignity.

It was about a year ago, Mr. Speaker, that I announced my cosponsorship of a bill to designate Dr. King's birthday a national holiday. It is a great personal disappointment that Congress did not complete consideration of this legislation in time for the anni-

versary of Dr. King's birthday this year. As we open the 2d session of the 96th Congress, I again pledge my support for this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me so that next year we may celebrate Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday as a national holiday.●

**IMPORTANT HEMISPHERIC
MEETING ON GASOHOL**

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1980

● Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last November 25 through 29 the city of New Orleans was host to the First Inter-American Conference on Renewable Sources of Energy. This meeting was the first of its kind in the Western Hemisphere. The purpose of the conference was to bring together the latest technologies, the relevant economic thinkers, and government leaders to work on the development of plans to encourage production of alcohol fuels from the biomass.

The meeting was a spectacular success and attracted over 500 participants from 51 countries and 40 States of the United States. Several Members of this House addressed the delegates. The meeting was sponsored by Gov. Edwin Edwards and the State of Louisiana and the chairman of the conference was Louisiana State Representative de Lesseps S. Morrison. The focus of the conferees was on the reality of alcohol fuels, the incentives that government should provide for private enterprise, the economic benefits of various crop sources and their byproducts, the creation of an efficient marketing system and the necessity for rapid implementation.

One of the results of the conference was the formation of a committee of legislators from nine States. The purpose of the group is to facilitate a continuing dialog and positive action on renewable energy, particularly the fermentation of ethanol for use in the production of gasohol. The legislators recognize that action by State legislatures is necessary to encourage development of alcohol as an alternative fuel to lessen our dependence on the OPEC countries. The members of the committee of legislators include:

State Delegate Ward Teel, Christiansburg, Virginia.

State Representative Bruce W. Anderson, Slayton, Minn.

State Senator Jack M. Bangerter, Bountiful, Utah.

State Senator Max E. Coffey, Charleston, Illinois.

State Representative Dave M. Holbrook, Belgoni, Miss.

State Representative William Harris, Marion, Illinois.

State Senator Robert Mitschler, Oswego, Illinois.

State Representative Manuel A. Fernandez, Chalmette, La.

State Representative Don Lash, Rockville, Indiana.

State Representative Clyde W. Kinball, New Roads, La.

State Representative De Lesseps S. Morrison, New Orleans, La.

State Representative Ted Meyer, Chicago, Illinois.

State Senator Adeline J. Geo-Karis, Zion, Illinois.

State Representative Ralph Miller, Norco, Louisiana.

State Senator Loran Schmit, Bellwood, Nebraska.

State Representative Deal Shelor, Mineola, Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, because this conference was of great interest to the American agricultural movement, to the Nation's consumers, and to the many countries of the Western Hemisphere that are dependent on imported petroleum, I would like to include with my remarks an article describing the conference which appeared in the January 1980, issue of Gasohol U.S.A.

[From Gasohol U.S.A., January 1980

INTERAMERICAN ALCOHOL FUELS CONFERENCE

When an impressive roster of international gasohol experts met at the Interamerican Alcohol Fuels Conference in New Orleans last month, the issue of alcohol exports came to the fore. Whether or not the Senate-passed restrictions on alcohol imports actually make it past a House-Senate Conference Committee, many Latin nations don't believe they will have large quantities of alcohol to export. A recent Brazilian decision to sell 500 million litres of 190 proof alcohol overseas in order to improve Brazil's balance of payments picture met with a great deal of criticism. Representatives at the conference—including Costa Ricans, Nicaraguans, and Argentines—told *Gasohol U.S.A.* that it would be many years before large scale exports of alcohol could take place. The consensus seemed to be that the substitute fuel was needed in their own countries.

Re-affirming that view, several beverage alcohol traders noted that the world market for 190 proof alcohol had firmed up considerably since May 1979, when Brazil dumped a large quantity of alcohol on the Asian market at 28 cents per litre (98 cents a gallon). Prices now range from 40 cents to 45 cents per litre (\$1.52 to \$1.71) and are rising, while costs for production in developing nations are still hovering around the 90 cents per gallon range. Excess capacity is being bought up rapidly, they said, as a hedge against a world oil shortfall.

From the outset, speeches by U.S. spokesmen were dominated by a prairie populism, exhortations to self reliance and thinly veiled threats against OPEC that appealed only peripherally to Latin American delegates. References to a "hemispheric coalition," made by Representative Floyd Fithian and others did not, according to some Latin Americans, come close to recognizing the central question.

Keynote speaker Elliot Janeway called alcohol fuels "the simple, clean, ready at hand answer to the problem we have created for ourselves by taking the horses (octane—a reference to lead) out of the gasoline. If we put the alcohol back into the refinery, we put the horses back into the gasoline, we won't have to worry about fighting a war the enemy's way. . . instead of using less and paying more, we'll use more and pay less . . ." he said.

Janeway also touched on the classic mid-western slogan by pointing out a victory for democracy's side will see a vindication of the slogan *A Bushel for a Barrel*, Janeway also said that the U.S. should build a bat-

assistance to Cambodia, specifically to the more than 40,000 Cambodians who faced imminent death in western Cambodia after being pushed back across the border by the Thai military.

Neither side accepted the offer. The political contest, Sweden discovered, was very real. Even though Stockholm was the only western country to continue major aid to Vietnam it, too, would have had to grant something like recognition to Heng Samrin before aid was accepted.

Soon other countries and agencies would stumble over the recognition hurdle. Only the International Red Cross and UNICEF could give aid to both sides of the civil war without breaking their charters or governmental statutes. The U.N. and most other countries continue to recognize Pol Pot as the leader of Cambodia because they oppose foreign invasion and occupation. The Vietnamese argued then, as they do now, that Pol Pot was the Hitler of Southeast Asia—a man President Carter described as the worst violator of human rights—and does not deserve international support.

In August and September, after a summer of fits and starts, the Red Cross and UNICEF prematurely announced agreements to set up a \$110 million aid program designed to send in at least 600 tons of rice daily. In early October, however, Phnom Penh denied that it had accepted this arrangement and made pointed criticism of the "illegal entry" of UNICEF and Red Cross teams to Pol Pot's sanctuaries. It was a final attempt to steer all aid through Phnom Penh and it failed.

This followed a series of other defeats for Heng Samrin: At the Havana conference of nonaligned nations, neither delegation from Cambodia was seated; at the U.N., Pol Pot kept his seat. After these failures in the international arena, Hanoi turned back to the battlefield. The Vietnamese have begun a dry season offensive to wipe out Pol Pot and make the recognition question moot. Suddenly, Pol Pot became the number one problem facing Cambodia, not food.

HANOI'S TURNAROUND

Just as the United States began championing aid for famine victims, Hanoi changed its policy. Washington decried Hanoi for blocking western aid. Hanoi countered that Washington's newest friend, China, was arming the troops of the genocidal leader Pol Pot. Heng Samrin officials and Hanoi now said that Cambodia only faced a "food shortage" that could be solved with one good harvest.

"This so-called famine is a trap, a Chinese plot," said Cu Dinh Ba, counselor for the Vietnamese mission at the U.N. "The only problem facing Kampuchea is a return of Pol Pot . . . the West is playing up [the famine] to supply food and ammunition to the Pol Pot forces."

During an interview, Ba and Vietnamese Ambassador Ha Van Lau said aid could only be given to Phnom Penh, that the situation was not so severe to warrant aid to Pol Pot as well. War had become the paramount issue, war and the politics of control of Indochina. For if the resistance troops are not destroyed during this dry season, the Vietnamese could face continued guerrilla war that would drain their already burdened economy.

Apparently, the Chinese military aid to Pol Pot has been sufficient to allow his troops to continue damaging the Vietnamese forces. There are more guns in Cambodia now, visitors have said, than food. And because of the close friendship between the United States and China—and American support of Pol Pot at the U.N.—Hanoi is

convinced that American policy is aimed directly at defeating Vietnam.

Washington is equally convinced Vietnam would allow the people of Cambodia to die if it were necessary for Hanoi's control of Indochina.

Recently the Soviet Union claimed it contributed \$85 million in aid for civilians in Cambodia. Vietnam said it had given another \$50 million in food relief. Undoubtedly, both nations have helped, but if their aid had been of such magnitude the eye-witness accounts of famine in Cambodia are wrong. When asked about such inconsistencies, Ba, the Vietnamese official, said the western reports of famine and holocaust were done by "Chinese agents."

Throughout this political contest of wills over the existence of a famine and how to feed the people, tens of thousands of Cambodians have died and thousands more have been permanently damaged by illnesses. Earlier, during Pol Pot's reign, at least one million died or were executed. Before that, during the civil war, at least half a million people were killed.

It is a record of war that has reduced a bountiful agricultural country to one whose existence is in question. Now, with the faces of starvation peering out of newspapers and television screens, U.S. officials are searching for culprits. But few countries and few American politicians can easily exculpate themselves. The regimes of Heng Samrin and Pol Pot, and their allies, Vietnam, the Soviet Union and China, can be directly blamed for fighting over the country with scant regard for the lives of the civilians.

But the continuing antagonism between Hanoi and Washington is also crucial. Since the Sixties, Cambodia has borne the brunt of the rivalry between these two nations. If the two powers ever sat down and began to resolve their differences, there might be reason to believe a political solution for this strategically placed country could be found. Continued obstinacy can only spell more tragedy. ●

GEORGE MEANY

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1980

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, the death of a great American, George Meany, saddens all the friends and supporters of working men and women in this country whose lives and futures were changed for the better by George Meany during his leadership of the AFL-CIO. He has left behind a list of achievements that is remarkable. Minimum wages, equal rights, improved health and safety standards in the work place, guarantees of pension benefits, and recognition of the bargaining rights of millions of American workers.

His credo was "In unity there is strength," and he did as much as any American in history to unify working people. George Meany carried on the great crusade of the American labor movement that had initiated free public education, an end to child labor, the eight-hour day, protection against garnishment, apprenticeship laws, creation of a national bureau of labor statistics, workers' compensation, and free collective bargaining.

Historians can trace the history of social and economic progress in America to the efforts of men like George Meany who fought for social security and unemployment insurance, civil rights, and health care for the elderly.

George Meany gave the American worker influence in the policies of this Nation. No President could ignore him; he was a formidable, frank, and fair spokesman for the millions of citizens who earned a living at their labors.

He opposed Communists, Fascists, dictators, or bosses who had no regard for the rights of workers. George Meany recognized that the labors of workers did not belong to the state, and he fought against those efforts to shackle the freedom of labor unions to represent their members.

While George Meany put the interests of the American worker first, he also recognized the importance of the international labor movement and of the very difficult obstacles that unorganized workers in most of the world faced. He founded the American Institute for Free Labor Development, and in its 18 years of existence it trained more than 350,000 labor leaders and union members in Latin America and the Caribbean countries. This program has sown the seeds of freedom for the labor movement in many countries, and is an enduring bond between the United States and many Latin countries.

In his farewell remarks to the 13th biennial convention of the AFL-CIO, George Meany summed up a lifetime in which he helped to construct the house of labor on a solid foundation. He said:

This federation is the house of labor. It is well-built, ready to stand, and to shelter workers long beyond the lifetime of everyone in this hall. And there are plenty of rooms in the house of labor to accommodate all organizations of workers. Today, the American trade union movement is vital, dynamic, growing. It is strong and unified.

George Meany made it that way. He was the master builder of the American labor movement. ●

IT WILL LIVE ON

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1980

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, the birthday of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was celebrated throughout the Nation. The Reverend King, as the foremost leader of the civil rights movement in our Nation's history, is remembered by people of all racial and social backgrounds as a man who strove to insure freedom and dignity for all human beings.

Dr. King came to the public eye in December of 1955 with his leadership of the Montgomery bus boycott. On December 1 of that year, a black woman named Rosa Parks, a seam-

stress tired after a hard day's work, refused to give up her seat on a bus to a white person as the law required. Her subsequent arrest sparked a citywide boycott of the bus system by the city's blacks. As a politically active pastor at a Montgomery church, Dr. King became the leader of the struggle.

The boycott lasted 382 days; Dr. King's problem as a tactician was, in his own words, to "be militant enough to keep people aroused to positive action and yet moderate enough to keep this fervor within controllable and Christian bounds." When he was arrested for the first time on January 26, 1956, on the charge of driving 30 miles an hour in a 25-mile zone and 4 days later when his home was bombed, this strategy was brought into question. The people were ready for violence.

Nevertheless, the boycott was won without resorting to physical violence. The integrity of the movement did not falter, nor did it ever falter with Dr. King at the helm. He proved in this first contest an unwavering commitment to the principle of nonviolent social change. In the formulation of his personal philosophy, Reverend King's strongest influence, besides Jesus of Nazareth, proved to be Mohandas Gandhi, whose passive resistance movement has helped to free India from British domination. "From my Christian background I gained my ideals," King once said, "and from Gandhi my operational technique."

Dr. King was indeed a great leader, but his greatness as a human being will insure his place in history. He lived life with the moral imperative to improve the lives of all human beings, refusing at all times to confuse the ends and means of his struggle. His love was not confined to any one group of people or specific interest. The nobleness of his spirit was evidenced by a refusal to give into the temptations of violence and politics in achieving his goals. Reverend King would not trade the life of one man for another. In 1964 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. In his acceptance speech he crystallized this philosophy:

Nonviolence is the answer to the crucial political and moral questions of our times—the need for man to overcome oppression and violation without resorting to violence and oppression.

Dr. King may be best remembered for the 1963 march on Washington, the largest civil rights demonstration in the history of the United States. About 250,000 people, 60,000 of them white, gathered on behalf of the civil rights bill then pending Congress. No one there that day, and indeed few Americans alive today, will forget the scene at the Lincoln Memorial when Reverend King said, "I have a dream."

As a founder and president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Reverend King left us with an important forum in which to continue the struggle and realize his dream. More importantly though, he left us

with an inspiration and a perennial call for love and understanding that transcends the current struggle. Even when the promise of the civil rights movement is fulfilled, and I am sure that day will come in the not-too-distant future, the spirit and greatness of Dr. King will live on. From his pulpit at the Ebenezer Baptist Church, to the steps of the Lincoln Memorial and finally to that hotel balcony in Memphis, Reverend King preached and lived his message of human dignity. It will live on.●

COMMUNIST ANTI-SEMITE RUNS FOR PRESIDENT AS A DEMOCRAT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1980

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, you have to grant Communist groups like the U.S. Labor Party expertise in one thing: They know how to throw as many curves as a sidewinder. Having failed to sucker Conservatives and members of the Republican Party into joining a so-called Whig coalition against the establishment, U.S. Labor Party head Lyndon LaRouche thinks the members of the Democratic Party might prove more gullible. So now he is running for President on the Democratic Party ticket.

Like other messianic revolutionary would-be leaders, LaRouche has delusions that he is, in his words, "the American Lenin" who had "corrected" various "errors" of Karl Marx. When his comrades in the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party (SWP) rejected his self-revelation as the new Lenin and expelled him, LaRouche for a time played with a second Trotskyite splinter group, the Workers League, before deciding to organize his own faction in Students for a Democratic Society, the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC).

After failing to destroy rival Communist factions via the use of thuggery and violence during 1972 and 1973, LaRouche decided to form a united front with conservatives and Republicans. When that did not work, LaRouche and the U.S. Labor Party alined themselves with Colonel Qaddafi, the chief patron of the most extreme elements of the Palestine Liberation Organization. From there it was only a short time before the USLP's alliances with various U.S. anti-Semitic groups who also report on Qaddafi and the PLO with warm approval became a matter of public record.

The following very excellent brief item about LaRouche and his bizarre political cult written by William P. Hoar appeared in the January 16, 1980, issue of the Review of the News:

Question. What is the truth about Lyndon H. LaRouche?

Answer. Until November of 1979, Mr. LaRouche was head of the U.S. Labor Party, the

electoral arm of the National Caucus of Labor Committees, itself an offshoot of the Marxist Students for a Democratic Society turned into—among other things—an authoritarian anti-Jewish cult. LaRouche is a "former" Trotskyite who once termed himself "the American Lenin."

Nevertheless, on December 18th, the Federal Election Commission made Lyndon LaRouche an authorized recipient of federal matching funds as a Presidential candidate. You see, Mr. LaRouche applied for the funds as a Democrat (having not made it under the Labor banner in 1976), and qualified by raising \$100,000 with \$5,000 coming from at least 20 states in contributions of \$250 or less. (A task which could be accomplished with only 20 supporters in 20 states.) The F.E.C. informs us that Lyndon LaRouche is among the first four candidates granted matching funds, the others being Howard Baker, Jimmy Carter, and George Bush. Thus far, the taxpayers are funding this "former" Communist to the tune of \$100,000. To continue to receive matching funds, however, he must get at least 10 percent of the vote in successive primaries.●

A COLD YEAR, ECONOMICALLY

HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 23, 1980

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the best year-end wrapups on the economy appeared in the Chicago Tribune written by Bill Neikirk.

It is not pleasant reading, but it is a rational analysis of where we are.

I recommend it to my colleagues:

A COLD YEAR, ECONOMICALLY

(By Bill Neikirk)

WASHINGTON.—President Carter began 1979 with a burst of optimism about the nation's economy.

"First," he wrote in his annual economic report last January, "the rate of inflation should slow this year to about 7½ per cent over the year as a whole, and to somewhat below 7 per cent by the end of the year. Second, moderation of inflation will help us to avoid a recession and improve the prospects for sustained economic growth in 1980 and beyond."

Now, as 1979 fades, the cold economic numbers of the year brand the President either as a terrible seer, a Pollyanna, or an ineffective leader. Inflation this year was 13 per cent, not 7½. A recession is on the horizon, if not already here. The prospects for sustained economic growth for 1980 and beyond are dim, indeed.

It doesn't take much analytical ability to conclude that obviously something went wrong. Neither does it take much analytical ability to decide what went wrong. What's not so obvious is who is to blame for this inflationary boom, and whether anything could have been done to prevent its untimely visitation upon the American economy.

The Carter administration is carefully attempting to nurture the notion that events beyond its control were responsible for this year's fall into the economic sinkhole. As the weeks produced one bad economic report after another, the administration showed more resourcefulness in identifying villains than it did in developing the following policies to take some of the sting out of the price increases.

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

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

A SATIRE ON OVERREGULATIONS

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

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

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY MR. THRODAHL

This is the story of the U.S. pencil industry. Remember, we are looking back from our vantage point of 1990. It's strange to think that, back in 1979, just anyone could use a pencil any way they wanted to.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REMEMBERING DR. KING

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRESIDENT FORD CRITICIZES ADMINISTRATION ATTEMPTS TO "REWRITE HISTORY"

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

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

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

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

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

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

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GERALD R. FORD

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

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

SOVIET A-PLANT ASSEMBLY LINE MOVING

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

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

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

SOVIET A-PLANT ASSEMBLY LINE MOVING

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

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

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

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

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

ATOMIC MACHINERY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRANSPORTING MODULES

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

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

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

HE HAD A DREAM

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

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

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

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

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

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

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

REGULATIONS AND STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. DOUGLAS APPLIGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 28, 1980

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

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